

Exhibit

“B”

Curtis Neeley Jr.

From: Microsoft Customer Support
<SERCH.SRCH.WW.00.EN.STR.SHW.AU.T01.HOT.00.EM@css.one.mi
crosoft.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 7:16 PM
To: curtis@curtisneeley.com
Subject: RE: SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Litigation

Hello Curtis,

For us to be able to further review your request to disassociate your name "Curtis Neeley" with any inappropriate contents in Bing.com, Microsoft must first receive a valid subpoena or court order. Please address the appropriate legal document to Microsoft Corporation and include all pertinent information for Microsoft. The legal document may be faxed to 425-708-0096.

Law Enforcement Officials should refer to the Microsoft Online Services Legal Request Hotline:

In the United States: 425-722-1299

Outside the U.S.: (011) 425-722-1299

Criminal defense subpoenas: Microsoft requires a formally served subpoena and is unable to respond to faxed or mailed requests.

Sincerely,

Catherine
The Online Safety Team

--- Original Message ---

From : "Curtis Neeley Jr."
Sent : Wednesday, July 11, 2012 10:46:24 PM UTC
To : "Microsoft Customer Support" , "Bridget A Hauler" , "Hwallen" , "Jdoan" , "Jthane" , "Mpage" , "Willie S. Haley"
Subject : SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Litigation

"Catherine", et al,

Bing DOES control the content harvesters called "bots" and then Bing is the original content provider for the sampled content given in a new context. The portions of the "Communications Decency Act" that survived the *Reno v ACLU* mistake causes this statute to violate common sense, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

The content has been **HEAVILY REVISED** a long time as suggested. The following pages do not retain the text "Curtis Neeley" and have not for months or even years.

1. <http://www.michelle7.com/covers/2002/08/index.php>
2. <http://www.creative-nude.net/cnnpn.html>
3. <http://www.michelle7-erotica.com/covers/2002/02/index.php>
4. [http://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akt_\(v%C3%BDtvarn%C3%A9_um%C4%9Bn%C3%AD\)](http://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akt_(v%C3%BDtvarn%C3%A9_um%C4%9Bn%C3%AD))

DOES ANYONE THERE ACTUALLY READ THIS before the "SAME FORM" response is sent repeatedly?

Please send me your individual contact information so that I may eventually issue a subpoena or the contact information for your immediate department employer.

The obviously unconstitutional "CDA" law follows.

47 USC § 230 - Protection for private blocking and screening of offensive material

(c) Protection for "Good Samaritan" blocking and screening of offensive material

(1) Treatment of publisher or speaker

No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider.

Please send me a different reply and pretend like this issue is being revised or the hidden or cached rational is being updated.

Email tag - your it again.

Please do not use small text.

Sincerely,

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 creating meaningful visual art. The Curtis Neeley Foundation will be created to preserve and promote his artistic photographic legacy

Neeley v NameMedia Inc et al, (5:12-cv-05074) Free Docket mirror.
Booklet Complaint in [HTML](#) or [PDF](#).
Attachment #1 Exhibit [232](#) A Bill. -PDF file.

FORM answer was from from further below from Sent: Monday, June 11, 2012 7:37 PM WORD for word:
Bing doesn't control the operation or design of websites indexed by Bing. Bing also doesn't control what these websites publish. If you have concerns about any content on the website, contact the owners of the website that publishes the information. If you have data privacy concerns, contact the data provider directly or go to their help to learn how to change your privacy settings. After the website removes the information and Bing has crawled the website again, the offensive or harmful information won't appear in our results

From: Microsoft Customer Support
[mailto:SERCH.SRCH.WW.00.EN.STR.SHW.AU.T01.HOT.00.EM@css.one.microsoft.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 12:44 PM
To: curtis@curtisneeley.com
Subject: RE: SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Litigation

