

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS**

CURTIS J NEELEY JR, MFA

VS

CASE NO. 5:09-cv-05151-JLH

NameMedia Inc.

Network Solutions Inc.

Google Inc.

**SUPPLEMENTAL EXPLANATION OF THE  
MOTION FOR A MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT**

The reply to the facts Docket #77 contained several misquotes or presentations of improper understandings of an email communication being treated as contracts or proposals. Plaintiff is uncertain that these were honest misunderstandings or if these were attempts to treat a casual email dialog as contractual or for misleading the Court. Pursuant to Federal Rules of CP [12](e), Plaintiff asks the Judge to direct the Defendant to make a more definite statement specifically of the statements outlined in the supporting statement filed herewith as directed by Local Rule 7.2 **[or treat this as a communication with the Court that is served on attorneys for each party pursuant to Local Rule 7.3(a).]** This is further explained for the copyright and Local Rule challenged Counsel in attached Supplemental Brief, which will show why the motion does not violate Federal Rules of CP 11(b) and is at worst a pro se litigant's misreading of Federal Rules of CP 11(d) regarding Matters Presented Outside the Pleadings and a harmless error pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 61.

Respectfully submitted,

Curtis J Neeley Jr, MFA