



[DOCKET. (Accessed Jul. 12, 2022). Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, PETITION FOR REHEARING with APPENDIX, *Arunachalam v. Lyft Inc.*, Case No. 19-8029, filed May 20, 2020 (U.S. Supreme Court). Source: <https://www.supremecourt.gov/search.aspx?filename=/docket/docketfiles/html/public/19-8029.html> and https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-8029/144359/20200528121405657_20200528-121229-95750681-00000528.pdf]

 		Search documents in this case: <input type="text"/>		Search
No. 19-8029				
Title:	Lakshmi Arunachalam, Petitioner v. Lyft, Inc.			
Docketed:	March 18, 2020			
Lower Ct:	United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit			
Case Numbers:	(19-40597)			
Decision Date:	December 17, 2019			

DATE	PROCEEDINGS AND ORDERS
Mar 12 2020	<p>Petition for a writ of certiorari and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed. (Response due April 17, 2020)</p> <p>Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis Petition Appendix Certificate of Word Count Proof of Service</p>
Apr 29 2020	<p>DISTRIBUTED for Conference of 5/15/2020. [Provided to all Justices.]</p>
May 18 2020	<p>The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion and this petition.</p>
May 20 2020	<p>Motion for reconsideration of order denying leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed by petitioner.</p> <p>Main Document Proof of Service [Attached.]</p>
Jun 10 2020	<p>DISTRIBUTED for Conference of 6/25/2020. [Provided to all Justices.]</p>

[RECUSAL of
Chief Justice
John G.
Roberts, Jr.]

Jun 29 2020

Motion for reconsideration of order denying leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed by petitioner DENIED. The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion.

[RECUSAL of
Chief Justice
John G.
Roberts, Jr.]

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE
Attorneys for Petitioner		
Lakshmi Arunachalam	222 Stanford Avenue Menlo Park, CA 94025	(650) 690-0995
Party name: Lakshmi Arunachalam		

No. 19-8029

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman,

Petitioner,

v.

LYFT, INC.,

Respondent,

**ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman,

Self-Represented Petitioner

222 Stanford Avenue

Menlo Park, CA 94025

Tel: (650) 690-0995


Fax: (650) 854-3393

Email: laks22002@yahoo.com

Dated: May 20, 2020

Self-Represented Petitioner

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman.



RULE 29.6 STATEMENT

The Rule 29.6 disclosure statement included in the petition for a writ of certiorari remains accurate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
OTHER AUTHORITIES	v
PETITION FOR REHEARING.....	1
THIS COURT PROFOUNDLY FAILS TO PROTECT PATENT HOLDERS IN VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION — BROKE THE LAW, AVOIDED ENFORCING ITS OWN LAW, <i>FLETCHER</i> , ITS OWN GOVERNING PRECEDENTS — THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND	2
JUSTICE ROBERT’S RECUSAL IS AN ADMISSION THAT HE HAS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH THE KNIGHTS OF MALTA.....	3
SEVEN JUSTICES RECUSED FROM DR. ARUNACHALAM’S CASES OF THEIR OWN VOLITION.....	3
DR. ARUNACHALAM IS A SENIOR FEMALE INVENTOR WHO IS BEING DENIED ACCESS TO THIS COURT BY DENYING HER IFP MOTION. COURT’S ORDER IS ERRONEOUS AND FRAUDULENT, CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT, VIOLATING THE 8th AMENDMENT, IN RETALIATION FOR DR. ARUNACHALAM PUTTING THEM ON NOTICE OF A FACT ADMITTED BY CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, OF HIS OWN MISCONDUCT, FOR WHICH SHE IS NOW BEING FALSELY DUBBED AS “FRIVOLOUS OR MALICIOUS,” JUST BECAUSE THE COURT FINDS FACTS PRESENTED BY DR. ARUNACHALAM INCONVENIENT OR EMBARRASING	4
THIS COURT DOES NOT HAVE CLEAN HANDS IN THIS RETALIATORY DENIAL OF DR. ARUNACHALAM’S MOTION	5
INTERVENING LAW: <i>VIRNETX</i> REVERSED AND REMANDED ON 5/13/20 WHICH COURTS FAILED TO APPLY TO DR. ARUNACHALAM’S CASES.....	6
THIS CASE SUPERCEDES <i>MARBURY V. MADISON</i> THAT 3 DEPARTMENTS HAVE ACTED AS ONE, TO STEAL DR. ARUNACHALAM’S PATENTS AND UNJUSTLY ENRICH CORPORATE INFRINGERS BY TRILLIONS OF DOLLARS. THIS COURT MUST REVERSE ITS ORDER OF 5/18/20.....	6

J. MARSHALL DECLARED: “THE LAW OF THIS CASE IS THE LAW OF ALL.”	7
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.....	9
CONCLUSION.....	9
CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL/SELF-REPRESENTED PETITIONER.....	11
RULE 44 CERTIFICATE.....	12
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	13
APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES:</u>	Page
<i>Cooper v. Aaron</i> , 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958).....	9
<i>Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward</i> , 17 U.S. 518 (1819).....	passim
<i>Fletcher v. Peck</i> , 10 U.S. 87 (1810)	passim
<i>Grant v. Raymond</i> , 31 U.S. 218 (1832).....	2
<i>U.S. v. American Bell Telephone Company</i> , 167 U.S. 224 (1897)	2
<i>VirnetX v. Cisco Systems</i> , Fed. Cir. 5/13/20.....	6
 <u>OTHER AUTHORITIES:</u>	
William E. Simonds, <i>Manual of Patent Law</i> (1874).....	7

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman, (“Dr. Arunachalam”) respectfully requests rehearing of the Court’s Order dated May 18, 2020, dismissing her Petition for Writ of Certiorari, denying her IFP Motion, misapplying Rule 39.8, dubbing her “frivolous or malicious,” cruelly punishing her for the Court’s own misconduct.

In striving to protect her patent property rights, information came to Dr. Arunachalam that Chief Justice Roberts maintains an impermissible conflict of interest relationship with a foreign power—The Sovereign Military Order of Malta (SMOM), officially the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of Saint John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta, commonly known as the Order of Malta or Knights of Malta.

The Knights of Malta is a sovereign power, answers to the Pope of Rome¹ whose annual budget is \$1.5 billion, funded by European governments, the United Nations, the European Union, foundations and public donors. The Knights of Malta cannot take vows that conflict with the Catholic Church.² On 3/11/2020, they established formal diplomatic relationship with Estonia, whose government is involved in the Spy Gate scandal and the fabrication of the spurious Steele “Dirty Dossier.” See Figure, Appendix 1A.

The British Monarch is a member of the Knights of Malta. The last Grandmasters of the Order of Malta came from Britain. Former-Grandmaster Andrew Willoughby Ninian Bertie was Queen Elizabeth II’s cousin and originated his position within the Grand Priory of England.³ The British arm of the Order of Malta controlling St John’s Wood is known as the Grand Priory of England. This

¹ J.H. (February 7, 2017). Why the pope has taken control of the Knights of Malta. The Economist. <https://www.economist.com/the-economist-explains/2017/02/07/why-the-pope-has-taken-control-of-the-knights-of-malta>

² "Pope’s Private Letter Reveals Early Involvement in Power Struggle," Jan. 30, 2019. WikiLeaks. "To the Venerable Brother Cardinal RAYMOND LEO BURKE Patron of the Sovereign Order of Malta, From the Vatican, Dec. 01, 2016. ('In the letter, Pope Francis states: "In particular, members of the Order must avoid secular and frivolous (sic) behavior, such as membership to associations, movements and organisations which are contrary to the Catholic faith and/or of a relativist nature."'). https://wikileaks.org/popeorders/document/Attachment_1/page-4/#pagination

³ Knights of Malta. (Accessed May 19, 2020). The Great Priory of the United Religious, Military and Masonic Orders of the Temple and of St. John of Jerusalem, Palestine, Rhodes and Malta of England and Wales and its Provinces Overseas. <https://www.markmasonshall.org/orders/order-of-malta>

location was once also a Knights Templar headquarters in Britain—the current site of the Inns of Court from which even American courts take instruction.

The Order of Malta owned Londinium (TheCityofLondon UK, which presents its name without spaces between the words.) TheCityofLondon UK was eventually rented out by the Order of Malta as their headquarters. The Jesuits took over Londinium in 1825, aided by the Rothschild banking family and perennial advisors to the Federal Reserve and Bank of England.

Dr. Arunachalam should not be punished by this Court because Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr.'s partiality is in question by this Knights of Malta conflict of interest.

I. THIS COURT PROFOUNDLY FAILS TO PROTECT PATENT HOLDERS IN VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION — BROKE THE LAW, AVOIDED ENFORCING ITS OWN LAW, ITS OWN GOVERNING PRECEDENTS⁴ — THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND.

In dismissing Dr. Arunachalam's petition, this Court fails to correct a systemic injustice being foisted upon American inventors by the unconstitutional practice of allowing the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office—itsself now run by foreign powers – SERCO and QinetiQ, to rescind patent contracts already awarded.

Both SERCO and QinetiQ⁵ are controlled by a “Special Share” held by the British Monarch that gives it total control over these companies, including their subsidiaries in the United States. SERCO's contracts to manage the U.S. Patent Office are available on the General Services Agency website.⁶

A patent grant is a contract and cannot be rescinded once awarded

Chief Justice Marshall is crystal clear on fundamental property rights — **a patent grant is a contract and cannot be rescinded once awarded – the Supreme Law of the Land.** Dr. Arunachalam's Petition asks this Court to enforce the law, its own law, that EVERY lower court in Dr. Arunachalam's cases

⁴ *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);

⁵ Qinetiq Group Plc, Co. No. 4586941. (Jun. 03, 2003. Resolutions at General Meeting, p. 29. Companies House. ("15. SPECIAL SHARE, 15.1 Special Shareholder, The Special Share may only be issued to, held by and transferred to the Crown (or as it directs).").

