Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
Protecting and Promoting the Open Internet	)	Docket No. 14-28
	)	
	)	

Motion for Protective or Clarifying Order re: fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2017/db0203/DOC-343346A1.pdf

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Commission Chairman Ajit Pai is alleged to have released the following statement creating a need for a more specific use of English for this litigant to understand this FIAT and determine if relevant to proceedings this litigant is involved in before the Federal Communications Commission. The request for clarification is done before seeking redress for the allegation of revoking carefully considered Federal Communications Commission Reports and Orders in proceedings 14-28 and 16-106 in the Eastern District Court of Arkansas.

> WASHINGTON, February 3, 2017 – Federal Communications Commission Chairman Ajit Pai issued the following statement today on FCC rescissions of midnight regulations:
>
> "In the **waning days** of the last Administration, the Federal Communications Commission's Bureaus and Offices released a series o**f controversial orders and reports**. In some cases, Commissioners were given no advance notice whatsoever of **these midnight regulations**. In other cases, **they were issued** over the objection of **two of the four Commissioners**. **And in all cases, their release** ran contrary to the wishes expressed by the leadership of our congressional oversight committees. **These last-minute actions**, which did not enjoy the support of the majority of Commissioners at the time they were taken, should not bind us going forward. Accordingly, they are being revoked."

II. Reason Protective or Clarifying Order is Warranted

In order to better protect personal interests in the orders of the Federal Communications Commission in proceedings 14-28 and 16-106; This litigant requests either an "Order of Protection" or an "Order Clarifying" the statement above after released by Chairman Commissioner Pai before being reappointed for a new term as Commissioner in 2017, after foisted on U.S. citizens by President Trump.

This litigant spent thousands of legal hours and pursued five Federal Communications Commission Commissioners in United States District Court for the *pornography addicted* Western District of Arkansas seeking "online" be recognized as the common wire carrier "online" has always been. This demand was ALMOST met on February 26, 2015 in *Neeley Jr. v 5 Federal Communications Commissioners, et. al.* (14-cv-05135)(14-3447), while still pending in the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals. The 16-106 proceeding begun on April 1st, 2016 though "online" communications privacy being finally required of ISPs was never an April Fool's joke and was considered important by most though treated as a political tool by Commissioner Ajit Pai.

Litigant, Curtis J Neeley Jr., now request specific the dates instead of the ("*waning days*") colloquialism used and the specific orders "*revoked*" by FIAT versus the ("*controversial orders and reports*") colloquialism used. Litigant, Curtis J Neeley Jr., request the precise regulations "*revoked*" instead of the ("*these midnight regulations*") colloquialism used and seeks which reports or order numbers were "*revoked*" by FIAT instead of the ("*[t]hey were issued*") as used. Where was the fifth voting commissioner during ("*two of the four Commissioners*") deception and which cases were the mysterious report or orders released for versus the ("*[a]nd in all cases, their release*") colloquialism used for which actions exactly instead of the ("*[t]hese last minute actions*") colloquialism used.

And where AGAIN was the fifth commissioner when the ("the majority of Commissioners at the time they were taken") falsehood was used and which orders are being revoked and by what authority is this done instead of ("*they are being revoked*"), as used in the statement.

III. CONCLUSION

The Opposition to 9/10 Petitions for Reconsideration in Proceeding 16-106 may or may not be impacted by the useless statement explained above. The FCC should not allow ANY-SIZE ISPs to continue collecting and selling proprietary customer information. The "*open nternet*" is a "*hazardous nuisance*" allowed for 18+ years to encouraging both consumption and production of pornography as negatively impacted humanity and makes *Reno v ACLU* (96-511) a VOID decision. ISP competition would quickly thrive if the FCC allowed/encouraged portable FM radios to become portable 'hot-spots' and include USB modems and market FM wi-fi as would quickly make broadband ubiquitous.

This litigant asks the FCC Commissioners to carefully consider clarification of the statement *allegedly* made by Chairman Commissioner Ajit Pai and issue a Protective Order requiring no prior orders be revoked ny FIAT. FCC Commissioners must carefully consider communications broadcasting harms to all of humanity, as allowed to continue counter to law. Curtis J. Neeley Jr. will adamantly oppose continued malfeasance, "*till the right thing is done*[1]*",* and doubts this can be done except via a new Supreme Court.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Curtis J. Neeley Jr

Curtis J. Neeley Jr
Uniquely Concerned Citizen Litigant
Newark, AR 72562
(479) 263-4795

February 06, 2017

1 This is the response the dying mother of Curtis J. Neeley Jr. gave when asked whether or not to accept a $5,000,000.00 *verbal* settlement offer from GOOG Inc to wholly settle and drop the FCC common carrier claim also.

DOES ANYONE BELIEVE Curtis J. Neeley Jr. WILL STOP PURSUING A SAFE COMMON CARRIER OF WIRE?