

No. 18-9115

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,

Petitioner,

v.

PAZUNIAK LAW OFFICE LLC, *ET AL*,

Respondents,

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT
OF DELAWARE

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam

Dated: October 31, 2019

Pro Se Petitioner

222 Stanford Avenue

Menlo Park, CA 94025


Tel: (650) 690-0995

Fax: (650) 854-3393

Email: laks22002@yahoo.com

Pro Se Petitioner

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam



RULE 29.6 STATEMENT

The Rule 29.6 disclosure statement included in the petition for a writ of certiorari remains accurate.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam (“Dr. Arunachalam”) respectfully requests rehearing of the Court’s 10/7/2019 Order, which denied the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, and to take Judicial Notice of the Court’s Order in Petitioner’s Case No. 18-9383, which states:

“Because the Court lacks a quorum, 28 U. S. C. §1, and since the qualified Justices are of the opinion that the case cannot be heard and determined at the next Term of the Court, the judgment is affirmed under 28 U. S. C. §2109, which provides that under these circumstances “the court shall enter its order affirming the judgment of the court from which the case was brought for review with the same effect as upon affirmance by an equally divided court.” Justice Thomas, Justice Ginsburg, Justice Breyer, Justice Alito, Justice Sotomayor and Justice Kagan took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.”

Six Justices lost jurisdiction and can take no part in the consideration or decision of this Petition for Rehearing (*nor in any of Petitioner’s current or past cases.*) Chief Justice Roberts is (*procedurally, by self-recusal*) conflicted out of taking part in the consideration or decision of Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Certiorari or in this Petition for Rehearing (*or in any of Petitioner’s current or past cases*), for the same procedural reason(s), as detailed *infra*.

A. Microsoft is a Respondent in Petitioner’s Case 18-9386 in this Court; Chief Justice Roberts set a precedent in recusing himself in Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Limited Partnership, 563 U.S. (2011), due to relationship and financial conflicts of interest with Microsoft and Microsoft counsel Theodore Olson and Thomas Hungar, Gibson Dunn & Crutcher LLP

[The conflict unfettered in this Petition for Rehearing; reversing, this Court’s Order of October 7, 2019, which denied the Petition for Writ of Certiorari in the instant case, and reversing, this Court’s Order of October 7, 2019, in Petitioner’s Case 18-9383, affirming the lower court’s jurisdictional stay of adjudicative authority by judges in willful and wanton breach of solemn oath(s) and arrogant refusal to recuse upon notice in failing to enforce, protect, and consider the laws of the land and law of the case; patent statutes; as well as, the Constitutional mandates imposed upon them to uphold the Supremacy and Separation of Powers Clauses of the Constitution and sanctity of contracts (specifically) the ‘Mandated Prohibition’ Constitutional (*stare decisis*) precedent, against repudiating government issued contract grants; ignored by these judges continuing to color the erroneous and fraudulent repudiations of government issued patent contract grants.].

Microsoft is a Respondent in Petitioner's Case 18-9386 in this Court and a Third Party Requester in Re-Examinations of Petitioner's patents. Therefore, Chief Justice Roberts lost subject matter jurisdiction and is conflicted out of all of Petitioner's current and past cases, for the same reason(s) delineated in *Microsoft v i4i Limited Partnership*, 563 U.S. (2011).

B. Seven Justices lost subject matter jurisdiction in all of Petitioner's cases. Justices Breyer and Alito hold direct stock in IBM, a Respondent in Cases 19-5033 and 18-9386. Justice Alito holds direct stock in JPMorgan Chase & Co, Respondents in Case 19-5033 and in Wells Fargo Bank, a Respondent in the Petitioner's Case 18-9386.

Justices Breyer and Alito are conflicted out of all of Petitioner's current and past cases, because they hold direct stock in IBM, a Respondent in Petitioner's Cases 19-5033 and 18-9386 in this Court. Justice Alito holds direct stock in JPMorgan Chase & Co, Wells Fargo Bank — Respondents in Petitioner's Case Nos. 19-5033 and 18-9386, and in Exxon Mobil Corporation — a Defendant in Petitioner's Cases in Western Texas District Court and the Fifth Circuit; stand, in conflict, along with Justice Roberts, on the same principle delineated in *Microsoft v. i4i Limited Partnership*, 563 U.S. (2011).

C. This Court's 10/7/19 Order is VOID, erroneous and must be reversed, if for no other reason than to ensure a standard of Judicial Conduct for lower courts to follow; if for no other reason than that, to avoid wasting this Court's time settling 'First Impression' conduct(s) materially applying and ethically self-enforced.

With seven Justices with conflicts of interest and lack of jurisdiction, this Court's 10/7/19 Order is *erroneous*.

