

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
THE UNITED STATES, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [5:16-cv-06591-EJD](#)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Re: Dkt. No. 96

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam (“Plaintiff”) moves for leave to file an amended complaint naming DOES 1-6 and adding new claims. The motion is scheduled for hearing on February 8, 2018. Defendants United States of America, United States District Court for the District of Delaware, United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeals Board (“PTAB”), and United States District Court for the Northern District of California (collectively “Defendants”) oppose the motion and request that the case be dismissed without leave to amend. The motion is fully briefed. The Court finds it appropriate to take the motion under submission for decision without oral argument pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-1(b). For the reasons set forth below, Plaintiff’s motion is denied.

II. BACKGROUND

Plaintiff’s 230-page original complaint is captioned “Independent Action Under FRCP R60(b)(6), 60(d) For Fraud Upon the Court, Where Compelling Circumstances Exist.” Plaintiff

**CASE NO.: [5:16-CV-06591-EJD](#)  
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED  
COMPLAINT**

1 alleged that she is the inventor of eleven patents relating to real-time Web transactions from Web  
2 applications; that she founded a company called Pi-Net; and that she lost her business due to  
3 Defendants' alleged misconduct. Plaintiff alleged that Defendants made certain judicial rulings  
4 against her interests at a time when she suffered from medical distress and was deprived of her  
5 constitutional right to be heard. She also alleged that Defendants failed to apply the correct legal  
6 standards regarding patent validity; failed to disqualify a judge for judicial bias and conflicts of  
7 interest; and failed to allow her to substitute in as Plaintiff in a case pending in Delaware.  
8 Plaintiff's original complaint also included allegations of malfeasance by John Podesta, Hillary  
9 Clinton, Barack Obama, and the Clinton Foundation. Plaintiff's complaint also referred to  
10 discrimination, elder abuse, retaliation, cruel and unusual punishment, RICO claims, obstruction  
11 of justice, treason, civil rights violations, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and many  
12 other issues. In the prayer for relief, Plaintiff asked the Court to void the judgments issued in  
13 other cases in the Northern District of California, the District Court for the District of Delaware,  
14 the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and the Patent Trial and Appeals Board  
15 ("PTAB"). The cases discussed in the original complaint included, but were not limited to,  
16 District of Delaware cases 1:12-cv-282-SLR/RGA and 1:14-cv-490-RGA, Northern District of  
17 California cases 3:15-cv-00023-EDL, and Federal Circuit cases 14-1495, 15-1424, 15-1433, 15-  
18 1429, 15-1869 and 15-1831. Four of the 2015 Federal Circuit cases are appeals of Patent Trial  
19 and Appeal Board decisions.

20 On August 30, 2017, the Court dismissed the original complaint because it did not set forth  
21 a short and plain statement of the claims, nor set forth a basis for relief under Rule 60,  
22 Fed.R.Civ.P. The Court also held that the doctrine of judicial immunity applied. The Court  
23 granted Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint. Dkt. No. 72.

24 In September of 2017, Plaintiff filed a 290-page First Amended Complaint. After  
25 reviewing the entirety of the First Amended Complaint, the Court issued an Order Striking  
26 Plaintiff's Pleading because the First Amended Complaint (1) purported to add new parties and

27 **CASE NO.: [5:16-CV-06591-EJD](#)**  
28 **ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT**

1 new claims without leave of the Court, (2) failed to comply with Rule 8, Fed.R.Civ.P., and (3)  
2 alleged conduct and claims protected by judicial immunity and over which the Court lacked  
3 jurisdiction.

