

Lakshmi Arunachalam, Ph.D.

222 Stanford Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(650) 854-3393
laks@webxchange.com

August 15, 2012

**District of Columbia
Board on Professional Responsibility**

Re: Chief Judge Randall R. Rader

The District of Columbia Bar
1101 K Street NW, Suite 200
Washington DC 20005
202-737-4700

By USPS Express Mail,
Aug. 15, 2012

Dear Members of the Board,

***Re: Disciplinary complaint against Chief Judge Randall R. Rader re. his conduct in
Leader Tech v. Facebook, Case No. 2011-1366 (Fed. Cir.)***

I regret but feel compelled to bring the conduct of Federal Circuit **Chief Judge Randall R. Rader** to your attention. I believe that his conduct in *Leader Tech v. Facebook*, Case No. 2011-1366 (Fed. Cir.) ("*Leader v. Facebook*") has been unethical and does not instill the confidence of the public in the administration of justice.

Frankly, my general concern is that this complaint will be swept under the carpet and not be fully investigated. Pundits label "self-policing" of white collar misconduct in the legal profession as largely ineffective since attorneys are disciplining each other and feel the natural sympathy of "there but by the grace of God go I." Therefore, I challenge this Board to include a majority of laypeople in this evaluation. This will inject a modicum of objectivity and third party accountability into a process that otherwise looks to the average person as nothing more than attorney whitewashing.

My other concern is that if I do not mention a particular matter in this letter, the Board will then not investigate additional matters that may arise from its investigation. Therefore, I respectfully ask that you not limit your investigation to only the matters I raise herein, but rather to all matters that arise from the investigation, including the matters I raise below.

Disciplinary Complaint Against Chief Judge Randall R. Rader

The following are my complaints:

1. Judge Rader signed, or oversaw the signing of, Orders regarding mine and Leader Technologies' motions and petitions in this case where at least some of those motions were not even given to the judges according to Federal Court Clerk of Court staffer, Valerie White on Aug. 7, 2012. Worse, the Jul. 11, 2012 Order was entered only *hours* after my time-stamped motion was received by the court. According to Ms. White, the judges would not have had time to receive and consider my motion.ⁱ See Orders, Jul. 11, 2012ⁱⁱ and Jul. 24, 2012,ⁱⁱⁱ *Leader Tech v. Facebook*, Case No. 2011-1366 (Fed. Cir.).

2. Judge Rader violated Leader Technologies' due process rights under The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution. Specifically, Judge Rader oversaw and ultimately affirmed the unilateral, illegal conversion of Leader's "clear and convincing evidence" appeal into a different "substantial evidence" argument. Then, Judge Rader affirmed the panel's illegal action that dipped sporadically into the cold record for evidence to support the court-fabricated argument; even digging out evidence not put before the jury, then ruling on their newly-minted argument. These actions were a manifest injustice since (a) the Federal Circuit is not a trial court, and (b) if the Federal Circuit is going to take on the role of a trial court by evaluating *new evidence*, then it is duty-bound to permit a full briefing by the parties. Leader was never permitted to confront its accuser, which in this case was the Federal Circuit itself.

The Federal Circuit is an appeals court designed to *correct* mistakes of law, not retry cases prejudicially in favor of their friends and well-funded litigants with whom they curry favor. Therefore, the attorneys being overseen by Chief Judge Rader, and ultimately Judge Rader himself, *usurped* the proper administration of justice in their professional actions, in breach of their professional licenses to practice law.

Chief Judge Rader and his court essentially accused Leader Technologies of things that were not even tried in the lower court, without giving Leader their due process rights to confront, in this case, their *Federal Circuit* accusers. Nothing in Judge Rader's professional oath permits such a *usurpation* of the legal process.

3. Judge Rader oversaw the ignoring of the substance of my motions which included firm evidence of matters that required *serious review and reasoned comment* instead of the cursory denials that they received. For example, I provided clear proofs of substantial conflicts of interest among the Clerk and judges, substantial new evidence of Facebook's withholding of key evidence in this case, and egregious oversights of law that cannot possibly pass for judicial discretion. It is the Chief Judge's solemn duty to manage and discipline his court and prevent conflicts of interest and undue influence from tainting his court's decisions. Instead, Judge Rader was silent, and his Clerk seems to

Disciplinary Complaint Against Chief Judge Randall R. Rader

have been in on the cover-up. Therefore, the normal judicial disciplinary mechanisms set forth in the Judicial Code have broken down in this court.