Hello Curtis,

Bing doesn't control the operation or design of websites indexed by Bing. Bing also doesn't control what these websites publish. If you have concerns about any content on the website, contact the owners of the website that publishes the information. If you have data privacy concerns, contact the data provider directly or go to their help to learn how to change your privacy settings. After the website removes the information and Bing has crawled the website again, the offensive or harmful information won't appear in our results.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Catherine
The Online Safety Team

--- Original Message ---

From : "Curtis Neeley Jr."
Sent : Tuesday, June 12, 2012 12:16:23 PM UTC
To : "Microsoft Customer Support"
Subject : RE: SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Litigation

Catherine, Safety Support Team, et al,

MSFT(Bing) may not currently prevent adult content from returning in searches. This adult content suppression will begin very soon as a result of laws passed in 1934 but not enforced or followed now.

Mr Neeley advises the Online Safety Team report was self-contradictory. Catherine wrote, "[a]fter the website removes the information and Bing has crawled the website again, the offensive or harmful information won't appear in our results". Hardly; The fact that the harmful information continues to return after the website has been revised is still harmful to Neeley. The one original nude by Neeley that was once on the site has been removed. MSFT(Bing) is aware of this website revision and no longer returns this one image. MSFT(Bing) however still associates every other nude or inappropriate image from the revised website with the text "curtis neeley" despite having searched the revised page and discovering removal of this text.

Mr Neeley does not wish MSFT(Bing) still associate his personal name or the text "curtis neeley" with ANYTHING nude. MSFT(Bing) may allege this is because of the website's past use of the text "curtis neeley". This leaves MSFT(Bing) legally liable for defamation and presenting Mr Neeley in a false negative light due to gross negligence.

The following eight nude images should no longer return for uses of the text "curtis neeley".

These are shown in searches for "curtis neeley nude".

1. <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 81)

1A. <http://www.bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 81)

2. <http://ts2.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 82)

2A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 82)

3. <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 83)

3A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 83)

4. <http://ts4.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 84)

4A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 84)

5. <http://ts1.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 86)

5A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 86)

6. <http://ts1.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 87)
 - 6A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 87)
 7. <http://ts1.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 92)
 - 7A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 92)
 8. <http://ts1.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 93)
 - 8A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 93)
-

The following image will remain PERPETUALLY at Wikipedia Foundation and the website was revised LONG AGO.

There is no use of use of the text "curtis neeley" except in a very abstract and hidden portion of this page.

http://www.bing.com/images/search?q_curtis%20neeley%20site%3Awikipedia.org&go=&form=QBIL&qs=n (replace ?q_ with ?q=)

This search returns Neeley's 1992 car wreck image and the nude from the cs.wikipedia.org subdomain.

http://www.bing.com/images/search?q_figurenude%20site%3Awikipedia.org&go=&form=QBIL&qs=n#x0y0 (replace ?q_ with ?q=)

This search reveals the same nude image from several other wikipedia.org subdomains as well as another nude.

These searches demonstrate that MSFT(Bing) search results here again prove the fact that the websites were revised AT THE SAME TIME but the MSFT(Bing) results associate "curtis neeley" with the cs.wikipedia.org results but NOT the jp.wikipedia.org, it.wikipedia.org or en.wikipedia.org subdomains. This is proof enough for requesting summary judgment for the MSFT(Bing) neglect and Catherine should advice a lawyer for MSFT(Bing).

47 USC §230 preclusions or preemptions will be found invalid.

The following two images should not be associated with the text "curtis neeley".

Perpetual-1. <http://ts1.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46954005845781> (add last two of 48)

Perpetual-1A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46954005845781> (add last two of 48)

<http://curtisneeley.blogspot.com/2012/06/srx1177334446id-msft-litigation.html>

Sincerely,

Curtis J Neeley Jr, MFA
2619 N. Quality Ln, Ste 123
Fayetteville, AR 72703
Voice: 479-263-4795

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 creating meaningful visual art. The Curtis Neeley Foundation will be created to preserve and promote his artistic photographic legacy.

