

**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.

**BRIEF SUPPORTING MOTION REQUESTING  
LEAVE TO FILE REPLACEMENT COMPLAINT**

**I Parties Added**

a. Yahoo Inc, AOL LLC, Microsoft Corporation, IAC, FCC, ICANN Inc and the United States are the parties that Plaintiff seeks to add in the action that is now before the Court. Some were not noticed until January when defendant NAMEMEDIA INC finally deleted the nude photographs and finally noticed as demanded by NAMEMEDIA as can be seen demanded in the record as early as July 24, 2009.

**II Claims Added**

a. Defendants Yahoo Inc, AOL LLC, Microsoft Corporation, IAC, each defamed the Plaintiff while violating his rights to exclusively control attribution to modified art or not to be credited to modified art that subjects the artist to public shame. They each attributed images not allowed to be broadcast on TV to minors and thereby disclosed information that the common person would prefer to maintain privately. Display of the original art photographs of the Plaintiff to minors is a manner of display abhorrent to the Plaintiff and thereby a defamation by AR Statute 16-63-207.

b. The added Plaintiff's, as well as Google Inc, each go further and "broadcast" or traffic in pornography that affects all children and by including the Plaintiff's original figure nude art, they defame him and imply a consent of this trafficking of obscene material.

The added Plaintiff's, as well as Google Inc, violated substantive Due Process right to be free from displaying art unfit for public broadcast to my minor children or compelling the Plaintiff to show adult art to his children by allowing them to use the internet without constant supervision. No "COPA" law is needed to guarantee this right that is already enjoyed in many overseas locations or by requiring using lycos.com for all searches.

## Relevant standard

- a. The federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 15(c)(1)(B) are the controlling legal standard
- b. This amendment asserts a claim that arose out of the conduct or occurrences attempted to be set out in the original pleading and are within the 120 days allowed by Federal Rules of CP Rule 4(m).
- c. The Supreme Court ruled Monday May 24, 2010 that limitations, as defenses, do not begin to accrue until the last of continuing offenses. Lewis v. Chicago, (08-974) This ruling reinstates all prejudicially dismissed claims and dismissed parties in the current action.

Whereby; Plaintiff believes this action warrants appeal unless replaced by a brain damaged pro se party due to the District Court rulings contrary to a recent Supreme Court decision, amending to the replacement while dismissing the original will save all parties expenses and not waste the diligence of the Court already invested. Seven days will give enough time to locate the Agents for Service and submit them to Court for Certified Postal USMS Summons and filing the attached Replacement Complaint with the Court. Plaintiff will be able to use the gracious Court offer to use their location for the Rule 26(f) conference to deal with having only one regular functioning arm.

Respectfully and humbly submitted,

Curtis J Neeley Jr, MFA