

✓  
RECEIVED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Crystal L. Cox  
Pro Se Plaintiff  
**2:13-cv-00297-JCM-VCF**  
SavvyBroker@Yahoo.com

2013 APR 12 P 1:35

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
**2:13-cv-00297-JCM-VCF**

BY \_\_\_\_\_ DEPUTY

Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox

Motion to Legally Relate Supreme Court of the State of  
New York, County of New York Case  
Number 105573-2011 (Rakofsky v. The Internet)

vs.

Defendant Marc J. Randazza, and Named Defendants

I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, request this court to enter Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York Case Number 105573-2011 (Rakofsky v. The Internet), as a Related Case to **2:13-cv-00297-JCM-VCF**.

**Note to Court:**

This is my **second filing** of this Motion to Relate Rakofsky v. The Internet. I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, mailed this motion previously to this court, via Certified Mail. The motion was not placed on the docket. When I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, enquired as to what happened, here is the eMail details with Peggie Vannozzi, Courtroom Administrator to Judge Miranda M. Du' US District Court, District of Nevada.

I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox eMailed the Following to Peggie Vannozzi, Courtroom Administrator to Judge Miranda M. Du' US District Court, District of Nevada;

"Hello,

Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox here, I noticed an update to the docket today, I noticed that motions I mailed were added to the docket, I also noticed, that 2 motions were missing and want to make sure they were not overlooked in the packet.

Thank you for your time,"

Peggie Vannozzi Responded with:

"Hello,

You mention that 2 motions were missing and you wanted to make sure they were not overlooked in the packet. These items were filed yesterday, with the documents mailed to you at the address you provided. You will not be able to view the documents from this email as the links will connect to the Nevada CMECF log in page and you do not have permission yet to file. Please review this list and tell me what you think is missing.

-----+-----+-----  
03/2	vi	MOTION for Pro Se Litigant to File Electronically filed
7/20	ew	by Plaintiff Crystal L Cox. Motion ripe 3/27/2013. (AC)
13	7	(Entered: 03/28/2013)

-----+-----+-----  
03/2	vi	MOTION to Enjoin the U.S. Attorney General filed by
7/20	ew	Plaintiff Crystal L Cox. Responses due by 4/13/2013.
13	8	(AC) (Entered: 03/28/2013)

-----+-----+-----  
03/2	vi	MOTION Requesting Reason for Recusal/Removal of
7/20	ew	Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe filed by Plaintiff
13	9	Crystal L Cox. Responses due by 4/13/2013. (AC)
		(Entered: 03/28/2013)

-----+-----+-----  
03/2	vi	MOTION for Appointment of Counsel filed by Plaintiff
7/20	ew	Crystal L Cox. Motion ripe 3/27/2013. (AC) (Entered:
13	10	03/28/2013)

-----+-----+-----  
03/2	vi	MOTION Certifying Completion of CMECF Tutorial filed by
7/20	ew	Plaintiff Crystal L Cox. Responses due by 4/13/2013.
13	11	(AC) (Entered: 03/28/2013)

-----			
	03/2	vi	MOTION to Continue In Forma Pauperis filed by Plaintiff
	7/20	ew	Crystal L Cox. Responses due by 4/13/2013. (AC)
	13	12	(Entered: 03/28/2013)
-----			
	03/2	vi	MOTION to Legally Relate the Southern District of New
	7/20	ew	York case no. 1:07-cv-09599-SAS filed by Plaintiff
	13	13	Crystal L Cox. Responses due by 4/13/2013. (AC)
			(Entered: 03/28/2013)
-----			

**I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox responded with:**

"Thanks You I have attached the 2 documents missing, maybe they were mistakenly taken as part of the one motion to relate. There were 2 other motions to related in the packet, i have attached them here as reference to help find them. , as they were all mailed together.

what is missing is two motions to relate.

I have seen the docket, thank you for the information.

thank you for your time

Crystal L. Cox  
Pro Se Litigant"

Peggie Vannozzi Responded with:

"I found the original documents you sent and these two documents you have attached are not part of the documents we have. I spoke to the person who opened the mail on 3/27 and she said that she put the documents that were docketed are the ones that were in the envelope.

You will need to mail these two documents to the Court. I cannot download them.

