

Filed on behalf of Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam

By: Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, *Pro Se*

222 Stanford Avenue

Menlo Park, CA 94025

Tel: (650) 690-0995

Fax: (650) 854-3393

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAP America, Inc.

Petitioner

v.

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam

Patent Owner

---

CASE CBM2014-00018

Patent 8,037,158

---

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, WILLIAM V. SAINDON, and BRIAN J.  
McNAMARA, Administrative Patent Judges.

PATENT OWNER DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM'S NOTICE OF APPEAL

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office  
c/o Office of the General Counsel  
Madison Building East, 10B20  
600 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314-5793

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a) and § 90.3(b)(1) that Patent Owner (“PO”), Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam (“Dr. Arunachalam”) hereby timely appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (“CAFC”) from the Decision on Request for Rehearing entered on May 22, 2015 (Paper 35), from the Final Written Decision entered on March 6, 2015 (Paper 33), and from all underlying orders, decisions, rulings and opinions, including without limitation the Decision on Institution of Covered Business Method Review (CBM) entered on March 7, 2014 (Paper 14).

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a)(3)(ii), PO further indicates that the issues on appeal include, but are not limited to, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB” or “Board”)'s application and use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard, claim constructions, determination of unpatentability of claims 9-10 of U.S. Patent No. 8,037,158 (“’158 patent”) under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and of claims 4–6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, determination that the ’158 patent is a covered business method patent and is not a technological invention, determination that 35 U.S.C. § 101 is a permissible basis for review, analysis of the alleged prior

art references, denial of constitutional rights and due process to PO by the Board, PTAB Judge's violation of Canon 2 and conflicts of interest in Petitioner, Third Party Requester and litigants in PO's cases in the District Courts and at the USPTO, failure by USPTO/PTAB to appoint an impartial tribunal and to remove Judge McNamara for violating U.S. laws and the U.S. Constitution, not limited to denying PO access to filing electronically in the PRPS system in response to PO's Motion to Recuse Judge McNamara due to his direct stock in Third Party Requester and financial interests in SAP, JPMorgan and other litigants in PO's cases with regard to the same '158 patent and other patents in the same priority chain, failure by the USPTO/PTAB to void *ab initio* all decisions and orders by Judge McNamara due to the aforementioned financial and other conflicts of interest, his bias in favor of Petitioner and against PO and fraud on the Court and USPTO, failure by USPTO/PTAB to appoint Judges technically competent to conduct a CBM review of the subject patent, PTAB not having technical understanding of the alleged prior art, Lawlor, Computerworld, Electronic Banking, SFCU, SNMP, CORBA1 or CORBA2, PTAB misled by fraud by Petitioner, Petitioner's Counsel and Petitioner's expert witness in falsely misleading the PTAB with false technical and other information, inability by the PTAB Judges to discern the falsehood in such false technical and other information, lack of knowledge by the PTAB Judges of the lack of technical

capabilities in the art-of-the day in 1995, the priority date of the '158 patent deriving priority from PO's provisional patent application with S/N 60/006, 634 with a priority date of November 13, 1995; failure of the PTAB judges to consider the file histories of the '158 and parent patents and provisional application in the priority chain, determination that SAP had standing to institute this proceeding, and any finding or determination supporting or related to those issues, as well as all other issues decided adversely to PO in any orders, decisions, rulings and opinions and the unconstitutionality of the proceedings.

PO also hereby appeals the USPTO exceeding its statutory authority through rulemaking, including without limitation by adopting rule 37 C.F.R. § 42.301(a) defining "covered business method" and 37 C.F.R. § 42.300(b) alleging unexpired claims should be given their "broadest reasonable construction."

Simultaneous with this submission, a copy of this Notice of Appeal is being filed with the PTAB. In addition, three copies of this Notice of Appeal, along with the required docketing fees, are being filed with the Clerk's Office for the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

Date: June 18, 2015

222 Stanford Avenue  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
Tel/fax: 650.690.0995/650.854.3393  
Email: laks22002@yahoo.com

Respectfully submitted,  
**DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM**



*Pro Se* Patent Owner

**CERTIFICATE OF FILING**

I hereby certify that on June 18, 2015, the PTAB authorized the Patent Owner “to file and serve her Notice of Appeal by first class mail and e-mail to opposing counsel and the Board. Patent Owner must also comply with all other requirements for pursuing an appeal” and I certify that the original version of the foregoing, PATENT OWNER DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM’S NOTICE OF APPEAL, was filed by via Express Mail through the U.S. Post Office on this 18th day of June, 2015, with the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, at the following address:

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office  
c/o Office of the General Counsel  
Madison Building East, IOB20  
600 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314-5793

**CERTIFICATE OF FILING**

I hereby certify that three (3) true and correct copies of the foregoing, PATENT OWNER DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM’S NOTICE OF APPEAL, along with the filing fees, were filed by Express Mail through the U.S. Post Office on this 18th day of June, 2015, with the Clerk’s Office of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, at the following address:

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit  
717 Madison Place, N.W., Suite 401  
Washington, DC 20005

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing, PATENT OWNER DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM’S NOTICE OF APPEAL, was served, by electronic mail and also by FIRST CLASS U.S. Mail on this 18th day of June, 2015, on the following counsel for the Petitioner:

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.