

22-145

To The  
Supreme Court of the United States

ORIGINAL

AIDONG CHEN, *Petitioner,*

vs.

KPMG LLP, Kevin Martelli, William Koch,  
David Halik, Simon Phillips

FILED  
JAN 25 2022  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

BRAD FISHER; STEPHEN CHASE; CLIFF JUSTICE;  
CARL CARANDE; TANDRA JACKSON; DARREN  
BURTON; LISA MADDEN; CLAUDIA SARAN; WILLIAM  
WILLIAMS; VINODH SWAMINATHAN; DEMETRIOS D  
MAHARAMAS

*Defendants*

On Petition For A Writ of Certiorari To The 3<sup>rd</sup>  
Circuit Appealing Court

To Correct the Systematic and Institutional Discrimination  
by The Third Circuit Court, then implement the justice.

APPLICATION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Aidong Chen

Peter Hughes

Plaintiff Pro Se.

Defendant Attorney

RECEIVED  
AUG - 9 2022  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

How to deal with the compromised judges in the lower courts? How to deal with the systematic and institutional discrimination from the 3<sup>rd</sup> circuit appealing court (USCA3)? How to deal with the situation that USCA3 clerks got compromised, which is evidenced by the facts that they prevented plaintiff the access to the E-filing even the helpdesk agreed, allowed way overdue motion from defendants, and made decisions without judges? How to deal with the problem that big corporation can compromise, if not control, the judges, then overtake the cases from the originally and randomly assigned compliant judges, and later exercised reckless bias, stubbornly insisted in the case even after requesting for assigning back, randomly reassignment or escalation? How to deal with the situation that the compromised judges allowed defendants to ignore summons, failed to form jury even explicitly requested, allow no disclosure even previous judge ordered, allow no deposition, allow no debate, allow no trial, allowed fake evidence from defendants while concealing plaintiff's solid written evidence, and threaten plaintiff not to disclose to the public? How to deal with the situation that the compromised judges acted as the de facto defendant attorney when the defendant attorney refused to discuss? **How to deal with the cases that judges in the same courthouse combat each other, both in federal and USCA3?**

Could the Supreme Court save the last decency of US judicial system? Could the Supreme Court use RICO to

discipline KPMG since KPMG frequently compromised US organization (PCAOB several times) and judicial systems? Is it possible for the regular resident to have any voice in the US judicial system in front of big corporation's influence, while all the related organization like EEOC, FBI, US congress cannot provide the necessary help? Here please allow me ask further questions: if US judicial completely lost accountability, could IRS got involved since that is the only organization that collects tax from individual then funding federal agents? Or when the litigations file at other countries, could US justice department help to implement the remedy if plaintiff wins in that situation?

Could the US Supreme Court seriously enforce honesty, as well as to punish the stunning dishonesty, during the procedures, for all the involved parties including plaintiff, defendants, attorney and judicial staffs?

## Table of Content

Cover .....	i
Questions .....	ii, iii
<b>1. ((b) (i)) Parties and individual involved</b>	
.....	1
<b>2. ( (b) (ii) )Corporate Disclosure</b>	
.....	3
<b>3. ((b) (iii)) Proceedings in the Courts</b>	
.....	3
<b>4. (d) Citation of Opinions and orders</b>	
.....	10
<b>5. ((e) (i)) The date the judgment or order sought to be reviewed was entered</b>	
.....	10
<b>6. ( (e) (ii)) Rehearing</b>	
.....	11
<b>7. ( (e) (iv) ) Confer the US Supreme Court to review</b>	
.....	12
<b>8. (f) Constitutional provisions, treaties, statutes and ordinances and regulations</b>	
.....	13
<b>9. ((g),(h)) Statements of facts, and reasons for allowance of the writ.</b>	
.....	15
<b>10. Relief Requested .....</b>	20
a. From KPMG: \$6,300,000 and \$3,960,000,000	
b. From individuals; all the incoming after Oct 5th, 2017 if they failed to defense	
c. KPMG to discipline William Kochs	

- d. Apply RICO to KPMG (acted as Mafia) due to KPMG compromised PACOB and US Judicial system.

