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 19, 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

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES: **Page**

OTHER AUTHORITIES:

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 Rome[1] 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, Exhibit A.

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 Willougby 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 PRECEDENTS[4] — 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—itself now run by foreign powers – SERCO and QinetiQ, to rescind patent contracts already awarded.

Both SERCO and QinetiQ[5] 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 **Exhibit A** 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 19, 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 19, 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 19, 2020

Date

Exhibit A

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/