App. No. 20-1165

In the Supreme Court of the United States

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman,

Petitioner,

v.

CITIGROUP INC., CITICORP, CITIBANK, N.A.,

Respondents,

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to
the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman,
SELF-REPRESENTED PETITIONER
222 Stanford Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(650) 690-0995
(650) 854-3393 (FAX)
laks22002@yahoo.com

February 18, 2021

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the inferior courts *arbitrarily* claiming collateral estoppel without once proving it nor applying Supreme Court precedent dating back more than two hundred years or 35USC §282 and suppressing material evidence[1], *thereby* adversely dominating the process to prevent *Dartmouth College* and *Fletcher* from ever coming before this Court, constitutes denying a citizen due process and access to the courts, violating the 1st, 5th and

---

[1] ***wherein*** material evidence includes at least:

a. *Prima facie* intrinsic evidence of th terms and conditions of the patent grant in Patent Prosecution History;
b. This Court's own *stare decisis Mandated Prohibition* of the Constitution against repudiating Government-issued patent grant contracts, declared in *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward* (1819), *Grant v. Raymond* (1832), *Fletcher v. Peck* (1810);
c. All claims in patents-in-suit, not examined, as per **35USC §282:** "Each claim of a patent (whether in independent, dependent, or multiple dependent form) shall be presumed valid independently of the validity of other claims; dependent or multiple dependent claims shall be presumed valid even though dependent upon an invalid claim. The burden of establishing invalidity of a patent or any claim thereof shall rest on the party asserting such invalidity," and must be proven with "clear and convincing evidence."
d. Expert opinions by Stanford's Dr. Markus Covert and Dr. Jay Tenenbaum proving that Petitioner's patent claim terms are not indefinite, nor patent claims collaterally estopped, as per the court's False Official Statements;
e. Witness testimony of the courts' failure to perform their ministerial duties to abide by their solemn oaths; and,
f. USPTO's unconstitutionally appointed judges (APJs) to perform the function of the Judiciary, violating the Separation of Powers, Contract and Appointments Clauses of the Constitution.

14th Amendments, the Bill of Rights, the Separation of Powers, Contract and Appointments Clauses of the Constitution, anti-trust laws and 35 U.S.C. § 282.

2. Whether it is within the purview of inferior courts and USPTO to estop a Supreme Court precedent, estop the Constitution, and estop a citizen from being heard *without inquiry*, ***where*** Supreme Court precedent dating back more than two hundred years collaterally estops repeatedly fraudulent and erroneous renditions of the legal and factual basis of a case, in False Official Statements[2] by inferior courts acting as *defacto* Defendants[3], thereby adversely dominating the process, and violating basic tenets of due process of law.

3. *Whereas,* it is one thing for the inferior courts and USPTO to abuse and adversely dominate process and procedure, and suppress material evidence thereby defrauding inventors; and, *whereas*, it is something else entirely to instigate breach of solemn oaths against the Separation of Powers, Appointments and Contract Clauses of the

---

[2] The Federal Circuit willfully made false allegations that it rejected *Fletcher*, *Aqua Products*, Patent Prosecution History Estoppel, the Contracts Clause, Judge Andrews' failure to recuse, **by mere mention**, without stating when and on what grounds, while glaringly omitting that Judge Andrews himself admitted direct stock holding in a litigant JPMorgan Chase & Co. and that the three Branches of Government violated the Separation of Powers and Contract Clauses of the Constitution.

[3] Defendants were in default, where the inferior courts put the Defendants in dishonor to not answer the inventor's Complaint or Appeal

Constitution, *that* endanger national security, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States, *whether* this Court to take any action other than dismissing the False Official Statements[4] in the Federal Circuit's Orders, that lack proof and legal merit and encouraged and resulted in – lawless action against the inventor and the Constitution, causing the rest of the Judiciary to follow suit, would **constitute a Bill of Attainder in violation of Art. I, Sec. 9, Cl. 3 of the United States Constitution.**

4. Whether Justice Barrett, as the sole Justice with jurisdiction, has a solemn oath duty to enforce the Supreme Law of the Land — this Court's own Precedent in *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward* (1819), *Grant v. Raymond* (1832), *Fletcher v. Peck* (1810) — the Prohibition of the Constitution from repudiating Government-issued patent grant contracts, *where* Chief Justice Roberts recused, seven Justices in silence thereof lost subject matter jurisdiction, *whereby* the courts and USPTO adversely dominated the process to prevent *Dartmouth College* and *Fletcher* from ever coming before this Court, leaving the inventor with rights and no remedy, in violation of the

---

[4] The allegations by the Federal Circuit in its Orders are denied as facially and substantively flawed, and otherwise unconstitutional, and must be dismissed with prejudice and strict proof at time of hearing is demanded.

Separation of Powers[5] and Contract Clauses of the Constitution.

5. If there is no quorum, whether Justice Barrett is duty-bound to enforce the Supreme Law of the Land — this Court's *stare decisis Prohibition* of the Constitution, *and*, must necessarily subject to judicial inquiry against individuals charged with the transgression, where clerks and judges have no avenue of escape from the paramount authority of the Constitution, when exertion of power has overridden private rights secured by that Constitution.
6. *Where* the inferior courts do not have the authority to reject enforcing this Court's *stare decisis* ruling in "*Fletcher v. Peck*," or the cast-in-stone "Patent Prosecution History Estoppel," or the "Contract Clause of the Constitution", or to reverse the Federal Circuit's *stare decisis Aqua Products'* ruling *disparately* only in the inventor's case while

---

[5] Congress enacted the America Invents Act for the Executive Branch (USPTO) to perform the function of the Judiciary by USPTO's unconstitutionally appointed judges (APJs) in violation of the Separation of Powers, Contract and Appointments Clause of the Constitution— in contempt of this Court's own *stare decisis Prohibition* of the Constitution against repudiating government-issued patent contract grants, in a corrupted re-examination process, without considering material *prima facie* intrinsic evidence – Patent Prosecution History. Congress created the Federal Circuit in 1982 to invalidate granted patents, in contempt of this Court's *stare decisis Prohibition* — the Supreme Law of the Land.