Given the legions of questionable conduct in this case, anything less than full legal comment where the court explains and justifies their actions inject volumes of uncertainty into the legal process and is wholly unjust to Leader Technologies, the proven inventor whose invention is being infringed by Facebook.

As it stands now, the average person on the streets sees nothing but a Federal Circuit that is doing the bidding of Facebook; law and the American legal process be damned. It is the solemn duty of this Board to stand against such lawlessness.

4. Judge Rader did not disclose his prior associations with a person likely to be a key Leader witness, Professor James P. Chandler. Professor Chandler was a professor of law at George Washington University and likely quite known to the whole court; and certainly well-known at least to Judge Rader who was his student. It is also likely that undisclosed differences exist with various members of the court and Professor Chandler since the professor was instrumental in the passage of the Federal Trade Secrets Act and the Economic Espionage Act in 1996. Indeed, Professor Chandler worked closely with the Senate Judiciary Committee under Chairman Oren Hatch. Judge Rader was employed by Senator Hatch for eight years. The conflict is evident.^{iv}

At the very least these associations required disclosure. This association was likely to inject bias into the proceedings and should have been grounds for disqualification, or at least a request for waiver. Instead, the Clerk and the judges were utterly silent. Given that Professor Chandler's testimony (suppressed by the district court) would have been helpful to Leader and not Facebook, this oversight *shouts* for attention.

In addition, Professor Chandler has assisted the Judiciary in the prosecution of trade secrets and espionage cases. Therefore, it is quite likely that many, if not most, of the members of the Federal Circuit should have disclosed this association.

5. Judge Rader did not disclose his and the Federal Circuit's prior associations with various Facebook attorneys, as I proved in my renewed motion. These associations were likely to inject bias into the proceedings and should have been grounds for disqualification or at least a request for waiver.^v

6. Judge Rader did not oversee the disclosure of conflicts of interest in his court among the judges, clerk, employees and their families who were or would be beneficiaries of the Facebook IPO. I show in my renewed motion that at least two (and common sense dictates likely more) of the judges acquired stock in Facebook during the

Disciplinary Complaint Against Chief Judge Randall R. Rader

pendency of the *Leader v. Facebook* proceedings. Since Facebook's highly publicized initial public offering occurred during the pendency of the court's decision, this matter must certainly be material and would inject bias, and the disclosure one way or the other would have satisfied the requirement for judges to avoid even the appearance of impropriety, especially when considering that at least Judges Lourie and Moore had indeed acquired Facebook stock during the pendency of this case.^{vi}

7. Chief Judge Rader's court authorized public disclosure of key court decisions *timed* to Facebook media needs regarding its IPO in what the average person on the street can only consider Facebook bias. The announcement of the decision was *timed* on the same day as the beginning of the Facebook Road Show in New York on May 8, 2012, and the announcement of the denial of Leader petition for rehearing was *timed* and unexpectedly announced first by *Fox Business* by the interviewer Shibani Joshi during a nationally televised interview of Leader's Chairman Michael McKibben on July 16, 2012.^{vii}

8. Judge Rader's court has failed to provide timely FOIA information which asked that the court disclose its conflicts checking process in general, and specifically what conflicts checking occurred prior to and during the pendency of *Leader v. Facebook*.

9. Judge Rader's court denied my six-page motion for reconsideration citing the page-count rule of all things (without citing the Rule I allegedly broke). The courts are duty-bound to give *pro se* filers latitude and not just summarily dismiss motions for such things as number of pages. It is evident that the court wished to hide behind procedure instead of address the substance of my motion (where I proved that Mark Zuckerberg and Facebook withheld newly discovered evidence from Leader Technologies). In any event, Judge Rader's court insulted me as a *pro se* filer for what, if anything, was an inconsequential infraction (I believe I did comply with the rule in any event; this is a red herring). I believe the court is mis-citing its own rule to throw outsiders off the track. Such attorney-clerk tricks are becoming all too common.

10. Judge Rader's court and Judge Rader's signature on the denial of Leader's petition for rehearing *en banc* is an abuse of discretion by denying motions without providing a justifying reason. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Foman v. Davis*, 371 US 178 (1962) at 182 states: "outright refusal to grant the leave without any justifying reason appearing for the denial is not an exercise of discretion; it is merely abuse of that discretion and inconsistent with the spirit of the Federal Rules."

