

Exhibit A



Curtis Neeley Jr MFA



Add as
Favorite
Send message
RSS

Location

Fayetteville, Arkansas, USA

Title

5:2009cv05151

Company

Neeley Publications

Bio

Trying to be a photo artist.

MY RECENT POSTS

[Bad Faith | Dennis Factors](#)

November 03, 2010 10:56PM

[legacies and rulings...](#)

November 01, 2010 01:28PM

[Settlement email 10-28-2010](#)

October 28, 2010 11:16AM

[FCC ordered to regulate the](#)

[Internet exactly like TV, radio,](#)
October 13, 2010 09:18AM

[The end of the open Internet is at](#)
[hand.](#)

October 08, 2010 11:37AM

MY RECENT COMMENTS

"Calling the Senator "HOT" was
inappropriate. I mean have you
seen her?..."

September 22, 2010 07:24PM

"How is OS monetized? How is
money generated by OS to allow
them to provide such..."

September 20, 2010 02:35PM

"1. If you rarely if ever talk to
anyone but know more "copy-
right" law..."

September 20, 2010 02:27PM

"As a SEVERELY disabled person
who spent years in a hospital bed
please remember t..."

September 20, 2010 02:10PM

"http://open.salon.com/bl
og/curtisneeley/2010/08/04/i_h
ow_i_made_the_fcc_begin_to_□
230;"

August 07, 2010 01:19AM

[« Back to Posts](#)

AUGUST 6, 2010 3:22PM

Sept 14 is a day that will live in infamy.....

RATE: 0

Made

Making it right finally **made** the Internet moral.

GOOG - - GO AWAY!

Opposing Counselors, ET AL:

December 07 is a date living in infamy that might last as long as the impact of the decision GOOG board members will make or have chosen by not acting by September 14, 2010. Either settle or self eviscerate CEO, Eric Schmidt. The honorable choice is yours. Honorable is obviously not a term that describes GOOG corporate policy on their best day.

The 8th Circuit Court has allowed the "bad guys" in this case two weeks and one day instead of twenty-one (21) days. That is only six days less than requested and will result in more than fifteen million dollars of profiting on pornography to anonymous users. EVERY time a person searches for Curtis Neeley in an image search and finds nudes and are referred to since May 6, 2004 will be presented to a JURY. One search for his name or "penis photo" results in links to an image that has NEVER been on .

Here we can see another can of worms the "bad guys" guys will now face. It is SPECULATIVE [ly] shown demonstrated in evidence. The Eighth Circuit has locked all of the EVIDENCE submitted because they do not allow nude photos to be shown in PACER. Visiting Google Inc image search and typing in Mr Neeley's personal name cannot be publicly shown? OUCH! The erect penis photo that is repetitively ATTRIBUTED or alleged to have been found on Mr Neeley's personal website has NEVER been on the site although it results in about X hits per day. X is not ZERO but is known. The following is one URL. It is not the ONLY one but the only one an from Google Inc.

[http://www.google.com/images?
hl=en&source=imghp&q=Curtis+Neeley&btnG=Search+In](http://www.google.com/images?hl=en&source=imghp&q=Curtis+Neeley&btnG=Search+In)

It would greatly save Google Inc to cease displaying Michael Peven's erect penis in image searches for whatever reason they result as attributed to Mr Neeley's website. The "bad guys" got fifteen more days to profit and that will increase the PUNITIVE award for outrage enough to take 15 days of profiting away. Mr Neeley will ask for 30 million for these 15 days and hopes the jury realizes moral outrage at being attributed to nudes that Mr Neeley did not do and absolutely abhors will be worth more than Google Inc is worth entirely. A year after sued, Google Inc still returns image searches for Curtis Neeley's name that are not allowed shown publicly at the Eighth Circuit Docket-? Hmmm?

Mr Neeley did not even take all the nude photographs and was a ten year old when Michael Peven MFA took a picture of an erect penis, probably his own, that you attribute to Mr Neeley! It has never been on

CURTIS NEELEY JR MFA'S FAVORITES



Emily
Holleman



Kathy
Riordan



Kerry
Lauerman



Joan
Walsh

[view all](#)

UPDATES



[My Mad Men
Husband](#)

*posted by: Kathy
Riordan*



[Salon Kitchen
Challenge:](#)

[Travel snacks](#)
*posted by: Emily
Holleman*



[New Reading
Club starting --
along with some
free books!](#)

*posted by: Kerry
Lauerman*



[Me on Open
Salon](#)

*posted by: Joan
Walsh*

CURTIS NEELEY JR
MFA'S LINKS

My links

5:09-cv-05151

1977 Transcript PDF

RAPIST Polanski

CurtisNeeley.com

contrary to the outrageous claim seen in the link above? It was once on the Uark.edu server but was removed by administrators after a complaint by Mr Neeley. The page where the pornographic photo was can still be seen: <http://comp.uark.edu/~mpeven/Site/Books.html>

It is the hole outlined above the text [SNATCHES....]. It is still marketed online at

<http://www.vampandtramp.com/finepress/p/primitive-press.html> with a link to where Google Inc found the porn they attribute to Mr Neeley.