giving Microsoft the benefit of *Aqua Products*, and much less by mere mention of the word(s) "*Fletcher*" or "patent prosecution history estoppel" or " Contracts Clause" or "*Aqua Products,*" without once providing any basis in fact or the law, and in breach of solemn oaths to enforce this Court's *stare decisis Prohibition* of the Constitution against repudiating patent contract grants, wherein their Orders are downright False Official Statements, so as to prevent *Dartmouth College* and *Fletcher* ever coming before this Court, and defaming the inventor as "frivolous" for defending the Constitution and putting them on Notice to enforce the Supreme Law of the Land, oppressing the inventor and making it downright hazardous, expensive and burdensome for the inventor to have access to the courts upon the question of due process itself, and taking away her ECF filing capability, all under adverse domination of process and procedure, depriving the inventor of her 1st, 5th and 14th Amendment rights and property rights,

whether this Court's solemn oath duty to not give such authority to the inferior courts to be in contempt of the Constitution and the law, contrary to facts and the Law of the Case — the Supreme Law of the Land — this Court's *stare decisis Prohibition* of the Constitution, as declared in *Fletcher v. Peck, Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward, Grant v. Raymond,* and patent statutes 35USC §282 makes it necessary for this Court to not be in

dishonor by aiding and abetting the inferior courts' violations of civil and criminal laws and the Constitution, in misprision thereof, in the public's interest and in the interest of justice, and for Justice Barrett, who is duty-bound, to enforce the Supreme Law of the Land — this Court's *stare decisis Prohibition* of the Constitution, *and*, to necessarily subject to judicial inquiry against those individuals whose exertion of power has overridden private rights secured by the paramount authority of the Constitution from which they have no avenue of escape.

7. Whether this Court is going to go along with the same faulty logic as the inferior courts' Orders, lacking an arguable basis in law or fact and are contrary to law, violating the 1st, 5th and 14th Amendments, 35 U.S.C. § 282 and the Separation of Powers, Appointments and Contract Clauses of the Constitution or bring such lawlessness to an end as in *TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC*, 581 U.S. 16-341 (1917), 137 S. Ct. 1514, wherein this Court ruled that the Court's *stare decisis Fourco Glass Co. v. Transmirra Products Corp.,* 353 U.S. 222–226 (1957) holds, reversing the century-long refusal by the Federal Circuit to uphold *Fourco,*
   (a) *whereas* the courts and USPTO *arbitrarily* and *capriciously* revoked the terms and construction of the patent grant contract cast in stone and estopped from being revoked by

the file history, contrary to this Court's *stare decisis* precedent in *Festo Corp. v Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 535 U.S. 722 (2002);

(b) *whereas* the inferior courts failed to specify what is collaterally estopped, by what, in their False Claims;

(c) *whereas* the inferior courts contorted their False Claims by twistifications of what claim in which patent;

(d) *whereas* the inferior courts failed to examine 213 virgin, non-examined valid claims, in contempt of the presumption of validity of all patent claims, as delineated in the Patent Statute **35USC §282 [6]**;

(e) *whereas* the Federal Circuit *disparately* reversed its own *Aqua Products'* reversal of all Orders that failed to consider "the entirety of the record" *only in the inventor's case*, but gave Microsoft the benefit of its *Aqua Products'* ruling;

(f) *whereas* the inferior courts "acting with an improper purpose and to engage in conduct knowingly and dishonestly with the specific

---

6 "Each claim of a patent (whether in independent, dependent, or multiple dependent form) shall be presumed valid independently of the validity of other claims; dependent or multiple dependent claims shall be presumed valid even though dependent upon an invalid claim. The burden of establishing invalidity of a patent or any claim thereof shall rest on the party asserting such invalidity," and must be proven with "clear and convincing evidence."

intent to subvert, impede, or obstruct the proceeding," and "acting with consciousness of wrongdoing;"

(g) *whereas* the evidence the Federal Circuit court and clerk's office sought to deny has been material.

(h) *whereas* the endeavor had the natural and probable effect of interfering with the due administration of justice, in violation of federal criminal laws 18 U.S.C. §§371, 1512, 1513, and 1503, with crime in progress, requiring this Court to compel the inferior courts and USPTO to stop being in dishonor and dereliction of their ministerial duties to abide by their solemn oaths to enforce this Court's *stare decisis Prohibition* declared in *Dartmouth College* and *Fletcher*, and to timely docket a citizen's filings and stop tampering with the public record and hand over to the Hearing panel the evidence, material to the case, which they have removed from the docket with intent to deceive the public and to deprive the inventor of her property rights and constitutional rights;

(i) *whereby* the courts and USPTO adversely dominated the process to prevent this Court's *stare decisis Prohibition* of the Constitution from repudiating Government-issued patent contract grants without compensating the inventor, declared in *Dartmouth College* and *Fletcher* from ever coming before this Court;

(j) *whereas* the inferior courts' Orders constitute downright False Official Statements by operation of law;

(k) *whereas* the Federal Circuit failed to grant a citizen her protected rights to the benefits of the equal protection of the laws and freedom to petition the Government for redress of grievance in violation of the 1st, 5th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution; *and,*

(l) *whereas* the courts and USPTO oppressed a citizen; injured 73-year old, disabled citizen's health, denying a citizen her fundamental right to health and emergency medical care; and made it expensive, hazardous and burdensome for the citizen to have access to the court and denied her a fair hearing and substantive and procedural due process on the question of due process itself, all in violation of the Constitutional provision. *See* ALP VOL. 12. CONST. LAW, CH. VII, SEC. 1, §141. With respect to Fundamental, Substantive, and Due Process Itself.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS BELOW

Petitioner, Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, the inventor and sole assignee of the patent(s)-in-suit, was the Appellant in the court below. Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam is the sole Petitioner in this Court. Respondents CITIGROUP INC., CITICORP, CITIBANK, N.A., were the Appellees in the court below. Daniel Brune, Dr. Sherna Madan and Murugappan Natesan were *Amicus Curiae* in the Federal Circuit.

Related Cases. This case 20-2196 (Fed. Cir.) has not previously been before this Court.

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT

Pursuant to this Court's Rule 29.6, Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam is an individual and has no parent company and no publicly held company owns 10% or more of its stock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES: **Page**

STATUTES

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI UNDER ADVERSE DOMINATION OF PROCESS

Petitioner Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a 73-year old disabled ethnic female of color, thought leader and **inventor** of a dozen patents on the Internet of Things (IoT) – Web Apps displayed on a Web browser, with a priority date of 11/13/95, hereby files this Petition for Writ of Certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in process disorder and tampered with the public record, violating 18 U.S.C. §§371, 1512, 1513, and 1503.

OPINIONS BELOW

The Order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit dismissing the Appeal and Order denying Petition for *En Banc* Re-Hearing in Petitioner's Appeal Case No. 20-2196 which is an Appeal from Case No. 1:14-cv-00373-RGA (D. Del.) in the U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware are reproduced at App. 1a and App. 4a. The Order of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California is reproduced at App. 6a. The above Orders are not published.