⁶ Press Release. (Nov. 150, 2018). Serco Processes 4 Millionth Patent Application for U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. SERCO.

systematically failed to enforce.

The matter in this Petition addresses one of the most fundamental property rights—the right to hold patents without fear of government intrusion and confiscation.

By dismissing this Petition, this Court is evidently attempting to bully Dr. Arunachalam into silence to avoid enforcing *Fletcher*, promoting theft.

By 8 Justices failing to address Chief Justice Roberts' evident conflicts of interest by his membership in the Knights of Malta sets a horrible precedent that judges may maintain conflicts of interest in any court.

II. JUSTICE ROBERT'S RECUSAL IS AN ADMISSION THAT HE HAS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH THE KNIGHTS OF MALTA

Dr. Arunachalam's mere question about Chief Justice Roberts' relationship with the Knights of Malta triggered him to recuse. He *admitted* to the fact that he "engaged in conflict of interest against inventors as a member of the Knights of Malta with fealty to the Queen of England who controls SERCO and QinetiQ Group Plc, both British companies, in services that prejudice the inventor's patent properties."

Six Supreme Court Justices Kagan, Sotomayor, Thomas, Ginsburg, Breyer and Alito, recused from her Case No. 18-9383.

In light of these Supreme Court recusals in Dr. Arunachalam's cases, the Order that Dr. Arunachalam's Petition is "frivolous or malicious" is an evident dereliction of duty by this Court to protect her property rights with an accusation against her, which is itself unfounded and therefore itself frivolous on its face.

III. SEVEN JUSTICES RECUSED FROM DR. ARUNACHALAM'S CASES OF THEIR OWN VOLITION.

Dr. Arunachalam's cases are all one single continuum of judicial misfeasance, malfeasance, non-feasance, and treasonous breach of their solemn oaths of office in not enforcing the Supreme Law of the Land.

It is a fundamental property rights issue embedded in the U.S. Constitution. A patent property is a natural right to one's intellectual property granted by contract; which once agreed, cannot be revoked, at least without due compensation.

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 – Patent and Copyright Clause of the Constitution. [The Congress shall have power] “To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.”

It is not Dr. Arunachalam’s fault that Chief Justice Roberts “engaged in conflict of interest against inventors as a member of the Knights of Malta...”

Nor is it her fault that seven Justices breached their solemn oath of office and lost jurisdiction because they failed to enforce *Fletcher, Dartmouth College* — the Supreme Law of the Land in her cases.

Indeed, Dr. Arunachalam is being punished under the color of law by this Court that is evidently attempting to sweep the issues under the rug, hoping Dr. Arunachalam will remain gagged.

IV. DR. ARUNACHALAM IS A SENIOR FEMALE INVENTOR WHO IS BEING DENIED ACCESS TO THIS COURT BY DENYING HER IFP MOTION.

COURT’S ORDER IS ERRONEOUS AND FRAUDULENT, CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT, VIOLATING THE 8th AMENDMENT, IN RETALIATION FOR DR. ARUNACHALAM PUTTING THEM ON NOTICE OF A FACT ADMITTED BY CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, OF HIS OWN MISCONDUCT, FOR WHICH SHE IS NOW BEING FALSELY DUBBED AS “FRIVOLOUS OR MALICIOUS,” JUST BECAUSE THE COURT FINDS FACTS PRESENTED BY DR. ARUNACHALAM INCONVENIENT OR EMBARRASING.

The remaining eight Justices—out of which six more had already recused from Dr. Arunachalam’s cases and cannot rule— ruled in this case that she was “*frivolous or malicious*” per Rule 39.8, thus making it expensive, hazardous and burdensome for her to have access to the courts—all in violation of the Constitution. See ALP Vol XII, Sec. 141.

How could this Court speak from both sides of its mouth? Chief Justice Roberts himself admitted (which is *not* a frivolous admission, thus giving validity to Dr. Arunachalam’s assertion) to the fact he “engaged in conflict of interest against inventors as a member of the Knights of Malta...”, and then the Court speaking from the other side of its mouth that she is “*frivolous or malicious*.”

It is an undisputed fact that the Court lost its jurisdiction in repeatedly avoiding the enforcement of its own Governing Precedents – the Supreme Law of the Land, delineated in *Fletcher* and *Dartmouth College*. How can the Judiciary committing treason by breaking their solemn oaths of office dub my repeated notices to the Judiciary “*frivolous or malicious*”?

If Dr. Arunachalam’s Petition was frivolous, then Chief Justice Roberts had no basis to recuse.

If Dr. Arunachalam’s Petition was malicious, then the facts she raises would have to be false, which his recusal shows they are not.

How can the Justices call Dr. Arunachalam’s Petition “frivolous and malicious” when Chief Justice Roberts recused himself as a result of it? In other words, if it was frivolous, then Justice Roberts had no reason to recuse.

As to malice, Dr. Arunachalam does not take issue with Justice Roberts personally, only with his conduct on the bench. Justices are duty bound to avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest. Since his membership in the Knights of Malta is confirmed, then Dr. Arunachalam bringing up this fact and asking for an ethics ruling *cannot* be malicious.

V. THIS COURT DOES NOT HAVE CLEAN HANDS IN THIS RETALIATORY DISMISSAL OF DR. ARUNACHALAM’S PETITION

Dr. Arunachalam came to this Court with clean hands. And yet this Court is impeaching her credibility because of its evident misconduct.

That this Court failed to enforce the law is judicial malfeasance, misfeasance and nonfeasance.

This Court’s failure to address Chief Justice Robert’s evident conflict of interest with the Knights of Malta, and all that this implies regarding the Pope of Rome, the British Monarch, the Inns of Court in Britain and the United States, SERCO and QinetiQ is palpable.

This Court’s response to call Dr. Arunachalam’s assertions of fact regarding this conflict of interest as “*frivolous or malicious*” speaks to the complicity of the other Justices.

To then dismiss Dr. Arunachalam’s Petition for Writ of Certiorari is evident

retaliatory, cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the 8th Amendment — for Dr. Arunachalam putting them on notice that the Justices failed to enforce the Law of the Land and this Court's Governing Precedents — the Supreme Law of the Land, *Fletcher, Dartmouth College* and breached their solemn oaths of office and lost their jurisdiction.

VI. INTERVENING LAW: *VIRNETX* REVERSED AND REMANDED ON 5/13/20, WHICH COURTS FAILED TO APPLY TO DR. ARUNACHALAM'S CASES

On 5/13/2020, the Federal Circuit reversed and remanded in *VirnetX* because the PTAB Administrative Patent Judges were *unconstitutionally appointed*, and yet discriminately failed to apply it to USPTO reexams and IPR/CBM reviews of Dr. Arunachalam's patents.

The Federal Circuit discriminately failed to reverse its Erroneous and Fraudulent and Void Orders in her cases even though the District Courts and the PTAB failed to consider "the entirety of the record" — Patent Prosecution History — requiring reversal of those Orders pursuant to the Federal Circuit's own *Aqua Products, Inc. v. Matal* ruling of October, 2017.

VII. THIS CASE SUPERCEDES *MARBURY V. MADISON* THAT THREE DEPARTMENTS HAVE ACTED AS ONE TO STEAL DR. ARUNACHALAM'S PATENTS AND UNJUSTLY ENRICH CORPORATE INFRINGERS BY TRILLIONS OF DOLLARS.

This Court dismissed this case, even though it supercedes *Marbury v. Madison* in constitutional significance that three Departments have all been acting as one, to steal patents of Dr. Arunachalam's significant inventions which have enabled the nation to work remotely during the COVID-19 Pandemic.

There is no question here that the Court has a solemn oath duty to enforce the law — the Supreme Law of the Land.

How can this Court impeach Dr. Arunachalam as "*frivolous or malicious*" for this Court's own misconduct in not enforcing the Law of the Land — *Fletcher, Dartmouth College*, that govern patent law.

How can this Court impeach Dr. Arunachalam as "*frivolous or malicious*" for merely raising the fact of Chief Justice Roberts' relationships to the Knights of Malta, and all that this implies regarding the Pope of Rome, the British Monarch, the Inns of Court in Britain and the United States, SERCO and QinetiQ?



Figure 1: Meghan Keneally. (July 3, 2012). After joking about heading to Malta to escape criticism....Chief Justice Roberts heads to Malta as it emerges that he may have written for AND against opinions on Obamacare. The Daily Mail. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2168451/Chief-Justice-Roberts-heads-Malta-emerges-written-AND-opinions-Obamacare.html>

See also **Appendix 1A** for substantial corroborating evidence, which further renders Dr. Arunachalam non-frivolous and non-malicious.

**VIII. J. MARSHALL DECLARED:
“THE LAW OF THIS CASE IS THE LAW OF ALL.”**

William E. Simonds, the U.S. Patent Office Commissioner from 1891 to 1892, wrote in the Manual of Patent Law (1874):

“A Patent is a Contract between the inventor and the Government representing the public at large.”

Chief Justice J. Marshall declared:

"It can require no argument to prove that the circumstances of this case constitute a contract."

J. Marshall declared in *Dartmouth College v. Woodward* (1819) that:

"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?

Are Petitioner's patent property rights being impaired by this Court? The answer is "yes" to both questions.

