

App-1

APPENDIX-A

Case: 22-2155 Document: 34 Page: 1 Filed: 04/25/2023

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

PROBIR KUMAR BONDYOPADHYAY,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES,

Defendant-Appellee

2022-2155

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Southern District of Texas in No. 4:22-cv-02204,
Judge Keith P. Ellison.

ON MOTION AND ON PETITION FOR PANEL
REHEARING

App-2

Before MOORE, Chief Judge, LOURIE and DYK
Circuit Judges.

Case: 22-2155 Document: 34 Page: 1 Filed: 04/25/2023

2

BONDYOPADHYAY v. US

PER CURIAM.

O R D E R

Probir Kumar Bondyopadhyay files a petition for panel rehearing out-of-time which the court construes as including a motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing out-of-time.

Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) The motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing out-of-time is granted. The petition for panel rehearing is accepted for filing.

(2) The petition for panel rehearing is denied.

(3) The mandate of the court will issue May 2, 2023.

April 25, 2023

Date

FOR THE COURT

/s/ Jarrett B. Perlow

Jarrett B. Perlow

Chief Deputy Clerk

App-3

APPENDIX-B

Case: 22-2155 Document: 27 Page: 1 Filed: 02/22/2023

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

PROBIR KUMAR BONDYOPADHYAY,
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES,
Defendant-Appellee

2022-2155

Appeal from the United States District Court for
the Southern District of Texas in No. 4:22-cv-02204,
Judge Keith P. Ellison.

Decided: February 22, 2023

App-4

PROBIR KUMAR BONDYOPADHYAY, Houston,
TX, pro se.

NELSON KUAN, Commercial Litigation Branch,
Civil Division, United States Department of Justice,
Washington, DC, for defendant-appellee. Also
represented by SCOTT DAVID BOLDEN, BRIAN M.
BOYNTON, GARY LEE HAUSKEN.

Case: 22-2155 Document: 27 Page: 2 Filed: 02/22/2023

2

BONDYOPADHYAY v. US

Before MOORE, Chief Judge, LOURIE and DYK,
Circuit Judges

PER CURIUM

Dr. Probir K. Bondyopadhyay appeals a decision of
the United States District Court for the Southern
District of Texas dismissing his complaint for failure
to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. For
the following reasons, we affirm.

BACKGROUND

App-5

Dr. Bondyopadhyay owns U.S. Patent No. 6,292,134. This is his third appeal regarding the '134 patent. Relevant here, on November 27, 2019, Dr. Bondyopadhyay filed a complaint against the United States in the Court of Federal Claims, which the court construed as alleged infringement of the '134 patent, fraudulent or false conduct by the government, and a patent-based Takings Clause claim. *Bondyopadhyay v. United States*, 149 Fed. Cl. 176,178 (2020) (*Bondyopadhyay III*), *aff'd*, 850 F. App'x 761 (Fed. Cir. 2021) (*Bondyopadhyay IV*). The United States moved to dismiss the complaint as barred by the doctrine of *res judicata* and for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. *Bondyopadhyay III*, 149 Fed. Cl. At 183. The Court of Federal Claims determined Dr. Bondyopadhyay's infringement claims were barred under *res judicata* because of a non-infringement judgement entered against him in 2014. See *Bondyopadhyay IV*, 850 F. App'x at 762-63 (citing *Bondyopadhyay v. United States*, 136 Fed. Cl. 114, 116 (2018) (*Bondyopadhyay 10*, *aff'd* 848F. App'x 301 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (*Bondyopadhyay II*)). Regarding his takings claim and fraud claim, the Court

App-6

of federal Claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Id. At 763. We affirmed the Court of Federal Claims' dismissal of Dr. Bondyopadhyay's claims. Id. At. 764-65.

On July 5, 2022, Dr. Bondyopadhyay files a complaint in the Southern District of Texas, alleging Bondyopadhyay III "failed to differentiate between" Article 1's grant of power to Congress to promote the progress of science and the useful arts and the Fifth Amendment's Takings Clause. See S. App'x 16. Specifically, he alleges he is entitled to "enforcement of a U.S. Constitutional Order. . . arising out of unauthorized use of a patented invention" by the Air Force, which he refers to as a 'Jeffersonian Claim.'" S. App'x 15. He also argues that when the Air Force updates the system that system will then infringe his U.S. patent No. 11,296,408. S. App'x 15. The United States moved to dismiss under Rules 12(b)(1) and Rules 12(b)(6). The district court granted the motion under Rule 12(b)(6). S. App'x 1-3. Dr. Bondyopadhyay appeals. We have jurisdiction over the claims regarding the '134 patent under 28 U.S.C. Section 1295(a)(1).