JURISDICTION

The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit entered judgment with opinion in Petitioner's Appeal on 11/3/20, denied Petition for *En Banc* Re-Hearing on **12/28/20** (App.1a and App. 4a). This Court's jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

Chief Justice Roberts recused. Seven Justices sat in silence thereof, and lost subject matter jurisdiction. They failed in their ministerial duty to uphold their solemn oaths of office to enforce the Supreme Law of the Land — this Court's own *stare decisis Prohibition* of the Constitution from repudiating Government-issued patent grant contracts without just compensation to the inventor, as declared by Chief Justice Marshall in *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward,* 17 U.S. 518 (1819), *Grant v. Raymond,* 31 U.S. 218 (1832), *Fletcher v. Peck,* 10 U.S. 87 (1810) — the Law of the Case. This leaves only Justice Barrett as the sole standing Justice with jurisdiction.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS, JUDICIAL CANONS AND JUDICIAL RULES OF PROCEDURE INVOLVED

U.S. Const.:

Separation of Powers Clause, Arts. I, II & III; "The separation of powers ...the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial branches of the United States government are kept distinct in order to prevent abuse of power."

Contract Clause, **Art. I, §10, clause 1; Art. I, §§9 & 10**; "No bill of attainder or *ex post facto* Law shall be passed or law impairing the obligation of contracts."

Equal Protection of the Laws Clause, Amend. XIV, §1; "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor... deprive any

person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Due Process Clause, Amends. V & XIV; "Procedural due process is the guarantee of a fair legal process when the government tries to interfere with a person's protected interests in life, liberty, or property." "...Supreme Court has held that procedural due process requires that, at a minimum, the government provide the person notice, an opportunity to be heard at an oral hearing, and a decision by a neutral decision maker. The Court has also ruled that the Due Process Clause requires judges to recuse themselves in cases where the judge has a conflict of interest. ...*Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868 (2009). Substantive due process is the guarantee that the fundamental rights of citizens will not be encroached on by government..."

Vol. XII, Constitutional Law, Chapter 7. Sec. 140. *Erroneous and Fraudulent Decisions. Due Process and Equal Protection of Law*: Procedure. Sec. 1. *Due Process of Law*. Sec. 141. *Denying or Hindering Access to the Courts upon the Question of Due Process Itself*.

Amend. I; "Right to Petition the Government for a Redress of Grievances."
42U.S.C. § 1983 Civil Rights Act;
JUDICIAL CANONS 2, 2A, 3, 3(A)(4);
FRCP Rule 60(b) (1-4 & 6);
18 U.S. C. Section 2381;
18 U.S. Code§ 2382 - Misprision of treason:
"Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States

and **having knowledge of the commission of any treason** against them, conceals and does not, as soon as may be, disclose and make known the same to the President or to some judge... **is guilty of misprision of treason...**"

The Legislature's 2011 America Invents Act (AIA) Re-examination Provision is a bill of attainder that took away Petitioner/inventor's rights and remedies. There can be no rights without a remedy. See *infra*.

Chief Justice Marshall declared in this Court's significant *'First Impression' Constitutional Res Judicata* precedential ruling in *Fletcher v. Peck* (1810), *Grant v. Raymond* (1832); *U.S. v. American Bell Telephone Company*, 167 U.S. 224 (1897); *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward* (1819); that a Grant is a Contract that cannot be repudiated by the most absolute power, in accord with the Constitution. This is the 'Law of the Land.' *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward* (1819): "The law of this case is the law of all... applies to contracts of every description..." These apply the logic of sanctity of contracts and vested rights directly to federal grants of patents under the IP Clause. By entering into public contracts with inventors, the federal government must ensure what Chief Justice Marshall described in *Grant v. Raymond* (1832) as a "faithful execution of the solemn promise made by the United States."

In *U.S. v. American Bell Telephone Company*, 167 U.S. 224 (1897), Justice Brewer declared: "*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."

To uphold **Patent Prosecution History** is a key contract term between the inventor and the Federal Government/USPTO. The claim construction of claim terms agreed to between the inventor and the Original Examiner at the USPTO before the patent was granted is cast in stone and cannot be changed by the USPTO, Courts or the patentee. Federal Circuit ruled in *Aqua Products, Inc. v. Matal*, Case No. 15-1177, October 4, 2017 that Orders by Courts and USPTO/PTAB that did not consider the "entirety of the record"— Patent Prosecution History — are void and reversed.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case is about the courts and USPTO adversely dominating the process to prevent *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, 17 U.S. 518 (1819), *Grant v. Raymond*, 31 U.S. 218 (1832), *Fletcher v. Peck*, 10 U.S. 87 (1810) from ever coming before this Court.

As a result, the 73-year old, disabled female inventor of color has not had her day in Court in over a 100 cases.

BACKGROUND

Edison invented electricity. Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone. Petitioner, Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, invented the Internet of Things (IoT) — Web Apps displayed on a Web browser. The USPTO

granted her a dozen patents that have a priority date of 1995, a time when two-way real-time Web transactions from Web Apps were non-existent.

Examples of the inventor's IoT machines are the millions of Web Apps in Apple's App Store in Apple's iPhone, in Google Play in Android devices, Web banking Web Apps, healthcare Web Apps, Fitbit, Zoom, Facebook, Twitter, social networking Web Apps, to name a few.

The USPTO and courts made it expensive, hazardous and burdensome for the inventor to have access to the court; called her names without an iota of evidence; and oppressed her to keep her silent of their failure to enforce *Dartmouth College* and *Fletcher*. The evidence the Federal Circuit court and clerk's office sought to deny has been material. The endeavor had the natural and probable effect of interfering with the due administration of justice, in violation of federal criminal laws 18 U.S.C. 371, 1512, 1513, 1503, with crime in progress, requiring this Court to stop the inferior court clerks and judges from being in dishonor and dereliction of their ministerial duties.

Defendants and the Government unjustly enriched themselves by trillions of dollars by their continued, unlicensed use of Dr. Arunachalam's patents, and importing infringing products from China, hurting the domestic industry.

Judge Andrews, USPTO Administrative Judges McNamara and Siu and the Federal Circuit attacked the Constitution, cost the inventor her health,

threatened the inventor, and successfully halted this Court from hearing *Dartmouth College* and *Fletcher*.

This Court has, in the recent past, enforced its own precedents, in *TC Heartland* and *Fourco*. There is nothing for the courts to consider, as Chief Justice Marshall declared, save enforce the Constitution.

The inferior courts and USPTO propagated lies. The Judiciary does not get a free pass to commit war on the Constitution.

Judges and clerical officials cannot dispute that the inferior courts' and USPTO's False Official Statements and defamatory attacks on the inventor lack proof and legal merit.