Like J. Marshall stated in *Dartmouth*,

"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**, J. Marshall stated: "these principles and authorities prove **incontrovertibly that**" a patent grant **"is a contract."** J. Marshall declared 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."**

This Court's and lower court Orders violate the U.S. Constitution and constitute treason. 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.”

IX. 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.

Corporate Infringers stole Petitioner’s patents and distributed its use to everyone including the U.S. Government, realizing unjust enrichments in the trillions of dollars. Petitioner is the inventor of “The Internet of Things (IoT)” — “Web Applications Displayed on a Web browser.” The Judiciary deprived Petitioner of the payment for each Web transaction/per Web application in use, which it allowed Corporate America 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.

This Court’s 5/18/20 Order is in violation of the U.S. Constitution and 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 *Fletcher* and this Court’s Governing Precedents. Why has the Judiciary not enforced *Fletcher* and this Court’s Governing Precedents? They know why — because enforcing *Fletcher* exposes the entire Patent System, operating as a criminal enterprise, defrauding the public. What is the point of this Court’s *Fletcher* Precedent, if this Court has never enforced it?

Dr. Arunachalam has been forced to state the obvious. The Court does not like it. So the Court dismissed the Case and denied Petitioner her IFP Motion for false reasons, misapplying Rule 39.8, impeaching her as "frivolous or malicious" while Chief Justice Roberts admitted by his recusal that the facts and the law are on Petitioner's side.

The Court should grant rehearing, void its 5/18/20 Order and grant the Petition for Writ of Certiorari. A Certificate of Service is attached here below.

Respectfully submitted,

Lakshmi Arunachalam

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

Self-Represented Petitioner
Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman
May 20, 2020

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL/SELF-REPRESENTED PETITIONER

I, Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman, self-represented petitioner, certify that as per the Court rules, this document contains 2998 words only, as counted by the tool available in Microsoft WORD, and is well within the 3000 word limit.

Respectfully submitted,

Lakshmi Arunachalam

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

Self-Represented Petitioner

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman
May 20, 2020

RULE 44 CERTIFICATE

I, Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman, self-represented petitioner, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, declare under penalty of perjury that the following is true and correct:

1. This petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay.
2. The grounds of this petition are limited to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.

Lakshmi Arunachalam

Signature

Executed on May 20, 2020

Date

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**

[COMPILER'S NOTE: These censored pages are contained in the original file following:

[Click here to go directly to the censored pages](#) referenced above.]

No. 19-8029

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman,

Petitioner,

v.

LYFT, INC.,

Respondent,

**ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman,

Self-Represented Petitioner

222 Stanford Avenue

Menlo Park, CA 94025

Tel: (650) 690-0995

Fax: (650) 854-3393

Email: laks22002@yahoo.com

Dated: May 20, 2020

Self-Represented Petitioner

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman.

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT

The Rule 29.6 disclosure statement included in the petition for a writ of certiorari remains accurate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
OTHER AUTHORITIES	v
PETITION FOR REHEARING.....	1
THIS COURT PROFOUNDLY FAILS TO PROTECT PATENT HOLDERS IN VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION — BROKE THE LAW, AVOIDED ENFORCING ITS OWN LAW, <i>FLETCHER</i> , ITS OWN GOVERNING PRECEDENTS — THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND	2
JUSTICE ROBERT’S RECUSAL IS AN ADMISSION THAT HE HAS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH THE KNIGHTS OF MALTA.....	3
SEVEN JUSTICES RECUSED FROM DR. ARUNACHALAM’S CASES OF THEIR OWN VOLITION.....	3
DR. ARUNACHALAM IS A SENIOR FEMALE INVENTOR WHO IS BEING DENIED ACCESS TO THIS COURT BY DENYING HER IFP MOTION. COURT’S ORDER IS ERRONEOUS AND FRAUDULENT, CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT, VIOLATING THE 8th AMENDMENT, IN RETALIATION FOR DR. ARUNACHALAM PUTTING THEM ON NOTICE OF A FACT ADMITTED BY CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, OF HIS OWN MISCONDUCT, FOR WHICH SHE IS NOW BEING FALSELY DUBBED AS “FRIVOLOUS OR MALICIOUS,” JUST BECAUSE THE COURT FINDS FACTS PRESENTED BY DR. ARUNACHALAM INCONVENIENT OR EMBARRASING	4
THIS COURT DOES NOT HAVE CLEAN HANDS IN THIS RETALIATORY DENIAL OF DR. ARUNACHALAM’S MOTION	5
INTERVENING LAW: <i>VIRNETX</i> REVERSED AND REMANDED ON 5/13/20 WHICH COURTS FAILED TO APPLY TO DR. ARUNACHALAM’S CASES.....	6
THIS CASE SUPERCEDES <i>MARBURY V. MADISON</i> THAT 3 DEPARTMENTS HAVE ACTED AS ONE, TO STEAL DR. ARUNACHALAM’S PATENTS AND UNJUSTLY ENRICH CORPORATE INFRINGERS BY TRILLIONS OF DOLLARS. THIS COURT MUST REVERSE ITS ORDER OF 5/18/20.....	6

J. MARSHALL DECLARED: “THE LAW OF THIS CASE IS THE LAW OF ALL.”.....	7
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.....	9
CONCLUSION.....	9
CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL/SELF-REPRESENTED PETITIONER.....	11
RULE 44 CERTIFICATE.....	12
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	13
APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES:</u>	Page
<i>Cooper v. Aaron</i> , 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958).....	9
<i>Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward</i> , 17 U.S. 518 (1819).....	passim
<i>Fletcher v. Peck</i> , 10 U.S. 87 (1810)	passim
<i>Grant v. Raymond</i> , 31 U.S. 218 (1832).....	2
<i>U.S. v. American Bell Telephone Company</i> , 167 U.S. 224 (1897)	2
<i>VirnetX v. Cisco Systems</i> , Fed. Cir. 5/13/20.....	6
<u>OTHER AUTHORITIES:</u>	
William E. Simonds, <i>Manual of Patent Law</i> (1874).....	7

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman, (“Dr. Arunachalam”) respectfully requests rehearing of the Court’s Order dated May 18, 2020, dismissing her Petition for Writ of Certiorari, denying her IFP Motion, misapplying Rule 39.8, dubbing her “frivolous or malicious,” cruelly punishing her for the Court’s own misconduct.

In striving to protect her patent property rights, information came to Dr. Arunachalam that Chief Justice Roberts maintains an impermissible conflict of interest relationship with a foreign power—The Sovereign Military Order of Malta (SMOM), officially the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of Saint John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta, commonly known as the Order of Malta or Knights of Malta.

The Knights of Malta is a sovereign power, answers to the Pope of Rome¹ whose annual budget is \$1.5 billion, funded by European governments, the United Nations, the European Union, foundations and public donors. The Knights of Malta cannot take vows that conflict with the Catholic Church.² On 3/11/2020, they established formal diplomatic relationship with Estonia, whose government is involved in the Spy Gate scandal and the fabrication of the spurious Steele “Dirty Dossier.” See Figure, Appendix 1A.

The British Monarch is a member of the Knights of Malta. The last Grandmasters of the Order of Malta came from Britain. Former-Grandmaster Andrew Willoughby Ninian Bertie was Queen Elizabeth II’s cousin and originated his position within the Grand Priory of England.³ The British arm of the Order of Malta controlling St John’s Wood is known as the Grand Priory of England. This

¹ J.H. (February 7, 2017). Why the pope has taken control of the Knights of Malta. The Economist. <https://www.economist.com/the-economist-explains/2017/02/07/why-the-pope-has-taken-control-of-the-knights-of-malta>

² "Pope’s Private Letter Reveals Early Involvement in Power Struggle," Jan. 30, 2019. WikiLeaks. “To the Venerable Brother Cardinal RAYMOND LEO BURKE Patron of the Sovereign Order of Malta, From the Vatican, Dec. 01, 2016. (‘In the letter, Pope Francis states: “In particular, members of the Order must avoid secular and frivolous (sic) behavior, such as membership to associations, movements and organisations which are contrary to the Catholic faith and/or of a relativist nature.”’). https://wikileaks.org/popeorders/document/Attachment_1/page-4/#pagination

³ Knights of Malta. (Accessed May 19, 2020). The Great Priory of the United Religious, Military and Masonic Orders of the Temple and of St. John of Jerusalem, Palestine, Rhodes and Malta of England and Wales and its Provinces Overseas. <https://www.markmasonshall.org/orders/order-of-malta>

location was once also a Knights Templar headquarters in Britain—the current site of the Inns of Court from which even American courts take instruction.

The Order of Malta owned Londinium (TheCityofLondon UK, which presents its name without spaces between the words.) TheCityofLondon UK was eventually rented out by the Order of Malta as their headquarters. The Jesuits took over Londinium in 1825, aided by the Rothschild banking family and perennial advisors to the Federal Reserve and Bank of England.

Dr. Arunachalam should not be punished by this Court because Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr.'s partiality is in question by this Knights of Malta conflict of interest.

I. THIS COURT PROFOUNDLY FAILS TO PROTECT PATENT HOLDERS IN VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION — BROKE THE LAW, AVOIDED ENFORCING ITS OWN LAW, ITS OWN GOVERNING PRECEDENTS⁴ — THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND.

In dismissing Dr. Arunachalam's petition, this Court fails to correct a systemic injustice being foisted upon American inventors by the unconstitutional practice of allowing the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office—itsself now run by foreign powers – SERCO and QinetiQ, to rescind patent contracts already awarded.

Both SERCO and QinetiQ⁵ are controlled by a “Special Share” held by the British Monarch that gives it total control over these companies, including their subsidiaries in the United States. SERCO's contracts to manage the U.S. Patent Office are available on the General Services Agency website.⁶

A patent grant is a contract and cannot be rescinded once awarded

Chief Justice Marshall is crystal clear on fundamental property rights — **a patent grant is a contract and cannot be rescinded once awarded – the Supreme Law of the Land.** Dr. Arunachalam's Petition asks this Court to enforce the law, its own law, that EVERY lower court in Dr. Arunachalam's cases

⁴ *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);

⁵ Qinetiq Group Plc, Co. No. 4586941. (Jun. 03, 2003. Resolutions at General Meeting, p. 29. Companies House. ("15. SPECIAL SHARE, 15.1 Special Shareholder, The Special Share may only be issued to, held by and transferred to the Crown (or as it directs).").

⁶ Press Release. (Nov. 150, 2018). Serco Processes 4 Millionth Patent Application for U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. SERCO.

systematically failed to enforce.

The matter in this Petition addresses one of the most fundamental property rights—the right to hold patents without fear of government intrusion and confiscation.

By dismissing this Petition, this Court is evidently attempting to bully Dr. Arunachalam into silence to avoid enforcing *Fletcher*, promoting theft.

By 8 Justices failing to address Chief Justice Roberts’ evident conflicts of interest by his membership in the Knights of Malta sets a horrible precedent that judges may maintain conflicts of interest in any court.

II. JUSTICE ROBERT’S RECUSAL IS AN ADMISSION THAT HE HAS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH THE KNIGHTS OF MALTA

Dr. Arunachalam’s mere question about Chief Justice Roberts’ relationship with the Knights of Malta triggered him to recuse. He *admitted* to the fact that he “engaged in conflict of interest against inventors as a member of the Knights of Malta with fealty to the Queen of England who controls SERCO and QinetiQ Group Plc, both British companies, in services that prejudice the inventor’s patent properties.”

Six Supreme Court Justices Kagan, Sotomayor, Thomas, Ginsburg, Breyer and Alito, recused from her Case No. 18-9383.

In light of these Supreme Court recusals in Dr. Arunachalam’s cases, the Order that Dr. Arunachalam’s Petition is “frivolous or malicious” is an evident dereliction of duty by this Court to protect her property rights with an accusation against her, which is itself unfounded and therefore itself frivolous on its face.

III. SEVEN JUSTICES RECUSED FROM DR. ARUNACHALAM’S CASES OF THEIR OWN VOLITION.

Dr. Arunachalam’s cases are all one single continuum of judicial misfeasance, malfeasance, non-feasance, and treasonous breach of their solemn oaths of office in not enforcing the Supreme Law of the Land.

It is a fundamental property rights issue embedded in the U.S. Constitution. A patent property is a natural right to one’s intellectual property granted by contract; which once agreed, cannot be revoked, at least without due compensation.

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 – Patent and Copyright Clause of the Constitution. [The Congress shall have power] “To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.”

It is not Dr. Arunachalam’s fault that Chief Justice Roberts “engaged in conflict of interest against inventors as a member of the Knights of Malta...”

Nor is it her fault that seven Justices breached their solemn oath of office and lost jurisdiction because they failed to enforce *Fletcher, Dartmouth College* — the Supreme Law of the Land in her cases.

Indeed, Dr. Arunachalam is being punished under the color of law by this Court that is evidently attempting to sweep the issues under the rug, hoping Dr. Arunachalam will remain gagged.

IV. DR. ARUNACHALAM IS A SENIOR FEMALE INVENTOR WHO IS BEING DENIED ACCESS TO THIS COURT BY DENYING HER IFP MOTION.

COURT’S ORDER IS ERRONEOUS AND FRAUDULENT, CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT, VIOLATING THE 8th AMENDMENT, IN RETALIATION FOR DR. ARUNACHALAM PUTTING THEM ON NOTICE OF A FACT ADMITTED BY CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS, OF HIS OWN MISCONDUCT, FOR WHICH SHE IS NOW BEING FALSELY DUBBED AS “FRIVOLOUS OR MALICIOUS,” JUST BECAUSE THE COURT FINDS FACTS PRESENTED BY DR. ARUNACHALAM INCONVENIENT OR EMBARRASING.

The remaining eight Justices—out of which six more had already recused from Dr. Arunachalam’s cases and cannot rule—ruled in this case that she was “*frivolous or malicious*” per Rule 39.8, thus making it expensive, hazardous and burdensome for her to have access to the courts—all in violation of the Constitution. *See* ALP Vol XII, Sec. 141.

How could this Court speak from both sides of its mouth? Chief Justice Roberts himself admitted (which is *not* a frivolous admission, thus giving validity to Dr. Arunachalam’s assertion) to the fact he “engaged in conflict of interest against inventors as a member of the Knights of Malta...”, and then the Court speaking from the other side of its mouth that she is “*frivolous or malicious*.”

It is an undisputed fact that the Court lost its jurisdiction in repeatedly avoiding the enforcement of its own Governing Precedents – the Supreme Law of the Land, delineated in *Fletcher* and *Dartmouth College*. How can the Judiciary committing treason by breaking their solemn oaths of office dub my repeated notices to the Judiciary “*frivolous or malicious*”?

If Dr. Arunachalam’s Petition was frivolous, then Chief Justice Roberts had no basis to recuse.

If Dr. Arunachalam’s Petition was malicious, then the facts she raises would have to be false, which his recusal shows they are not.

How can the Justices call Dr. Arunachalam’s Petition “frivolous and malicious” when Chief Justice Roberts recused himself as a result of it? In other words, if it was frivolous, then Justice Roberts had no reason to recuse.

As to malice, Dr. Arunachalam does not take issue with Justice Roberts personally, only with his conduct on the bench. Justices are duty bound to avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest. Since his membership in the Knights of Malta is confirmed, then Dr. Arunachalam bringing up this fact and asking for an ethics ruling *cannot* be malicious.

V. THIS COURT DOES NOT HAVE CLEAN HANDS IN THIS RETALIATORY DISMISSAL OF DR. ARUNACHALAM’S PETITION

Dr. Arunachalam came to this Court with clean hands. And yet this Court is impeaching her credibility because of its evident misconduct.

That this Court failed to enforce the law is judicial malfeasance, misfeasance and nonfeasance.

This Court’s failure to address Chief Justice Robert’s evident conflict of interest with the Knights of Malta, and all that this implies regarding the Pope of Rome, the British Monarch, the Inns of Court in Britain and the United States, SERCO and QinetiQ is palpable.

This Court’s response to call Dr. Arunachalam’s assertions of fact regarding this conflict of interest as “*frivolous or malicious*” speaks to the complicity of the other Justices.

To then dismiss Dr. Arunachalam’s Petition for Writ of Certiorari is evident

retaliatory, cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the 8th Amendment — for Dr. Arunachalam putting them on notice that the Justices failed to enforce the Law of the Land and this Court’s Governing Precedents — the Supreme Law of the Land, *Fletcher, Dartmouth College* and breached their solemn oaths of office and lost their jurisdiction.

VI. INTERVENING LAW: *VIRNETX* REVERSED AND REMANDED ON 5/13/20, WHICH COURTS FAILED TO APPLY TO DR. ARUNACHALAM’S CASES

On 5/13/2020, the Federal Circuit reversed and remanded in *VirnetX* because the PTAB Administrative Patent Judges were *unconstitutionally appointed*, and yet discriminately failed to apply it to USPTO reexams and IPR/CBM reviews of Dr. Arunachalam’s patents.

The Federal Circuit discriminately failed to reverse its Erroneous and Fraudulent and Void Orders in her cases even though the District Courts and the PTAB failed to consider “the entirety of the record” — Patent Prosecution History — requiring reversal of those Orders pursuant to the Federal Circuit’s own *Aqua Products, Inc. v. Matal* ruling of October, 2017.

VII. THIS CASE SUPERCEDES *MARBURY V. MADISON* THAT THREE DEPARTMENTS HAVE ACTED AS ONE TO STEAL DR. ARUNACHALAM’S PATENTS AND UNJUSTLY ENRICH CORPORATE INFRINGERS BY TRILLIONS OF DOLLARS.

This Court dismissed this case, even though it supercedes *Marbury v. Madison* in constitutional significance that three Departments have all been acting as one, to steal patents of Dr. Arunachalam’s significant inventions which have enabled the nation to work remotely during the COVID-19 Pandemic.

There is no question here that the Court has a solemn oath duty to enforce the law — the Supreme Law of the Land.

How can this Court impeach Dr. Arunachalam as “*frivolous or malicious*” for this Court’s own misconduct in not enforcing the Law of the Land — *Fletcher, Dartmouth College*, that govern patent law.

How can this Court impeach Dr. Arunachalam as “*frivolous or malicious*” for merely raising the fact of Chief Justice Roberts’ relationships to the Knights of Malta, and all that this implies regarding the Pope of Rome, the British Monarch, the Inns of Court in Britain and the United States, SERCO and QinetiQ?



Figure 1: Meghan Keneally. (July 3, 2012). After joking about heading to Malta to escape criticism....Chief Justice Roberts heads to Malta as it emerges that he may have written for AND against opinions on Obamacare. The Daily Mail. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2168451/Chief-Justice-Roberts-heads-Malta-emerges-written-AND-opinions-Obamacare.html>

See also **Appendix 1A** for substantial corroborating evidence, which further renders Dr. Arunachalam non-frivolous and non-malicious.

**VIII. J. MARSHALL DECLARED:
“THE LAW OF THIS CASE IS THE LAW OF ALL.”**

William E. Simonds, the U.S. Patent Office Commissioner from 1891 to 1892, wrote in the Manual of Patent Law (1874):

“A Patent is a Contract between the inventor and the Government representing the public at large.”

Chief Justice J. Marshall declared:

“It can require no argument to prove that the circumstances of this case constitute a contract.”

J. Marshall declared in *Dartmouth College v. Woodward* (1819) that:

“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?

Are Petitioner’s patent property rights being impaired by this Court? The answer is “yes” to both questions.

Like J. Marshall stated in *Dartmouth*,

“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**, J. Marshall stated: “these principles and authorities prove **incontrovertibly that**” **a patent grant “is a contract.”** J. Marshall declared 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.”**

This Court’s and lower court Orders violate the U.S. Constitution and constitute treason. 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.”

IX. 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.

Corporate Infringers stole Petitioner’s patents and distributed its use to everyone including the U.S. Government, realizing unjust enrichments in the trillions of dollars. Petitioner is the inventor of “The Internet of Things (IoT)” — “Web Applications Displayed on a Web browser.” The Judiciary deprived Petitioner of the payment for each Web transaction/per Web application in use, which it allowed Corporate America 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.

This Court’s 5/18/20 Order is in violation of the U.S. Constitution and 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 *Fletcher* and this Court’s Governing Precedents. Why has the Judiciary not enforced *Fletcher* and this Court’s Governing Precedents? They know why — because enforcing *Fletcher* exposes the entire Patent System, operating as a criminal enterprise, defrauding the public. What is the point of this Court’s *Fletcher* Precedent, if this Court has never enforced it?

Dr. Arunachalam has been forced to state the obvious. The Court does not like it. So the Court dismissed the Case and denied Petitioner her IFP Motion for false reasons, misapplying Rule 39.8, impeaching her as “frivolous or malicious” while Chief Justice Roberts admitted by his recusal that the facts and the law are on Petitioner’s side.

The Court should grant rehearing, void its 5/18/20 Order and grant the Petition for Writ of Certiorari. A Certificate of Service is attached here below.

Respectfully submitted,



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

Self-Represented Petitioner
Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman
May 20, 2020

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL/SELF-REPRESENTED PETITIONER

I, Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman, self-represented petitioner, certify that as per the Court rules, this document contains 2998 words only, as counted by the tool available in Microsoft WORD, and is well within the 3000 word limit.

Respectfully submitted,



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

Self-Represented Petitioner
Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman
May 20, 2020

RULE 44 CERTIFICATE

I, Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman, self-represented petitioner, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, declare under penalty of perjury that the following is true and correct:

1. This petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay.
2. The grounds of this petition are limited to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.



Signature

Executed on May 20, 2020
Date

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on May 20, 2020, I filed an original of the foregoing “PETITION FOR REHEARING,” Appendices, Certificate of Counsel/ Self-Represented Petitioner of the number of words, Rule 44 Certificate and Verification and IFP Motion for FEE WAIVER with the Clerk of the Court in the Supreme Court of the United States, by Express Priority Mail via the U.S. Postal Service for overnight delivery to:

Clerk of Court,
Supreme Court of the United States,
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543

and I certify that I served a copy on counsel of record for Respondent, Lyft, Inc., via email and by Priority Mail via the U.S. Postal Service for overnight delivery at the following addresses:

Lyft, Incorporated
Kristin Sverchek
General Counsel at Lyft, Inc.,
185 Berry Street, Ste 5000
San Francisco, CA 94107
844. 250.2773; **415-230-2905 x1127**
kristin@lyft.com
Attorney for Lyft, Inc.;

May 20, 2020

Respectfully submitted,



Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman,
222 Stanford Ave,
Menlo Park, CA 94025
650 690 0995;
laks22002@yahoo.com

Self-Represented Petitioner
Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>App. 1a</u> : Rule 44 Documents of intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.....	App. 1a - 24a
--	---------------

APPENDIX 1A



Figure 1: Meghan Keneally. (July 3, 2012). After joking about heading to Malta to escape criticism....Chief Justice Roberts heads to Malta as it emerges that he may have written for AND against opinions on Obamacare. *The Daily Mail*. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2168451/Chief-Justice-Roberts-heads-Malta-emerges-written-AND-opinions-Obamacare.html>

See also:

Grace Wyler. (July 3, 2012). PHOTO: Chief Justice John Roberts Has Escaped To Malta. *Business Insider*. <https://www.businessinsider.com/chief-justice-john-roberts-malta-photo-2012-7>

Melissa Jeltsen. (July 3, 2012). John Roberts Arrives In Malta (PHOTOS). *HuffPost*. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/john-roberts-arrives-in-malta_n_1647506

Byron Tau. (July 3, 2012). Photo of the day: Roberts in Malta. *Politico*. <https://www.politico.com/blogs/politico44/2012/07/photo-of-the-day-roberts-in-malta-127988>

Editor. (July 3, 2012). VIDEO: Roberts 'hiding out' in Malta. MSNBC.
<https://www.msnbc.com/politicsnation/watch/roberts-hiding-out-in-malta-44416067640>

Mark Walsh. (October 1, 2015). John Roberts marks 10 years as chief justice by taking the long view. American Bar Association Journal. ("Just as he retreated to Japan this summer, Roberts left for the island nation of Malta soon after the NFIB decision.").

https://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/john_roberts_marks_10_years_as_chief_justice_by_taking_the_long_view



Figure 2: J.H. (February 7, 2017). Why the pope has taken control of the Knights of Malta. *The Economist*. <https://www.economist.com/the-economist-explains/2017/02/07/why-the-pope-has-taken-control-of-the-knights-of-malta>



Figure 3: Press Release. (June 23, 2016). Pope Francis Received the Grand Master of the Sovereign Order of Malta in Audience. Order of Malta.
<https://www.orderofmalta.int/2016/06/23/pope-francis-receives-the-grand-master-of-the-sovereign-order-of-malta-in-audience/>



Figure 4: Queen Elizabeth in her Knights of Malta regalia.




Figure 5: Knights of Malta. (Accessed May 19, 2020). The Great Priory of the United Religious, Military and Masonic Orders of the Temple and of St. John of Jerusalem, Palestine, Rhodes and Malta of England and Wales and its Provinces Overseas. <https://www.markmasonshall.org/orders/order-of-malta>



Figure 6: Elected government of the Sovereign Order of Malta. The Sovereign Council assists the Grand Master in the government of the Order of Malta. It is composed of the Grand Master, who presides over it, the holders of the four High Offices (Grand Commander, Grand Chancellor, Grand Hospitaller and Receiver of the Common Treasure) and six members. Knights of Malta. (Accessed May 19, 2020). Sovereign Council. Order of Malta. <https://www.orderofmalta.int/government/sovereign-council/>





Figure 7: Press Release. (June 27, 2016). The Sovereign Order of Malta's Global Fund for Forgotten People distributed its 2016 grants on St. Johns's Day on June 24th. <https://www.orderofmalta.int/2016/06/27/global-fund-for-forgotten-people-distributes-29-grants/>



Figure 8: Press Release. (March 11, 2020). Estonia and Sovereign Order of Malta

establish diplomatic relations. Order of Malta. [Estonia was involved in helping create the Christopher Steele "Dirty Dossier" that was used to try and organize a coup d'état against U.S. President Donald Trump].

<https://www.orderofmalta.int/2020/03/11/estonia-sovereign-order-malta-establish-diplomatic-relations/>



Major, Lindsey & Africa 2010
Partner Compensation Survey

June 9, 2011 | Press Release

Major, Lindsey & Africa Announces Seven New Partners

HANOVER, Maryland – June 9, 2011 – Major, Lindsey & Africa (MLA), the world's largest legal search firm, announced today that Deborah Ben-Canaan (San Diego), Catherine Butts (Atlanta), Carl Hopkins (Hong Kong), Jacquelyn Knight (New York), Jeff Liebster (New York), Jane Sullivan Roberts (Washington, D.C.) and Lee Udelsman (New York) have been named partners. The seven join MLA's Advisory Board.

MLA partnership is based on exceptional individual performance, adherence to MLA values and norms as demonstrated through exemplary citizenship and a significant contribution to the increased profitability of the firm as a whole.

"Partnership criteria are demanding," says Simon Robinson President of MLA. "Each of these new partners has demonstrated they are an outstanding recruiter, team member, leader and ambassador for the firm. These seven people make MLA a better place to work and contribute to the strength of our firm in everything they do."

Deborah Ben-Canaan, Partner and member of the In-House Practice group, has ten years of in-house search placement experience at all levels from Corporate Counsel to General Counsel. She received her B.S. with high distinction, from The Pennsylvania State University and her J.D., magna cum laude, from Washington College of Law, The American University.

Catherine Butts, Partner and member of the In-House Practice Group, has twenty years of experience in legal recruiting, the last ten focusing on General Counsel and other senior level in-house searches across the U.S. She holds a B.A. from Southern Methodist University.

Carl Hopkins, Partner and Office Practice Leader-Partner Practice Group Asia, specializes in partner level search and the establishment of Asian offices for international law firms. He received a B.A. (Hons) from the University of Southampton and studied law at The College of Law, London.

Jacquelyn Knight, Partner and member of the Partner Practice Group, has successfully placed numerous partners of varied backgrounds, and partner groups, in small, mid-sized and large national firms. She holds a B.S., summa cum laude, from Fordham University and a J.D. from St. John's University School of Law.