<http://www.vampandtramp.com/finepress/p/primitive-manmade-blueL.jpg>

Peven is a tenured professor who has no degree in photography in charge of the photography department! Yes, Mr Neeley published figure nude photographs at Wikipedia with CC-BY-3 licensure <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>. Mr Neeley always will be known and collected internationally for figure nude art. Please roll up your sleeves and read the license. It requires attribution but does not waive MORAL rights.

i.e "In addition to the right of licensors to request removal of their name from the work when used in a derivative or collective they don't like, copyright laws in most jurisdictions around the world (with the notable exception of the US except in very limited circumstances) grant creators "moral rights" which may provide some redress if a derivative work represents a "derogatory treatment" of the licensor's work."

Carefully read the part that says, "...with the notable exception of the US except in very limited circumstances," and explain how attributing them to Mr Neeley before children, including his, is not an outrageous violation of moral rights of an artist or the rights of a parent?

Opposing counsel suggested already this might better resolve in legislature? It might eventually be and that worm is already out of the can. Mr Neeley is attempting to have a Moral Copyright Recognition Act introduced in congress and in the Senate. Both Senators and Congressmen feel the moral rights are already on the books and are overlooked as well as oversight needing established regarding regulation of communications transmitted by wire.

There are several equally important issues among the group of cats counselors are attempting to herd. It will require a great deal of explaining to the common juror but can be done. Compare this litigation to Pandora's box. Some things once begun are impossible to stop.

US Title 15 is unconstitutionally vague and out-of-date and especially § 1125.

US Title 17 has been unconstitutional since March 31, 1790 when established by un-elected representatives, judges, and publishers. Do your own research there 'we' already have.

The Communications Act of 1934

<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/1934new.pdf> already requires that the Internet be regulated or since the FCC was created. The pages that mention the Internet by name are 89, 90, 118 where Internet is defined as follows on p. 90. "INTERNET. --The term "Internet" means the international computer network of both federal and non-Federal interoperable packet switched data networks."

Opposing counselors and more importantly, the JURY, might recognize the Internet described better on p. 8 as follows. "(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.

Please explain how the FCC replied to the complaint made by Mr Neeley stating that regulation of the Internet was outside their jurisdiction? Perhaps they in some way missed (51)? The JURY won't. The time when pornography sustained search engines by being unregulated is over guys. Porn sales should be regulated and not regulating communications BY WIRE has been plead as nonfeasance. Anything that would be rated in a movie must also be rated when transmitted by wire.

NAMEMEDIA INC has demonstrated one obvious solution by hiding evidence and placing a malicious robots.txt file on their sleepspot server. All sites could control how they are indexed and should rate themselves. The FCC Internet division soon will require them to self regulate or self fine. Mr Neeley maintains several web servers and one of them rejects all attempts to access by ALL search engines or links and records each attempt as well as displaying a rational to the bounced visitor. Search for the term figure nude and follow the links returned. It will, however, let you see the entry page but see no nudes. Google Inc, you may thank Separate co-defendant NAMEMEDIA INC for making that easier to illustrate to the jury.

In the future a warning screen that is BLANK will be all a properly coded porn site will show. That is all shown now on any "deceptive" licensed "parked" page with "AdBlock Plus for FireFox" plug-in and this function will be required after this lawsuit for all browsers. This was a can of worms that you should have avoided at all costs. The genie might be impossible to coax back into the bottle. American juries are not stupid enough to not see the truth. All American search engines profit massively on pornography.

Ten - thousand million by 8/14/2010 and Mr Neeley will quietly disappear if you exclude all uses of Mr Neeley's name returning nudes like lycos.com does already and get your search engine *conspirators* to do the same thing. A non-profit search engine makes EVERY OTHER SEARCH ENGINE a footnote in history by 2020 and solves the budget problem of America. FOREVER!

Counter or don't, judges just might want to surf for porn enough to do the dishonorable thing? Letting the masses rule in spite of rights guaranteed by laws stopped CA discrimination and revealed at least some judges still defend moral principles anchored in law. We will soon see if the Eighth Circuit does as well. The Courts are not the only group of worms.

Curtis J Neeley Jr, MFA

DISCLAIMER: Curtis Neeley suffered a severe traumatic brain injury that often very negatively impacts his communications. He is often perceived as blunt, tactless, self-centered and rude. Although Curtis has a severe disability, he is determined to continue performing meaningful art. The Curtis Neeley Foundation is created to preserve and promote his artistic photographic legacy.

[Open Salon](#)

[About](#)
[Privacy](#)

[Contact](#)
[Advertising](#)

[Help](#)


[Terms](#)



© 2010 Salon Media Group, Inc.

P.S. Did any of you see MIM's last announcement? They finally called pornography plainly nothing more than pornography and not "child" pornography, "blond" pornography, "MILF" pornography or even the ridiculous "illegal" pornography. They called pornography simply by its bare name! Porn profits will soon be drastically reduced... game over guys. Genie has been in the tiny bottle since the Internet was invented by 'Gore' et al. I doubt you will sweet talk it back in.

YOUR TAGS: [Add](#)

TIP: [Tip!](#) Enter the amount, and click "Tip" to submit! 

SHARE: [Email](#)

Comments

[Post the first comment](#)