Appendix 1 - Judge Mannion's conference Transcripts on Jul 17th, 2019 .....	22
Appendix 2 - Critical evidence .....	30
Appendix 3 - opinions & decisions .....	35
#3-1 Opinion & Decision, district court for employment .....	32
#3-2 Opinion & Decision, district court for IP .....	49
#3-3 Opinion & Decision, 3rd circuit court for employment case.....	58
# 3-4 Opinion & Decision, 3rd circuit court for IP case .....	74
# 3-5 Denial of Rehearing.....	84
# 3-6 Denial of Rehearing.....	87

**1. ((b) (i))Parties and individual involved****Contact:****Plaintiff: Aidong Chen, Plaintiff Pro Se****Defendant: Peter Hughes**

However, Peter Hughes is only qualified for the initial communication, he exercised serious dishonesties, according to Rule 5 and 8, he will have serious trouble if he appears in the US Supreme Court. He needs to forward to other counsel that conform Rule 9.

Please allow only briefly listed the parties, all the contact information was in the docket.

**Plaintiff: Aidong Chen, Pro. Se****Defendants: KPMG LLP; Kevin Martelli, William Koch,  
David Halik, Simon Phillips****BRAD FISHER; STEPHEN CHASE; CLIFF JUSTICE;  
CARL CARANDE; TANDRA JACKSON; DARREN  
BURTON; LISA MADDEN; CLAUDIA SARAN;  
WILLIAM WILLIAMS; VINODH SWAMINATHAN;  
DEMETRIOS D MAHARAMAS****Defendant Attorney: Peter Hughes, Eric L Mackie**

This appeal is a combination of case USCA3 # 21-1014 (it was mistakenly recorded as 12-1014) and USCA3 # 21-1202.

USCA3:

Honorable Judge Chery Ann Krause

Judge CHAGARES, PHIPPS and COWEN

Clerks: PATRICIA S. DODSZUWEIT, William T. Walsh, John T O'Brien

It is important to list the USCA3 clerks here, since it is the clerks made the decisions (# 2:18-cv-12650-MCA-JAD Document 104). Judge Cheryl Ann Krause supported plaintiff but got silently replaced, while the three judges just appeared in the last minute, as well as in the richest time of KPMG of the year (serious indication of corruption).

Federal District Newark NJ court:

case#: 2:18-cv-12650-MCA-SCM, filed on Aug 2018 due to employment discrimination. Decision was made on Nov 24<sup>th</sup>, 2020.

case#: 2:20-cv-09314-MCA-JAD, filed on July 2020 with jury requested due to Intelligence Property dispute. decision was made on Jan 7<sup>th</sup>, 2021.

Related district judges:

**Honorable Judge Steven Mannion**

**Judge Joseph Dickson**

**Judge Madeline Cox Arleo**

**2. ( (b) (ii) )Corporate Disclosure**

Plaintiff is Aidong Chen, Pro Se, KPMG ex-employee, an individual, no official corporation disclosure; however, any necessary information requested by the US Supreme Court will be provided;

Defendants are KPMG LLP, the corporate disclosure were provided in Docket#13, 2:18-cv-12650-MCA-SCM by Peter Hughes. Individual defendants are/were all KPMG employees.

Peter Hughes is from OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C. It is important to get endorsement from his firm since he confronted court, got seriously condemned by Honorable Judge Steven Mannion, that is why he and KPMG spent so much effort to change judges. Later he was sure that the judge was completely at his side, he organized fake evidence. The case should have been resolved by Judge Steven Mannion on July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

**3. ((b) (iii)) Proceedings in the Courts**

Plaintiff filed appeal to the US Supreme Court in Jan 21<sup>st</sup>, 2022 to protest USCA3, the last communication with USCA3 was on Nov 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021 with denial of rehearing. It is within 90 days.

Due to the format problems, it got denied and plaintiff filed on March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022. It got denied due to confusion between Writ of Certiorari and Application for Justice. On Jun 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2022, plaintiff used booklet format applied for Application of Justice, got denied on June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2022 due to the format problem. On July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2022, plaintiff called the clerk office at the Supreme Court and was advised to use the handbook

to correct the formats. All the subsequent filings were within 60 days from court's reply.d

