

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

CURTIS J NEELEY JR, MFA

VS

CASE NO. 5:09CV05151

NameMedia Inc.
Network Solutions Inc.
Google Inc.

BRIEF SUPPORTING REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT

Comes now Plaintiff, respectfully to this court and requests the Court grant the *Pro Se* pauper Plaintiff Leave to file Amended Complaint to Docket #53 to simply append adding search engine Defendants AOL LLC, Yahoo Inc, and Microsoft Inc who all now violate the Privacy of the Plaintiff and the Rights of attribution of copyrights while defaming, slandering and libeling the Plaintiff and causing extreme outrage and emotional distress. Google Inc has not answered but has filed a Motion to dismiss that was not timely. A Motion for Summary Judgment was the legal effect desired. Docket #63 is legally deficient and does not comply with Local Rules where Local Rule 56.1(a) requires a list of material facts not contested. The Motion to Dismiss must be denied because it does not conform to the local rule. *Pro Se* Plaintiff might be confused by legalities but conspiring to violate trademarks seems to be the meaning of Contributory Violation and was in the Second Amended Complaint. See Docket #53 ¶ #3. “[*The Defendants conspired*] to cybersquat the Plaintiff’s domains without concern or even a rudimentary search for [*existing trademark rights*].” Emphasis added since initially overlooked. Conspire –verb 1. to agree together, esp. secretly, to do something wrong, evil, or illegal. See "*conspired*." Dictionary.com Unabridged. Random House, Inc. 09 Feb. 2010

Pro Se Plaintiff seeks leave to file a Third Amended Complaint and Justice requires the *Pro Se* Plaintiff be granted leave to file a Third Amended Complaint that names the three additional Defendants and different but related Causes of Action in this same suit by appending the following text to Docket #53 and asking for one-hundred billion in punitive damages split amongst the Defendants trying to extinguish copyrights by class actions. Google wants to buy the right to kill copyrights and copyrights should be beyond price. The appended portion needed to be addressed was discovered when NAMEMEDIA finally removed the copyright violations in late January and they were no longer in the Google Inc cache or other search engines due to Photo.net. The portion below would be appended and the Plaintiff will not continue to bother with legal triviality or again violate rules while trying to apply them.

To be appended

Google Inc CEO, Eric Schmidt, said in a recent interview with CNBC: *“If you have something that you don't want anyone to know, maybe you shouldn't be doing it in the first place.”* Plaintiff does world-class figure nude photography and does not want minors or Muslims to know. Plaintiff did two books that involve nude photography and does not want them displayed to minors or Muslims and especially not his own children.

Figure nude photography or the human figures nude as objects of art is a term coined by Plaintiff. The photography of the nude of the disabled Plaintiff has already been disclosed to minor children of the Plaintiff and their friends. This has caused outrageous harm to familial relationships due to the slander, defamation and libel that Google Inc, Microsoft Inc, Yahoo Inc, and NAMEMEDIA INC all conspired or conspire to do to nude art of the Plaintiff currently. NAMEMEDIA INC finally deleted the nude art they attributed to Plaintiff with no

permission while claiming a license. See Ex. BING, YAHOO, AOL to see Plaintiff nudes attributed while displayed with no check for age just like was seen in Docket 60 Exhibit #8 by Google Inc or that can be viewed on any of the search engine of new Defendants currently by using the name of the Plaintiff. Eric Schmidt, of Google Inc, feels Plaintiff should simply not do figure nude art if Plaintiff does not wish to have it disclosed.

The Department of Justice Deputy Assistant Attorney General William Cavanaugh objected to the Google Inc settlement in NY for scanning millions of copies of books and ignoring copyrights stating: *“A global disposition of the rights to millions of copyrighted works is typically the kind of policy change implemented through legislation, not through a private judicial settlement.”* Combine this with the outrageous feeling about privacy and copyrights of Erik Schmidt and it is clear that Google Inc wants to end copyrights and rights to attribution with a class action settlement. See NYSD Case 1:05-cv-08136-DC Docket #720

Copyright and rights to attribution are not rights that are granted by US Title 17. These rights are fundamental rights granted by the creator that have been inadequately enumerated by US Title 17 and first violated by an attorney, Benjamin Huntington, on June 23, 1789 in the United States in HR10 debated and passed in the Second Session of Congress on June 23, 1789. It was nearly word for word the same for the first two sentences as the Statute of Anne from April 10, 1710. It first required the registration and submission of a copy of the book to the library of the King to “purchase” exclusive rights. Three hundred years and Google wants to lawyer it away in a class action lawsuit.

On “April Fools Day”, or April 01, 1790, the hoax was on all artists who were fooled by a lawyer. A career Council introduced the first copyrights practical joke or a hoax called a law. Artists were fooled into thinking that United States law then protected copyrights. There have been million of artists fooled into thinking that copyrights are protected by federal law. Million are still fooled today. All copyright laws were ever for were creating licenses to sue and creating clients for lawyers.

US Title 17 is contrary to the Bill of Rights and specifically the Ninth Amendment. Copyright legislation has been unconstitutional since May 31, 1790. It is time for a Constitutional Amendment to declare the fundamental right copyrights are to finally be recognized as fundamental instead of licensed and disparaged by US Title 17.

Imagine Google Inc had digitally copied a library of movies and used them without permission and without regards to copyrights. They will as soon as they get copyrights completely erased by Courts. They already bought YouTube Inc and are saying video is going to be their next content source. Google Inc plans are to eliminate copyrights to art, then books, and then to video. Google Inc is at least getting America convinced that the new millennium is the Information Age and Internet access to information should be almost universal. Google Inc wants us all to know that if we do not want anyone to know something we should not do it because information should be universally accessible to entice fingers to twitch.

WHEREAS premises herein considered and supported by the record, Curtis J. Neeley Jr. respectfully requests the Pro Se Plaintiff be granted leave to amend the complaint as described above. Leave granted to amend better serves Justice and copyrights. The DOJ will be served by mail as a party from this point forward and might perhaps also be added as well.

Respectfully Submitted

Curtis J. Neeley Jr., MFA

