

Does the following text seem familiar to the Commission? The text should be familiar because the FCC by WIRE COMMUNICATIONS transmitted them to me from the following URL. Words were transmitted from some apparatus somewhere across a wire and into the apparatus I used to display them. Perhaps the FCC should examine the Communications Act of 1934 p8 ¶ (51) or USC 47 § 153 ¶(52). <www.tmcnet.com/usubmit/2010/08/21/4968373.htm> This URL causes them to be re-broadcast via unregulated WIRE COMMUNICATIONS.

Statement of FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

“... blah blah blah...Fast forward and along came the Internet. And, one more time, industry found a compliant Commission to do its work. “Here’s the idea,” they told their Commission allies. “We don’t want the next generation of telecommunications to be saddled with all those protections that consumers and advocates had fought so hard for with plain old telephones”—I’m talking about things like ensuring reasonable and comparable services and rates across the country no matter where you live, **protecting privacy, supporting public safety**—“so,” they went on, “why not take access to broadband out of that part of the law that protects consumers and put it in a really **vague part of the statute** where nothing is really guaranteed, where every protection for consumers would have to be built from the ground up, and where whenever any future Commission tries to do something positive, we can **drag them into court and have a much better chance of keeping it from happening?**” “Done deal,” two previous FCCs replied. “We’ll call access to the Internet an ‘information service’ instead of telecommunications.” And, presto, the deed was done. They moved it out from where it was and that meant that the **safeguards** that accompanied plain old telephone service would **have no guaranteed place in the digital world**. Can you believe it? Well, it happened—although, I should point out, only over my strong objections and those of my friend and then-colleague, Jonathan Adelstein. By the way, **no other country in the world that I can find ever played a semantic game like this wherein they stopped calling “telecommunications” telecommunications, gave it a new name, and used that as the excuse to undercut how an industry meets its responsibilities to the public.** blah blah blah ...”

After a bit of thought about Mr Copps insight lets rewind nearly twenty years. Curtis J Neeley Jr was too preoccupied with graduation in 1986 when Teri Weigel was a Playboy Centerfold in April. She was very cute as are most Centerfolds. Skip a bout half a decade forward to 1991 and Ms Weigel performed in her first explicit adult film. No other Playboy Centerfold had ever needed to sell her body the way she did. Ms Weigel began using her body and selling images of herself being used by wire otherwise called the Internet and was sued by Playboy in 2000 for using their logo on her website.

I am not familiar with the results of that lawsuit but can visit Ms Weigel's WIRE COMMUNICATIONS broadcast URL of <teriweigel.com> in 2010 and see a bunny graphic and the curser becomes a bunny graphic. Evidence therefore leads me to believe Playboy lost. From the index page Ms Weigel does not broadcast pornography but does advise the minors who visit that clicking the entry requires that you be 18. Clicking the enter link takes the visitor to <veryteri.com/teriweigel.html>. we see Ms Weigel sitting naked displaying her breasts that are no longer the 34B they were in 1986 when in Playboy on this WIRE BROADCAST URL.

A lot has changed in the twenty-four years. Google Inc went from nothing to the world's largest porn distributor by WIRE COMMUNICATIONS. Google Inc says they have as a mission organizing all the Earths information. This sounds like a laudable goal for Earth's biggest trafficker of pornography? Visiting Google Inc video search engine and turning of safe search results in visitors being shown Ms Weigel's face with her lips wrapped around a large penis that belongs to presumably Peter North at the following WIRE BROADCAST URL <video xnxx.com/video51873/teri_weigel_and_peter_north_fuck> unless you are in China where Google has agreed not to traffic in pornography. It appears that the Earth's most successful porn trafficker believes the potential for real business besides pornography trafficking has potential. The video you see above shows explicit sex and Ms Weigel's breasts are closer to 34B at this time. Google Inc is not alone is peddling Ms Weigel's pornography.

Microsoft Corporation sends viewers to the following movie. <spankwire.com/Terri-weigel-vs-Lex-Steele/video217125>. Here we see Ms Weigel engaged in explicit sexual acts with a black man named Lex Steele with an exceptionally large penis.