Jeff Liebster, Partner and member of the Partner Practice Group, has facilitated the placement of partners in a variety of practice groups with many of the top law firms in the country as well as office openings and firm mergers. He has a B.A., with high distinction, and a J.D. from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Jane Sullivan Roberts, Partner and member of the Partner Practice Group, focuses on the representation of individual law firm partners and groups and conducts searches for senior in-house positions. She holds a B.A., magna cum laude, from The College of the Holy Cross, a M.Sc. from Brown University and a J.D., cum laude, from Georgetown University Law Center.

Lee Udelsman, Partner and member of the In-House Practice Group, places senior in-house counsel in all industries and across borders. Udelsman was a partner at a major labor and employment law firm and then was a senior sales officer at two public companies. In addition to his law degree, he earned an LL.M. from Georgetown University Law Center.

About Major, Lindsey & Africa

Founded in 1982, Major, Lindsey & Africa is the world's largest and most experienced legal search firm. Combining local market knowledge and a global recruiting network, MLA has earned recognition for its track record of successful General Counsel, Corporate Counsel, Partner, Associate and Law Firm Management placements. With offices throughout the U.S., Hong Kong, London and Tokyo, MLA recruiters are dedicated to understanding and meeting clients' and candidates' needs while maintaining the highest degree of professionalism and confidentiality. MLA considers every search a diversity search and has been committed to diversity in the law since its inception. For these reasons, MLA was voted "Best Legal Search Firm in the U.S." in the most recent national survey of America's top law firms. To learn more about MLA, please visit our website at www.mlaglobal.com.

Contact for Major, Lindsey & Africa
Clare Brilliant
Marketing Manager
(410) 579-3117
cbrilliant@mlaglobal.com

[Reproduced for educational purposes only. Fair Use relied upon.]

[Download PDF](#)

© 2011 Major, Lindsey & Africa

[Home](#) | [Help](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Privacy Policy and Terms & Conditions of Use](#)

Major, Lindsey & Africa Offices

Atlanta	Boston	Charlotte	Chicago	Corporate Office	Dallas	Hong Kong
Houston	London	Los Angeles	Miami	Milwaukee	New York	Orange County
Palo Alto	Philadelphia	San Diego	San Francisco	Seattle	Tampa	Tokyo

App. 9A



Powerful placements.™

ATTORNEY SEARCH
CONSULTANTS

(877) 482-1010

PARTNER AND PRACTICE GROUP PLACEMENTS

Abrams, Fensterman, Fensterman, Eisman,
Greenberg, Formato & Einiger
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory
& Natsis
Alston & Bird
Akerman Senterfitt
Andrews Kurth
Archer & Greiner
Arent Fox
Arnold & Porter
Aronberg Goldgehn
Baker & Daniels
Baker & Hostetler
Baker & McKenzie
Baker Botts
Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum & Nagelburg
Barnes & Thornburg
Barton Barton & Plotkin
Bello Black & Welsh
Bingham McCutchen
Bird & Bird
Blank Rome
Brown Rudnick
Bryan Cave
Buchalter Nemer
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft
Carroll, Burdick & McDonough
Carter Ledyard & Milburn
Chadbourne & Parke
Chamberlain, Hrdlicka, White, Williams & Martin
Chapman and Cutler
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton
Clifford Chance
Clyde & Co.
Coblentz, Patch, Duffy & Bass
Cohen Tauber Spievack & Wagner
Cooley Godward Kronish
Corr Cronin Michelson Baumgardner
& Preece

Covington & Burling
Cozen O'Connor
Crowell & Moring
Cummings & Lockwood
Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle
Davis Polk & Wardwell
Davis Wright Tremaine
Dechert
Dewey & LeBoeuf
Dewitt, Ross & Stevens
Dickinson Wright
Dickstein Shapiro
DLA Piper
Dorsey & Whitney
Drinker Biddle & Reath
Duane Morris
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
Ellenoff Grossman & Schole
Emmet, Marvin & Martin
Epstein Becker & Green
Fenwick & West
Field Fisher & Waterhouse
Fish & Richardson
Fitzgerald Abbott & Beardsley
Foley Hoag
Fox Horan & Camerini
Fox Rothschild
Freeborn & Peters
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson
Fulbright & Jaworski
Garvey Schubert Barer
Gass Weber Mullins
Gersten Savage
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher
Godfrey & Kahn
Goldberg Kohn
Golenbock Eiseman Assor Bell & Peskoe
Goodwin Procter

Rev 3.15.11

Gordon & Polsker
Gordon & Rees
Gould & Ratner
Greenberg Glusker
Greenberg Traurig
Hahn & Hessen
Hahn Loeser & Parks
Hammonds
Haynes and Boone
Herbert Smith
Herrick, Feinstein
Hodgson Russ
Hogan Lovells
Holland & Knight
Horwood Marcus & Berk
Howard, Rice, Nemerovski, Canady, Falk
& Rabkin
Howrey
Hughes Hubbard & Reed
Hunter Maclean
Hunton & Williams
Husch Blackwell Sanders
Jackson Lewis
Jennifer M. Honey
Jones Day
Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman
Katten Muchin Rosenman
Kaye Scholer
Kelley Drye & Warren
King & Spalding
Kirkland & Ellis
K&L Gates
Klehr, Harrison, Harvey, Branzburg & Ellers
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel
Lane Powell
Latham & Watkins
Lathrop & Gage
LeClairRyan
Leonard, Street and Deinard
Linklaters
Littler Mendelson
Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell
Loeb & Loeb
Lowenstein Sandler
Luce Forward
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips

Mayer Brown
McCarter & English
McDermott Will & Emery
McGuireWoods
McKee Nelson
McKenna Long & Aldridge
McQuaid, Bedford & Van Zandt
Meister Seelig & Fein
Michael Best & Friedrich
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovksy and Popeo
Montgomery, McCracken, Walker & Rhoads
Morgan Lewis & Bockius
Morrison & Foerster
Murtha Cullina
Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg
Nixon Peabody
Nutter McClennen & Fish
Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart
Olshan Grundman Frome Rosenzweig &
Wolosky
O'Melveny & Myers
O'Neil, Cannon, Hollman, DeJong
Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe
Parker, Poe, Adams & Bernstein
Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison
Pepper Hamilton
Perkins Coie
Phillips Nizer
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman
Polsinelli Shughart
Preis & Roy
Proskauer Rose
Putney, Twombly, Hall & Hirson
Quarles & Brady
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges
Reed Smith
Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren
Riddell Williams
Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi
Ropes & Gray
Ruden McClosky
Sadis & Goldberg
Saul Ewing

Schiff Hardin
Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis
Schuyler Roche
Sedgwick, Detert, Moran & Arnold
Seyfarth Shaw
Shapiro Buckman
Shearman & Sterling
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton
Shipman & Goodwin
Sidley Austin
Sills Cummis & Gross
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom
SmithAmundsen
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal
Squire Sanders & Dempsey
Starn O'Toole Marcus & Fisher
Steptoe & Johnson
Stickler & Nelson
Stinson Morrison Hecker
Stoel Rives
Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young
Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth
Stroock & Stroock & Lavan
Susman Godfrey
Thompson & Knight
Thompson Coburn
Thompson Hine
Townsend and Townsend and Crew
Troutman Sanders
Tuggle Duggins & Meschan
Ulmer & Berne
Vedder Price
Venable
Verrill & Dana
Warshaw Burstein Cohen Schlesinger & Kuh
Weil, Gotshal & Manges
White & Case
Wiedner & McAuliffe
Wildman Harrold
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati
Winston & Strawn
Zelle, Hofmann, Voelbel, Mason & Gette
Zukerman Gore Brandeis & Crossman



ATTORNEY SEARCH
CONSULTANTS

(877) 482-1010

Powerful placements.™

PLACEMENTS LAW FIRMS

Representative List

Abrams, Fensterman, Fensterman, Eisman,
Greenberg, Formato & Einiger*
Addleshaw Goddard
Adler Pollock & Sheehan
Akerman Senterfitt*
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld*
Alden Law Group
Allen & Overy
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis*
Alston & Bird*
Andrews & Kurth*
Applegate & Thorne-Thomsen
Appleby
Archer & Greiner*
Arent Fox*
Arkin Kaplan Rice
Arnold & Porter*
Aronberg Goldgehn*
Ashurst
Ater Wynne
Axinn, Veltrop & Harkrider
Axiom Legal
Baker & Daniels*
Baker & Hostetler*
Baker & McKenzie*
Baker Botts*
Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum & Nagelburg*

Barger & Wolen
Barnes & Thornburg*
Barroway Topaz Kessler Meltzer & Check
Barton Barton & Plotkin*
Baute & Tidus
Bello Black & Welsh*
Berman DeValerio Pease Tabacco Burt &
Pucillo
Bernstein, Litowitz, Berger & Grossmann
Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod
Bingham McCutchen*
Bird & Bird*
Blake, Cassels & Graydon
Blank Rome*
Boies, Schiller & Flexner
Bracewell & Giuliani
Broad and Cassel
Brooks, Pierce, McLendon, Humphrey &
Leonard
Brown McCarroll
Brown Rudnick*
Brune & Richard
Bryan Cave*
Buchalter Nemer*
Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney
Budd Larner
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft*
Cahill Gordon & Reindel

