

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Civil Action No. 14-91-RGA
	:	
KRONOS INCORPORATED,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Civil Action No. 14-373-RGA
	:	
CITIGROUP, INC., et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

In the above-captioned cases, Plaintiff has filed the same motion, the body of which states:

Plaintiff Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam (“Dr. Arunachalam”) hereby moves this Court to and puts the Court on Notice to enforce the Mandated Prohibition from repudiating Government-issued contract grants of any kind, as declared by Chief Justice Marshall in *Fletcher v. Peck*, 10 U.S. 87 (1810) and *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, 17 U.S. 518 (1819), which have never been repudiated and stand as the law of the land and case, of which this Court’s solemn oath duty compels this Court to enforce above all else, with all due respect.

(No. 14-91, D.I. 78; No. 14-373, D.I. 71 (footnote omitted)). To the extent the motion seeks relief based on the theory that the cited cases prevent the Patent Trial and Appeals Board from invalidating Plaintiff’s patents, and that there is some action I can take if I accepted that position,

the argument is foreclosed by, among other things, decisions of the Court of Appeals. *See Arunachalam v. IBM*, 759 F. App'x 927, 932-33 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 140 S.Ct. 249 (2019).

Thus, the motion (No. 14-91, D.I. 78; No. 14-373, D.I. 71) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 18 day of June 2020.

/s/ Richard G. Andrews
United States District Judge

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Civil Action No. 14-91-RGA
	:	
KRONOS INCORPORATED,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

ORDER

The above-captioned case, which is stayed and administratively closed, is UNSTAYED and REOPENED.

The Court has reviewed the proposals for how to proceed and related commentary. (D.I. 79-84). The case was stayed by stipulation in 2014. (D.I. 14). At the time, Defendant had filed a motion to dismiss. (D.I. 5). The accompanying briefing (D.I. 6, 9, 10) was based on the law as it was at the time, and it was scattershot inasmuch as four patents were then at issue. Now only one asserted patent remains. The Court has considered Defendant’s request for supplemental briefing (D.I. 84) but does not believe that would be helpful. What would be helpful is re-briefing. The earlier briefing will not be considered. The Court will consider a renewed motion to dismiss and brief in support which shall be due no later than fourteen (14) days from the date this Order is filed.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 18th day of June 2020. A separate order will be entered setting a schedule after the motion to dismiss is resolved.

/s/ Richard G. Andrews
United States District Judge