From: Microsoft Customer Support
[mailto:SERCH.SRCH.WW.00.EN.STR.SHW.AU.T01.SPT.00.EM@css.one.microsoft.com]
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2012 7:37 PM
To: curtis@curtisneeley.com
Subject: RE: SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Mitigation time -no- Litigation time

Hello Curtis,

We do apologize for any inconvenience this has caused you.

With regards to the search result, we have reviewed and validated that the images you reported is no longer visible in Bing Search Result under Off, Moderate and Strict SafeSearch settings.

Please note that Adult Content is not removed from Bing.com and should only show when Safe Search Setting are set to Off.

If this result does not reflect on your end, for simple troubleshooting you may need to Clear your browser's Cache then restart your computer.

Notes:

? Bing doesn't control the operation or design of websites indexed by Bing. Bing also doesn't control what these websites publish. If you have concerns about any content on the website, contact the owners of the website that publishes the information. If you have data privacy concerns, contact the data provider directly or go to their help to learn how to change your privacy settings. After the website removes the information and Bing has crawled the website again, the offensive or harmful information won't appear in our results.

Thank you,

Catherine

--- Original Message ---

From : "Curtis@CurtisNeeley.com"

Sent : Monday, June 04, 2012 12:16:26 AM UTC

To : "Microsoft Customer Support"

Subject : SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Mitigation time -no- Litigation time

This is a notice that Curtis J Neeley Jr has ALREADY begun litigation against your employer in the

United States Court for the Western District of Arkansas. The case is labeled as follows.

Neeley v NameMedia Inc et al, (5:12-cv-05074). The prayer in the discovery seeks 125,000 from Google Inc for each image done by Mr Neeley that remains associated with the search "curtis neeley" after being advised this is a usage that is NOT DESIRED and after the personal name was removed. This was done years ago in US Court with Google Inc but this very thread establishes MSFT as grossly negligent for these two CONTINUING after advised it was inappropriate and not supported by current page content. One is documented conclusively as changing last over 150 days ago and remaining changed.

The request for punitive damages will now be supported for a greater amount than is paid for every person working in Bing Customer Support including the reader and all persons in this dialog.

The wild, woolly "open Internet" was interesting for the last 10-20 years but violated scores of laws besides the Constitution and will no longer exist as it does now very soon.

Good-luck Bing Customer Service in your job searches.

> Hi,

>

>

>

> Just like what my colleague inform you on the previous interactions.

> The best way for the URL's that you are requesting to be removed is for

> you to contact the site owner. Please be informed that site owner has a

> tool that they can utilize in removing the URL's that you are referring

> to from Bing.

>

>

>

> Once the site owner has made the necessary changes or removal of the

> said URL's it will reflect in Bing on our normal refresh cycle.

>

>

>
> Thank you for your patience and understanding.

>
>
>
>
> Michael

>
> Bing Technical Support

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> --- Original Message ---

> From : "Curtis@CurtisNeeley.com"

> Sent : Friday, June 01, 2012 7:00:27 PM UTC

> To : "Microsoft Customer Support"

> Subject : RE: SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Mitigation time

>
> Renan says, "we do not remove pages in the index on request. After the
> published content is removed or corrected, it will be corrected in the
> search database by our normal content refresh processes".

>
> MSFT will regret allowing an employee to send this type "ignorant"
> email. The message thread below reveals that the content was altered
> December 20th 2011 and has not been refreshed normally in the ensuing
> 150 days. Either MSFT alters the index expeditiously or Neeley will
> sue them.

>
> Whoops, Neeley v NameMedia Inc, et al, (5:12-cv-05074) has already been
> filed and MSFT is already sued therein.

> The <[michelle7-erotica.com](http://www.michelle7-erotica.com)> image is entirely gone!