When it comes to appealing at USCA 3, plaintiff got denied on rehearing on Nov 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021. On Oct 4<sup>th</sup>, 2021, plaintiff got arbitration that plaintiff lost the appeal on case #21-1202; on Sep 29<sup>th</sup>, 2021 plaintiff got arbitration that plaintiff lost the appealing on case# 21-1104. Both arbitrations had the names of the judges (CHAGARES, PHIPPS and COWEN) on. Since those arbitrations were like joke and were full of stunning mistakes, plaintiff even called each Judges' chambers to verify it was not clerks' makeup. I was told that I should have contacted USCA3 clerk office. On July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2021, Clerk PATRICIA S. DODSZUWEIT, with no judge's name, arbitrated that plaintiff lost the case based on the way overdue motion from defendants. On March 31<sup>st</sup> 2021, Clerk William T Walsh, John T O'Brien arbitrated plaintiff lost the appeal, without judge, which even contradicted to the schedules drafted by USCA3 on March 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2021. **On May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2021, Honorable Judge Cheryl Ann Krause indicated that plaintiff appealed in time when Peter Hughes stubbornly lied otherwise. Judge Krause was silently replaced.** On June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021, Peter Hughes email plaintiff asked permission to extend reply from June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2021 to June 25<sup>th</sup>, plaintiff agreed provided court agrees. Court extended to June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2021; however, on July 1<sup>st</sup> 2021, when plaintiff checked with USCA3 Clerk office, clerk confirmed they did not get anything. When they got motion on July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2021, clerk, not the judges, immediately arbitrated that plaintiff lost the appeal.

**USCA3 clerk office is very problematic.** USCA3 clerk office prevented the helpdesk to provide e-filing access, did not provide any paper filings with date or docket number. **If the US Supreme Court got the filings from USCA3, before the clerk office or justice could rely on them, please DO verify with plaintiff, because it is very possible that the clerks altered or eliminated the filings.** The clerk's problem was already demonstrated here.

Please forgive plaintiff not to provide USCA3 docket number because no such information. USCA3 bypassed all the essential procedures, removed the compliant Honorable Judge **Cheryl Ann Krause** from the case, then treated the appeals as a joke. The clerks, later, the judges, acted as the de facto defendant attorneys. No judicial independence at all from USCA3.

#### **Proceedings in the US district court (Newark NJ).**

The employment discrimination case was filed on Aug 2018, after voluminous childish behaviors from Peter Hughes, finally in Feb 2019, the confidentiality protocol issued and respected. Defendant provided disclosures. Deposition over plaintiff happened on Apr 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019 at Peter's office. However, defendant skipped almost all the requested materials, distracted plaintiff with a lot of technical manuals. Surprisingly, one extremely critical disclosure voluntarily leaked by individual defendant William Koch (KPMG-CHEN—003087, see Appendix #2), for the purpose to hijack KPMG to be too big to fail so as to defend for him. Appendix #2 clearly indicated how he encouraged and

coordinated with David Halik & Kevin Martelli to retaliate & plagiarize against plaintiff. Other unexpected disclosures (KPMG-CHEN-000649, 000650, 000651) provided by KPMG compliance, demonstrated how Kevin Martelli tried to lie to KPMG compliance department. When Kevin got reminded by his supervisor, he pretended to follow but did not, instead, **Kevin explicitly asked plaintiff to ignore KPMG compliance**, which caused dilemma for Aidong (Plaintiff Pro Se). The above two pieces of information were even hidden by Kevin away from my last supervisor Martin Kaestner and HR director Simon Phillips. With such solid written evidence in Appendix #2, there is no way for Peter Hughes to defend for them. William's sabotage hijacked KPMG LLP.

Due to the critical information, plaintiff was sure that it was due to the huge business value of Artificial Intelligence innovation (managed by KPMG ATGO #1056) attracted plagiarism and attacks, plaintiff requested more disclosure to prove and Judge Mannion agreed and ordered. Due to the sabotage behavior from William Koch, and plaintiff's sharp memory for details, Peter Hughes dared not to provide any further disclosures, nor dare to organize any depositions. His client William Koch hijacked KPMG, which was totally out of his control were deposition conducted. William Koch is really evil for KPMG. He framed real contributors for long time (including plaintiff, at least six victims), serious legal liability for KPMG; during the litigation, he intentionally leaked the critical evidence to the disclosures, de facto hijacked KPMG, which would cause KPMG immediate loss were judicial procedures

followed. That is why Peter Hughes and KPMG spent so much effort to compromise judges so as to bypass procedures. William Koch's evil sabotage behavior against KPMG is consistent before and during the litigation.

