

# IN THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

Curtis J Neeley Jr., MFA

v.

**CASE NO. 5:09CV05151**

NameMedia Inc.  
Google Inc.

## **BRIEF SUPPORTING REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Comes now Plaintiff, respectfully to this United States Court for the Western District of Arkansas and requests being permitted to file the attached Amended Complaint to add numerous Defendants and claims as herein described concisely complying with Local Rule 5.5 and other Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as if represented by well paid BAR admitted Counsel.

No other filing in this EXTREMELY complicated and broadly impacting action is required. The attached complaint desires to replace the prior litigation entirely. This Brief will describe all claims and all Defendants and Plaintiff realizes that slow judicial appointments and confirmations affect the ability of the Court to address this civil litigation quickly due to timeliness guaranteed criminals. The Supreme Court, with no question whatsoever, will review this litigation. Only a JURY has firm Seventh Amendment Constitutional footing to affect such broadly impacting rulings of law. Law is either logical or is WRONG as will be made obvious herein.

## Defendants Added

1. Plaintiff desires to add Defendants to the above titled action as follows:

Network Solutions LLC, Joseph Stephen Meese Morse, IAC (IACI), Yahoo Inc (YHOO), Microsoft Corporation (MSFT), Federal Communications Commission (FCC), ICANN Inc (ICANN), and the United States.

## Claims Added

Claims added follow each Defendant named to better organize this EXTREMELY complicated and extremely unique legal action.

### **Network Solutions LLC:**

1. Network Solutions LLC has a business policy that violates Title 15 § 1125(d) and has trafficked in six domain names owned by the Plaintiff during this litigation as can be seen in the record. Network Solutions LLC made these offers while realizing every tortuous action they undertook would face a JURY and after establishing an undeniable policy of trafficking in domain names not owned by Network Solutions LLC and thereby violating US Title 15 § 1125(d) as a matter of policy.

### **Joseph Stephen Meese Morse:**

2. Joseph Stephen Meese Morse was granted permission to publish fine art figure nude photographs done by the Plaintiff in a book early in 2006 while Plaintiff was an incompetent. Plaintiff appreciates this publication and does not believe Defendant Google Inc was authorized by Defendant Joseph Stephen Meese Morse to republish this book scanned from a library in New York or elsewhere and claim *The Authors Guild et al v Google Inc.*, (1:2005-cv-08136) created “copyright law alternatives” via class action.

3. Joseph Stephen Meese Morse is added because Google Inc claimed authorization by Joseph Stephen Meese Morse although no permission to republish the nude images digitally was ever given by the Plaintiff during this litigation in March 2010 when alleged by Google Inc to have been authorized.

### **Yahoo Inc (YHOO):**

4. Yahoo Inc (YHOO) republished and republishes Plaintiff's original figure nude art for commercial gain at <yahoo.com> while attributing the nude art correctly and incorrectly to the Plaintiff using the personal name shared with his father before minors, atheist, and Muslims. Arkansas law permits defense of personal honor currently when defamatory or slanderous allegations are made. Public display of nude art has been understood and acknowledged during thousands of years of common law and much longer as realized by common sense to be immoral when done before minors, Muslims, or any human motivated by lust anywhere on Earth. Allegedly, Adam and Eve first sewed clothing from leaves to conceal their nudity. Humans, therefore, have always realized there existed lustful potential when viewing the naked human form. Plaintiff believes the nude figure can be shown exclusively as an art OBJECT without the motivation for lust. The Plaintiff recognizes this is usually not done and lust is usually the principle motivation for most display of nudity on Earth.

5. Yahoo Inc makes massive tax-exempt profit due to the trafficking in nudity whether indecent or artistic with no concern for the laws meant to regulate indecent wire communications. Yahoo Inc is careful to solicit a waiver before displaying some the Plaintiff's nude art and this very solicitation is a demonstration of the YHOO realization that the attribution is usually considered defamatory or prohibited.

6. No discovery is required and this added defendant should face a preliminary injunction that no nudes are returned in searches containing the Plaintiff's personal name. Any inclusion of the plaintiff's name should prevent the return of nude photographs whether truthful attributions or untruthful.