Peggie Vannozzi  
Courtroom Administrator to Judge Miranda M. Du  
US District Court, District of Nevada"

**I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox responded with:**

"oK thank you, I will remail. I am 100% sure they were in the packet, as I paid for the copies at the mail place and have my receipt. I will remail, however can you please ask them to check through one more time, they did not have a paper clip, they were one page motions. There were in the packet, I am absolutely sure. So they must have been lost somehow.

Crystal L. Cox "

**Peggie Vannozzi Responded with:**

"I did notice that the Motion relating civil case 1:07-cv-11196-SAS is attached to document 13. It is better for you to re-mail the documents to minimize confusion rather than email me and ask me to make amendments to your documents. Thank you"

**I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox responded with:**

"Ok, I am not asking for an amendment. I mailed motions to be filed, and they were not. I labeled each motion separate, and I signed them, I paid to print, to mail certified and I got a signature, I followed proper procedure and in no way asking for an amendment. I did it right the first time.

"I did notice that the Motion relating civil case 1:07-cv-11196-SAS is attached to document 13" You said this, if it accidentally was attached, that is besides the proper procedure that each motion to relate was filed, labeled and signed as separate documents.

I filed in Pauperis, it is hard for me to get to town, to print, to pay to mail, to certify a second time for a motion that was filed properly. Thank you for your time, though you have not helped me with this issue. I know exactly what was in the envelope, the courts there have messed up, not me, please do not think I have asked for an amendment or special favors, I have NOT asked for an amendment in any way.

I did this right and at my own personal cost. Which I now have to redo, because they are not seen for some reason as separate motions, though they are for sure labeled as separate motions and signed separately.

I even wrote how many pages were in each.

I will reDo this, however please understand my frustration, as this is a RICO, Racketeering, Conspiracy complaint, and I am under constant sabotage, attack, threats, harassment, and having documents disappear. I will mention this in future motions, as I believe that the District of Nevada has discriminated against me and has favored whom are now defendants in this case, and I am in another District of Nevada case where some are Plaintiffs. I am not asking for an "amendment", I need that to be clear. I am asking for fair, unbiased treatment as a pro se litigant.

Thank You for your time, I will reMail when I get the money to.

Blessings to You..

**Crystal L. Cox**  
**Pro Se Litigant"**

The eMail conversation Ended there, so I am re-mailing this motion to relate Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York Case Number 105573-2011 (Rakofsky v. The Internet).

Upon my knowledge and belief, this was a **deliberate act** to protect named defendants in a RICO / Racketeering case involving over 90 Defendants, which most are among the biggest tech companies, media companies and law firms in the world.

**I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox move this court to Legally Relate, Add Related Case; Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York Case Number 105573-2011 (Rakofsky v. The Internet).**

I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, have been targeted by a large number of the same defendants as this case. I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, have been subject to Internet Mobbing, Harassment, Defamation, Retaliation and the same as Plaintiff Rakofsky alleges.

I, Plaintiff Crystal L. Cox, believe these cases are legally related.

Some, not all connected Defendants are Jordan Rushie, Eric Turkewitz, Simple Justice NY LLC, Scott H. Greenfield, Bennett and Bennett, Mark Bennett, Above the Law, and more.

The Rakofsky v. The Internet case also involves other connected parties Proskauer Rose Law Firm and Marc J. Randazza, Randazza Legal Group, AboveTheLaw.com, Elie Mystal, Breaking Bad Media LLC, Siddiq Law, Brian Tannebaum, and more. It is of public importance that these cases be legally related.

In RICO / Racketeering Cases, it is essential to prove pattern and history. The Rakofsky v. The Internet will provide such proof and essential to the merits, and matter of law of District of Nevada RICO 2:13-cv-00297-MMD-VCF.



Respectfully Submitted  
Pro Se Plaintiff  
District of Nevada 2:13-cv-00297-MMD-VCF  
Crystal L. Cox  
PO Box 2027  
Port Townsend, WA 98368  
Crystal@CrystalCox.com

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

**On** April 6th, 2013

I hereby certify that I served the foregoing on:

Attention: Judge Mirada Du Court Clerk  
Las Vegas Courts  
District of Nevada Courts  
333 S. Las Vegas Blvd.  
Las Vegas, NV 89101



Respectfully Submitted  
Pro Se Plaintiff  
District of Nevada 2:13-cv-00297-MMD-VCF  
Crystal L. Cox  
PO Box 2027  
Port Townsend, WA 98368  
Crystal@CrystalCox.com