

No. 23-7233

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 10 2024
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OTTAIT
FRANK [unclear] — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

NATIONAL GRAD AT vs. GRAD AT
— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

USCA FED. CIRCUIT # 23-1666
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

CHIKIZIE OTTAIT
(Your Name)

271 WYNTHAM LAKES DRIVE,
(Address)

Dallas, GA 30157
573015A
(City, State, Zip Code)

718 581 4539
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. ON THE QUESTION OF LAW
2. PETITION FOR REVIEW ON PATENT INFRINGEMENT
3. PETITION FOR REVIEW ON THE TOOLS OF US 840 PATENT
4. PETITION FOR REVIEW ON DE NOVO STANDARD AGAINST THE ABOVE MENTIONED CASE
5. PETITION FOR RELIEF, REVERSE AND AMEND DE NOVO STANDARD ON TOOL AGAINST US 840 PATENT.
6. RE-INSTATE AND REVERSE ALL CASES I WAS FOUND GUILTY, RELYING ON 840 PATENT OBJECTIVE I. BECAUSE PATENT 840 HAVE OTHER 9 (CHARACTERISTIC) OBJECTIVES (USING DE NOVO STANDARD)
7. YOUR HON. IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE REVERSE ALL THE CASES, I WAS FOUND GUILTY, RELYING ON WILCMA OR US PATENT 4/201,013 (DE NOVO)

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

CHIKRIZIB OJIAT

PETITIONER

NATIONAL GRID

RESPONDENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW N/A 1

JURISDICTION..... SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES
35 USC 271, 37 CFR 1.57

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 37 CFR 1.75

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... PATENT INFRINGEMENT § 1 claim priority
with ref.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT..... QUESTION OF LAW

CONCLUSION..... JUSTICE IS REASON TO AMEND.
F.R.C.P. 15(d). TENDRANT V HAKOMIN-

TMKIN INC 878 F.2d 1413, 1417, 11 US P.Q.2d
1303 1306-07 (FED. CIR. 1989)
THE DISTRICT COURT USED MARKMAN FOR CLAIM CONSTRUCTION: MY REF.
DEFINE WHAT WORD IS INDEX TO APPENDICES CLAIMED, AND A PRIOR ART TO
DEFENDANT PRODUCT.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

DOCKET NUMBER 2023-1666

HON. JUDGE NEWMAN HELD THAT; COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND STARE DECISIS REQUIRE THAT THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE TERMS REMOVABLE, ATTACH, ^{ADAPT,} CONNECTOR, INTERCONNECTOR, POVOTAL CONNECTION GOVERN IN SUBSEQUENT ACTION. THIS INSTANT COURT FAILED TO CONSTRUCT THE MEANING OF THE WORD ABOVE THEREFORE THE PROCLAIM OF CLAIM BAR IS WITHOUT MERIT. I PLEASE TO THE JUSTICE TO REVERSE THE JUDGMENT. INTRINSIC MEANING OF INTERCONNECTOR IS THE DEVICE AND EQUIPMENT; POVOTAL CONNECTING; ONLINE CONNECTION TO A LAPTOP, OR CABLE/EQUIPMENT. THE EQUIPMENT TO LAPTOP HAS FIX MOUNT OR TOOLS ALSO AND THE DEVICE.

STATUTES AND RULES 35 USC 271

THE PATENT, U.S. 840 MERIT 37 C.F.R 1.57, 37 C.F.R 1.75 ARRANGEMENT AND MODIFICATION AS PRIOR ART (37 CFR 1.57) TO DEFENDANT PRODUCT. THE DEFENDANT PRODUCT IS FURTHER RESTRICTED BY RULE 102, 103, 112

SEE AN ALTERNATIVE BOOK HOLDER^{IN} FIG. 8, PAGES, PARAGRAPH 2, A REF. FIG. 4, 420. IS A CONNECTOR. U.S. PATENT 840.

OTHER U.S. PATENT 840; REF. FIG. 4, 420 (FIG 4) or PRIOR ART.