Where seven Justices removed themselves for conflicting interests to avoid the appearances of impropriety impinging on the question of fundamental fairness in the adjudications thereof.

Where the question arising from the lower court comforting Judges refusing to remove themselves from patent breaches of solemn oaths by staying jurisdiction and adjudications (wreaking of conflicting abuses and first impression party conflicts).

THE FIRST QUESTION IS WHERE THE JUDICIAL LEADERSHIP [HERE SEVEN JUSTICES.] OF THE HIGHEST COURT SETS OR COMPLIES WITH AN ETHICAL STANDARD DEMONSTRATING IMPARTIALITY AND COMPLIANCE WITH JUDICIAL CONDUCT TO REMOVE ONESELF FROM A CASE.

WHY WOULD THIS COURT FAIL TO ENFORCE (OR EXPECT ALL LOWER COURT JUDGES TO COMPLY WITH THE ETHICAL STANDARD OR LEADERSHIP EXAMPLE TO REMOVE ONESELF WHERE A CONFLICT ARISES GIVING A REAL OR REASONABLE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY; OR, BREACH OF SOLEMN OATH.

ANY REASONABLE PERSON (OR UNREASONABLE PERSON FOR THAT MATTER) WOULD ASK (UNDER THESE PREVAILING CIRCUMSTANCES): WHO DO THESE LOWER COURT JUDGES THINK THEY ARE TO INDIFFERENTLY BE IN BREACH OF THEIR SOLEMN OATH(S) AND REFUSE TO REMOVE THEMSELVES FROM THE CASE; AND,

ANY APPELLATE COURT JUDGE COLORING THE SOLEMN OATH BREACH BY AFFIRMING THE ARROGANT REFUSALS TO PREVAIL; CLEARLY, HAS LOST JURISDICTION IN THE SOLEMN OATH BREACH PROCESS.

Where seven Justices maintaining conflicts of interest (however real or imagined), have removed themselves from this Court's Order of October 7, 2019 in Petitioner's Case 18-9383; it, is reasonable to infer their actions were honestly made in the interest of fundamental fairness and justice; *made*, with an interest to avoid any appearance of impropriety. **Likewise, they must remove themselves from this Court's Order of October 7, 2019 in Petitioner's cases 19-5033, 18-9386 and in the instant case (because they lost subject matter jurisdiction in all of Petitioner's cases), due to their financial and other conflicts of interest, as Chief Justice Roberts did in *Microsoft v. i4i Limited Partnership*, 563 U.S. (2011).**

However, where the same cannot be inferred from the arrogant refusal of the judges refusing to remove themselves, for breach of solemn oath in failing to uphold, protect, enforce, consider, or acknowledge the laws of the land and law of the case, and the Constitution itself (in every respect); for, good cause showing; *and*, the appellate court's *erroneous decision* in affirming the judges' arrogant refusal(s) to recuse (*while in breach of solemn oath*). The appellate court, *affirming* in furtherance, *ultra vires*, stays the jurisdiction patently in breach of solemn oath(s) by wanton failure to uphold the Constitution, the laws of the land and law of the case regarding the Mandated Prohibition against repudiating government issued contract grants. *Affirming*, the appellate court *ultra vires* grant(s) adjudicative authority to continue coloring the repudiations of contract grants without compensation (*under color of law and judicial authority*); **promoting, anti-trust and depriving inventors of their right to redress under the constitutional provision where erroneous and fraudulent decisions (on venue or not) govern adjudicative proceedings.**

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Court should grant this Petition for Rehearing, vacate its own 10/7/2019 erroneous Order denying the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, the 7 Justices must remove themselves from taking any part in the consideration or decision in this petition, and (1) grant certiorari; or alternatively (2) in addition, vacate the judgment below at the Supreme Court of Delaware and Newcastle County Superior Court of Delaware, enter a GVR order and remand to the Supreme Court of Delaware and/or to the Newcastle County Superior Court of Delaware to re-start the case with an impartial judge. A Certificate of Service is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Lakshmi Arunachalam

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam

Pro Se Petitioner

222 Stanford Avenue, Menlo Park, CA 94025

Tel: (650) 690-0995; Fax: (650) 854-3393; laks22002@yahoo.com

Pro Se Petitioner

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam

October 31, 2019

RULE 44 CERTIFICATE

I, Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, Petitioner *pro se*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, declare under penalty of perjury that the following is true and correct:

1. This petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay.
2. The grounds of this petition are limited to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.

Executed on October 31, 2019

Lakshmi Arunachalam

Signature

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam

Pro Se Petitioner

222 Stanford Avenue, Menlo Park, CA 94025

(650) 690-0995; laks22002@yahoo.com