On July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019, in front of solid evidence for employment case, Honorable Judge Steven Mannion condemned Peter's confrontation, warned Peter that he will be really unhappy if he continued to confront and behaved like a baby. Judge Steven Mannion also promised accountability of justice to plaintiff, ordered Peter Hughes to discuss and prepare one offer to settle down the employment case, as well as more disclosures about Intelligence Property dispute (plaintiff cited constitution provisions that plaintiff, not KPMG, owns the IP of AI innovation). Peter Hughes pretended to follow, but in fact he provided various excuses to confront, eventually he managed to move the case to his favorite judges.

From Peter Hughes' response, he disagreed that the case could be finally arbitrated by Judge Steven Mannion. Later communication indicated he compromised Judge Madeline Cox Arleo from the very beginning, just because Judge Steven Mannion insisted to follow the procedures and laws, which caused inconvenience for Peter and Judge Arleo. In fact, the decisions from these two judges were completely opposite.

Judge Joseph Dickson replaced Judge Steven Mannion for unknown reason. Judge Joseph Dickson first retrieved the transcripts on July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019, then sealed it. Judge

Dickson tried to coordinate an in-person conference; however, Judge Dickson and Peter Hughes rescheduled three times, often just one or two days ahead. Now I can recall that they tried to make it not to happen, then blame it's plaintiff's fault. Plaintiff was at Michigan, travel to New Jersey needs some efforts. Together with the sad fact that Judge Dickson bypassed all the judicial procedures, relied on the fake evidence organized by Peter Hughes (Document 69 Filed 05/15/20), seal plaintiff's evidence and threatened plaintiff not to disclose to the public, made opposite decision from that of Judge Mannion, plaintiff realized that Judge Dickson got compromised by defendant; on the other hand, after plaintiff bifurcated IP dispute into a separate case with jury requested, Judge Dickson seemed to stay away, so the really problematic judge is Judge Arleo at Newark. After plaintiff realized the reckless bias, plaintiff requested to move the case back to Judge Manion, or had a random reassignment, or escalated to cheif judge. All got ignored or denied. Judge Arleo insisted to stay in the case. Plaintiff called the clerk office, clerk indicated that either party had the right to request re-assignment or escalation. So plaintiff is firmly confirmed that Judge Arleo got compromised. Judge Arelo allowed defendant to ignore summons and refuse to form a jury for the IP case so that she can completely control the case. Judicial independence was ruined.

It is a big problem since Judge Arleo is an Article III judge, the only way to remove her from bench is to impeach, which requires very high standard and a lot of efforts. Judge

should have been the social model, why acted in such a childish way?

In the later filing, plaintiff even explicitly indicated that plaintiff visited FBI Detroit field office asking help to investigate. Later the same group (Kevin Martelli, William Koch and David Halik) **framed Darryl Swofford, eventually caused his death.** Judge Arleo even said plaintiff undermined his claim of racial discrimination, because they also attacked Caucasians. It is such a shock. The earlier victims were all non-Caucasians; after the values become more clear and significant, they start to attack any person so long as they could plagiarize.

It is so frustrated that the judicial system could be manipulated by big corporation and professional attorney to such a level. Newark NJ district court as a whole seems great. There was great judge like Steven Mannion. The clerks were really doing, and ONLY doing, what they are expected to do. It is not a case for USCA3, the clerks there had problems. Clerks prevented docket access, allow overdue motion, and made serious judicial decisions with bias and without judges.

**Judges in the same courthouse combated each other,** this happened at both federal court Newark NJ district, as well as USCA3. This alone is the strong and enough reason for writ.

**4. (d) Citation of Opinions and orders**

USCA3 judges CHAGARES, PHIPPS and COWEN were obviously out of compliance. They allowed the clerks made decision and only appeared in the opinion and judgment in the last minute. They quietly replaced the compliant Judge Krause. Clerk refused to share who were active judges until the time to share the judgment.

Judges CHAGARES, PHIPPS and COWEN were frivolous. They mixed up the information in the two cases. They cited the future events, in Sep 29, 2021, they cited the events in Nov & Dec 2021, which may or may not happen. Even if they indicated that should have been 2020, it clearly indicated how careless they were. Their opinion and judgment are more like defense for defendants than a true arbitration, solely relied on defendant while completely excluded plaintiff. Judicial system lost independence in both federal court Newark NJ district and USCA3. **Since judges exercised reckless bias, contradictions are stunning, judicial integrity was ruined at both district and USCA3 courts, plaintiff only appendix their opinions without elaboration here, see Appendix #3.**

**5. ((e) (i)) The date the judgment or order sought to be reviewed was entered**

The cases asked to be review are listed below.

