

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITIZENS FINANCIAL GROUP INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 12-355-RGA

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

WELLS FARGO BANK N.A.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 13-1812-RGA

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

KRONOS INCORPORATED,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 14-91-RGA

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

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Plaintiff has filed a “Renewed Motion to Vacate Judgment pursuant to FRCP 60(b) and 60(d).” (No. 12-355, D.I. 130; No. 13-1812, D.I. 47; No. 14-91, D.I. 55; No. 14-373, D.I. 47).

All four of these cases are currently stayed (although in a separate motion, Plaintiff has requested that the stays be lifted). On March 18, 2015, I summarized their status:

Pi-Net filed No. 12-355 on March 19, 2012, asserting the ‘500, ‘158, and ‘492 patents against Citizens Financial Group, Inc. On June 21, 2013, I stayed the case in light of pending CBM review of the three asserted patents. (D.I. 82). The case remains stayed. Pi-Net filed No. 13-1812 on November 1, 2013, asserting the ‘500 and ‘492 patents against Wells Fargo & Company. About the time I might have held a scheduling conference, Judge Robinson decided on May 14, 2014, in Pi-Net v. J. P. Morgan, No. 12-282-SLR, that the ‘500, ‘158, and ‘492 patent claims were invalid. (No. 12-282-SLR, D.I. 165 & 166). There has thus been no substantive progress in the No. 13-1812 case, although it has not been formally stayed. In No. 14-91, Pi-Net filed a case on January 22, 2014, against Kronos Inc., asserting the ‘500, ‘492, ‘833, and ‘894 patents. While preliminary motions were pending, the parties stipulated to a stay pending resolution of the appeal from the *J.P. Morgan* case. (No. 14-91-RGA, D.I. 14). I granted the stay. In No. 14-373, Pi-Net filed suit against Citigroup, Inc. on March 24, 2014, asserting the ‘500 and ‘492 patents. On June 17, 2014, the parties agreed to stay the case, which I granted. (No. 14-373-RGA, D.I. 9).

(D.I. 121).¹

Plaintiff has exhausted her appeals in the J.P. Morgan case. Nevertheless, the instant

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, docket item citations are to No. 12-355. Plaintiff is now Dr. Arunachalam, and not Pi-Net.

motion appears to be some sort of effort at a collateral attack on the J.P. Morgan decision or as a second and untimely motion to reconsider my earlier decisions on recusal. (D.I. 120, 126).

Whichever way it is characterized,² it is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff also seeks permission to file electronically. (D.I. 129). The request is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 4 day of April 2016.


United States District Judge

² On recusal, in addition to that which is in the dockets of these cases, I have filed relevant orders docketed in the J.P. Morgan case. No. 12-282-RGA (D.I. 259, 270).