

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
FAYETTEVILLE DIVISION**

CURTIS J. NEELEY, Jr.

PLAINTIFF

VS.

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

NAMEMEDIA, INC.;
and GOOGLE, INC.

DEFENDANTS

**SEPARATE DEFENDANT NAMEMEDIA, INC.'S RESPONSE TO
MOTION REQUESTING PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS TO STOP DEFAMATIONS
AND TITLE 15 §1125 VIOLATIONS**

Separate defendant NameMedia, Inc. ("NameMedia"), for its Response to Plaintiff's Motion Requesting Reconsideration of Order in Docket #125 Denying Appeal to Amend, states as follows:

The Court should deny Plaintiff's motion in its entirety. As Plaintiff has repeatedly done in this litigation, he has filed a motion for relief without setting forth legal authority sufficient to support the extraordinary relief requested. In this motion, he appears to ask for injunctive relief which is not the subject of an existing complaint. While it is not entirely clear exactly what Plaintiff seeks, he apparently asks for an injunction prohibiting the major internet search engines from the "broadcast[ing] of pornography or nudity that is not allowed [or] broadcast on television...", as well as an injunction requiring the FCC to "regulate communications by wire, as commonly called 'the Internet', for uses of the Plaintiff's personal name....". Aside from the frivolity of the substantive relief requested by Plaintiff, he fails to set forth the applicable legal standard for the granting of a preliminary injunction.

Plaintiff is has repeatedly reminded the Court that he is appearing *pro se*. However, “[p]ro se litigants are not excused from complying with court orders or substantive and procedural law.” *See American Inmate Paralegal Assoc. v. Cline*, 859 F.2d 59 (8th Cir. 1988). Under F.R.C.P. 11(b), by signing or submitting a pleading, an attorney *or* unrepresented party certifies that to the best of the person’s knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances, “the claims, defenses, and other legal contentions are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law or for establishing new law....” (F.R.C.P.11(b)(2)). The defendants herein should not be continually required to incur the expense of responding to Plaintiff’s frivolous motions.

Respectfully submitted,

H. WILLIAM ALLEN (ABN 69001)
BROOKS C. WHITE (ABN 2000093)
ALLEN LAW FIRM
A Professional Corporation
212 Center Street, 9th Floor
Little Rock, AR 72201
(501) 374-7100

By: /s/ H. William Allen
H. William Allen

By: /s/ Brooks C. White
Brooks C. White

Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant
NameMedia, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Brooks C. White, hereby certify that on this 7th day of July, 2010, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System which will send notification of such filing to the following attorneys of record:

Michael H. Page
Durie Tangri, LLP
217 Leidesdorff Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
mpage@durietangri.com

Jennifer H. Doan
jdoan@haltomdoan.com
Joshua R. Thane
jthane@haltomdoan.com
Haltom & Doan
Crown Executive Center, Suite 100
6500 Summerhill Road
Texarkana, TX 75503

I hereby certify that, on this 7th day of July, 2010, I mailed a copy of the foregoing to the following *pro se* plaintiff:

Mr. Curtis J. Neeley, Jr.
2619 N. Quality Lane, Apt. 123
Fayetteville, AR 72703

/s/ Brooks C. White
Brooks C. White