App. No. _____

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,

Petitioner,

v.

FREMONT BANCORPORATION, *ET AL*,

Respondents,

ON APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PRO SE PETITIONER'S APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Lakshmi Arunachalam, Ph.D.
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

Dated: February 11, 2019

***PRO SE* PETITIONER'S APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

To the Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and Circuit Justice for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit:

Pro Se Petitioner Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam ("Petitioner" or "Dr. Arunachalam") respectfully requests that the time to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in this matter be extended for sixty days (60) days to and including May 18, 2019. The Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ("Ninth Circuit") issued its Order on December 18, 2018 (*see* Ex. A). Absent an extension of time, the Petition would therefore be due on March 18, 2019. *Pro Se* Petitioner is filing this Application at least ten days before that date. See S. Ct. R. 13.5. This Court would have jurisdiction over the judgment under 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1254(1).

BACKGROUND

The District Court rendered seven Orders between 4/23/15 and 3/16/2017 denying due process to Dr. Arunachalam. Judge Laporte warred against the Constitution in treasonous[1] breach of her solemn Oath of Office, not enforcing the Supreme Law(s) of the Land *Mandated Prohibition* declared by Chief Justice

---

[1] *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958). *Marbury v. Madison,* 5 U.S. 137, 177 (1803); *Ableman v. Booth,* 62 U. S. 524 (1859); *Sterling v. Constantin,* 287 U. S. 397 (1932)

Marshall in *Fletcher v. Peck*, 10 U.S. 87 (1810) against rescinding Government-Issued Patent Contract Grants by the highest authority, *reaffirmed* by the Supreme Court; lost her jurisdiction and immunity. **Respondents and the Ninth Circuit have not proven an *Exemption* from the *Mandated Prohibition*. The *'LAWS OF THE LAND'* on my side, Judge Laporte dismissed the Constitution** without a hearing. Judge Laporte *disparately* failed to consider *Patent Prosecution History* and the Federal Circuit's *Aqua Products, Inc. v. Matal* ruling of October 4, 2017, reversing all Orders that failed to consider Patent Prosecution History. Her Orders are void. The Ninth Circuit panel dismissed the Appeal on December 18, 2018.

Dr. Arunachalam was denied individual liberty and property outside the sanction of law and without due process of law. This Court stated, on Government officials non-exempt from absolute judicial immunity, that "no avenue of escape from the paramount authority of the...Constitution...when ...exertion of...power... has overridden private rights secured by that Constitution, the subject is necessarily one for judicial inquiry...against...individuals charged with the transgression." *Sterling v. Constantin,* 287 U. S. 397 (1932).

This Court has stated on numerous occasions that where an individual is facing a deprivation of life, liberty, or property, procedural due process mandates that he or she is entitled to adequate notice, a hearing, and a neutral judge.

Dr. Arunachalam has been deprived of her fundamental rights that are "implicit in the concept of ordered liberty," *Palko v. Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319 (1937); *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976); an individual's right to some kind of a hearing ("the right to support his allegations by arguments however brief and, if need be, by proof however informal."); Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., stated, *Baldwin v. Missouri*, 281 U.S. 586, 595 (1930):

> "persons holding interests protected by the due process clause are entitled to "some kind of hearing"...that assessment is to be made both concretely, and in a holistic manner. It is not a matter of approving this or that particular element of a procedural matrix in isolation, but of assessing the suitability of the ensemble in context."

Indeed, this case was dismissed, in contravention of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth, Seventh, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments.

REASONS FOR GRANTING AN EXTENSION OF TIME

The time to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be extended for sixty (60) days for these reasons:

1. *Pro Se* Petitioner, Dr. Arunachalam, recently underwent surgery requiring a recuperation period of 4-6 weeks. Dr. Arunachalam has an appointment with the surgeon at Stanford on March 4, 2019 for a prospective additional surgery. Due to the surgery and the press of other business (seven appeals, patent litigation), all of which she is handling *pro se*, additional time is warranted to allow preparation of a Petition.

2. This case presents an extraordinarily important issue warranting a carefully prepared Petition. The decision of the Court of Appeals, if followed, will conflict with Supreme Court precedent with respect to its findings on: (a) the denial of liberty and property without due process of law, and (b) this Court's *Oil States* ruling that violates the Separation of Powers, Supremacy and Contract Clauses of the U.S. Constitution and failed to consider this Court's precedential *'First Impression' Res Judicata Mandated Prohibition* declared by Chief Justice Marshall in *Fletcher v. Peck*, 10 U.S. 87 (1810) against rescinding Government-Issued Patent Contract Grants by the highest authority, *reaffirmed* multiple times by this Court — the Supreme Law(s) of the Land. The decision avoids "the *Fletcher* challenge."

3. There is at minimum a substantial prospect that this Court will grant certiorari and, indeed, a substantial prospect of reversal.

4. Petitioner is interviewing outside counsel with Supreme Court expertise to provide consulting assistance to her in this case. Additional time is necessary and warranted for that counsel, *inter alia*, to become familiar with the record, relevant legal precedents and historical materials, and the issues involved in this matter.

5. No meaningful prejudice would arise from the extension, as this Court would hear oral argument and issue its opinion in the same Term regardless of whether an extension is granted.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the time to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in this matter should be extended sixty (60) days to and including May 18, 2019.

Dated: February 11, 2019

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
Email: laks22002@yahoo.com

Pro Se Petitioner
Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam

VERIFICATION

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. Section 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct based upon my personal knowledge.

Lakshmi Arunachalam

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam
Pro Se Petitioner
222 Stanford Ave,
Menlo Park, CA 94025
650 690 0995
laks22002@yahoo.com

Executed on February 11, 2019

Pro Se Petitioner
Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam