

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

In re: LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,
Petitioner

2019-114

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the District of Delaware in No. 1:12-cv-00282-RGA, Judge Richard G. Andrews.

ON PETITION

PER CURIAM.

ORDER

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam petitions for a writ of mandamus “to correct void order(s) the trial court(s) had no power or jurisdiction to render” and to compel “all District and Appellate Courts[] to comply with the Law of the Land as delineated in *Fletcher v. Peck*, 10 U.S. 87 (1810), [and] uphold Contract Laws of the Land and Patent Prosecution History.” Dr. Arunachalam also moves to waive the court’s filing fee.

Dr. Arunachalam is the named inventor of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,987,500; 8,037,158; and 8,108,492, and the founder of Pi-Net International Inc., to which she initially

assigned the patents. Pi-Net sued JPMorgan Chase & Co. for patent infringement in March 2012. In May 2014, the district court granted JPMorgan's motion for summary judgment that the asserted claims of the patents were invalid. Pi-Net appealed to this court (Appeal No. 2014-1495), and the case was dismissed for failure to prosecute. After the Supreme Court denied review in January 2016, the district court denied Dr. Arunachalam's various motions to be substituted for Pi-Net and to vacate the judgment. She did not timely appeal those orders.

Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, available only where the petitioner shows: (1) a clear and indisputable right to relief; (2) there are no adequate alternative legal channels through which she may obtain that relief; and (3) the grant of mandamus is appropriate under the circumstances. *See Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court for the Dist. of Columbia*, 542 U.S. 367, 380–81 (2004). Dr. Arunachalam's petition is simply expressing disagreement with the prior decisions of the district court and this court dismissing her claims and declining to reopen her case. As such, it is clear that her petition must be denied.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) The petition is denied.

(2) The motions to waive the court's filing fee are denied as moot.

FOR THE COURT

March 27, 2019

Date

/s/ Peter R. Marksteiner

Peter R. Marksteiner

Clerk of Court