

## APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>App. 1a:</u> Fifth Circuit Order and Entry of Judgment (12/4/19) .....	App. 1a
Federal Circuit Order (1/9/20).....	(Contd.) App. 1a
<u>App. 2a:</u> District Court Order (7/15/2019).....	App. 2a

**App. 1a**  
**Fifth Circuit Order and Entry of Judgment (12/4/19)**

*United States Court of Appeals*  
FIFTH CIRCUIT  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

**LYLE W. CAYCE  
CLERK**

**TEL. 504-310-7700  
600 S. MAESTRI PLACE,  
Suite 115  
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130**

December 04, 2019

MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES LISTED BELOW:

No. 19-50659 Lakshmi Arunachalam v. Intuit, Incorporated  
USDC No. 6:19-CV-172

Enclosed is an order entered in this case.

Sincerely,

LYLE W. CAYCE, Clerk

McCauslands

By: Melissa B. Courseaull, Deputy Clerk  
504-310-7701

Ms. Lakshmi Arunachalam  
Mr. Michael John Sacksteder  
Mr. Jeffrey Ware

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 19-50659

---

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

INTUIT, INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas

---

Before HAYNES, GRAVES, and ENGELHARDT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

This panel previously granted Appellee's motion to dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction and denied as moot the motion to transfer the appeal. The panel has considered Appellant's motion for reconsideration. IT IS ORDERED that the motion is DENIED.

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 19-50659

---

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

INTUIT, INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas

---

Before HAYNES, GRAVES, and ENGELHARDT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

This panel previously granted Appellee's motion to dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction and denied as moot the motion to transfer the appeal. The panel has considered Appellant's motion for reconsideration. IT IS ORDERED that the motion is DENIED.

**(Contd.) App. 1a**  
**Federal Circuit Order (1/9/20)**

RE: Please file and docket my Motion(s) in the 7 cases. Opposing Counsel is copied here. Paper copies have been sent to the Court via Fedex for overnight delivery. Certificate of Service attached.

From: prose (prose@cafc.uscourts.gov)  
To: laks22002@yahoo.com  
Date: Thursday, January 9, 2020, 04:25 AM PST

The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit is unable to accept these filings as they are not related to any active, pending cases with us. These motions should be submitted to the court of origin (USCA – 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit).

Thank you,

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit  
717 Madison Place, NW  
Washington, DC 20439

---

**From:** Lakshmi Arunachalam <laks22002@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 31, 2019 12:52 AM  
**To:** prose <prose@cafc.uscourts.gov>; Lakshmi Arunachalam <laks22002@yahoo.com>; Jay Yates <jyates@pattersonsheridan.com>; msacksteder@fenwick.com; ops@berryaviation.com; anthony.lannie@apachecorp.com; kristin@lyft.com; twest@uber.com; Pat Heptig <pheptig@heptiglaw.com>  
**Subject:** Please file and docket my Motion(s) in the 7 cases. Opposing Counsel is copied here. Paper copies have been sent to the Court via Fedex for overnight delivery. Certificate of Service attached.

Dear Mr. Marksteiner,

Please file and docket my Motion(s) in the 7 cases. Opposing Counsel is copied here. Paper copies have been sent to the Court via Fedex for overnight delivery. A Certificate of Service is attached.

Regards

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam

*Pro Se Plaintiff-Appellant in the 7 cases*

222 Stanford Ave

Menlo Park, CA 94025

650 690 0995

laks22002@yahoo.com

**App. 2a**  
**District Court Order (7/15/19)**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

**LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,**  
*Plaintiff*

**-v-**

**INTUIT, INC.,**  
*Defendant*

**W-19-CV-00172-ADA**

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT INTUIT, INC.'S  
MOTION TO DISMISS**

Came on for consideration Defendant Intuit, Inc.'s Motion to Transfer Venue or Alternatively to Dismiss Complaint. ECF No. 17. The Court has also considered all responses and replies to the Motion. The Court has also considered all other motions, responses, and replies filed by the Parties in this case. After consideration, the Court is of the opinion that Defendant's Motion to Dismiss should be **GRANTED**.

In this case, Plaintiff Dr. Laksni Arunachalam is asserting United States Patent No. 7,930,340 (the “‘340 Patent”). In another case before this Court, Plaintiff asserted the same patent against Exxon Mobil Corporation. *Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam v. Exxon Mobil Corp.*, No. 6:19-cv-171-ADA (W.D. Tex., Feb. 26, 2019) (complaint), ECF No. 1. In that case, the Court held that Plaintiff’s ‘340 Patent was invalid based on collateral estoppel. *Id.* ECF No. 35. Because the Court has already held that Plaintiff’s ‘340 Patent is invalid, Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss should be granted in this case for the same reasons the Court listed in its previous Order. Because the Court will grant Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss, it will not consider Defendant’s Motion to Transfer Venue.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Defendant Intuit’s Motion to Dismiss Complaint (ECF No. 17) is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that any relief not specifically granted in this Order is  
**DENIED.**

**SIGNED** this 15th day of July, 2019.



---

ALAN D ALBRIGHT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

**LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,**  
*Plaintiff*

-v-

**INTUIT, INC.,**  
*Defendant*

**W-19-CV-00172-ADA**

§  
§  
§  
§

**FINAL JUDGMENT**

Came on for consideration the status of the above-entitled cause of action. In accordance with the Court's Order Granting Defendant Intuit Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss, the Court enters its judgment as follows:

**IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff's claims are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that any relief not specifically granted in this Final Judgment is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FINALLY ORDERED** that this case is closed.