### **IAC/InterActiveCorp. (IACI)**

7. IAC/InterActiveCorp. (IACI) displays nudes that are attributed correctly as a result of searches for the plaintiff's personal name at <ask.com>. IACI also makes massive tax-exempt profit due to the trafficking in nudity whether indecent or artistic with no concern for the laws meant to regulate indecent wire communications. IACI often solicits a waiver before displaying art and this very solicitation is a demonstration realizing that the attribution to nudes is usually considered defamatory or improper.

8. No discovery is required and this added defendant should face a preliminary injunction that no nudes are returned in searches containing the Plaintiff's personal name. Any inclusion of the plaintiff's name should prevent the return of nude photographs whether truthful attributions or untruthful.

9. IACI has already apparently attempted to mitigate their exposure and the JURY should consider this in the damages request in the conclusion. IACI has at least already started to try.

### **Microsoft Corporation (MSFT)**

10. Microsoft Corporation (MSFT) displays nudes that are attributed to the Plaintiff correctly as a result of searches for the plaintiff's personal name at <bing.com>. MSFT makes massive tax-exempt profits due to the trafficking in nudity whether indecent or artistic with no concern for the laws meant to regulate indecent wire communications. MSFT often solicits waivers before displaying art and this very solicitation is *prima facie* demonstration of realization that the attribution to nudes is usually considered defamatory or would be otherwise restricted by law.

11. No discovery is required and this added defendant should face a preliminary injunction that no nudes are returned in searches containing the Plaintiff's personal name. Any entry of the plaintiff's name should prevent the return of nude photographs whether truthful attributions or untruthful.

## **NameMedia Inc.**

### **I. First tort by NameMedia Inc.**

12. NameMedia Inc initiated realization of the need for this litigation. NameMedia Inc initially attributed nude images truthfully to the Plaintiff to persons who logged in to the <photo.net> website and asserted being an adult and foregoing anonymity. This was an acceptable requirement to the Plaintiff that assured the original figurenude art would not be displayed to anonymous viewers. At some indeterminate date in 2007, NameMedia Inc purchased <photo.net> and altered the business policies and "terms of use" to assert permanent licensure of all uploaded art to the domain. At this time NameMedia Inc also began to allow anonymous access to all content already uploaded regardless of the desires of the original artist.

13. NameMedia Inc used <photo.net> and conspired with Google Inc and began attributing Plaintiff to nudes truthfully but no longer allowed the Plaintiff to remove the original figurenude images. On December 26, 2008 the continued truthful attribution of original figurenudes created by the Plaintiff because an extreme source of distress because Google Inc and <photo.net> had begun causing nude images to be correctly attributed to the Plaintiff during image searches at <photo.net> and at <google.com>.

14. These disparaging results were displayed while alleging the Plaintiff caused them intentionally and was untrue and prohibited by Arkansas laws regarding libel and defamation. Plaintiff attempted to cause the figurenude photographs to be deleted after his minor child expressed outrage their parent's name caused nudes to be returned in search engines causing the minor child distress at school.

15. At roughly this time the Plaintiff had recovered enough intellect to survive on his own with minimal assistance. The Plaintiff began to establish and publish original figurenude art in late 2008 while attempting to exclusively morally control attribution.

16. The Plaintiff first politely requested and then demanded that Hannah Thiem, the Digital Millennium Copyright Agent (DMCA) for NameMedia Inc, delete the Plaintiff's figurenude art in early 2009. Ms Thiem was notified using IP tracking beacons as well as via several community websites. Notifications via <flickr.com> and <myspace.com> are in the record. These DMCA notifications were carefully monitored and NameMedia Inc continued to violate the moral rights of the Plaintiff not adequately secured for American citizens.

17. NameMedia Inc counsel claimed these monitored notifications violated Ms Thiem's privacy but NameMedia Inc continued to display the figurenude art of the Plaintiff maliciously during this very litigation until after January 24, 2010.