USCA3 #21-1014, decision entered on Sep 29, 2021.

USCA3 #21-1202, decision entered on Oct 4th, 2021  
Request for rehearing for both cases on Nov 8th, 2021 even the USCA3 sent the letter indicated plaintiff has such a right, and plaintiff did make the requests in time for rehearing, but got denied on Nov 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021.

Newark NJ federal court case#: 2:18-cv-12650-MCA-SCM, decision entered on Nov 24, 2020, appealed at USCA3 #21-1014

Newark NJ federal court case#: 2:20-cv-09314-MCA-JAD, Decison entered on Jan 7th, 2021, appealed at USCS3 #21-1202

Opinion and judgment were appended. Since all the judicial procedures were skipped after Judge Mannion left the case, judges acted as defendant attorney, jury not formed, fake evidence from defendant were used to make decisions, while plaintiff's solid written evidence provided by the defendants were sealed, the opinion were obviously biased with stunning mistakes, no need to spend a lot of time citing them but the Supreme Court could if that deems needed.

#### **6. ((e) (ii)) Rehearing**

For USCA3 #21-1014, USCA3 #21-1202,

Both got denied for rehearing on Nov 8th, 2021

For Newark NJ federal court case#: 2:18-cv-12650-MCA- JAD and case#: 2:20-cv-09314-MCA-JAD, 1202, Judge Arleo never indicated that plaintiff had the right for rehearing, nor indicated that plaintiff could appeal. So rehearing is not relevant for the district court.

My appeal at the US Supreme Court is like an original filing, while all the judges' contradictory behaviors are extra strong evidence. Those childish behavior affirm plaintiff's perception: were judicial procedures followed, defendant side will immediately lose, judge Mannion already arbitrated that way.

#### **7. ((e) (iv)) Confer the Supreme Court to review**

Due to the loss of judicial independence at federal court, also penetrated through USCA3, together with the fact that USCA3 exercised systematic and institutional discrimination, judges combated each other within the same courthouse, it is necessary for the US Supreme Court to review. **For the filings from USCA3, it is important to let plaintiff review first before the Supreme Court could rely on it, since USCA3 clerks prevented the access to e-filings, did not send the filed proceedings with docket numbers, plaintiff never reviewed any filed documented in any**

**format. It is very possible that clerks at USCA3 altered or eliminated the filings.**

**8. (f) Constitutional provisions, treaties, statutes and ordinances and regulations.**

**a. US constitution provisions.**

US constitution explicitly indicated that the inventor automatically owns the invention, any other agreements are secondary. GPU for AI innovation (ATGO #1056) was plaintiff's original idea, original proposal, almost completely and solely finished by plaintiff alone after other members left one by one. What is more, the work is archived at least 4 levels above plaintiff's assigned level, it is not invention by profession so plaintiff owns that invention, so plaintiff owns a good fraction of the whole line of business. KPMG could not use the exception to gain the ownership, since that is not expected from that assigned level. Plaintiff claims **\$3,960,000,000** from KPMG, formula was provided in federal docket. **The invention kicked off 4<sup>th</sup> industrial revolutions at KPMG.** The innovation is not a regular invention, the invention itself had a lot of value, as well as it will trigger a series and long lasting innovations without too much further efforts. Plaintiff spent efforts from 1997 till 2017 archive that. As of 1997, Kevin Martelli, one current principle, was still at high school.

b. KPMG ATGO #1056, a KPMG regulation

This is the project management file, as well as KPMG compliance requirements & promises. It clearly listed that plaintiff was the lead and it had nothing to do with Kevin Martelli, William Koch or David Halik. In fact, even on Oct 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017, six days after plaintiff was fired, KPMG ATGO called plaintiff back to the office to lead the project, since William Koch had absolutely no idea how to continue (vendor explicitly said so as well).