Judge Rader's court clerk failed to docket my motions, leaving the public in the dark as to the subject of the denials of those motions which have been published. Such

Disciplinary Complaint Against Chief Judge Randall R. Rader

dereliction of duties is tantamount to the kinds of censorship one would expect to see in a totalitarian state. Further, Federal Circuit Clerk staffer Valerie White told caller Steve Williams on Jul 7, 2012 that the court had “no record” of even receiving any of my three motions. This sort of conduct by a major U.S. court is unacceptable.^{viii}

11. The public record shows the possibility of undue influence over the proceeding by political and foreign influences. More specifically, at least Judges Lourie and Moore acquired Facebook stock through well-publicized transactions involving the very substantial involvement of investors in Facebook (including the closely related companies Zynga and Groupon) with close ties to the current U.S. administration and to the Russian government (“Facebook investor DST comes with ties to Alisher Usmanov and the Kremlin – Three Goldman Sachs bankers, Alexander Tamas, Verdi Israelian and John Lindfors joined DST over the past three years.” *The Guardian*, Jan. 4, 2011). Clerk of Court Horbaly’s central role in this questionable conduct is evident.^{ix}

For the sake of economy, I will not attach hard copies of the supporting documents, but will provide links to the downloadable documents online. Should the Board wish to have hard copy print outs of the cited documents, I will provide them upon request.

Given the already public nature of this case, and the fact that I am already in contact with members of the U.S. legislature, I will be providing copies of this complaint to members of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, among others. In this spirit, I would request that you make the results of your investigation publicly available.

Respectfully yours,

/s/

Lakshmi Arunachalam, Ph.D.

CEO

WebXchange, Inc.

Resources:

1. White Brief, *Leader Tech v. Facebook*, Case No. 2011-1366 (Fed. Cir.). Accessed Aug. 14, 2012 <<http://www.leader.com/docs/Leader-v-Facebook-APPEAL-Opening-Brief-25-Jul-2011.pdf>>.
2. Red Brief, *Id.* Accessed Aug. 14, 2012 <<http://www.leader.com/docs/Leader-v-Facebook-FACEBOOK-APPELLEE-BRIEF-24-Oct-2011.pdf>>.

Disciplinary Complaint Against Chief Judge Randall R. Rader

3. Gray Brief, *Id.* Accessed Aug. 14, 2012 <<http://www.leader.com/docs/Leader-v-Facebook-LEADER-REPLY-BRIEF-28-Nov-2011.pdf>>.
4. Green Brief, and Motion for Leave to File of Amicus Curiae Lakshmi Arunachalam, Ph.D.; Motion for Reconsideration; Renewed Motion for Leave to File. Accessed Aug. 14, 2012 <<http://www.scribd.com/amer4innov>>.
5. The *Leader v. Facebook* investigative reports of former *Bloomberg TV* reporter Donna Kline. Accessed Aug. 14, 2012 <<http://www.donnaklinenow.com>>.

ENDNOTES:

ⁱ Conversation between Federal Circuit Clerk of Court staff member Valerie White and Ohio resident Steve Williams. “Judicial Hyperactivity at the Federal Circuit. Accessed Aug. 14, 2012 <<http://www.donnaklinenow.com/investigation/judicial-hyperactivity-at-the-federal-circuit#comment-3365>>.

ⁱⁱ Order, Jul. 11, 2012. Accessed Aug. 14, 2012 <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/100272477/Delivery-Receipt-and-Order-Re-Amicus-Curiae-Lakshmi-Arunachalam-PhD-Motion-for-Leave-to-File-Jul-11-2012#page=2>>.

ⁱⁱⁱ Order, Jul. 24, 2012. Accessed Aug. 14, 2012 <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/102490453/Order-DENYING-Motion-for-Reconsideration-of-Motion-for-Leave-to-File-Amicus-Curiae-Lakshmi-Arunachalam-P-D-Brief-Re-Leader-v-Facebook-Jul-24-20>>.

^{iv} Renewed Motion of Lakshmi Arunachalam, Ph.D. For Leave To File Brief of Amicus Curiae In Support Of Leader Technologies’ Petition For Rehearing And Rehearing En Banc, *Leader Tech v. Facebook*, Case No. 2011-1366 (Fed. Cir.), July 28, 2012, p. 6-10. Accessed Aug. 15, 2012 <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/101191619/Renewed-Motion-for-Leave-To-File-Amicus-Curiae-Lakshmi-Arunachalam-Ph-D-Brief-Jul-27-2010-Leader-v-Facebook-CLERK-S-COPY-WITH-EXHIBITS#page=15>>.