* Includes placements of Partners, Practice Groups and/or Mergers

Rev 3.15.11

Cantilo & Bennett	Davis Polk & Wardwell*
Caplin & Drysdale	Davis Wright Tremaine
Capsticks Solicitors	Deacons
Carey Olsen	Debevoise & Plimpton
Carr & Ferrell	Dechert*
Carroll, Burdick & McDonough*	Devore & DeMarco
Carter Ledyard & Milburn*	Dewey & LeBoeuf*
Cassidy Shimko Dawson & Kawakami	Dewey Pegno & Kramarsky
Chadbourne & Parke*	Dewitt Ross & Stevens*
Chamberlain, Hrdlicka, White, Williams & Martin*	Dickinson Wright*
Chapman and Cutler*	Dickstein Shapiro*
Cheng Cohen	DLA Piper*
Chuhak & Tecson	The Dontzin Law Firm
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton*	Dornbush Schaeffer Strongin & Venaglia
Clifford Chance*	Dorsey & Whitney*
Clyde & Co.*	Drinker Biddle & Reath*
Coblentz, Patch, Duffy & Bass*	Duane Morris*
Cohen Lans	Dykema Gossett
Cohen, Tauber, Spievack & Wagner*	Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott*
Cole, Schotz, Meisel, Forman & Leonard	Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge*
Constantine Cannon	Eisner & Frank
Cooley Godward Kronish*	Ellenoff Grossman & Schole*
Corr Cronin Michelson Baumgardner & Preece*	Emmet, Marvin & Martin*
Covington & Burling*	Epstein Becker & Green*
Cox Smith Matthews	Eversheds
Cozen O'Connor*	Farella Braun & Martel
Cravath, Swaine & Moore	Feldman Gale
Crouch & Ramey	Fenwick & West*
Crowell & Moring*	Field Fisher Waterhouse*
Cummings & Lockwood*	Filice Brown Eassa & McLeod
Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle*	Finers Stephens Innocent
Davis & Gilbert	Fish & Richardson*
	Fitzgerald Abbott & Beardsley*

* Includes placements of Partners, Practice Groups and/or Mergers

Foley & Lardner	Grippo & Elden
Foley Hoag*	Gunderson Dettmer Stough Villeneuve
Ford & Harrison	Franklin & Hachigian
Fox Horan & Camerini*	Hahn & Hessen*
Fox Rothschild*	Hahn Loeser & Parks*
Fragomen, Del Ray, Bernsen & Loewy	Hallett & Perrin
Francis, Orr & Totusek	Hammonds*
Freeborn & Peters*	Haynes and Boone*
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer*	Herbert Smith*
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson*	Herrick, Feinstein*
Friedman Kaplan Seiler & Adelman	Herzfeld & Rubin
Friedman & Solomon	Hinckley, Allen & Snyder
Fross Zelnick Lehrman & Zissu	Hodel Briggs Winter
Frost Brown Todd	Hodgson Russ*
Fulbright & Jaworski*	Hogan Lovells*
Gardere Wynne Sewell	Holland & Knight*
Garfunkel, Wild & Travis	Horwood Marcus & Berk*
Garvey Schubert Barer*	Howard Rice Nemerovski Canady Falk & Rabkin*
Gass Weber Mullins*	Howrey*
Gersten Savage*	Hughes Hubbard & Reed*
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher*	Hunter Maclean*
Gilmore, Rees & Carlson	Hunton & Williams*
Godfrey & Kahn*	Husch Blackwell Sanders*
Goldberg Kohn*	Irell & Manella
Golenbock Eiseman Assor Bell & Peskoe*	Jackson & Campbell
Goodwin Procter*	Jackson DeMarco Tidus Peckenpaugh
Gordon & Polscer*	Jackson Lewis*
Gordon & Rees*	Jeffer Mangels Butler & Marmaro
Gordon Tilden Thomas & Cordell	Jenner & Block
Gould & Ratner*	Jennifer M. Honey*
Greenberg Glusker*	Jones Day*
Greenberg Traurig*	Jones Walker
Gregory P. Joseph Law Offices	

* Includes placements of Partners, Practice Groups and/or Mergers

Kane & Fischer	Littler Mendelson*
Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer	Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell*
Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman*	Loeb & Loeb*
Katten Muchin Rosenman*	Looper Reed & McGraw
Kauff McClain & McGuire	Lowenstein Sandler*
Kaye Scholer*	Luce Forward *
Kelley Drye & Warren*	Macfarlanes
Kennedy Covington Lobdell & Hickman	Manatt, Phelps & Phillips*
Kenyon & Kenyon	Maxwell Winward
Kilpatrick Stockton	Mayer Brown*
King & Spalding*	McCarter & English*
Kirby McInerney & Squire	McCormick Barstow
Kirkland & Ellis*	McDermott Will & Emery*
K&L Gates*	McDonald & McCabe
Klehr, Harrison, Harvey, Branzburg & Ellers*	McElroy, Deutsch, Mulvaney & Carpenter
Kleinberg, Kaplan, Wolff & Cohen	McGuireWoods*
Kobre & Kim	McKee Nelson*
Kornstein Veisz Wexler & Pollard	McKenna Long & Aldridge*
Kostelanetz & Fink	McQuaid Bedford & Van Zandt*
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel*	Meister Seelig & Fein*
Lane Powell*	Michael Best & Friedrich*
Lankler Siffert & Wohl	Michael Simkins
Latham & Watkins*	Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy*
Lathrop & Gage*	Milberg
Law Office of Abraham A. Gutnicki	Miller & Chevalier
Lawler, Metzger, Keeney & Logan	Minter Ellison
LeClairRyan*	Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovksy and Popeo*
Leonard, Street and Deinard*	Mishcon de Reya
Levene, Neal, Bender, Yoo & Brill	Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp
Levenfeld Pearlstein	Montgomery, McCracken, Walker & Rhoads*
Levi Lubarsky & Feigenbaum	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius*
Lewis and Roca	Morgan Miller Blair
Linklaters*	Morrison & Foerster*

* Includes placements of Partners, Practice Groups and/or Mergers

Rev 3.15.11

Morse, Barnes-Brown & Pendleton	Posternak Blankstein & Lund
Morvillo, Abramowitz, Grand, Iason Anello & Bohrer	Preis & Roy*
Moses & Singer	Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch
Munger, Tolles & Olson	Proskauer Rose*
Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr	Pryor Cashman
Murtha Cullina*	Putney, Twombly, Hall & Hirson*
Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg*	Quarles & Brady*
Newmeyer & Dillion	Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges*
Nishimura & Asahi	Reed Smith*
Nixon Peabody*	Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren*
Nutter McClennen & Fish*	Richards Kibbe & Orbe
Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart*	Riddell Williams*
Olshan Grundman Frome Rosenzweig & Wolosky*	Robertson, Freilich, Bruno & Cohen
O'Melveny & Myers*	Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi*
O'Neil, Cannon, Hollman, DeJong*	Ropes & Gray*
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe*	Ruden McClosky
Parker, Hudson, Rainer & Dobbs	Ruskin Moscou Faltischek
Parker, Poe, Adams & Bernstein*	Rutan & Tucker
Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler*	Sacker & Partners
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker*	Sadis & Goldberg*
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison*	Satterlee Stephens Burke & Burke
Pepper Hamilton*	Saul Ewing*
Perkins Coie*	Sayles Werbner
Phillips Lytle	Schiff Hardin*
Phillips Nizer*	Schlam Stone & Dolan
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman*	Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis*
Pinsent Masons	Schulte Roth & Zabel
Pircher, Nichols & Meeks	Schuyler Roche *
Polsinelli Shughart*	Sedgwick, Detert, Moran & Arnold*
Porzio, Bromberg & Newman	Seltzer Caplan McMahon Vitek
Post & Schell	Seward & Kissel
	Seyfarth Shaw*
	Shartsis Fries

* Includes placements of Partners, Practice Groups and/or Mergers

Shearman & Sterling*	Tabet DiVito & Rothstein
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton*	Taylor & Company Law Offices
Shipman & Goodwin*	The McCormack Firm
Shore Chan Bragalone	Thompson & Knight*
Sidley Austin*	Thompson Coburn*
Sills Cummis & Gross*	Thompson Hine*
Simmons & Simmons	Thompson, Loss & Judge
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett	Togut, Segal & Segal
SJ Berwin	Torys
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom*	Townsend and Townsend and Crew*
SmithAmundsen*	Tuggle Duggins & Meschan*
Smyser Kaplan & Veselka	Troutman Sanders*
Snell & Wilmer	Ulmer & Berne*
Snyder Law Firm	Vedder Price*
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal*	Venable*
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey*	Verrill Dana*
Starn O'Toole Marcus & Fisher*	Vinson & Elkins
Stearns Weaver Miller Weissler Alhadeff & Sitterson	Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease
Stephenson Harwood	Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz
Steptoe & Johnson*	Waltman & Grisham
Stevens & Lee	Warshaw Burstein Cohen Schlesinger & Kuh*
Stinson Morrison Hecker*	Webster Dyrud Mitchell
Stoel Rives*	Weil, Gotshal & Manges*
Stokes Lawrence Velikanje Moore & Shore	Westerman Ball Ederer Miller & Sharfstein
Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young*	Wexler Wallace
Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth*	Wheeler Trigg Kennedy
Stroock & Stroock & Lavan*	White & Case*
Sullivan & Cromwell	Wiedner & McAuliffe*
Sullivan & Worcester*	Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon*
Summit Law Group	Willkie Farr & Gallagher
Susman Godfrey*	Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr*
Sutherland Asbill & Brennan	Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati*
	Wilson, Treviño, Freed, Valls & Trevino

* Includes placements of Partners, Practice Groups and/or Mergers

Winstead Sechrest & Minick

Winston & Strawn*

Withers

Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Hertz

Wolf Popper

Wollmuth Maher & Deutsch

Wragge & Co

Yarmuth Wilsdon Calfo

Zelle, Hofmann, Voelbel, Mason & Gette*

Zetlin & De Chiara

Zuckerman Spaeder

Zukerman Gore Brandeis & Crossman*

* Includes placements of Partners, Practice Groups and/or Mergers



ATTORNEY SEARCH
CONSULTANTS

(877) 482-1010

Powerful placements.™

PLACEMENTS FORTUNE 500 COMPANIES

Representative List

Abbott Laboratories

AbitibiBowater*

AECOM Technology

Affiliated Computer Svcs.