Judge Andrews and the Federal Circuit have demonstrated beyond doubt that they will abuse their power in adversely dominated processes and procedures.

The Federal Circuit Orders are *void ab initio* as a legal nullity that runs patently contrary to the plain language of the Constitution. This Court must dismiss the Federal Circuit's False Official Statements as moot, relating to *Fletcher*, Patent Prosecution History Estoppel, *Aqua Products*, the Contracts Clause of the Constitution, and refusal by Judge Andrews to recuse, while glaringly omitting Judge Andrews' own admission of direct stock holding in litigant JPMorgan Chase & Co., and of the violation of the Separation of Powers Clause of the Constitution by all three Branches of Government.

The Federal Circuit judges and clerks repeatedly issued False Official Statements that were the result of widespread and concerted fraud against the public trust and inventors.

Judicial processes and procedures were adversely dominated by judges and clerks *arbitrarily* and *capriciously* without giving the inventor due process of law. Insufficient or no evidence exists upon which a reasonable jurist could conclude that Petitioner was "frivolous," "malicious," or "vexatious" and therefore these were False Official Statements by the Judiciary.

The Judiciary willfully made False Official Statements that encouraged and resulted in – lawless action against the inventor and the Constitution, causing the rest of the Judiciary to follow suit.

In all this, the Judiciary gravel endangered national security, threatened the integrity of the legal system, and imperiled two other coequal branches of Government. The Judiciary betrayed their trust as Judiciary, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. The allegations by the Federal Circuit in its Orders are denied and strict proof at time of hearing is demanded.

Petitioner avers that the Orders with false allegations lodged against Petitioner by the Federal Circuit are facially and substantively flawed, and otherwise unconstitutional, and must be dismissed with prejudice.

1. **The lack of due process included but was not limited to the inferior courts' failure to**

conduct any meaningful review or other investigation, engage in any full and fair consideration of any evidence in support of False Official Statements in their Orders:

The Judiciary denied Petitioner Due Process of Law by ignoring its own procedures and precedents going back to the mid-19th century. The inferior courts failed to conduct any full and fair discussion by allowing the Petitioner's position to be heard in any court or USPTO. The Judiciary had no reason to dismiss the case without even a case management conference in over a 100 cases, engage in zero discovery or investigation, and fail to grant Petitioner, falsely accused as frivolous for fighting for her property and constitutional rights, her opportunity to be heard in person or through counsel – all basic tenets of due process of law. The Federal Circuit clerks and judges discriminated against the inventor to silence her about their defrauding inventors for over 2 centuries.

The inferior courts' Orders violate the Rules and Procedures and Practice of the Court. It piles layers of false allegations that the Federal Circuit rejected *Fletcher*, *Aqua Products*, Patent Prosecution History Estoppel, the Contracts Clause, Judge Andrews' failure to recuse, without stating when and on what grounds, alleging multiple wrongs *in a single mention of the words* "*Fletcher*," "*Aqua Products*," "Patent Prosecution History Estoppel," the Contracts Clause," "refusal by Judge Andrews' to recuse," while glaringly omitting that Judge Andrews' himself admitted direct stock holding in a litigant JPMorgan Chase & Co. and that the 3 Branches of Government violated

the Separation of Powers Clause of the Constitution. The Judiciary failed to adhere to its own strict Rules, with intent to deceive, with false allegations of collateral estoppel interwoven designed for just such a purpose without providing any evidence to prove the falsely alleged collateral estoppel.

2. Proceedings of the District Court and Federal Circuit:

Petitioner filed a Patent Infringement Action against Respondents Citigroup *et al* on 3/24/2014 for infringement of Dr. Arunachalam's patents, U.S. Patent Nos. 5,987,500; and 8,108,492. Judge Andrews dismissed the case on 6/18/20, after 6 years, denying Dr. Arunachalam due process, not giving her an opportunity to be heard, after allowing the Respondents to go into Default without filing an answer to the Complaint, without even an initial case management conference. His Order is replete with False Official Statements of a falsely alleged collateral estoppel from void Orders by a financially conflicted Judge Andrews who admitted to buying direct stock in JPMorgan Chase & Co. during the pendency of Dr. Arunachalam's case against JPMorgan Chase & Co., Case No 12-282-RGA/SLR/RGA (D.Del.), without considering material *prima facie* intrinsic evidence of Patent Prosecution History, that proves that Dr. Arunachalam's patent claim terms are **not** indefinite and patent claims are **not** invalid **nor not** enabled. The District Court, as *defacto* Defendant, ruled in favor of Defendants Citigroup *et al*, without a hearing, without considering material *prima facie* intrinsic evidence of Patent Prosecution History, or the Law of the Case or

Law of the Land or enforcing this Court's *stare decisis* Precedents – the Prohibition of the Constitution from repudiating Government-issued patent contract grants as declared by Chief Justice Marshall in *Fletcher, Dartmouth College,* on the false claim of a falsely alleged collateral estoppel on hearsay without any evidence, condemning without inquiry, nor applying Patent Statute 35 U.S.C. Sec 282 and failed to consider all the patent claims. Judge Andrews failed to apply the Federal Circuit's *Aqua Products, Inc. v Matal,* Case No. 15-1177, Fed. Cir. October 4, 2017, ruling that reversed all Orders and decisions by courts and PTAB that failed to consider "the entirety of the record" – Patent Prosecution History. The Federal Circuit dismissed the Appeal, calling Dr. Arunachalam names, that she is "frivolous," without an iota of evidence in an erroneous and fraudulent rendition of the legal and factual basis of the case, affirmed Judge Andrews' Order, without a hearing. Judge Andrews' Orders and the Federal Circuit's Orders are ERRONEOUS AND FRAUDULENT. The Judiciary has now made it expensive, hazardous and burdensome for Dr. Arunachalam to have access to the court, in violation of the Constitutional provision. Dr. Arunachalam is entitled to Constitutional redress.

Judges warred against the Constitution in treasonous breach of their solemn Oaths of Office, not enforcing the Supreme Law(s) of the Land *Mandated Prohibition* declared by Chief Justice Marshall against repudiating Government-Issued Patent Contract Grants by the highest authority; lost their jurisdiction. The courts have not proven an Exemption from the *Mandated Prohibition* of the Constitution.

The inferior courts' Order(s) are void, predicated upon fraudulent and erroneous renditions of the case and the law, not consistent with Procedural Rules and 'Law of the Case' and 'Law of the Land.'

> "A decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and never becomes final." *Kenner v. C.I.R.*, 387 F.2d 689 (7th Cir.1968).