> [http://www.bing.com/images/search?q=curtis+neeley+nude&view=detail&id=AB
> BEC5D7FF89C0D7A05C8790D16E4925E61D000D&first=0&FORM=IDFRIR](http://www.bing.com/images/search?q=curtis+neeley+nude&view=detail&id=ABBEC5D7FF89C0D7A05C8790D16E4925E61D000D&first=0&FORM=IDFRIR)

>
> The NUDE image MSFT alleges to have indexed and associated with "curtis
> neeley" in text/image searches on the page above is no longer there!
> This trivial factual matter is in addition to the fact that "curtis
> neeley" had been gone for months on the page above. How long does MSFT
> need to realize that 2 + 2 is NOT 3? TIME IS UP! People are going to
> soon learn, along with MSFT.

>
> [http://www.bing.com/images/search?q=curtis+neeley+nude&view=detail&id=98
> 949B22D20868D1629531C9A03C6ED9912B3E0B&first=0&FORM=IDFRIR](http://www.bing.com/images/search?q=curtis+neeley+nude&view=detail&id=98949B22D20868D1629531C9A03C6ED9912B3E0B&first=0&FORM=IDFRIR)

>
> The image/page §230 <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/47/230>>
> link remaining above is despite the fact that "curtis neeley" text has
> not been on this page since December 20, 2011 at 18:13 as can be seen
> documented [HERE](#)

> <http://cs.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Akt_%28v%C3%BDtvarn%C3%A9_um%C4%9Bn%C3%AD%29&action=history> ! This image will remain at Wikipedia Foundation perpetually. The entire image at <<http://www.bing.com/images/search?q=curtis+neeley+nude&view=detail&id=ABBEC5D7FF89C0D7A05C8790D16E4925E61D000D&first=0&FORM=IDFRIR>> was removed in demonstration of the First Amendment harm of the negligence now on display with the "idiotic" reply.

> "Idiotic" and "ignorant" are terms that are not normally found in scholarly white papers or legal texts. This offensive use of text will, however, be published and be searchable by Bing relatively quickly. The Magistrate Judge, Erin L Setser, now considering this case as well as the general public are able to search the entire wire communications venue disguised as the Internet. The Internet was created by the Supreme Court in 1997 by egregious legal error of an aged court. The Supreme Court will ultimately be involved in this case again as will Congress.

> Use of the offensive term "ignorant" for Renan's response is more than likely true despite MSFT attempting to train Renan in search software. Searching or indexing software is EXTREMELY simple to most programmers but Renan is obviously not a programmer. The ability to "program" is apparently not common. No programmer caliber intellectual works in customer service and Renan's intellect may exceed most programmers in communications ability. The fact that the normal mind can excel in one genre and lack another entirely is an aspect that Neeley is struggling now to accept. Mr Neeley is the severely brain injured polymath struggling to explain the illegal and inappropriate nature of the open Internet to the US Courts and the public. "[A service] provider that gains knowledge or awareness of infringing activity retains safe-harbor protection if it 'acts expeditiously to remove, or disable access to, the material.' Thus, the nature of the removal obligation itself contemplates knowledge or awareness of specific infringing material, because expeditious removal is possible only if the service provider knows with particularity which items to remove." - -

From 2nd Circuit decision on *Viacom et al v YouTube, et al*

> <<http://madisonian.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Viacom-v-Youtube-2d-cir.pdf>>

> The four files that **MUST BE DELETED** quickly are as follows except switching the trailing numerals (1: "76" with "74"), the trailing numerals (2: "84" with "94"), the trailing numerals (3: "94" with "06"), and the trailing numerals (4: "00" with "50"). Delete files A)I4695400564261674, B) I4695400571142894, C)I4652412231090506, and D)I4652412237775150.