**SIGNED** this 15th day of July, 2019.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**ALAN D ALBRIGHT**  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

## JUDGMENT

**It is hereby Ordered and adjudged that:**

1. The Wrongdoers and Respondents enforce *Fletcher v. Peck*, 10 U.S. 87 (1810) that a grant is a contract that cannot be repudiated; *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, 17 U.S. 518 (1819): “The law of this case is the law of all... Lower courts ...have nothing to act upon...”; *Grant v. Raymond*, 31 U.S. 218 (1832): “By entering into public contracts with inventors, the federal government must ensure a “faithful execution of the solemn promise made by the United States;” *U.S. v. American Bell Telephone Company*, 167 U.S. 224 (1897): “the contract basis for intellectual property rights heightens the federal government’s obligations to protect those rights. ...give the federal government “higher rights” to cancel land patents than to cancel patents for inventions;” *Ogden v. Saunders*, 25 U.S. 213 (1827) applies the logic of sanctity of contracts and vested rights directly to federal grants of patents under the IP Clause — the Law of the Case and Supreme Laws of the Land.
2. The Wrongdoers and Respondents apply to all of my cases(s) *Aqua Products Inc. v. Matal*, Fed. Cir. 15-1177 (2017) that reversed all Court and PTAB rulings that failed to consider “the entirety of the record” — Patent Prosecution History.
3. There is Trespass on Property, Trespass on Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a Woman’s rights, Trespass on the case, all by False Claim and Tampering with Public Record, Denial of Due Process, Lack of Jurisdiction and Injury: Respondents have been in Contempt, in Dishonor, in Breach of Fiduciary Duty/Public Trust/Solemn Oath of Office, moving into Jurisdiction Unknown.
4. The Judiciary’s and PTAB Orders and Judgment are Void and are hereby vacated.
5. Respondents are hereby criminally charged with trespass on property/rights/case by false claim and with treason for breaching their oaths of office and not enforcing the Supreme Law of the Land, which is the Law of the Case, in all of Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a Woman’s cases.
6. I Order the Bailiff to have the Respondents arrested for breach of their solemn oaths of office.
7. The Respondents, Judges, lawyers, Clerks and public officials are hereby Ordered to produce and place in the record their certified oaths of office and bonds within 7 days of Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a Woman’s “Notice Of And Verified Claim Of (1) Trespass On Property/ Rights/Case By False Claim and

Tampering with Public Record, Warranting Criminal Charges, (2) Lack Of Jurisdiction, (3) District And Fifth And Federal Circuit Courts' Void Orders And Judgment, And (4) Injury: In Contempt, In Dishonor, In False Claim, In Breach Of Fiduciary Duty/Public Trust/Solemn Oath of Office; Denial of Due Process, Moving Into Jurisdiction Unknown" being entered in the docket.

8. I Order the Clerk of the Court to Move this in to the Claims side of the Court, to the Common Law Court of Record. **I further Order the Clerk to stamp and sign this Judgment.**
9. I order each of the Respondents collectively to immediately pay damages of U.S. \$One Hundred Billion dollars to Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a Woman, within ten days from entry into the docket.

Dated: March 1, 2020

Ordered by:



Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a Woman.  
222 Stanford Ave  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
650 690 0995; Laks22002@yahoo.com

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 19-50659

---



DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

INTUIT, INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee

Certified as a true copy and issued  
as the mandate on Oct 23, 2019

Attest: *Jyle W. Cayce*  
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas

---

Before HAYNES, GRAVES, and ENGELHARDT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

IT IS ORDERED that Appellee's opposed motion to dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction is GRANTED. See 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(1).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Appellee's alternative motion to transfer this appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit is denied as moot.

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**FIFTH CIRCUIT**  
**OFFICE OF THE CLERK**

**LYLE W. CAYCE  
CLERK**

TEL. 504-310-7700  
600 S. MAESTRI PLACE,  
Suite 115  
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130

October 23, 2019

Ms. Jeannette Clack  
Western District of Texas, Waco  
United States District Court  
800 Franklin Avenue  
Waco, TX 76701

No. 19-50659 Lakshmi Arunachalam v. Intuit, Incorporated  
USDC No. 6:19-CV-172

Dear Ms. Clack,

Enclosed is a copy of the judgment issued as the mandate.

Sincerely,

LYLE W. CAYCE, Clerk

McDonald

By: Melissa B. Courseaull, Deputy Clerk  
504-310-7701

cc w/encl:

Ms. Lakshmi Arunachalam  
Mr. Michael John Sacksteder  
Mr. Jeffrey Ware