U.S. CONSTITUTION

AS A PRIOR ART TO THE DEFENDANT PRODUCT. THE CLEAR MEANING AND RELATES AND TO THE DEFENDANT PRODUCT IS FOUND IN REF. FIG. 4. MEANING FOR WORDS LIKE ADAPTABLE, CONNECTOR, INTERCONNECTOR, CLAIM CONSTRUCTION IS A MATTER OF LAW.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from federal courts:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is 23-1666

- reported at FEB. 12 2024; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix ~~_____~~ ^{none} to the petition and is

- reported at 2/1/23; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

For cases from state courts:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is SPNY

- reported at P. A ENGELMAYER OPINION/ORDER; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished. 2/1/2023

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- reported at 2/1/2023; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished. 2/1/2023

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

U.S. 840 MODIFIED 37 CFR 1.57, 37 CFR 175
AND 35 USCS 154 (A)
35 USC 271

[Faint, illegible handwritten text]

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

PATENT INFRINGEMENT.

OTTAWA V. PRAT CHRYSTER E.I. AT

IT IS AGAINST SUPREME COURT GUIDING
TO APPLY STARE DECISIS OR DE NOVO STANDARD
ON A SYSTEM THAT OPERATES WITH TOOLS
EVERY LAYMAN KNOW RELECTRONIC / TECHNOLOGY
EQUIPMENT OPERATE SYSTEM. THOSE EQUIPMENT
THAT FENABLE THE PLUMBING FUNCTION OR FUNCTION
OF THE CAMERA ARE TOOLS. PLEASE APPX. PAGE
22. (E.G. REMOTE CONTROL, MOUSE, SCREEN, ~~OR~~ SENSOR.)

SEE: DE NOVO STANDARD, REVIEW AND AMENDED
BY JUSTICE ALITO, JUSTICE BREYER AND JUSTICE
THOMAS

THE COURT SHOULD REMEMBER THE ALTERNATIVE
ARMS LIKE CONNECTORS, CLIP BODY AND INTER CONNECTION
SCREEN ETC. THE ALTERNATIVE ARMS, MAY REPLACE THE
MAJOR BOOK HOLDER. SEE THE ATTACHED APPDX, PAGE 33.
SEE US PATENT 840. CLAIM SECTION, PAGE 6, para 5a and
2. ~~37 C.F.R. 1.75(i)~~ SEE 37 C.F.R. 1.75(i)
HON. JUSTICE, PLEASE SEE FRESSOLA V. MANBECKI
36 USPQ2D 1211 (DDC 1995). PLEASE SEE THE
ATTACHED MEMORANDUM, PAGES 10 AND 11, PAGES 14 AND 15
28 AND 29. PLEASE TENNANT CO V HAKOMIJI UTILITY
(FPP CIR 1985) US PQ2D 1303.1206-7

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

QUESTION OF LAW

THE PATENT, U.S. PATENT 840 WAS GRANTED ON THE DAY OF DEC. 26 2006. THE PATENT MERITS 37 C.F.R. 1.57 AND 37 C.F.R. 1.75 AND 35 U.S.C. 154 35 U.S.C. 252 (INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE). 35 U.S.C. 271, 102, 103

I LEARNED THAT THE DISTRICT IN CASE #1:10 CV.07296 CM FILED 02/17/12 CONTRADICTS

THE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION WAS NOT PROPER, CLAIM DID NOT INCLUDE INTER-CONNECTOR, NOR CONNECTION (CONNECTION). SEE THE SUMMARY OF INVENTION NUMBER 9, PAGE 2, U.S. PATENT 840

SINCE THE INVENTION OF U.S. 840
IN 2006, THE PATENT, U.S. 840, MOBILE TECHNOLOGY
(CAMERA) WE NEVER EXPECTED THE PATENT TO HAVE
SUCH GREAT IMPACT ON SOCIETY. TODAY THE SOCIAL
SECURITY AND ECONOMIC LEVEL THE ~~THE~~ SOCIETY
ENJOY WAS / IS UNIMAGINABLE (A COUPLE OF YEARS (2008)
AFTER PATENT 840 WAS ALLOWED / GRANTED, SOCIETY
WAVE-UP TO A SILENCE WITNESS, NO ARM ROBBER STOPPING
TAXIS OR CABS, CABS GO TO ALL NEIGHBORHOODS, TOWNS, VILLAGES
~~THE~~ MOBILE TECHNOLOGY (AUDIO VIDEO / CAMERA) HAVE
UNITY PEOPLE, SAVE LIFE AND HELP THE POLICE.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

CHIKIZIE OTIAH

Attol

Date: 4/9/19