The courts failed to consider that the claims of the patents-in-suit falsely alleged as invalid are ***not*** invalid, because the *JPMorgan Court* 12-282-SLR/RGA (D.Del.) failed to consider Patent Prosecution History, which had already established the claim construction of the terms alleged falsely as "indefinite" by JPMorgan, as ***not*** indefinite. Based on this fraudulent and erroneous decision by the *JPMorgan Court* procured fraudulently by JPMorgan, the *Fulton Court* 14-490-RGA (D.Del.) — and financially conflicted Judge Andrews fraudulently concealed from the Court that Patent Prosecution History was not considered by the *JPMorgan Court* or *the Fulton Court* and propagated to all tribunals a false theory of Collateral Estoppel, which is moot because:

(i) Judge Andrews is financially conflicted, by his own admission of buying direct stock in JPMorgan Chase & Co. during the pendency of the case. His Orders are void. ***There can be no collateral estoppel from void Orders***.

(ii) Patent Prosecution History estops all other

estoppels.

(iii) Federal Circuit's *Aqua Products'* reversal of Orders that failed to consider "the entirety of the record" ——Patent Prosecution History (*which the District Court and Federal Circuit* ***disparately*** *failed to apply in Petitioner's case*); and

(iv) this Court's precedential *'First Impression'* Constitutional *Res Judicata* *Mandated Prohibition* from repudiating Government-Issued Contract Patent Grants declared by Chief Justice Marshall himself in *Fletcher* that **a Grant is a Contract** and reaffirmed in *Dartmouth College* (1819), *Grant v. Raymond* (1832), and *U.S. v. AT&T* (1897).

The inferior courts failed to give Dr. Arunachalam Equal Protection of the Laws and access to justice and to the courts.

Judge Andrews' Orders are void in *all* of Dr. Arunachalam's cases. PTAB Judges McNamara's direct stock in Microsoft and Siu's financial conflicts of interest with Microsoft and IBM, as disclosed in their Financial Disclosure Statements, and failing to recuse makes all Orders void in all the 15 IPR/CBM re-exams and 3 CRU re-exams of Dr. Arunachalam's patents at the USPTO/PTAB — material *prima facie* evidence Judge Andrews and PTAB Judges McNamara and Siu **lost jurisdiction;** yet failed to recuse and engaged in obstruction of justice and oppressed Dr. Arunachalam, in *Fulton Financial Corporation* Case 14-490-RGA (D.Del.) on Dr. Arunachalam's virgin, unadjudicated Patent, her U.S.

Patent No. 8,271,339 ("the '339 patent") and in the PTAB IPR/CBM Reviews and CRU re-exams of Dr. Arunachalam's patents. **Those Orders are NULLITIES and ANY and ALL Orders DERIVING from those NULL and VOID Orders are themselves NULLITIES.** Judges and lawyers repeatedly made False Official Statements and False Claims of *collateral estoppel from void Orders* and made a false propaganda and disseminated the **FALSE CLAIM** of *collateral estoppel from void Orders* to every District and Appellate Court.

FACTS, MEMORANDUM OF LAW, PROCESS AND PROCEDURE

1. **Adverse Domination of Process by Federal Circuit Court and its Clerks, making 73-year old disabled Petitioner a victim of their violations of federal criminal laws 18 U.S.C. §§371, 1512, 1513, 1503, and breach of solemn oaths by oppression and disparity, denying her Equal Protection of the Laws:**

to the prejudice of good order, discipline and justice, of a nature to bring discredit upon the judiciary and United States, violating federal and state civil and criminal laws and the Constitution. Inferior courts acted as *defacto* Defendant, Ordered Defendants to **not** answer Petitioner's Complaint, to Default, dismissed the case without a hearing, and ordered them to untimely move for attorney's fees for not answering the Complaint and no injury after 2 years after appeal at the Supreme Court. Petitioner is "the prevailing party," not Defendants, even by the District and Appellate Courts' **procedurally foul process**.

2. Courts Failed to Enter Default and Default Judgment in Petitioner's Favor, Upon Request, when the Defendants Did Not File an Answer to Petitioner's Complaint, per Order by District Court Judges Not to Answer—Petitioner Won the Case by Default.

Defendants default. Clerks refuse to enter default and default judgment. Judges dismiss the case without a hearing. "Upon Default, all matters are settled *res judicata* and *stare decisis*." "Default comprises an estoppel of all actions, administrative and judicial" by courts, PTAB and Defendants against Petitioner.

3. Judges' Retaliatory Ex-Actions Against Petitioner, Maliciously, Willfully, Knowingly And Recklessly Defamed Her As "Frivolous" And "Malicious" Without An Iota Of Evidence, for 73-Year Old, Disabled Inventor Fighting For Her Property Rights And Constitutional Rights, For Requesting The Judges And Clerks To Do Their Ministerial Duty To Abide by their Solemn Oaths and Enforce The *Mandated Prohibition* – the Law Of The Case And Law Of The Land And To Consider Patent Prosecution History — Material, Intrinsic *Prima Facie* Evidence That Her Claim Terms Are Not Indefinite And That Her Patent Claims Are Not Invalid, As Per *Stare Decisis* Supreme Court Precedents:

in *Festo Corp. v Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 535 U.S. 722 (2002); *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, 17 U.S. 518 (1819); *Grant v. Raymond*, 31 U.S. 218 (1832); *Fletcher v. Peck*, 10

U.S. 87 (1810); *Arunachalam v. Lyft*, 19-8029, voiding all Orders in **all** of Petitioner's Supreme Court cases, for want of jurisdiction; *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958); *Ableman v. Booth*, 62 U.S. 524 (1859); *Sterling v. Constantin*, 287 U.S. 397 (1932); and per Federal Circuit precedents in *Kumar v. Ovonic Battery Co., Inc. And Energy Conversion Devices, Inc.*, Fed. Cir. 02-1551, -1574, 03-1091 (2003), 351 F.3d 1364, 1368, 69. (2004); *Aqua Products Inc. v. Matal*, 15-1177 (Fed. Cir.2017); *Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*, No. 2018-2140, slip op. (Fed.Cir.10/31/2019) applies to: "All agency actions rendered by those [unconstitutionally appointed] APJs;" *Virnetx Inc. v. Cisco Systems and USPTO* (intervenor) (Fed. Cir. 5/13/2020).

4. Expert Opinions in Re-Examinations of Petitioner's Patents Prove She Is Not "Frivolous" Or "Malicious."

See Expert Opinions of Stanford's Dr. Markus Covert and Dr. Jay Tenenbaum in this Court Case 20-1112.