> 1. <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4695400564261676>>
> <http://bing.com/th?id=I4695400564261676>
> <<http://www.bing.com/th?id=I4695400564261676>>

> 2. <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4695400564261676>>
> <http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4695400564261676>
> 3. <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4695400564261676>
> 4. -----
> 5. <http://bing.com/th?id=I4695400571142884>
> <<http://bing.com/th?id=I4695400571142884>>
> 6. <http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4695400571142884>
> <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4695400571142884>>
> 7. <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4695400571142884>
> 8. =====
> 9. <http://bing.com/th?id=I4652412231090594>
> <<http://www.bing.com/th?id=I4652412231090594>>
> <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4652412231090594>>
> 10. <http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4652412231090594>
> <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4652412231090594>>
> 11. <<http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4652412231090594>>
> <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4652412231090594>
> 12. -----
> 13. <http://bing.com/th?id=I4652412237775100>
> <<http://bing.com/th?id=I4652412237775100>>
> 14. <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4652412237775100>>
> <http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4652412237775100>
> 15. <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4652412237775100>
> <<http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4652412237775100>>
>
> This alteration was done so that MSFT and GOOG do not use this post to
> try to §230 <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/47/230>> justify
> "reporting on the Internet" and finding these nudes again.
>
> Addition trivia that customer service might be interested in knowing is
> that the server aliases of ts3.explicit.bing.net and ts3.mm.bing.net
> have absolutely NOTHING separating these files from non-explicit files
> in content.
>
> 1. <http://www.bing.com/th?id=I4996048263971998>
> <<http://www.bing.com/th?id=I4996048263971998>>
> 2. <http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4996048263971998>
> <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4996048263971998>>
> 3. <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4996048263971998>
> <<http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4996048263971998>>
>
> The previous three "wholly unregulated wire locations" (URLs) are the
> same file and are "Holy Ghost" graphics and are not generally
> considered explicit.
>
>
> DELETE THESE FOUR
> FILES IMMEDIATELY!
> (Speak to your boss and other MSFT stockholders)
>
>

> http://open.salon.com/blog/curtisneeley/2012/06/01/microsoft_corporation
> [_stockholders](#)
> <http://open.salon.com/blog/curtisneeley/2012/06/01/microsoft_corporatio
> [n_stockholders](#)>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>> Hello Curtis,

>>
>>
>>

>> Thank you for writing back.

>>
>>
>>
>>

>> I apologize for the inconvenience that this issue may have caused you.

> As what had been mentioned, we do not remove pages in the index on
> request. After the published content is removed or corrected, it will
> be corrected in the search database by our normal content refresh
> processes. There are times when content located in Bing differs from
> the original page, as the webmasters/site owners have recently adjusted
> their content. Furthermore, there are times when this produces
>> non-relevant results. These non-relevant results will adjust
> themselves
> over time, and due to the possible click through popularity of a
> particular page, it might take longer than desired.

>>
>>
>>

>> I hope that this information was helpful. If you have further
>> questions, feel free in replying back on this email.

>>
>
>

>>Regards,

>
>>
>

>>Renan

>

>>Bing Technical Support

>
>
>
>

AG Opinion

No.96-161

Opinion No. 96-161

May 16, 1996

The Honorable Stanley Russ
State Senator
P.O. Box 787
Conway, Arkansas 72032

Dear Senator Russ:

This opinion is being issued in response to your recent question regarding a criminal history record form (Form K29/8/13) that the Department of Health has directed be completed by individuals who wish take an Emergency Medical Technician course. The form includes inquiries regarding both arrests and convictions. On behalf of the Conway Regional Medical Center, you have presented the following question:

Does the Department of Health's Form K29/8/13 violate the privacy of the individuals who are required to complete it?

It is my opinion that the Department of Health's Form K29/8/13 does not, generally speaking, violate individual privacy. (As explained below, however, there may be instances in which it would be appropriate for the student to withhold the requested information.)

The Arkansas Supreme Court has recognized the protectability of individual privacy interests both on common law tort grounds, see, e.g., Dunlap v. McCarty, 284 Ark. 5, 678 S.W.2d 361 (1984), and on constitutional grounds, see McCambridge v. City of Little Rock, 298 Ark. 219, 766 S.W.2d 909 (1989). In order to be protectable on either ground, the privacy interest at issue must be of an extremely personal nature. In addition, if the interest is claimed to be protectable on constitutional grounds, there must be a showing that the harm that would result to the individual as a result of the release of the information in question outweighs the importance of disclosing it.