^v *Id.*, pp. 16-17. <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/101191619/Renewed-Motion-for-Leave-To-File-Amicus-Curiae-Lakshmi-Arunachalam-Ph-D-Brief-Jul-27-2010-Leader-v-Facebook-CLERK-S-COPY-WITH-EXHIBITS#page=25>>.

^{vi} Donna Kline. “Judge Alan D. Lourie Chose Retirement Fund Value Over Justice? [citing Judge Moore’s public financial disclosure showing T. Rowe Price holdings and Facebook’s S-1 disclosure of a 5.2% holding by 158 T. Rowe Price Funds]” *Donna Kline Now!* Accessed Aug. 15, 2012 <<http://www.donnaklinenow.com/investigation/hijinks-at-the-high-court>>. See also T. Rowe Price Associates, Inc. “Principal And Selling

*Disciplinary Complaint Against **Chief Judge Randall R. Rader***

Stockholders, fn. 20,” [Facebook S-1 Filing](#), p. 129. Accessed Aug. 1, 2012; *See also* Judge Kimberly A. Moore Fidelity Contra-Fund Holdings, Renewed Motion of Lakshmi Arunachalam, Ph.D. For Leave To File Brief of Amicus Curiae In Support Of Leader Technologies’ Petition For Rehearing And Rehearing En Banc, *Leader Tech v. Facebook*, Case No. 2011-1366 (Fed. Cir.), July 28, 2012, pp. 13-16 <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/101191619/Renewed-Motion-for-Leave-To-File-Amicus-Curiae-Lakshmi-Arunachalam-Ph-D-Brief-Jul-27-2010-Leader-v-Facebook-CLERK-S-COPY-WITH-EXHIBITS#page=22>>.

^{vii} *See* Letter Complaint to Mr. William Suter, Clerk of Court, U.S. Supreme Court, written Aug. 11, 2012, submitted Aug. 13, 2012, p. 2. Accessed Aug. 14, 2012 <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/102686250/Lakshmi-Arunachalam-Ph-D-Judicial-Misconduct-COMPLAINT-to-the-U-S-SUPREME-COURT-Aug-11-2012>>. *See also* Renewed Motion of Lakshmi Arunachalam, Ph.D. For Leave To File Brief of Amicus Curiae In Support Of Leader Technologies’ Petition For Rehearing And Rehearing En Banc, *Leader Tech v. Facebook*, Case No. 2011-1366 (Fed. Cir.), July 28, 2012, p. 11-12 <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/101191619/Renewed-Motion-for-Leave-To-File-Amicus-Curiae-Lakshmi-Arunachalam-Ph-D-Brief-Jul-27-2010-Leader-v-Facebook-CLERK-S-COPY-WITH-EXHIBITS#page=20>>.

^{viii} *See* “Court Has ‘No Record’ Of These Motions as of Aug. 8, 2012.” *Donna Kline Now!*, Accessed Aug. 15, 2012 <<http://www.donnaklinenow.com/investigation/judicial-hyperactivity-at-the-federal-circuit>>.

^{ix} *Id.*, pp. 14-15 <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/101191619/Renewed-Motion-for-Leave-To-File-Amicus-Curiae-Lakshmi-Arunachalam-Ph-D-Brief-Jul-27-2010-Leader-v-Facebook-CLERK-S-COPY-WITH-EXHIBITS#page=23>>.



Search USPS.com or Track Packages

Quick Tools

Ship a Package

Send Mail

Manage Your Mail

Shop

Business Solutions

Track & Confirm

[GET EMAIL UPDATES](#)[PRINT DETAILS](#)

YOUR LABEL NUMBER	SERVICE	STATUS OF YOUR ITEM	DATE & TIME	LOCATION	FEATURES
EM341518075US	Express Mail®	Arrival at Unit	August 16, 2012, 10:26 am	WASHINGTON, DC 20004	Guaranteed By: August 16, 2012, 12:00 PM Proof of Delivery
		Processed through USPS Sort Facility	August 16, 2012, 8:42 am	WASHINGTON, DC 20074	
		Processed through USPS Sort Facility	August 15, 2012, 5:45 pm	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94128	
		Processed through USPS Sort Facility	August 15, 2012, 3:51 pm	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94125	
		Dispatched to Sort Facility	August 15, 2012, 1:16 pm	MENLO PARK, CA 94025	
		Acceptance	August 15, 2012, 12:14 pm	MENLO PARK, CA 94025	

Check on Another Item

What's your label (or receipt) number?

