20-2196

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, a woman,

V.

CITIGROUP INC., CITICORP, CITIBANK N.A., Defendants-Appellees,

> DOES 1-100, Defendants,

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Delaware in Case No. 1:14-cv-00373-RGA, Judge Richard G. Andrews

Amicus Curiae, Murugappan Natesan's AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR EN BANC REHEARING

November 12, 2020

Murugappan Natesan

3589 Rosincress Drive, San Ramon, CA 94582

Tel:

510-889-7753

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF IDENTITY OF THE AMICUS CURIAE, ITS INTEREST IN THE CASE, AND THE SOURCE OF ITS AUTHORITY TO FILE
STATEMENT OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> ON WHO AUTHORED THE BRIEF AND WHO CONTRIBUTED MONEY TO AUTHOR THE BRIEF7
AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF 8
CONCLUSION9
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH FRAP 32(a)(7)(B)
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE11

STATEMENT OF THE IDENTITY OF THE AMICUS CURIAE, ITS INTEREST IN THE CASE, AND THE SOURCE OF ITS AUTHORITY TO FILE

I, Murugappan Natesan, the *amicus curiae* in this case, reside at 3589 Rosincress Drive, San Ramon, CA 94582.

I am a Management Consultant who helps businesses conceptualize and implement strategic mission-critical programs that either help them grow, develop and deploy new products and services more quickly, implement programs that strengthen their infrastructure, services or institute best practices and business processes that improve productivity and increase competitiveness. I also work with key executives and assist them with developing their skills and that of their corporation to achieve better results and strengthen their institution to scale new heights. I understand the need for innovation and creativity to help us all continuously improve in how we do things for the betterment of individuals, corporations and society in general. I came to this country because it was the cradle of innovation and individual contribution was rewarded. Everyone could partake in the American Dream and reap the rewards of their creativity and innovation. I truly believe that the Constitution, the courts and the rule of law will not deny anyone their due rewards by denying due process and that the system of justice would always prevail and everyone can have their day in court. When I became a citizen of the United States, I took a solemn oath to defend

the Constitution of the United States. I expect public officials, judges and lawyers to abide by their solemn oath duty to defend the Constitution.

AMICUS CURIAE'S INTEREST IN THIS CASE: My interest in the case is to ensure justice and for the courts to help this Petitioner get her day in court by public officials merely performing their ministerial duty so as to not deny the Petitioner due process and allow her to collect royalties from the corporations who have infringed on her patents

SOURCE OF AMICUS CURIAE'S AUTHORITY TO FILE: I have filed a Motion for Leave to file this Amicus Curiae Brief.

STATEMENT OF AMICUS CURIAE ON WHO AUTHORED THE BRIEF AND WHO CONTRIBUTED MONEY TO AUTHOR THE BRIEF:

- 1. I, Murugappan Natesan, declare that I authored this brief.
- 2. Neither Petitioner or Appellees nor their counsel authored the brief in whole or in part.
- No party or a party's counsel contributed money that was intended to fund preparing or submitting the brief; and
- 4. No person, other than the *amicus curiae*, who is an individual, (there are no members, and no counsel) contributed money that was intended to fund preparing or submitting the brief.

November 12, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

Murugappan Natesan

3589 Rosincress Drive, San Ramon, CA 94582

Tel:

510-889-7753

AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM'S PETITION FOR EN BANC REHEARING

I, Murugappan Natesan, an amicus curiae, hereby file this Amicus Curiae Brief in support of Petitioner, Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT: The Court must remove any roadblocks in the flow of justice for the Petitioner. Public officials have not given the Petitioner her day in court in 20 years by failing in their ministerial duty to abide by their solemn oaths to enforce the Constitution and Supreme Court precedents ruled by Chief Justice Marshall in accord with the Contract Clause of the Constitution that a patent grant is a contract that cannot be revoked. This denial of due process warrants reversal of orders.

ARGUMENT: The Petitioner has been denied due process in 20 years by public officials failing to perform their ministerial duties and therefore the Petitioner has been left with rights and no remedy.

This is an extraordinary situation: because the Petitioner has no remedy from the courts as they have dismissed all her cases without giving her due process by failing in their ministerial duty to enforce the Constitution and Supreme Court precedents set by Chief Justice Marshall that a patent grant is a contract that cannot be rescinded by the absolute highest authority in accord with the Contract Clause and Separation of Powers Clause of the Constitution. This Court's lack of enforcement of the Law of the Land has caused the lower courts, USPTO, Supreme Court and clerks of courts

to violate their Constitutional obligation and to not comply with the law in the case of the Petitioner.

CONCLUSION: The solution for this complication is very simple. The Court should enforce the Law of the Land, as declared by Chief Justice Marshall in Supreme Court precedents. This will help ensure that justice is served.

November 12, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

Murugappan Natesan

3589 Rosincress Drive, San Ramon, CA 94582

Tel: 510-889-7753

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH FRAP 32(g)

The undersigned hereby certifies that this brief complies with the typevolume limitation of Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure 32(g).

- 1. The brief contains 303 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(a)(7)(B)(iii).
- 2. The brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in 14 point Times New Roman font.

November 12, 2020 Respectfully submitted,

EH

Murugappan Natesan 3589 Rosincress Drive, San Ramon, CA 94582

Tel: 510-889-7753

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on November 12, 2020, I filed an original of the foregoing briefs, with the Clerk of the Court in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, via the USPS to:

The Clerk of the Court,

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit,

717 Madison Place NW, Washington, DC 20439

and I certify that on the same day, I served a copy on counsel of record for all Appellees, via email and/or via the U.S. Postal Service at the following address:

Citi Group, Inc., Citicorp, CitiBank, N.A.;

Nicholas Hunt Jackson, Dentons US LLP

1900 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20006

(202) 408-6463; Email: nicholas.jackson@dentons.com

Eric Sophir; Foley & Lardner LLP

Washington Harbour

3000 K Street, N.W. | Suite 600

Washington, D.C. 20007-5109

Direct 202.295.4149; Cell 202.714.0431; esophir@foley.com

Counsel for Appellees, Citi Group, Inc., CitiBank, N.A;

November 12, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

Murugappan Natesan

3589 Rosincress Drive, San Ramon, CA 94582

Tel:

510-889-7753

Express

Case: 20-2196

Document: 24

Page: 9 Filed: 12/09/2020

Align top of FedEx Express® shi

RECEIVED

2020 NOV 13 AM 11: 44

US COURT OF APPEALS



ORIGIN ID:ZWIA (302) 427-3908 MURUGAPPAN NATESAN

SHIP DATE: 12NOV20 ACTWGT: 0.20 LB MAN CAD: 0901152/CAFE3407

3589 ROSINCRESS DRIVE

BILL SENDER

SAN RAMON, CA 94582 UNITED STATES US TO CLERK OF THE COURT US COURT OF APPEALS FOR FED. CIR. 717 MADISON PLACE NW

WASHINGTON DC 20439 REF: CITI GROUP DEPT: VIRTUAL DOCKET

INV: 687212



FedEx Express

TRK# 9040 1482 5480

FRI - 13 NOV 10:30A PRIORITY OVERNIGHT

EP BZSA

20439

DC-US IAD