## **II. Second realized tort by NameMedia Inc.**

18. Plaintiff had begun to attempt to exclusively morally control publication of his original figurenude art and this attempt caused research into his past creations of the nude form. Plaintiff discovered a truthful historical record of nude art being attributed to the Plaintiff at <web.archive.org/web/20020815143411/www.eartheye.com/nudes.html>. These nude photos are clearly the early work of an obvious master photographer developing the absolute use of the nude human form as a figure displayed exclusively as an OBJECT of art and not as a person.

19. While researching the historical use of <eartheye.com> for art, the domain was offered to the Plaintiff contrary to US Title 17 § 1125(d) repeatedly but was then sold to EDATS Inc in FL allegedly for \$2,300. The Plaintiff had advised NameMedia Inc that the domain had once been used for commerce and was rightly owned already by Curtis J Neeley Jr. from 1996 until 2003. The Plaintiff was then practically dared to pursue NameMedia Inc before domain name resolution panelists. This is the HOAX or excuse for law called the DNRP by those regulating the Ponzi scheme called the “Domain-name” economy.

### **III. Third tort by NameMedia Inc.**

20. Plaintiff researched his prior use of the Internet and discovered that <sleepspot.com> was archived at the Internet Archive just as <eartheye.com> is now. Since NameMedia still owns and licenses <sleepspot.com> they were able to use the robots exclusion protocol “REP” to cause the historical archives of this artwork to be hidden. Before the archive files were hidden, the Plaintiff was able to refresh his traumatically injured mind’s recollections and realizes that <sleepspot.com> was once an extreme use of the Internet to sell hospitality reservations. <sleepspot.com> involved more productive, reliable, and scalable uses of the Internet to sell reservations of “Spots to Sleep” than exists anywhere else to this date.

21. The distress and anger caused by the original figure nude photographs being shown against the Plaintiff’s desires caused the user profile to be banned due to angry posts at <photo.net> and allowed NameMedia Inc to realize the <sleepspot.com> historical records were *prima facie* evidence that NameMedia Inc had violated US Title 15 § 1125(d) when offering <sleepspot.com> to the Plaintiff as can be seen in the record for \$2,788 or can be ignored.

22. Had <eartheye.com> and <sleepspot.com> never been offered to the Plaintiff, the First Amendment protest use of <NameMedias.com> would never have been needed. It was used in an attempt to cause NameMedia Inc to recognize distress being caused by the display of original figurenude art and the distress caused by otherwise negatively impacting the Plaintiff's legacy. Every year when NameMedia Inc renewed the domain registration for <eartheye.com> and for <sleepspot.com>, they repeated the violation of US Title 15 § 1125(d) by conspiring with Google Inc or another party to USE each domain. Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren dismissed Network Solutions LLC due to limitations and also dismissed the US Title 15 § 1125(d) violations of NameMedia Inc due to attaching limitations to the improper date and was overruled by the Supreme Court on March 24, 2010 or only four days after this conflicting ruling in the United States Court for the Western District of Arkansas.

23. On roughly January 24, 2010, a new DMCA agent named Rob Rosell was discovered as "employed" by NameMedia Inc for <photo.net>. Rather than rely exclusively on the overworked and overloaded Federal Courts the Plaintiff elected to repeat the monitored DMCA notifications of Mr Rosell. Using unregulated wire communications, Mr Neeley was able to notify EVERY disclosed former website design client of Mr Rosell and request that the original figurenude photographs be no longer displayed to minors. The images were DELETED nearly overnight as most of Mr Rosell's clientele had, ironically, included church personnel.

24. One moral DMCA agent caused the kidnapped art to be deleted after nearly half a year of Federal litigation had been unsuccessful. Unable to understand the rational, but no longer having a valid First Amendment protest use of <namemedias.com>, the Plaintiff forwarded the domain to NameMedia Inc and will not renew the protest USE of the domain on October 15, 2010 since NameMedia Inc has deleted the original figurenude art as requested although the counterclaim helps assure that no settlement opportunity besides a JURY ruling now exists.

25. NameMedia Inc is hoping DMCA limitations to liability will in some way magically limit liability to the six images kidnapped and displayed many times at <photo.net>. No actual DMCA is now listed at <photo.net> as of September 26, 2010. NameMedia Inc hopes that limitations of liability can be established by assigning an employee the title and this hope is outrageous, humorous, and idiotic. Plaintiff hopes opposing Counsel remain as illogical about common law as it appears they are while allowing <photo.net> to operate with no DMCA parachute bearer. <photo.net/info/dmca-agent> is nothing but a fraudulent claim that only underscores the complete invalidity of the DMCA hope and certifies the solid dishonesty of NameMedia Inc. The Arkansas JURY in March 2011 is not likely to consider this HOAX to be humorous or the absurd Ponzi scheme called “domain-name industry” to be permissible.

#### **IV. Fourth tort by NameMedia Inc.**

26. December 18, 2009 in Docket #27 p.2 ¶ #2 it was disclosed as follows.

*2. NAMEMEDIA INC denied the allegations in paragraph 2 of the Complaint while using a robots.txt file to hide evidence that was once publicly available at the Internet Archive Inc that indisputably shows that they lie to further harass Plaintiff. See Ex. SS, Ex. EE.*

Plaintiff regrets using the three-letter colloquial terminology for misleading as is seen above but even BAR admitted attorneys must have recognized by now that placement of the robots.txt file compounds Plaintiff’s distress. This filing was before Prof. Kevin Lemley Esq had yet decided NameMedia Inc representation required too much of a “Devil’s advocate” position and left. Despite this departure, it would appear that Brooks Christopher White Esq would recognize the motion to compel now pending but opposed was an attempt to mitigate damages. Allowing the archive of the art to remain hidden is an outrageous failure to mitigate damages and does, in fact, increase damages now sought.

# **Google Inc**

## **I. Google Inc Title 15 torts**

27. Google Inc licensed <eartheye.com> and <sleepspot.com> in direct violation of US Title 15 § 1125(d) and USED both of these domains while splitting profits due to the license with NameMedia Inc exclusively using them both to sell exclusively GOOG advertisement. This USE of a domain in AdSense for Domains created two torts every year when the domain use was continued rather than being allowed to cease to resolve. Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren failed to attach the date for limitation to the correct date for repeated acts and the Supreme Court already overruled Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren on March 24, 2010 or four days after the improper date was used. This litigation is pending for a Writ of Certiorari currently because of this Supreme Court contradiction as well as District Conflict ruling regarding equitable tolling as well as supervisory jurisdiction for the claim that an insane minor in prison out of State had ever been the meaning of multiple disabilities in ADA 16-56-116 in spite of the definitions included in State law. Minority and insanity are usually considered defenses. If granted, the Petition for Certiorari only seeks the exact things sought in this amendment as only a JURY has sufficient authority to resolve this claim.

## **II. The Google Inc initially noticed malicious defamation torts**

28. Google Inc initially ran the image search engine at <photo.net> and still run it. This is how Google makes money while tax-exempt. Google Inc correctly attributed Mr Neeley to his original figure nude art that was displayed against his desires for over a year during protests and litigation. Google Inc continually claimed specific permission to display original nudes before minors in violation of the Communications Act of 1934 as amended and un-enforced although even a common person in the jury will realize it was always illegal.

29. Google Inc also displayed the Plaintiff's original figure nude art to children and the conspiracy with NameMedia Inc to continue this defamation while ignoring DMCA notifications for the six nude images shown is nothing short of outrageous in forcing a parent to display nude art to his own children. Google Inc CEO, Eric Schmidt, said in a CNBC interview as follows.

**"If you have something that you don't want anyone to know, maybe you shouldn't be doing it in the first place."**

The richest man in the history of the Earth has absolutely no right to disclose art in a way that shames the artist. Plaintiff's outrage at Eric Schmidt is unbounded.

