

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

DR. LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Civil Action No. 16-281-RGA
	:	
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS	:	
MACHINES CORPORATION, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**ORDER**


On May 22, 2018, I dismissed the only still pending count of the amended complaint with prejudice and closed the case. (D.I. 117). On June 22, 2018, Plaintiff appealed in what was docketed as Case No. 18-2105 in the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. (D.I. 123, 124). Plaintiff sought a writ of mandamus in the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which transferred the petition to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, which transferred the petition to the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, which transferred the petition back to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, where it was docketed as Case No. 19-112. (D.I. 159, 163). On January 28, 2019, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit affirmed all challenged rulings on direct appeal in No. 18-2105. (D.I. 161). The petition for writ of mandamus was denied by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit on March 27, 2019. (D.I. 163).

I granted in part various motions for attorney’s fees, in two sets of opinions and orders, the second set of which was on November 12, 2019. (D.I. 164, 165, 201, 202).

On November 20, 2019, Plaintiff filed two motions. She filed the first of them – the motion and notice to enforce the mandated prohibition etc. (D.I. 203) -- in eight different cases. Other than having the caption of the instant case, there is no other reference in the motion as to why it was filed in this case or to what in this case it related. It cites no rules as to why it could possibly be timely. Therefore, the motion and notice to enforce the mandated prohibition etc. (D.I. 203) is **DENIED**.

The second motion – the motion for the court to vacate its unconstitutional order D.I. 202 and enter a new and different order that is constitutional etc. (D.I. 204) – does mention in passing the “patents-in-suit” (D.I. 204 at 6), which could be a reference to the ‘506 patent that was asserted in the case. But, construing it as motion for reconsideration, it does not meet the standard for reconsideration because, while it references my most recent order – D.I. 202, what it is really challenging is the underlying decision that was affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in No. 18-2105. It is too late to move to reconsider that decision, and it does not provide any basis to reconsider the decision calculating the amount of attorney’s fees. Thus, the second motion (D.I. 204) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 27 day of January 2020.

  
United States District Judge