5. The Only People Who Have Been "Frivolous" And "Malicious" Are The Adjudicators, As Chief Justice Marshall Declared In *Trustees Of Dartmouth College V. Woodward* (1819):

Courts'/PTAB's rescinding act has the effect of an *ex post facto* law and forfeits Petitioner's estate "for **a crime NOT committed** by" her, "but **by the Adjudicators**" by their Orders which "unconstitutionally impaired" the contract with the inventor, which, "as in a conveyance of land, the court found a contract that the grant should not be

revoked." All court Orders in Petitioner's cases violate the U.S. Constitution, inconsistent with the "faithful execution of the solemn promise made by the United States" with the inventor. *See* Daniel Brune's *Amicus Curiae* Brief in Case 20-136, as filed in this Court Case 20-1112. Chief Justice Marshall declared that any acts and Orders by the Judiciary that impair the obligation of the contract within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States **"are consequently unconstitutional and void."** Chief Justice Marshall declared that war was actually levied under such circumstances in *U.S. v. Burr*, 25 F. Cas. 55, 161 (CCD, Va. No. 14693).

6. This Entire Case revolves around the Judiciary Avoiding Enforcing *Dartmouth College, Fletcher, et al* At All Costs. Why? — Because Enforcing *It* Exposes The Entire Patent System, Operating As A Criminal Enterprise, Defrauding The Public.

Courts dismissed Petitioner's Cases without a hearing for no valid reason with False Official Statements. Courts cannot prove Petitioner "abused the process," if there is even a process, much less "repeatedly" so, as the courts collusively allege *arbitrarily* and *capriciously*, without any evidence and have concertedly manufactured a fact, in a pattern, with the common objective of not enforcing *Dartmouth College*, and *Fletcher*. Courts have been demeaning and defaming Petitioner for no good reason and suppressing her to silence her from exposing their culpability and have exhibited bias in a reckless manner. The Federal Circuit Court clerks and judges committed overt acts of discrimination against an

elder, took away her ECF filing in adversely dominated process disorder to prevent *Dartmouth College* and *Fletcher* ever coming before this Court as that would expose the collusive fraud of the USPTO, the Federal Circuit and Congress in breach of public trust in taking granted patents without just compensation to the inventor, withheld documents and failed to docket Petitioner's filings, tampered with the public record, granted her fee waiver in all of Petitioner's cases except in Federal Circuit case 20-136, and teased and harassed her and made False Official Statements that Petitioner's credit cards did not work, when she proved that they indeed worked.

7. Courts Cannot Determine That Petitioner's Action Was "Frivolous, Unreasonable, Or Without Foundation."

Judges 'and Clerks' EXACTIONS were clearly in excess of their jurisdiction, to deprive Petitioner of her federally protected rights — to be free from a conspiracy "to prevent, by force, intimidation, or threat" her First Amendment rights to Petition the Government for Redress of Grievance; and from deprivations "of equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws." The courts have not proven bad faith or malice on Petitioner's part nor that any particular claim is frivolous, ***nor can they***.

The inferior courts' and PTAB's procedural irregularities and falsely accusing Petitioner as "vexatious" for defending the Constitution and their cruel and unusually punitive intentions are well documented. The courts denying Petitioner a fair hearing to cover up their own culpability and lawlessness — bespeaks of the courts and PTAB

biased against Petitioner, and not doing their solemn oath duty to enforce the Law of the Land. Judges' Orders of a false collateral estoppel without considering Patent Prosecution History and without applying *stare decisis* Supreme Court precedents are not legally sound and are not precedent. *Cherrington v. Erie Ins. Property and Cas. Co.*, 75 S.E. 2d. 508, 513 (W. Va, 2013).

8. Special Circumstances Warrant that this Petition for Writ of Certiorari be granted. Judges Did Not Find Actual Injury.

Judges did not allow Petitioner a fair hearing or fair procedural or substantive due process. Courts made it unreasonably burdensome, downright dangerous, and expensive for Petitioner to have access to the Court on the question of due process itself. Courts denied Petitioner fair access to process. Petitioner has no evidence that courts and PTAB have not violated Petitioner's rights. Defendants and the Government are unjustly enriched by trillions of dollars. Petitioner was injured by trillions of dollars in financial damages and personal injury to her health. Petitioner is the aggrieved party, entitled to damages, attorneys' fees, *not* the Defendants.

THIS COURT MUST REVIEW THIS CASE BECAUSE:

1. **J. Marshall Declared: "The Law Of This Case Is The Law Of All"** in *Dartmouth College v. Woodward* (1819):

   "Surely, in this transaction, every ingredient of a complete and legitimate contract is to be found. The points for consideration are, 1. Is this contract protected by the Constitution of the United States?

> 2. Is it impaired by the acts" of this Court?"
> The answer is "yes" to both questions.
>
> "Circumstances have not changed it. In reason, in justice, and in law, it is now what was in 1769... **The law of this case is the law of all**... The opinion of the Court, after mature deliberation, is that this is a contract the obligation of which cannot be impaired without violating the Constitution of the United States... It results from this opinion that the acts of" (emphasis added) the Judiciary "are repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, and that the judgment on this special verdict ought to have been for the Petitioner."

If a doubt could exist that a grant is a contract, the point was decided in *Fletcher*. If, then**, a grant be a contract within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States**, Chief Justice Marshall declared: "these principles and authorities prove **incontrovertibly that" a patent grant "is a contract."** And that any acts and Orders by the Judiciary that impair the obligation of the patent grant contract within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States **"are consequently unconstitutional and void."** The inferior courts' Orders violate the U.S. Constitution. J. Marshall declared in *Fletcher*: **'Crime by the Adjudicators':**

> "It would be strange if a contract to convey was secured by the Constitution, while an absolute conveyance remained unprotected...This rescinding act" "would have the effect of an *ex post*

facto law. It forfeits the estate of" Petitioner "for a crime ***not*** committed by" Petitioner, but by the Adjudicators by their Orders which "unconstitutionally impaired" the patent grant contract with Petitioner, which, "as in a conveyance of land, the court found a contract that the grant should not be revoked."

2. Petitioner's Patented Inventions Are Mission-Critical To U. S. Government's Operations, Enabling The Nation To Operate Remotely During Covid-19 And Enable National Security.

Respondents stole Petitioner's patents and distributed its use to everyone including the U.S. Government, realizing **unjust enrichments in the trillions of dollars**. The Judiciary deprived Petitioner of the payment for each Web transaction/per Web application in use, which it allowed Respondents to steal.