[Find](#)

LEGAL

[Privacy Policy](#) ›
[Terms of Use](#) ›
[FOIA](#) ›
[No FEAR Act EEO Data](#) ›

ON USPS.COM

[Government Services](#) ›
[Buy Stamps & Shop](#) ›
[Print a Label with Postage](#) ›
[Customer Service](#) ›
[Site Index](#) ›

ON ABOUT.USPS.COM

[About USPS Home](#) ›
[Newsroom](#) ›
[Mail Service Updates](#) ›
[Forms & Publications](#) ›
[Careers](#) ›

OTHER USPS SITES

[Business Customer Gateway](#) ›
[Postal Inspectors](#) ›
[Inspector General](#) ›
[Postal Explorer](#) ›

Copyright© 2012 USPS. All Rights Reserved.



Post Office To Addressee



EM 341518075 US

ORIGIN (POSTAL SERVICE USE ONLY)			DELIVERY (POSTAL USE ONLY)		
PO ZIP Code 94005	Day of Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Next <input type="checkbox"/> 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> 2nd Del. Day	Postage \$ 18.95	Delivery Attempt	Time	<input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM
Date Accepted 8/15/12	Scheduled Date of Delivery	Return Receipt Fee	Mo. Day	Time	<input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM
Mo. Day Year 8/15/12	Month Day	\$	Mo. Day	Time	<input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM
Time Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	Scheduled Time of Delivery	COD Fee Insurance Fee	Delivery Date	Time	<input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM
Flat Rate <input type="checkbox"/> or Weight	Military	\$ \$	Mo. Day	Time	<input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM
lbs. 7 ozs.	Int'l Alpha Country Code	Total Postage & Fees \$ 18.95	<input type="checkbox"/> WAIVER OF SIGNATURE (Domestic Mail Only) Additional merchandise insurance is void if waiver of signature is requested. I wish delivery to be made without obtaining signature of addressee or addressee's agent (if delivery employee judges that article can be left in secure location) and I authorize that delivery employee's signature constitutes valid proof of delivery.		
Acceptance Emp. Initials 21			NO DELIVERY <input type="checkbox"/> Weekend <input type="checkbox"/> Holiday		
CUSTOMER USE ONLY METHOD OF PAYMENT: Express Mail Corporate Acct. No.			Federal Agency Acct. No. or Postal Service Acct. No.		



FROM: (PLEASE PRINT) PHONE () Lakshmi Arunachalam 222 Stanford Avenue Menlo Park, CA 94025	TO: (PLEASE PRINT) PHONE () District of Columbia Board on Professional Responsibility The District of Columbia Bar 1101 K Street NW, Suite 200 Washington, DC 20005
--	---

FOR PICKUP OR TRACKING: Visit www.usps.com or Call 1-800-222-1811

USPS, WEST MENLO
MENLO PARK, California
940259992
0567830147 -0098
08/15/2012 (800)275-8777 12:17:20 PM

Product Description	Sales Receipt		Final Price
	Sale Qty	Unit Price	
WASHINGTON DC 20005 Zone-8 Express Mail PO-Add Flat Rate Env 8.30 oz. Label #: EM341518075US Thu 08/16/12 12:00PM - Expected Delivery. Money Back Guarantee Signature Requested			\$18.95
Issue PVI:			===== \$18.95
Total:			===== \$18.95
Paid by: VISA			\$18.95
Account #:	XXXXXXXXXXXX3970		
Approval #:	015753		
Transaction #:	636		
	23 903470284		

BRIGHTEN SOMEONE'S MAILBOX. Greeting cards available for purchase at select Post Offices.

Order stamps at usps.com/shop or call 1-800-Stamp24. Go to usps.com/clicknship to print shipping labels with postage. For other information call 1-800-ASK-USPS.

Get your mail when and where you want it with a secure Post Office Box. Sign up for a box online at usps.com/poboxes.

Bill#: 1000203817274
Clerk: 08

All sales final on stamps and postage
Refunds for guaranteed services only
Thank you for your business

HELP US SERVE YOU BETTER

Go to: <https://postalexperience.com/Pos>

TELL US ABOUT YOUR RECENT POSTAL EXPERIENCE
YOUR OPINION COUNTS