DISCUSSION

We review the district court's dismissal under regional circuit law, here the Fifth Circuit. In re TLI Commc'ns LLC Pat. Litig., 823 F.3d 607, 610 (Fed. Cir. 2016). The Fifth Circuit reviews "motions to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) do novo accepting all well-pleaded facts as true and viewing those facts in the light most favorable to the plaintiff." *Balle v. Nueces Cnty.*, 952 F. 3d 552, 556 (5th Cir. 2017) (internal citation and quotation marks omitted). We may affirm a dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) on any ground supported by the record, including for lack of standing, *Hosein v. Gonzales*, 452 F. 3d 401, 403 (5th Cir. 2006). Res judicata may be applied on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion where its application "is apparent from the complaint and judicially noticed facts and the plaintiff fails to challenge the defendant's failure to plead it as an affirmative defense." *Anderson v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.* 953 F.3d 311,314 (5th Cir. 2020). Dr. Bondyopadhyay argues his "Jeffersonian Claim" is not a Takings Clause claim. Appellant's informal Opening Br. At 7. He argues that the district court failed to assess infringement of the '134

App-8

patent “against the offending” Air Force Program. *Id.* at 7-8. Whether this claim is brought under the Fifth Amendment or under the Patent Act, Dr. Bondyopadhyay has already litigated these claims several times without success. See *Bondyopadhyay I*, 850 F. App’x at 762-765 (“But regardless how Dr. Bondyopadhyay characterized his claims, as unauthorized use of the patent or depriving him of a constitutional right to make a living, his claims boil down to patent infringement, claims that were previously adjudicated against him, and he has failed to allege sufficient additional facts to indicate otherwise.”). We affirm the district court’s dismissal based on *res judicata*. To the extent Dr. Bondyopadhyay alleges he is entitled to relief due to the Air Force’s future infringement of the ‘408 patent by implementing any “design corrections” taught by the ‘408 patent’s “simpler, cheaper[,] and faster” design, that alleged future injury is “conjectural or hypothetical.” See *Lujan v. Defs. Of Wildlife*, 504 US 555, 560 (1992) (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). We therefore affirm the district

App-9

court's dismissal of that claim for lack of jurisdiction.

AFFIRMED

App-10

Appendix-C

Case 4:22-cv-02204 Document 13

Filed on 08/15/22 in TXSD Page 1 of 3

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

PROBIR BONDYOPADHYAY	§	
Plaintiff	§	
	§	
vs.	§	Civil Action No.
	§	4:22-cv-02204
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	§	
Defendant	§	

ORDER

Before the Court is the Motion to Dismiss filed by Defendant ECF No.7. The Court held a hearing on the Motion on August 15, 2022. At that hearing, the Court took the Motion under advisement. For the reasons set forth below, the Court now GRANTS Defendant's

App-11

Motion to Dismiss and DISMISSES Plaintiff's claims
WITH PREJUDICE.

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleges that he is the inventor and owner of Patent 6,292,134, which is a patent for a "Geodesic Sphere Phased Array Antenna System (GSPAAS)." ECF No. 1 at 4. Plaintiff states that his case arises 'under Title 28 Section 1338(a) and because of its important broad significance, as a Writ of mandamus as well, for immediate implementation of a U.S. Constitutional Order (the Jefferson financial Claim [.]' Id. at 1. Plaintiff alleges that "Judge Marian Blank Horn of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims in her OPINION of June 23, 2020 has failed to differentiate between LIMITED TIME (Article 1 Section 8 Clause 8 of the U.S. Constitution) and PROPERTY (Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution)". Id. at 7.

App-12

Plaintiff therefore requests that the Court
“immediately apply the Constitutional Law on the
qualified FACT approved by the U.S. Court

CASE 4:22-cv-02204 Document 13 Filed on

08/15/22 in TXSD Page 2 of 3

of Federal Claims on June 23, 2020 ---- and direct the
Honorable U.S. Attorney of the Southern District of
Texas to enforce the Constitutional Order and fulfill
the U.S. Constitutional obligation of promoting
Progress of Science.” Id. at 8.