When it came to Martin Kaestner, he failed to report the verified retaliation committed by William. Martin teamed with Kevin to cheat Simon Phillips and Brad Fisher. Martin had very serious malfeasance, intentionally ignored plaintiff's update requests for six weeks when plaintiff was under serious attack while actively collaboration with Kevin to cheat KPMG organizations.

c. KPMG offer letter, with EEO promised

KPMG explicitly promised EEO and a retaliation free environment. None of them were respected by KPMG LLP for plaintiff. To make worse, real contributor who were champion in competition, CEO rewards winner, or archived business at \$500,000,000/year got framed, some people's family fall apart, even lost live. This all happened due to the bully from Kevin Martelli's group after William Koch

joined. William Koch had a long history to frame his coworkers. Both Mike Sorrano and Mitchell Kupferman, William's coworkers at KTech, reminded plaintiff on Oct 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017 to be extreme cautions of him, but that seemed too late.

Due to KPMG's failure of EEO caused suffering, stress and depression, plaintiff claims \$6,300,000 from KPMG.

**d. RICO (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act)**

KPMG compromised US serious organizations and judicial systems for several times. KPMG LLP should be criminally charged. The gang of three (Kevin Martelli, William Koch and David Halik) who repeatedly framed and plagiarized coworkers, caused several staff serious depression, family apart even staff death, should be criminally charged. Generally Attorney should be involved since individual has no right to criminally charge any party. **Plaintiff reserves the rights to claim all the earning after Oct 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017 from all the related individual defendants, with a punitive factor to be determined.**

**9. ((g),(h)) Statements of facts, and reasons for allowance of the writ.**

The reason requests the writ is that US lower court completely lost independence, big corporation compromised, if not controlled, some judges. KPMG had the power to manipulate the judicial system by moving the cases away from the compliant judges to their

favorite judges. This happened both in federal court Newark NJ district, as well as in USCA3.

The compromised judges made completely opposite decisions from the originally and randomly assigned judges. **The judges in the same courthouse combat each other. This fact itself is a strong reason for writ.** The compromised judges skipped all the essential judicial procedures: no disclosure, no deposition, no debate, no trial, while the originally assigned judge strictly followed the judicial procedures drafted in the schedules. Instead, the compromised judges relied fake evidence organized by Peter Hughes, sealed plaintiff's critical evidence, skipped to form the requested jury, threatened plaintiff not to disclose the written evidence to the public media. Later, Peter Hughes refused to discuss, the active compromised judges acted as the de facto defendant attorney. The opinions and judgments, it can be clearly sensed they are defendant statements, not arbitrations, by the compromised judge Arleo and USCA3 judges CHAGARES, PHIPPS and COWEN.

The clerks in USCA3 made decisions without judges, decision was made way ahead of the time, and the three judges only appeared in the very end when the decision was issued. It happened in the turning period of KPMG fiscal year, which is the richest time of KPMG. This was a strong indication that there was bribery involved. It is very serious, since the current chief judge CHAGARES of USCA3 was involved.

Unlike the clerks at Newark NJ district court, the USCA3 clerks had serious problems, they prevented plaintiff accessing the docket, nor provided the filed proceedings with docket numbers and date, so even the Supreme Court got the filings from USCA3, it is **NECESSARY to be reviewed by plaintiff before the Supreme Court could rely on them.** The compromised judges at USCA3 mixed up the information in the cases, cited the future events, would render the decisions in vain.

Due to all of the frivolous behaviors from judge CHAGARES, PHIPPS and COWEN, plaintiff called USCA3 executive committees, complained the possible cognitive problems of the judges since they **obviously should NOT cite future events**, which will render decision useless. I was told that they cannot do anything. The only action left to me is to appeal at the Supreme Court, which neither judges nor clerks indicated that plaintiff had such a right.

I also contacted US congressman, complained about the systematic and institutional discrimination from USCA3. Congress office replied that congress cannot oversee judicial system, instead suggested to resort to general attorney, which is still on going by plaintiff.

In Jan 21st, 2020, plaintiff visited FBI Detroit office, urging investigation after Montvale NJ policy department indicated that my case was too serious for them to investigate. It is very serious, due to the serious retaliation from Kevin Martelli's group after William Koch join,

several families fell apart and people died due to retaliation. The disputed Intelligence Property is at \$500,000,000 or more per year and will last more than 20 years. That is why KPMG would rather to take so much risk to compromise US judicial system so as to escape the enforcement instead of following orders by Judge Mannion. Were that followed, Darryl Sworfford's life could have been saved. **In June 2020, Darryl cried with a shaking voice in the phone to plaintiff about the suffering at KPMG. He said due to the problems from work, he lost health, lost job, lost family, lost wife; eventually in July 2020, he lost life.**