Petitioner's patented inventions are in ubiquitous use worldwide, allowing Microsoft, IBM, SAP, JPMorgan Chase & Co. and the U.S. Government to make $trillions, including investors with stock in the above Corporations, like Judge Richard G. Andrews, PTAB Judges McNamara, Stephen C. Siu who refused to recuse.

The inferior courts' Orders violate the U.S. Constitution, inconsistent with the "faithful execution of the solemn promise made by the United States" with the Petitioner/inventor.

The U.S. Supreme Court stated: "No ... judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it." *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958). "If a judge does not fully comply with the Constitution, then his orders are void, s/he is without jurisdiction, and s/he has engaged in an act or acts of treason."

Conclusion: The fact of the matter — the State of the Union — is: there is no middle ground. The Court is not fooling anyone. The three Branches of Government concertedly share a common objective — to remain silent as fraud, willfully and wantonly avoiding enforcing *Dartmouth College* and *Fletcher* and this Court's Governing Precedents. Why has the Judiciary not enforced *Dartmouth College* and *Fletcher* and this Court's Governing Precedents? They know why — because enforcing *Dartmouth College* and *Fletcher* exposes the entire Patent System, operating as a criminal enterprise, defrauding the public.

The Federal Circuit's decision(s) failed to enforce this Court's Governing Precedents and the *Mandated Prohibition* from repudiating Government-issued Patent Contract Grants as delineated in *Fletcher* and *Dartmouth College* and if followed, will conflict with this Court's precedent with respect to its findings on: (a) the denial of liberty and property without due process of law, and (b) violates the Separation of Powers, Supremacy and Contract Clauses of the U.S. Constitution in failing to apply this Court's precedential *'First Impression' Res Judicata Mandated Prohibition* declared by Chief Justice

Marshall in *Fletcher, Dartmouth College* against repudiating Government-Issued Patent Contract Grants by the highest authority, reaffirmed multiple times by this Court - the Supreme Law(s) of the Land.

3. The Judiciary injured citizens without providing a remedy by leaving them bereft of their vested rights directly to federal grants of patents under the IP Clause, Contract Clause, Separation of Powers Clause, Public Interest/Welfare Clause, Due Process and Equal Protections Clauses.

The inferior courts' Orders perpetrate the unconstitutionality of the AIA reexamination provision, in breach of contract with inventors of their protected rights to enjoy exclusive rights to collect royalties for a time certain — 20 years. It is not a "faithful execution of the solemn promise made by the United States" to inventors.

4. Rights without Remedies:

Inferior court rulings, and the Legislature's AIA reexamination provision violate the "Law of the Land;" **deprived the inventor of rights without remedies** by denial of substantive and fundamental rights by procedural and substantive unconscionability on discriminating terms, specifically denying her the equal protection of the *Aqua Products'* reversal itself, still unresolved, not applying prevention of oppression, giving superior bargaining power to Respondents *(having no reason to tender royalties owed)* in violation of Equal Protection of the Law to inventors.

5. This Case Involves Significant Constitutional Issues, More Significant Than *Marbury v. Madison,* 5 U.S. 137, 177 (1803).

In the case before us, the conflict of the inferior courts' Orders and AIA Reexamination provision, with the obligations of the contract is made the more evident by Federal Circuit's *Aqua Products*' reversal of all Orders where Patent Prosecution History (a contract term between the inventor and the Original Examiner before the patent was granted) was not considered. Federal Circuit *disparately* refused to apply its *Arthrex* and 5/13/20 *VirnetX* rulings that USPTO/PTAB Judges were unconstitutionally appointed, reversing all 18 Unconstitutional reexamination Orders, to Petitioner's patent cases. Lower Court ruling(s) must be reversed as unconstitutional.

REASON WHY THE WRIT SHOULD ISSUE

The courts and USPTO have made a concerted effort to prevent the government from functioning the way it should function. They committed overt crimes in violation of federal criminal laws and six independent violations of the Constitution. They violated the bill of attainder. They violated due process. They betrayed the oaths they swore to defend the United States Constitution by impairing the obligation of contracts in accord with the Constitution. Inventors have been injured physically and financially for standing for our Constitution, but they should never face such peril at

the hands of the USPTO, and inferior courts to hurt innovation, and to dishonor our Constitution[7].

III. The Inferior Courts Legally Erred.

Binding Supreme Court and Federal Circuit precedents squarely foreclose the inferior courts' determination by financially conflicted Judges (U.S. District Court Judge Andrews, PTAB Judges McNamara and Siu) to disparately deny Petitioner/Inventor her protected rights to the benefits of the Federal Circuit's *Arthrex* and *Virnetx* rulings that voided all PTAB rulings because the PTAB Administrative Patent Judges were appointed in violation of the Appointments Clause of the U.S. Constitution, U.S. Const., art. II, §2, cl. 2; the Federal

---

[7] Chief Justice Marshall declared a Government-issued "grant is a contract," and "The Law of this case is the law of all. ...is applicable to contracts of all descriptions...there is nothing for the court to act upon," save enforce the Constitution – the *Mandated Prohibition,* without impairing the obligation of contracts in accord with the Constitution. In *TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC*, 581 U.S. 16-341 (1917), 137 S. Ct. 1514, the Court ruled against the Federal Circuit not abiding by the Court's precedential rulings in *Fourco Glass Co. v. Transmirra Products Corp.*, 353 U.S. 222–226 (1957) for a century. The Court must take Judicial Notice of its own *stare decisis* precedents in accord with the Contract Clause of the Constitution. Courts have been in breach of their solemn oath duty to enforce the Law of the Land. Why? To acknowledge *Fletcher* is to admit deceiving the public for decades in a collusive fraud between the Judiciary, USPTO, the Legislature and Corporate Infringers. So the courts manufactured a false reason, calling Petitioner names, that Petitioner is "malicious," "frivolous" and has "repeatedly abused the process," for the courts' own misconduct. The courts damaged Petitioner's pristine reputation and impeccable credentials. Judges and clerks have lost their immunity, in their overt criminal acts to deprive Petitioner of her fair access to process and to the Court.

Circuit's *Aqua Products'* ruling that reversed all court and PTAB rulings that did not consider "the entirety of the record" – Patent Prosecution History; the Supreme Court's *Festo Corp. v Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 535 U.S. 722 (2002) ruling that restrains the lower courts from disparately failing to consider Patent Prosecution History in Petitioner's cases; and the Supreme Court's *stare decisis* prohibition of the Constitution mandated by this Court against repudiating Government-issued contract grants of any kind — the Law of the Case and the Supreme Law of the Land — declared by Chief Justice Marshall in *Fletcher v. Peck*, 10 U.S. 87 (1810), *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, 17 U.S. 518 (1819); *Ogden v. Saunders*, 25 U.S. 213 (1827); *Grant v. Raymond*, 31 U.S. 218 (1832); *U.S. v. American Bell Telephone Company*, 167 U.S. 224 (1897); and the courts continue in their persecution of the Petitioner/inventor in denying her substantive and procedural due process, denying her rights to a neutral judge, denying her property rights and constitutional rights, and making it expensive, hazardous and burdensome for her to have access to justice and to the courts on the question of due process itself all alike violate the Constitutional provision, ALP VOL. 12. CONST. LAW, CH. VII, SEC. 1, §141 and Petitioner is entitled to Constitutional Redress.

