

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

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

---

**In re: LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,**  
*Petitioner*

---

2019-113

---

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the District of Delaware in No. 1:14-cv-00490-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, 8,108,492, and 8,271,339 and the founder of Pi-Net International Inc., to which she initially

assigned the patent. Pi-Net sued Fulton Financial Corporation in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware for patent infringement in April 2014. The district court dismissed the complaint and closed the case on August 12, 2014. Pi-Net never appealed from that judgment.

In May 2017, Dr. Arunachalam filed a motion to be substituted for Pi-Net in the case, stating that she had reacquired title to the patent, and also moved to vacate all orders that had been issued in the case, arguing that the assigned judge “failed to uphold U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Marshall’s ‘First Impression’ Constitutional *Res Judicata* Ruling in *Fletcher v. Peck* in 1810.” The district court denied Dr. Arunachalam’s various motions, and she similarly did not file a timely appeal.

Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy and “may not appropriately be used merely as a substitute for the appeal procedure prescribed by the statute.” *Roche v. Evaporated Milk Ass’n*, 319 U.S. 21, 26 (1943). Because Dr. Arunachalam elected not to pursue her challenges through the ordinary review process, it is clear that her petition must be denied. *See In re Pikulin*, 243 F.3d 565, 2000 WL 1717166, at \*1 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (denying petition for writ of mandamus where the petitioner “had sixty days after the entry of judgment to file an appeal challenging the dismissal of the complaint, and [the petitioner] did not do so”).

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The petition is denied.
- (2) The motions to waive the court’s filing fee are denied as moot.

IN RE: ARUNACHALAM

3

FOR THE COURT

March 27, 2019  
Date

/s/ Peter R. Marksteiner  
Peter R. Marksteiner  
Clerk of Court

s35