### **III. Google Inc malicious defamatory library book re-publication tort in 2010**

30. Google Inc was advised during this litigation that the Plaintiff did not wish his original figure nude art to be digitally published and especially not while using a search for his name by anonymous viewers. This can be seen in the record already in this action. Plaintiff warned GOOG that the Plaintiff was published in a book that was in libraries and opposing GOOG Counselor commented on this already. The Plaintiff noticed in March 2010 that several original nudes published exclusively in a library book in 2006 were scanned and re-published by GOOG digitally while removing the disclosure of outrage posted at GOOG Books. GOOG announced creation of new US Title 17 alternatives via an unapproved class action settlement in the Southern District of New York as follows. "Google has reached a groundbreaking agreement with authors and publishers."

See <[books.google.com/googlebooks/agreement](http://books.google.com/googlebooks/agreement)>

31. The Plaintiff's original figure nude art was scanned and re-published during this lawsuit and statutory awards are 450,000 for the three images stolen if done just once. Display of them was malicious and the JURY award will easily support a punitive demand for a significant percentage of the company value for GOOG for these three nude image re-publications.

#### **IV. The Google Inc malicious disparaging penis defamations of 2010**

32. GOOG was advised continually that attribution to Michael Peven's erect penis photograph was no less than outrageously incensing and improper. Curtis J Neeley Jr., MFA has never seen Michael Peven's penis and believes Michael Peven is the reason Arkansas is not considered when photographic art is mentioned in America. Mr Peven has less artistic photography accumulated over thirty-plus years as head of one school's photography department than Mr Neeley has created in the last five years from a wheelchair and with one arm. The printout of the improper and defamatory image search at <google.com> with the claim that Michael Peven's erect penis photo is from the wire communications that use <open.salon.com> for broadcast is not done but can be seen in the Supreme Court record. When the Brief appendix was first created and filed at the Eighth Circuit and printed for the two Supreme Court petition appendixes, the claim was that the erect penis was on <curtisneeley.com>. It has never been on either wire communication location and the image is actually still visible over a year after first protested from <vampandtramp.com/finepress/p/primitive-manmade-blueL.jpg>. Plaintiff hopes to use a tiny portion of the massively PUNITIVE award to establish secondary photographic art education in AR and counteract the negative Michael Peven impact.

## **V. The Google Inc 2009 AdWords detrimental reliance**

33. Google Inc sold the Plaintiff advertising on AdWords that ran on domains exclusively licensed to sell Google Inc AdSense for Domains. In other words, Google AdSense for Domains sold advertisement on domains actively USED by GOOG in violation of US Title 15 § 1125(d). When sold these advertisements, the Plaintiff was led to believe these purchases were a result of *bona fide* search terms and not licensed US Title 15 § 1125(d) FRAUDS or “parked” sites.

## **ICANN Inc**

34. ICANN Inc is theoretically a non-profit organization more concerned with public policy than concerned by profit. ICANN Inc has a standing policy that allows domains to be registered for no *bona fide* use and ICANN is aware this fraudulent policy causes US Title 15 §1125 violations as well as creating a demand for ALL short mistakenly visited domains. More domain names exist registered currently for absolutely no *bona fide* use in commerce and exist to perpetuate the false “domain name economy” that is nothing but a complete fraud. ICANN Inc is aware this policy created an artificial demand for all short domains and is the largest use of domain names on the entire Earth. This artificial value for domains now requires the Plaintiff to pay to maintain any domain once registered and is the rational that motivates the Network Solutions LLC standing policy of offering domains or certified offers for domains not owned by Network Solutions LLC as a registrar. The Plaintiff registered <sleepspot.org> with Network Solution LLC to add it to <sleepspot.com> after this action and Network Solutions LLC has a policy of registering expiring domains and offering them at a premium to the previous owner as is described SPECULATIVELY now in the record in the same less-than-single spaced click-to-sign fraud that also alleges waiving jurisdiction to Virginia on the 114 pages agreed to when clicked. This outrageous fraud offers no authentication whatsoever but is how Network Solutions LLC and ICANN Inc turn absolutely nothing whatsoever into a multimillion-dollar profit.