IV. This is the Rare Case Where the Writ of Certiorari is warranted.

The Government misconduct by the Judiciary, the Agency (USPTO/PTAB) and Congress' unconstitutional America Invents Act violating the Appointments Clause of the U.S. Constitution, U.S. Const., art. II, §2, cl. 2., the Contract Clause and

Separation of Powers Clause of the Constitution and *stare decisis* prohibition of the Constitution mandated by this Court against repudiating Government issued contract grants of any kind — the Law of the Case and the Supreme Law of the Land and suppressing material *prima facie* evidence — Patent Prosecution History that Petitioner's patent claims are neither invalid nor claim terms indefinite, provide a more-than sufficient basis for granting this Petition for Writ of Certiorari. An innocent Senior Citizen, single, disabled 73-year old female inventor of color of significant inventions of the Internet of Things (IoT) — Web Apps displayed on a Web browser, that have enabled nation to function remotely during COVID, has been the target of elder abuse, fraud and obstruction of justice by financially conflicted Judges, who know that the Federal Circuit was created in 1982 to invalidate granted patents contrary to the *stare decisis* prohibition of the Constitution mandated by this Court against repudiating Government-issued contract grants of any kind — the Law of the Case and the Supreme Law of the Land, the Contract Clause and Separation of Powers Clause of the Constitution. The egregious Government misconduct, and the decades-long abuse of elderly, disabled Petitioner, injuring her physical health, subjecting her to emotional duress, and theft of her intellectual property and patents by Corporate Infringers aided and abetted by the USPTO, Congress, clerks and financially conflicted Judges, cry out for ending this ordeal immediately and permanently.

The inferior courts' orders reveal their plan to obstruct justice in Petitioner's cases indefinitely, rubbing salt in Petitioner's open wound from their misconduct and threatening her with sanctions and

sanctioning her with cruel and unusual punishment, falsely dubbing her "frivolous and malicious" with all evidence pointing to the contrary, particularly for Dr. Arunachalam defending the Constitution and asking the Government, Congress, Judiciary and USPTO/PTAB to enforce the Constitution and apply this Court's *stare decisis* precedents.

Petitioner has no alternative avenue of relief, her right to relief is "clear and indisputable" and, in these extraordinary circumstances, issuance of the writ is not just appropriate, it follows "as a matter of course." In *Re Reyes*, 814 F.2d at 168. Petitioner's cases require the courts to enforce the Constitution and the *stare decisis* prohibition of the Constitution mandated by this Court against repudiating Government issued contract grants of any kind — the Law of the Case and the Supreme Law of the Land, as declared by Chief Justice Marshall in *Fletcher*, *Dartmouth College*; *Grant v. Raymond*); *et al*; and the Contract Clause and Separation of Powers Clause of the Constitution.

V. Petitioner's Right to Relief is "Clear and Indisputable," and She Has no Alternative Avenue of Relief.

Petitioner has already suffered an unimaginable ordeal at the hands of unscrupulous, lawless, financially conflicted Judges (Andrews, McNamara, Siu) who have failed to enforce the law of the Land, and a seven-year abuse of elderly, disabled female inventor Dr. Arunachalam, injuring her physical health, subjecting her to emotional duress, and theft of her intellectual property and patents by Corporate Infringers aided and abetted by the USPTO, Congress, judges, clerks and financially conflicted

Judges. She has suffered from the defamation and libel by the courts and PTAB Judge McNamara. Petitioner has risked her life — financial ruin, and the mental anguish and physical injury caused by clerks and financially conflicted Judges obstructing justice and hindering access to the court, for which she is entitled to Constitutional redress. All for no legitimate reason.

The wrongful and wasteful failure to enforce *Fletcher* and *Dartmouth College* must end. Since the inferior courts refuse, Petitioner must ask this Court to order the inferior courts to stop obstructing justice and to comply with the controlling precedents of this Court and of the Federal Circuit. The Judiciary and USPTO/PTAB continuing in this fashion does not serve the interests of the public or the United States or inventors.

VI. Issuance of the Writ is Appropriate.

Petitioner, through no fault of her own, has been drawn into a nightmare of clerks obstructing justice and oppressing her and Judges failing to enforce the Law of the Land and this Court's *stare decisis Mandated Prohibition* from repudiating government issued patent contract grants. She has been subjected to deception, abuse, penury, obloquy, and humiliation. Having risked her life in defending the Constitution, she has found herself the target of elder abuse and obstruction of justice designed to strip her of her honor and savings, and to deprive her of her patent properties. She has been dragged through the mud and forced, through the artful withholding of information material *prima facie* evidence of Patent Prosecution History, crucial to the falsity of Judges' False Official Statements that falsely allege that her

patent claims are indefinite and invalid. The judges who are charged with adjudicating her case impartially have decided to be *defacto* Defendants. Equity demands an end to this nightmare and restoration of Petitioner's virgin patent properties and peace of mind.

The inferior courts went so far as to sanction Petitioner and took away her ECF filing for asking the Court to enforce the Constitution and to enforce the *stare decisis* prohibition of the Constitution mandated by this Court against repudiating Government issued contract grants of any kind — the Law of the Case and the Supreme Law of the Land, as declared by Chief Justice Marshall in *Dartmouth College, et al;* and the Contract Clause, Separation of Powers Clause and the Appointments Clause of the U.S. Constitution, U.S. Const., art. II, §2, cl. 2.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, given the plain text of the Constitution, the intent and understanding of the Framers, and Supreme Court precedent dating back more than two hundred years, this Court's responsibility to hear this case is clear and unavoidable. The petition for a writ of certiorari must be granted.

Respectfully submitted, February 18, 2021

Lakshmi Arunachalam

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, *Pro Se Petitioner*
222 Stanford Avenue, Menlo Park, CA 94025
(650) 690-0995; laks22002@yahoo.com

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

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, a woman
Self-Represented Petitioner

Executed on February 18, 2021

222 Stanford Ave,
Menlo Park, CA 94025
650 690 0995
laks22002@yahoo.com