Plaintiff has brought several lawsuits related to this
patent. ECF No. 7 at 1-2. To wit Plaintiff has sued in
this district on several different occasions “for
violating his rights under Article 1 Section 8 Clause 8
by making a false claim of ownership against his
invention.” 4:13-cv-01914, ECF No. 43 at 1. At various
points over the last few years, other judges have

App-13

dismissed Plaintiff's claims for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, inadequate standing, and failure to state a claim. *Id.* At 9; 4:20-cv-2536, ECF No. 14; 4:18-cv-3822, ECF No.'s 30 and 35.

Plaintiff also filed a related suit in the Court of Federal Claims, which was dismissed for failure to state a claim. 1:14-cv-00147, ECF No.'s 1, 232, and 233. Now, Defendant moves to dismiss Plaintiff's claims for lack of standing and failure to state a claim. ECF No. 7.

II. ANALYSIS

Here, Plaintiff fails to state a plausible claim for relief. See *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009) (“[O]nly a complaint that states a plausible claim for relief survives a motion to dismiss.”). Plaintiff's complaint amounts to a vague request for declaratory relief without any meaningful facts or

App-14

law in support. For example, Plaintiff writes: “The laser-sharp issue in this case is the Plaintiff’s position for a U.S District Court Order for enforcement of a U.S Constitutional order to settle a quantified Constitutional claim arising out of unauthorized use of a patented invention[.]” ECF No. 1 at 5. Plaintiff goes on to say that, “[r]eferring to the time line of the development and manufacturing activities the laser-sharp constitutional issue involves ‘UNAUTHORIZED PREGNANCY’ for the continuous time period of 11 years and 23 days and NOT the ‘STATUS OF THE FETUS’ after 12 years and 23 days.” Id. And in Plaintiff’s Objections to Defendant’s Motion,

CASE 4:22-cv-02204 Document 13 Filed on

08/15/22 in TXSD Page 3 of 3

App-15

he writes: "Response from U.S. Secretary of the Air Force therefore [has] to be sought before this U.S. Citizen Inventor considers putting this new U.S. Patent on sale in the international market." ECF No. 9 at 4.

Courts must "give pro se briefs a liberal construction." *Brown v. Sudduth*, 675 F.3d 472, 477 (5th Cir. 2012). But a pro se party "still must actually argue something that is susceptible of liberal construction." *Toole v. Peak*, 361 F. App'x 621 (5th Cir. 2010) (citing *Grant v. Cuellar*, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995)). Plaintiff's filing do not do so. He provides the Court with no basis to conclude that he raises plausible claims. Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Defendant's Motion to Dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).

App-16

A dismissal for failure to state a claim can be rendered with prejudice where leave to amend “would cause undue delay, be the result of bad faith, represent the repeated failure to cure previous amendments, create undue prejudice, or be futile.” *Morgan v. Chapman*, 969 F.3d 238, 248 (5th Cir. 2020) (citing FED. R. CIV. P. 15(a)(2)). Here, in light of the content of Plaintiff's Complaint, Plaintiff's representation at the hearing, and Plaintiff's repeated and unsuccessful efforts to bring similar claims elsewhere, the Court concludes that further amendments would be futile and result in the needless waste of resources. The Court therefore **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's claims **WITH PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED

SIGNED at Houston, Texas, on this the 15th day of August, 2022.

App-17

Appendix-C

Case 4:22-cv-02204 Document 13

Filed on 08/15/22 in TXSD Page 3 of 3

s./ Keith P. Ellison

KEITH P. ELLISON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

App-18
Appendix- D

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

Case 4:13-cv-01914 Document 43 Filed in TXSD

on 10/23/13 Page 1 of 9

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

PROBIR BONDYOPADHYAY	§	
Plaintiff	§	
	§	
v.	§	Civil Action
	§	No. H-13-1914
	§	
THE UNITED STATES	§	
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, et al.,	§	
Defendants		

ORDER

Case 4:13-cv-01914 Document 43 Filed in TXSD
on 10/23/13 Page 7 of 9

. . . Defendants agree Plaintiff is the original

App-19

Appendix- D

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

Case 4:13-cv-01914 Document 43 Filed in TXSD

on 10/23/13 Page 7 of 9

**inventor, do not dispute Plaintiff's rights to
the patent, and do not threaten future
infringement of the patent.**

SIGNED at Houston, Texas, on this

23 day of October, 2013

s/David Hittner

DAVID HITTNER

United States District Judge

App-20
Appendix- E
Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)
Relevant Excerpts
Case 1:14-cv-00147-MCW Document 232 Filed
02/09/18 Page 1 of 11
ORIGINAL
In the United States Court of Federal Claims
No. 14-147C
(Filed February 9, 2018)

PROBIR K. BONDYOPADHYAY, *

Plaintiff,

v.