4 Plaintiff now seeks leave to add new parties and new claims. The new defendants that  
5 Plaintiff seeks to add in this action are judges, including the undersigned judge<sup>1</sup>, and an Assistant  
6 U.S. Attorney. In the first cause of action, Plaintiff alleges that she entered into a contract with the  
7 USPTO, and that the USPTO/PTAB breached the contract by failing to uphold patent prosecution  
8 history estoppel, by conducting re-examinations of Plaintiff's patents, and by failing to abide by  
9 the Supreme Court's decision in Fletcher v. Peck, 10 U.S. 87 (1810). In the second cause of  
10 action, Plaintiff alleges, among other things, that the USPTO fraudulently induced her to give her  
11 invention to the USPTO in return for patent protection, and that the USPTO concealed that it  
12 would "illegally and unconstitutionally re-examine" her patents. Dkt. 96-1, p. 204. In the third  
13 cause of action, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants interfered with Plaintiff's contract with the  
14 USPTO. Plaintiff also asserts claims for intentional infliction of emotional distress;  
15 "negligence/professional misconduct"; "breach of contract, breach of public trust"; treason;  
16 conspiracy; deprivation of civil rights; and "Violations of the Constitution and Oaths of Office and  
17 Breach of Public Trust." Plaintiff also seeks relief pursuant to Rule 60, Fed.R.Civ.P. In the prayer  
18 for relief, Plaintiff requests that the Court void all of Defendants' Orders against Plaintiff and  
19 award \$250 billion in damages per Defendant.

20 III. STANDARDS

21 Leave to amend under Rule 15 is generally granted with liberality. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2)  
22 ("The court should freely give leave when justice so requires."); Morongo Band of Mission  
23 Indians v. Rose, 893 F.2d 1074, 1079 (9th Cir.1990). Leave need not be granted, however, where

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>1</sup> "A judge is not disqualified by a litigant's suit or threatened suit against him." U.S. v. Studley,  
26 783 F.2d 934 (9th Cir. 1986); see also U.S. v. Sutcliffe, 505 F.3d 944 (9th Cir. 2007) (citing  
27 Studley).

28 **CASE NO.: 5:16-CV-06591-EJD**  
**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED**  
**COMPLAINT**

1 the amendment of the complaint would cause the opposing party undue prejudice, is sought in bad  
2 faith, constitutes an exercise in futility, or creates undue delay. Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178,  
3 182 (1962); Janicki Logging Co. v. Mateer, 42 F.3d 561, 566 (9th Cir. 1994).

4 IV. DISCUSSION

5 Plaintiff's proposed amended complaint does not cure any of the defects noted in the  
6 Court's August 30, 2017 Order Denying Motion for Recusal; Granting Defendants' Motion to  
7 Dismiss With Leave to Amend. As a preliminary matter, the proposed amended complaint does  
8 not contain a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,"  
9 as required by Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Instead, Plaintiff's proposed  
10 amended complaint is a 240-page document (plus attachments) filled with legal terms and case  
11 citations that is needlessly long, highly repetitious, and confusing. Failure to comply with Rule 8  
12 alone warrants dismissal. See McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 1996).

13 The proposed amended complaint is also defective to the extent Plaintiff, once again, seeks  
14 relief pursuant to Rule 60, Fed.R.Civ.P. In the prayer for relief Plaintiff requests that the Court  
15 void all of Defendants' Orders against Plaintiff. A party cannot use a Rule 60 independent action  
16 "as a vehicle for relitigation of issues." Brown v. S.E.C., 644 Fed.Appx. 957, 959 (11th Cir. 2016)  
17 (quoting Travelers Indem. Co. v. Gore, 761 F.2d 1549, 1552 (11th Cir. 1985)).

18 Plaintiff's lawsuit is also barred by the doctrine of judicial immunity. See Jones v. U.S.  
19 Supreme Court, No. 10-2750 SI, 2010 WL 2975790 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (judicial immunity bars  
20 claims that are based upon allegations concerning judicial officer's decision-making while  
21 presiding over cases and acts performed in judicial capacity). Judicial immunity applies even  
22 where "the action [the judge] took was in error, was done maliciously, or was in excess of his  
23 authority; rather he will be subject to liability only when he has acted in the 'clear absence of all  
24 jurisdiction.'" Mullis v. U.S. Bankruptcy Court for Dist. of Nevada, 828 F.2d 1385, 1388 (9th Cir.  
25 1987) (quoting Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 356-57 (1978)). Here, there has been no  
26 showing that the judicial officer defendants acted in the clear absence of all jurisdiction.

27 **CASE NO.: 5:16-CV-06591-EJD**  
28 **ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT**