## **The Unconstitutional US Title 17**

35. George Washington signed US Title 17 on May 31, 1790 and this statute has been allowed to replace the common law right to be secure in created art and assign a fee for exclusive publication and also extort a book in exchange for this right. Benjamin Huntington introduced Noel Webster's revision of the 1710 British Statute of Anne and had once claimed law school studies warranted his avoidance of the Revolutionary War as a soldier. The United States, ironically, remains the only allegedly developed country that does not recognize the moral rights of an artist to be secure in the artist's creations. The United States is also the only country that allowed this exclusive right to be subjected to class action Court revision in spite of the Department of Justice objections and the objections of numerous other countries as well as this Plaintiff as seen in the record. The United States law to extort a fee for copying has been the most absurd legal HOAX now accepted by attorneys for admission to the "club" called the BAR. The common law right has never been recognized in the United States and US Title 17 has therefore violated the Ninth Amendment and the Fifth Amendment since passed but now also violates the doctrine of Equal Protection secured in the Fourteenth Amendment since the Berne Convention Implementation Act of 1988 was passed in 1989 and the United States became a Berne Convention Signatory recognizing the moral rights of artists in countries that recognized this moral fundamental or common law right. The United States alleges various State laws allowed moral rights to be guaranteed for other countries citizens and therefore did not require revision of the obviously unconstitutional US law. US Title 17 has been unconstitutional since May 31, 1790 for recognizing a price for rights. The founding slave owners guaranteed an exclusive right for only the wealthy who could afford to purchase this license to sue. **How much more obvious could it possibly be that US Title 17 has never been anything besides a HOAX? NOT MUCH**

36. The founding slave owners who created US Title 17 might wonder how a black man became President. A lot has changed since the slave owners declared independence and established a fee for what was once the common law exclusive control of art.

## **Federal Communications Commission**

37. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has not followed the law that established them known as the Communications Act of 1934. Regulation of WIRE COMMUNICATION was required before the political decision to rename a tiny subcategory of the favorite PORN venue or WIRE COMMUNICATIONS to the Internet for semantic disguise as follows on page 90.

*(1) INTERNET.--The term "Internet" means the international computer network of both Federal and non-Federal interoperable packet switched data networks.*

*(2) INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE.--The term "interactive computer service" means any information service, system, or access software provider that provides or enables computer access by multiple users to a computer server, including specifically a service or system that provides access to the Internet and such systems operated or services offered by libraries or educational institutions.*

*(3) INFORMATION CONTENT PROVIDER.--The term "information content provider" means any person or entity that is responsible, in whole or in part, for the creation or development of information provided through the Internet or any other interactive computer service.*

*(4) ACCESS SOFTWARE PROVIDER.--The term "access software provider" means a provider of software (including client or server software), or enabling tools that do any one or more of the following:*

*(A) filter, screen, allow, or disallow content;*

*(B) pick, choose, analyze, or digest content; or*

*(C) transmit, receive, display, forward, cache, search, subset, organize, reorganize, or translate content.*

How on Earth can anyone be expected to consider any of the semantics listed above to be anything besides various types of apparatus on either end of WIRE COMMUNICATIONS as clearly described on page eight?

38. The Communications Act of 1934 now states the following in simple common language.

**(51) WIRE COMMUNICATION.--The term "wire communication" or "communication by wire" means the transmission of writing, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by aid of wire, cable, or other like connection between the points of origin and reception of such transmission, including all instrumentalities, facilities, apparatus, and services (among other things, the receipt, forwarding, and delivery of communications) incidental to such transmission.**

The Federal Communications Commission has arguably regulated communications by television enough to usually ensure public television is not permitted to display the nude human figure except in very highly controlled circumstances or accidentally. The FCC attempted to bill CBS \$550,000 for the allegedly accidental display of Janet Jackson's naked right breast for (.7) seconds. This (.7) second breast exposure became the most popular wire search term known in 2004. Most humans who use WIRE COMMUNICATIONS, called something else to prevent content regulation, have seen Ms Jackson's breast for much longer than (.7) second. It is absurd with absolutely no room for speculation that WIRE COMMUNICATIONS are used by the Search Engine Defendants in the United States mostly for tax exempt PORN trafficking while taking advantage of the United States missing moral rights in US Title 17.