THE UNITED STATES

Defendant.

* Patent Infringement

* 28 U.S.C. § 1498; Direct

* Infringement; Doctrine of

* Equivalents; Insubstantial

* Differences; Triple Identity

* Test.

Probir K. Bondyopadhyay, Ph.D.

Houston, TX, pro se.

App-21
Appendix- E
Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)
Relevant Excerpts

Case 1:14-cv-00147-MCW Document 232 Filed

02/09/18 Page 1 of 11

OPINION AND ORDER

WILLIAMS, Judge.

In this action, Plaintiff pro se Dr. Probir K. Bondyopadhyay,¹ the inventor of United States Patent No. 6,292,134 (“the ‘134 Patent”) for a “Geodesic Sphere Phased Array Antenna System,” claims that the United States Air Force (“Air Force”) infringed Claims 14, 25, and 26 of his patent

1. Dr. Bondyopadhyay received a Ph.D. in electrical engineering from Polytechnic University of Brooklyn in 1983, and taught electrical engineering and computer science at both New York Institute of Technology and Maritime College. Tr. 7, 11.

App-22
Appendix- E
Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)
Relevant Excerpts

Case 1:14-cv-00147-MCW Document 232 Filed

02/09/18 Page 11 of 11

Conclusion

In sum, because the Ball Advanced Technology Demonstration antenna was incapable of providing hemispheric or greater coverage, it did not literally infringe the '134 patent. . . . Accordingly, Defendant's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**, and Plaintiff's "Motion of the Infringement Phase" (ECF No. 216) is **DENIED**. The Clerk is directed to enter judgment for Defendant. No costs.

s./ **Mary Ellen Coster Williams**

MARY ELLEN COSTER WILLIAMS

Judge

App 23

Appendix- E

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

FALSE AFFIDAVIT BY THE DEFENDANT

Case 1:14-cv-00147-MCW Document 69

Filed 07/30/15 Page 6 of 11

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT

OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

PROBIR K. BONDYOPADHYAY)

Plaintiff

) No. 14-147C

v.

) Judge Mary Ellen

) Coster Williams

THE UNITED STATES,

)

Defendant

)

THE UNITED STATES' OBJECTIONS AND
RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST SET OF
INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-12)

App 24
Appendix- E

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

FALSE AFFIDAVIT BY THE DEFENDANT

Case 1:14-cv-00147-MCW Document 69

Filed 07/30/15 Page 6 of 11

On April 24, 2015, Plaintiff Probir K. Bondyopadhyay filed his Motion for Discovery (Dkt. #55) asking Defendant's responses to twelve "Discovery Questions."

INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

"DQ-3 Did the said Boris Tomasic of the United States Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) invent the Geodesic Dome (Sphere) Phased Array Antenna System that the U.S. Air Force is developing under contract with the Ball Aerospace Corporation?"

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

App-25

Appendix- E

**Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)
Relevant Excerpts**

FALSE AFFIDAVIT BY THE DEFENDANT

Case 1:14-cv-00147-MCW Document 69

Filed 07/30/15 Page 6 of 11

The United States responds as follows:

On current information and belief, the United States contends that Boris Tomasic invented the Geodesic Dome Phased Array Antenna.

Case 1:14-cv-00147-MCW Document 69

Filed 07/30/15 Page 7 of 11

Signature and Oath of United States Air Force

{Interrogatory Nos. 1-8}

I declare under penalty of perjury that the factual matter contained in the response to Plaintiff's Interrogatory Nos. 1-8 deemed served on April 24,

