

**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.

Request for Leave to Withdraw Motion Seeking Sanctions

Plaintiff requests leave to withdraw Motion (*See* Docket #26) because Plaintiff had not yet fully studied the Manual for Pro Se Litigants and the Motion was already shown to be contrary to Fed R of C. P. by Defendant Response to Motion. (Docket # 30) Plaintiff anticipates many issues beginning to resolve with respect to the Defendant NAMEMEDIA INC request for Summary Judgment soon when Supplemental Reply Brief Objecting of Plaintiff is filed.

Plaintiff attempted to apply logic and did not notice certain rules to follow in the application of logical facts while harassing with lies filed. Lies may apparently be filed with the intention of harassing for 21 days. Plaintiff requests the Court excuse parts of Rule 11 that were not followed in Plaintiff Motion for Sanctions that was called ironic accurately by the Defendant. The Plaintiff feels it an ironic example of misapplied logic still being demonstrated to further support the affidavits of Rachel Neeley and Dianna Hausam supporting the mental disability due to a physical brain injury of the Plaintiff that tolls the outrage Statute Limitations Claim additionally.

Plaintiff still suffers from a severe traumatic brain injury and the accidental violation of Rules of C.P. 11 while seeking sanctions by the rule being violated is insane. It is insane and ironic that the Plaintiff has accidentally demonstrated a judgment lapse that might be called idiotic or insane. Only an idiot would violate the very rule being applied. Plaintiff realizes now that harassing lies may remain undisturbed for 21 days. The safe-haven for harassing communications seems illogical to the Plaintiff and Plaintiff will reserve filing an Amended Rule 11 Motion Opposing the criminally harassing communication in a timely manner. Plaintiff will file an Amended Opposition to the Defendant NAMEMEDIA INC harassing answers with Amended Supporting Briefs separately while accepting the license to harass the Civil Procedures Rule 11 unconstitutionally creates if allowed to remain unchallenged. Plaintiff Rules of C P Rule 5 Notice of a Challenge to Statutes will include USC 15, USC 17 and Notice of a Challenge to the Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 11 as well. Plaintiff reasserts that Laws are either logical or wrong.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff request the Improper Plaintiff Motion Requesting Sanctions (Docket #26) be withdrawn and supporting brief (Docket #27) be withdrawn as well. Plaintiff will file Supplemental Brief to clarify Docket #29 as well as filing Amended Motion or Brief Objecting to Harassing Answers.

Respectfully submitted,

Curtis J Neeley Jr, MFA

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on the ____ day of _____ 2010, Curtis James Neeley Jr, MFA will mail a copy of the foregoing to the attorney representing NAMEMEDIA INC at the following address:

H. WILLIAM ALLEN (ABN 69001)
KEVIN M. LEMLEY (ABN 2005034)
ALLEN LAW FIRM
A Professional Corporation
212 Center Street, 9th Floor
Little Rock AR 72201

/s/Curtis J Neeley Jr, MFA
Curtis J Neeley Jr, MFA