39. The FCC failure to regulate indecent wire communication has resulted in the *de facto* truth recognized by most parents that the Internet is mostly used for PORN trafficking. During the first quarter of 2010, for example, 37 percent of all the content hosted on the Internet was of pornographic nature. That number comes from <optenet.com> a Spanish IT security company.

40. After porn, the next four content types are shopping (9 percent), travel (5.7), computing (4.2) and sports (4.2). It is easy to see that the FCC failure to regulate WIRE COMMUNICATIONS has impacted this particular Plaintiff by allowing his original nude art to be trafficked by each Search Engine Defendant to minors, atheist, and Muslims anywhere on Earth except China and a few Muslim Countries. This can be seen demonstrated now existing in the record or by using WIRE COMMUNICATIONS and searching for the Plaintiff's personal name on any United States based search engine or PORN locator.

41. There is absolutely no need for further discovery since the Petition for a *Writ of Mandamus* is now pending before the Supreme Court that will require regulation of WIRE COMMUNICATIONS regardless of the apparatus on either end of the wire. This simply requires enforcing laws already on the books but disguised by those seeking to hide use of unregulated wire communications for pornography.

## **Dropped or dismissed claims**

42. Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren dismissed one party entirely due to not allowing equitable tolling of limitations to be submitted to a JURY as was ruled proper in the Sixth Circuit and at the same time disagreeing with the Supreme Court. Discretionary District Conflict Supreme Court jurisdiction has already been sought in the Petition for Certiorari now pending unopposed for denial by lust protecting judges or clerks at the Supreme Court in the docketed petitions of Curtis James Neeley, Jr., Petitioner v. NameMedia, Inc., et al., (10-6091) and In Re Curtis J. Neeley, Jr., Petitioner v., (10-6240)

43. Supreme Court Clerk Cynthia June Rapp Esq already decided this case needed to be denied and told Curtis J Neeley Jr. MFA that if he had ever posted nude photos to the Internet that there was nothing the Supreme Court would do about it now. Unelected and unconfirmed lawyers make the vast majority of Supreme Court decisions and few United States citizens realize this yet.

44. Cynthia June Rapp Esq already communicated her decision in this action and yet two other UNNAMED Supreme Court clerks were otherwise inclined. Every Supreme Court Justice is extremely aware of this litigation already and resolution of this litigation will require a JURY ruling rather than a group of elderly judges.

45. The pro se, pauper Plaintiff is extremely outraged at every party mentioned above except IACI and Joseph Stephen Meese Morse. The prayer for relief is highly altered and this Brief is 5,136 words in 46 paragraphs on 18 pages and uses twelve-point text and was written for ease of being read and scanned. Law applications are either logical or they are wrong. Resolution of this litigation will have the broadest impact of any ruling in history with absolutely no speculation.

46. Every perpetually pending claim is herein made moot except the request to become a District EC/EMF party or Docket #158. Granting this Motion will allow timely completion of service of every joined party by USPS. Docket #36 requested notification of the Attorney General by the District Court. The Attorney General and the FCC are aware now due to being served notice of pending docketed Supreme Court filings. Denial will simply cause more expense for EVERY party and negatively affect the legacy of Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren.

Respectfully Submitted

Curtis J. Neeley Jr., MFA

# CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that today I will file a copy of the foregoing with the Court clerk for the United States Court in the Western District of Arkansas and the clerk will scan each document and it will be made into a B&W PDF and be available to all attorneys representing the Defendants for this case. Their Counsel will each receive notification from EM/ECF. The color PDFs that were printed from are accessible free to the public at <<http://www.CurtisNeeley.com/5-09-cv-05151/Docket>> immediately and perpetually by the end of the day.

**[CurtisNeeley.com/5-09-cv-05151/Docket](http://www.CurtisNeeley.com/5-09-cv-05151/Docket)**

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