App-26

Appendix- E

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

FALSE AFFIDAVIT BY THE DEFENDANT

Case 1:14-cv-00147-MCW Document 69

Filed 07/30/15 Page 7 of 11

2015 through Plaintiff's motion for Discovery {Dkt. #55}, in Bondyopadhyay v. United States Court of Federal Claims No. 14-147C, is based upon the information available to and deemed reliable by the United States Air Force through its employees and is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

s./Chun-I Chiang

CHUN-I-CHIANG

Patent Attorney

Commercial Law & Litigation Directorate

App-27

Appendix- E

**Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)
Relevant Excerpts**

FALSE AFFIDAVIT BY THE DEFENDANT

Case 1:14-cv-00147-MCW Document 69

Filed 07/30/15 Page 7 of 11

Air Force Legal Operations Agency

1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1780

Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762

(240) 612-6641

Respectfully submitted,

BENJAMIN C. MIZER

Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney

General

JOHN FARGO

Director

App-28

Appendix- E

**Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)
Relevant Excerpts**

FALSE AFFIDAVIT BY THE DEFENDANT

Case 1:14-cv-00147-MCW Document 69

Filed 07/30/15 Page 7 of 11

s./ Alice Suh Jou

ALICE SUH JOU

Commercial Litigation Branch

Civil Division

U.S. Department of Justice

Washington, D.C. 20530

Telephone: (202) 532-4135

Facsimile: (202) 307-0345

Email: alice.s.jou@usdoj.gov

May 26, 2015

COUNSEL FOR THE

UNITED STATES

App-29

Appendix-F

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

Case: 18-1674 Document: 32-1 Page: 1

Filed: 09/07/2018

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

PROBIR KUMAR BONDYOPADHYAY,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES,

Defendant-Appellee

2018-1674

Appeal from the United States Court of Federal
Claims in No. 1:14-cv-00147-MCW, Judge Mary
Ellen Coster Williams.

App-30

Appendix-F

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

Case: 18-1674 Document: 32-1 Page: 2

Filed: 09/07/2018

Decided: September 7, 2018

PROBIR KUMAR BONDYOPADHYAY,

Houston, TX, pro se.

Before NEWMAN, O'MALLEY, and CHEN,
Circuit Judges,

PER CURIUM

I. BACKGROUND

A. The '134 Patent

Dr. Bondyopadhyay is the owner and named inventor of the '134 patent, titled "geodesic sphere phased array antenna system."¹

App-31

Appendix- G

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

Case 4:18-cv-03822 Document 30 Filed on

07/09/19 in TXSD Page 1 of 11

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

PROBIR BONDYOPADHYAY

Plaintiff. §

v. § CIVIL ACTION

§ NO. H-18-3822

THE U.S. SECRETARY OF §

DEFENSE §

Defendant. §

MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION

Case 4:18-cv-03822 Document 30 Filed on
07/09/19 in TXSD Page 6 of 11

**Defendant further concedes, in pertinent
part, that Plaintiff “is the original inventor”**

App-32

Appendix- G

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

Case 4:18-cv-03822 Document 30 Filed on

07/09/19 in TXSD Page 6 of 11

**who “has rights to the patent” and there are
no allegations that Defendant is “threatening
any future infringement of the patent”**

(Document No. 10, p.4).

Case 4:18-cv-03822 Document 30 Filed on

07/09/19 in TXSD Page 11 of 11

Signed at Houston, Texas, this 9th day of July, 2019

s/ Frances H. Stacy

FRANCES H. STACY

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

App-33

Appendix- H

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

Case 1:19-cv-01831-MBH Document 17

Filed 06/23/20 Page 1 of 22

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 19-1831C

Filed June 23, 2020

PROBIR K. BONDYOPADHYAY *

Plaintiff, *

* Pro Se; Patent
* Infringement;
* Res Judicata;
* Fifth Amendment
* Taking; Fraud;
* Statute of
* Limitations

v.

UNITED STATES,

Defendant. *

OPINION

HORN, J.

FINDINGS OF FACT

App-34

Appendix- H

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

Case 1;19-cv-01831-MBH Document 17

Filed 06/23/20 Page 6 of 22

The constitutional financial claim has already been recorded with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit [Exhibit-6]. It is \$100 per hour for 1500 hours per year for 11 years and 23 days, plus administrative and office cost of \$1000 per month for 60 months. The total amount of Constitutional Financial Claim is \$1,719,000.

Case 1;19-cv-01831-MBH Document 17

Filed 06/23/20 Page 7 of 22

Plaintiff's complaint in the above-captioned case, once again, appears to allege a Fifth

App-35

Appendix- H

Under Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)(vi)

Relevant Excerpts

Case 1;19-cv-01831-MBH Document 17

Filed 06/23/20 Page 7 of 22

**Amendment taking claim, stating that the
“Defendant has taken the livelihood of this
Independent Inventor for a prolonged period of
eleven years and 23 days and continues to
remain indifferent towards this Constitutional
Order for a long time.”**

s/Marian Blank Horn

MARIAN BLANK HORN

Judge