Plaintiff also reported Peter Hughes' incompliance to KPMG ethics and compliance (KPMG E&C) department. KPMG was very serious at the beginning; however, after they knew the serious truth, KPMG E&C indicated that it was up to court to fix. So KPMG overall, tolerated even supported the activities used to compromised US judicial systems. Since up to USCA3, including current chief judge CHAGARES was compromised, congress cannot oversee judicial system, only US Supreme Court could bring justice to plaintiff. The justice was promised by Judge Steven Mannion on July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019. Plaintiff wishes that IRS will never need to be challenged the qualification for collecting the tax to support courts, or plaintiff never needs to file litigations in other countries due to the issues in US judicial system. KPMG was an international corporation, in 2019, KPMG populated plaintiff's innovation to other countries.

In July 2019, it was still important to have further disclosure for IP dispute. After three years, with more than \$500,000,000/year revenue, opened a huge site at Chicago, hired 900+ staffs using the innovation, filed at least three patents, my innovation's value proved itself. Plaintiff protested three times to US patent office due to the wrongful authorization of the patents to KPMG. Patent administration office indicated it is up to court to correct the issues. In USA, the only accountable court left is the US Supreme Court.

Like the situation in the separation table, I told my supervisor Martin Kaestner, I will bring KPMG into the court. Judge Mannion explicitly promised accountability of justice to me, that is why I am still appealing. If the whole US judicial system completely lost accountability, I will challenge IRS for the qualification to collect tax, and/or file litigations in other countries, which is relevant to the plagiarism. Plaintiff had absolute no any issues during the employment. As a low level staff reached such a great success, if not got promoted, should never be fired on spot just because a group of Caucasians wanted to claim the work. To make things worse, plaintiff was framed with misconducts by KPMG, which NJ labor department did not agree at all.

As I indicated several times, since the federal court and USCA3 had serious and obvious problems, citing the opinion and decision had not too much value here. **If any, three Judges at USCA3 cited future event itself would totally invalidate those decisions and qualified a writ.**

Plaintiff promised everything stated here are true and is more than happy to go through deposition again if needed. Solid written evidence was attached in Appendix #1 and #2. Appendix #1 is the transcript of the conversation between Judge Mannion, Peter Hughes and Plaintiff. Appendix #2 was voluntarily provided by William Koch for the purpose to hijack KPMG for defending.

### **10. Relief Requested**

The project reached to great success. KPMG applied at least three patents, expand a huge site at Chicago and hired 900+ staff, facilitated the existing business, made more than \$500,000,000/year and can last more than 20 years.

Plaintiff respectfully requests the following relief requests.

- a. From KPMG: \$6,300,000 and \$3,960,000,000
- b. From individuals; all the incoming after Oct 5th, 2017 if they continue to ignore court; if they response, the remedy from the individual can be discussed.
- c. KPMG to discipline William Koch to save others.

Here is the elaboration.

- a. \$6,300,000 due to the employment discrimination; \$3,960,000,000 due to the partial ownership of the business derived from Artificial Intelligence. KPMG is more than welcome to get patent attorney to debate over this.
- b. All the involved individual defendants are using this innovation for their business; if KPMG failed to

settle the dispute, plaintiff reserve the right to include more individuals into the case. KPMG attorney Peter Hughes refused to represent the individuals, at the same time, threatened plaintiff because plaintiff tried to reach them to deliver the summons. Plaintiff respectfully urges court to order defendant KPMG to deliver the summons. Plaintiff reserves the right to reach the related individuals to deliver the litigation to them. If they ignore or fail to defense, plaintiff urge to take over all of their incoming made at KPMG after Oct 5th, 2017.

c. Discipline William Koch

William Koch is the really malicious staff made KPMG LLP, other defendants and plaintiff reach to such a situation. He framed a lot of other KPMGers but did not get disciplined, instead he gained promotion from the stealing and robbery. KPMG certainly knew the cases after the E&C report and litigation; however, William Koch leaked the critical evidence, which clearly demonstrated his conspiracy, together with Kevin Martelli and David Halik, against plaintiff. William's purpose is to hijack KPMG to defense. Even that de facto supported plaintiff's litigation, still William should be disciplined so as no others will suffer from him at KPMG.

Respectfully submitted by

Aidong Chen 08/03/2022

Aidong Chen, 08/03/2022