In my opinion, the criminal history information requested on the Form K29/8/13 does not rise to the level of protectability that has been recognized by the Arkansas Supreme Court for the following two reasons, which will be explained below: (1) Being a matter of public record (unless expunged or sealed, as discussed below), the requested criminal history information is not of an extremely personal nature. (2) The importance to the public and to the Department of Health of releasing this

information outweighs any harm that might come to the individual as a result of its release.

Matters of Public Record

Both convictions and arrests are matters of public record and, except under certain limited circumstances, are obtainable by any person at the courthouse which maintains the records, or by any citizen of the State of Arkansas under the Arkansas Freedom of Information Act. A.C.A. § 25-19-101 *et seq.* See Ops. Att'y Gen. Nos. 95-113; 93-329; *Hengel v. City of Pine Bluff*, 307 Ark. 457, 821 S.W.2d 761 (1991).¹

The limited circumstances under which criminal history information can be withheld are instances in which the individual's record has been expunged or a court has otherwise ordered that the information be kept under seal.

Various Arkansas statutes provide authority under which criminal records may, under the circumstances described in those statutes, be expunged or kept under seal. See, e.g., A.C.A. §§ 5-4-311; 5-64-407; 16-90-601 *et seq.*; 16-90-901 *et seq.*; 16-93-303; 16-93-510; 16-93-1207; all as amended by Acts 1995, No. 998; and 9-27-309. Under the authority of those provisions, a person whose criminal record has been expunged or ordered to be kept under seal is entitled to answer negatively to questions on forms regarding the criminal history that is the subject of the order of expungement or seal. Therefore, an individual whose criminal record has been expunged or ordered to be sealed may withhold the information requested on the Department of Health's Form K29/8/13.

Otherwise, however, the individual may validly be required to provide the information, and this requirement will not be deemed an invasion of the individual's privacy.

The Public's Interest in the Information

Licensed emergency medical personnel are endowed with a degree of authority that grants them immediate (and usually unquestioned) access to people's homes and personal effects, as well as access to the controlled drugs that are often required for the treatment of patients. For this reason, the public has a substantial

¹ I have previously opined, however, that information compiled by the Arkansas Crime Information Center pursuant to A.C.A. § 12-12-201 *et seq.* is not subject to disclosure. See Op. Att'y Gen. No. 91-111.

interest in being assured of the veracity and trustworthiness of these licensed personnel.

In order to provide such assurance, the legislature has authorized the Department of Health, through the Emergency Medical Services Advisory Council to promulgate rules for the licensure of emergency medical technicians. See A.C.A. §§ 20-13-207, -208, -209. The Department's requirement that the Form K29/8/13 be completed was issued pursuant to this statutory authority. In addition, the Department has promulgated rules for licensure, among which are certain other requirements that reflect an endeavor, consistent with the Form K29/8/13 requirement, to see that licensed emergency medical personnel remain free from criminal activity. See, e.g., E.M.S. Rules, Subpart H, No. 1 at p. 25 (Grounds for Discipline), and Subpart I, No. 3(c) at p. 26 (Penalties for Violation). These Department requirements are an attempt to provide the public with certain assurances regarding the emergency personnel in whom the public is obliged to place a certain amount of trust. It is my opinion that the public's interest in receiving such assurances outweighs any harm that might result to the individual as a result of the release of what is already public information about that individual.

For these reasons, I conclude that the Department of Health's Form K29/8/13 does not invade the personal privacy of those individuals who are required to complete it.

The Honorable Stanley Russ
State Senator
Opinion No. 96-161
Page 4

The foregoing opinion, which I hereby approve, was prepared by Assistant Attorney General Suzanne Antley.

Sincerely,

WINSTON BRYANT
Attorney General