This video is also trafficked by Yahoo Inc. Due to the amazing FCC non-regulation; Soldiers in Afghanistan can enjoy these exempt WIRE COMMUNICATION broadcasts of pornography. IAC/InterActiveCorp is another leader in porn broadcasts but is not yet as adept at pushing pornography.

Mr Neeley has typed slowly and hopes this makes it easier to get up to speed on what is being slowly described. Curtis J Neeley Jr has sued Google for trafficking in nude photos done by Mr Neeley to his children and their friends although advised it was offensive. Curtis J Neely Jr also feels the FCC is a group of men and women hoping to protect their ability to masturbate using unregulated WIRE COMMUNICATIONS. Mr Copps appears to agree that it was a political decision and has always been absurd. He attempted to reclassify the Internet into telecommunications?

During the great depression when telegraph wires sent dots and dashes that represented words, it was not a great stretch to believe that anything that could be represented by transmissions by wire would eventually include sounds and images. The Internet existed long before man had visited the moon.

The Internet today is nothing but a highly developed telegraph wire that is NOT being regulated as required by laws already written. No new laws need to be passed and nothing needs to be altered. Mr Neeley wonders if a severe traumatic brain injury helped him to see the nonfeasance of the Federal Communications Commission?

There is no need for the federal Communications Commission to respond to the filed and docketed *Petition for a Writ of Mandamus now before the Supreme Court*. (10-6240) Mr Neeley asks for no damages from the Federal Communications Commission. It is beyond the ability of even the entire United States to pay for the damages already done on Earth by the United States' international trafficking in pornography by WIRE COMMUNICATIONS. Curtis J Neeley Jr would not drop this litigation for an offer of all of Earth's money. Mr Neeley only wants the United States to begin enforcing the Communications Act of 1934 and be as embarrassed about this error as the country should be for driving out the indigenous people of America and dropping WMDs on two cities in Japan.

The Federal Communications Commission can consider this an *ex parte* communication and ignore it just as the FCC has WIRE COMMUNICATIONS since they began broadcasting pornography to the entire Earth.

Samuel Alito may never see the Petition and docketing is usually just a few weeks or months before denial. Curtis J Neeley Jr has obeyed the Great Counselor's bidding and accepts that there is nothing further for him to do until next year presenting (5:09-cv-05151) as amended to a JURY. Yes, to a J-U-R-Y!

Curtis J Neeley Jr will not stop fighting this battle until the Federal Communications Commissions begins enforcing the laws already written and Mr Neeley is not known to give up once beginning. The FCC is welcome to file a "friend of the Court" brief or wait till forced by an oversight committee or other. This *ex parte* communication is published via unregulated WIRE COMMUNICATIONS at <CurtisNeeley.com/5-09-cv-05151/Docket/index.htm>.

Humbly submitted,

s/ Curtis J Neeley Jr.

Curtis J Neeley Jr., MFA

WAIVER

Supreme Court of the United States

No. 10-6240

Curtis J. Neeley, Jr.
(Petitioner)

v.

(Respondent)

I DO NOT INTEND TO FILE A RESPONSE to the petition for an extraordinary writ of mandamus unless one is requested by the Court.

There are multiple respondents, and I do not represent all respondents. Please enter my appearance as Counsel of Record for the following respondent(s):

I certify that I am a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States (Please explain name change since bar admission):

Signature _____

Date: _____

(Type or print) Name _____

Mr.

Ms.

Mrs.

Miss

Firm _____

Address _____

City & State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____

SEND A COPY OF THIS FORM TO PETITIONER'S COUNSEL OR TO PETITIONER IF PRO SE. PLEASE INDICATE BELOW THE NAME(S) OF THE RECIPIENT(S) OF A COPY OF THIS FORM. NO ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE IS REQUIRED.

Solicitor General of the United States
Room 5614, Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N. W.
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary
445 12th Street, SW,
Washington DC. 20554

Cc:

John M. Scott
Conner & Winters, LLP
211 E. Dickson Street
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Joshua Reed Thane
Haltom & Doan
6500 Summerhill Road Suite 100
Texarkana, TX 75503

Brooks Christopher White
Allen Law Firm, P.C.
9th Floor; 212 Center Street
Little Rock, AR 72201

Obtain status of case on the docket. By phone at 202-479-3034 or via the internet at <http://www.supremecourtus.gov>. Have the Supreme Court docket number available.