Alcoa

Amazon.com

American International

Group (AIG)

AmerisourceBergen

Amgen

Apple

Aramark

AT&T

Automatic Data Processing

Bank of America Corp.

Baxter International

Boeing

Boston Scientific*

Broadcom

CB Richard Ellis**

Charter Communications*

Chevron

CIT Group

Clear Channel

Communications

Clorox

Coca-Cola

Colgate-Palmolive

Comcast

Commercial Metals

Constellation Energy

Cummins

CVS

Darden Restaurants

DaVita

Dean Foods

Delta Airlines

Dole Food**

Domtar*

Edison International*

Emerson Electric

Enbridge Energy Partners

Entergy

FedEx

Fiserv

Fluor

Fortune Brands

GameStop

Gap

General Cable

General Dynamics**

General Electric**

General Mills

Gilead Sciences

Goodrich

Goodyear Tire & Rubber

Google

Health Net*

Home Depot

Honeywell International**

Ingram Micro**

Intel

Int'l Business Machines (IBM)

ITT**

Jabil Circuit

Jacobs Engineering

Johnson & Johnson

Johnson Controls**

Kimberly-Clark

Lear

Marriott International

Marsh & McLennan

* Denotes GC Placement

** Denotes Divisional GC Placement

Rev. 8/17/2009

The above firms were included on the Forbes Fortune 500 list for 2009

Massachusetts Mutual	Quest Diagnostics
Life Insurance	Raytheon**
Mattel	Rite-Aid*
McDonald's	Rockwell Automation
McKesson	SAIC
Medtronic	Sears Holdings*
Merrill Lynch**	Smith International
Microsoft	Starbucks
Molson Coors Brewing**	State Street Corp.
Morgan Stanley	SunGard Data Systems
Motorola	Supervalu
New York Headquarter Bulge	Texas Instruments
Bracket Investment Bank	Textron
Nike	TJX
NiSource	USAA
Nordstrom*	United Technologies
Northern Trust Corp.	URS
Northrop Grumman	US Airways Group
Omnicom Group	Verizon Communications
Oracle	VF
Oshkosh Truck Corp.	Viacom
Paccar	Walgreen
PepsiCo	Walt Disney
Peter Kiewit Sons'	WellCare Health Plans
PetSmart	World Fuel Services
PG&E Corp.	Wyeth
Pulte Homes	Yahoo!**

* Denotes GC Placement

** Denotes Divisional GC Placement

Rev. 8/17/2009

The above firms were included on the Forbes Fortune 500 list for 2009



Powerful placements.™

ATTORNEY SEARCH
CONSULTANTS

(877) 482-1010

PLACEMENTS TECHNOLOGY

Representative List

3Com*

Acadia Enterprises

Accenture

Acer

Activision

Advanced Bionics*

AECOM Technology (ATC)

Agilent Technologies*

Agilisys (now Infor)

AgION Technologies

Allaire (now Macromedia)

Altera Corporation

Amazon Europe Holding
Technologies SCS

Amgen

Amkor Technology

AMS Holding Group

Applied Materials

ARM

Automatic Data Processing
(ADP)

Autonomy*

Avanade

AvantGo (now Sybase)

Bay Networks (now Nortel)

BEA Systems

Bell MicroProducts*

BMC Software

Borland*

Broadcom

Brocade*

BTG

Business Objects

Cabot Microelectronics

Cadence Design Systems*

CBS Interactive

Channel Wave Software (now
Commerce5)

Cirrus Logic

Citrix Online

Claria*

Cognos Corporation

Compaq (now Hewlett-
Packard)

COMSYS

Comverse

Cookson Electronics*

Covad Communications

Cray, Inc.*

Creative Worldwide

Dell

Diveo*

DivX

DRS Technologies

EarthLink

Edmunds Holding Co.

eDocs (now Siebel Systems)

eGreetings.com

Electronics for Imaging
(EFI)*

EMC Corporation

Emerson

Epicentric (now Vignette)

Epiq Systems

eRoom Technology (now
Documentum)*

Expedia*

Extreme Networks

Facebook.com*

Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l

First American CoreLogic

First Consulting Group

First Solar*

Force 10 Networks*

Freescall Semiconductor

Gateway

Gemplus

* Denotes GC Placement

Rev. 3/9/2011

Gerber Scientific	Landmark Graphics	OpenTV*
GetThere	Linuxcare (now Levanta)*	Openwave
Gomez	LogicaCMG	Oracle
Google	LSI Corporation*	palmOne (now Palm)
Green Hills Software	Macromedia (now Adobe)	Peritus Software (now Rocket Software)
Hewlett-Packard	Marimba (now BMC Software)*	Pioneer North America
Hitachi Home Electronics	Markland Technologies	Point Information Systems*
Homestore*	McAfee	Polycom
Honeywell	MEMC Electronic Materials*	Portal
Hutchison Whampoa Limited	Mercator Software (now Ascential Software)*	Phone.com (Openwave)
Hyperion*	Microsoft	PMC-Sierra*
IBM China/Hong Kong Limited	MicroStrategy	Primavera Systems, Inc.
Infineon	MIPS Technologies*	PTC
Ingram Micro - Singapore	Mitsubishi Electric Research Laboratory	Qimonda North America
Intel Corporation	Mobile 365	Rambus*
Intel China	Molex	Raytheon
Intellectual Ventures	National Semiconductor*	RealNetworks
Interactive Data	NAVTEQ*	Recall Corporation
Interleaf (now BroadVision)*	Network Associates (now McAfee)	Red Hat
International Rectifier*	Nokia Networks	Redback Networks*
Intertrust	Nokia Research Center	Restrac (now Webhire)
Intuit	Novellus*	Rockwell Automation
Intuitive Surgical	NVIDIA	Rovi Corporation
Iomega*	O2Micro International Ltd.	S3 Graphics
IPWireless*	Objective Systems Integrators (now Agilent Technologies)	SAIC
ITT Industries*	On2 Technologies*	Salesforce.com
JDS Uniphase		Samsung Semiconductor*
JDSU UK Ltd.		SanDisk Corp.*
Juniper Networks		Scientific-Atlanta

* Denotes GC Placement

Rev. 3/9/2011

Seagate Technology*	Verisign, Inc.*
Siebel Systems	VCE (Virtual Computing Environment)
Silicon Graphics (SGI)*	Vitria
Skyline Software Systems	WebTV Networks (now Microsoft)
Smith Micro Software	Wind River
Smiths Interconnect, Inc.	Workspeed
Sollectron*	Xilinx Inc.*
SRI International	Yahoo!
Stanley, Inc.	Yantra
Stratify	
Stream International (now Stream)*	
Sun Microsystems	
SunGard Data Systems	
Sylmark	
Symyx Technologies*	
Synopsys*	
Tellme Networks*	
Tessera	
Texas Instruments	
Thales North America*	
TIBCO	
Toshiba America*	
T-RAM	
Ubiquity Software*	
UNOVA (now Intermec)*	
UTStarcom	
Vendio Services	
VeriFone	
Verint	

* Denotes GC Placement

Rev. 3/9/2011

No. 19-8029

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman,
Petitioner,

v.

LYFT, INC.,
Respondent,

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman,
Self-Represented Petitioner
222 Stanford Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Tel: (650) 690-0995
Fax: (650) 854-3393
Email: laks22002@yahoo.com

Dated: May 20, 2020

Self-Represented Petitioner
Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman.

No. 19-8029

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman
— PETITIONER
(Your Name)

LA Lyft VS.
~~Intuity, Inc.~~ — RESPONDENT(S)

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

The petitioner asks leave to file the attached petition for a writ of certiorari without prepayment of costs and to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Please check the appropriate boxes:

☒ Petitioner has previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the following court(s):

Cases 19-1794 (Fed. Cir.); 4:13-cv-01248-PJH (ND Ca)
Case 19-1232 (D.C. Circuit)

☐ Petitioner has **not** previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in any other court.

☒ Petitioner's affidavit or declaration in support of this motion is attached hereto.

☐ Petitioner's affidavit or declaration is **not** attached because the court below appointed counsel in the current proceeding, and:

☐ The appointment was made under the following provision of law: _____, or

☐ a copy of the order of appointment is appended.

Lakshmi Arunachalam

RECEIVED
MAR 17 2020



* Domestic only



PS00001000014

EP14F Oct 2018
OD: 12 1/2 x 9 1/2



USPS.COM/PICKUP

FROM:

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM
222 STANFORD AVENUE
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

TO:

CLERK OF COURT,
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
1 FIRST STREET, NE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

MAR 12 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

SS

PERIS

writ of certiorari

orma pauperis in

-PJH (ND Ca)

ceed in forma

attached hereto.

the court below

f law: _____

Mis 01

Annachal

RECEIVED

MAR 17 2020

 This envelope is made from post-consumer waste. Please recycle - again!

This packaging is the property of the U.S. Postal Service® and is provided for use in connection with the purchase of U.S. Postal Service® products. This packaging is not for resale. EPI4F © U.S. Postal Service, 2004.

Dr. Lakshmi Aruna
Self-Represented P
222 Stanford Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94
Tel: (650) 690-0995
Fax: (650) 854-339
Email: laks22002@

Self-Represented Pe
Dr. Lakshmi Arunac

* Domestic only. ✕ For Domestic shipments, the maximum weight is 70 lbs. For International shipments, the maximum weight is 4 lbs.