

Brief - Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Judicial Statement	1-2
Statement of the Issues.....	2-4
Statement of the Case	17-21
Statement of Facts	4-7
Standard of Review [Law Memoranda. ,],,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	13-17
Argument	7-16 ; 20-22
with Rules and Statutes	

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved

Cases

<i>Cannon v. University of Chicago</i> 441U.S.677 (1979).....	p.10-13
<i>J.I. Case Co. v. Borak</i> , 377 U.S. 426, 433 (1964).....	p.8-11
<i>Ross &Co v Redington</i> (1979).....	p.8-11
<i>Alexander v. Sandoval</i> , 532U.S.275 (2001).....	p.8-11
<i>Grutter v. Bollinger</i> , 539 U.S. 306 (2003).....	p.10-13
<i>Cort v. Ash</i> (1975),.....	p.8-11
<i>Datamize, LLC v. Plumtree Software, Inc.</i> , 417 F.3d 1342, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2005). p.6	
<i>Fosnocht v. Demko</i> , 438 F. Supp. 2d 561 at 563	p.5-6
<i>Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.</i> 458 US 419 (1982).....	p.23

U.S. CONSTITUTION : U.S. Const. Amend I ; U.S. Amend IV, V
Const. Amend VII ;U.S. Const. Amend XIII ; U.S. Const. Amend XIV.....p.1-23

AMENDMENT I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment IV – “ The right of the people to be secure in their persons , houses , papers, and effects , against unreasonable ... seizures , but upon probable cause , supported by Oath or Affirmation , and particularly describingthe things to be seized .

AMENDMENT V -

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury,; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, *nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.*

Amendment V- Eminent Domain

The power of the government to take private property and convert it into public use. The Fifth Amendment provides that the government may only exercise this power if they provide just compensation to the property owners. see, e.g. Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp. 458 US 419 (1982). “The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution says ‘nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.’ Due Process Clause ... it is not due process of law if provision be not made for compensation.....

“When . . . [the] power [of eminent domain] is exercised it can only be done by giving the party whose property is taken or whose use and enjoyment of such property is interfered with, full and adequate compensation, not excessive or exorbitant, but just compensation.”¹⁹⁰ The Fifth Amendment’s guarantee “that private property shall not be taken for a public use without just compensation was designed to bar Government from forcing some people alone to bear public burdens which, in all fairness and justice, should be borne by the public as a whole.”¹⁹¹

AMENDMENT VII

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

AMENDMENT XIII

SECTION 1.

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

AMENDMENT XIV

SECTION 1.

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws

Federal Rules of Evidence.....p. 1-23

Rule 102 - Rule 102 Purpose -

A party may claim error in a ruling to admit or exclude evidence only if the error affects

a substantial right of the party and:

(1) if the ruling admits evidence, a party, on the record:

(A) timely objects or moves to strike; and

(B) states the specific ground, unless it was apparent from the context; or

(2) if the ruling excludes evidence, a party informs the court of its substance by an offer of proof, unless the substance was apparent from the context.

Rule 201. Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts.

(b) Kinds of Facts That May Be Judicially Noticed. The court may judicially notice a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it:

(2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.

Rule 402. General Admissibility of Relevant Evidence

Relevant evidence is admissible unless any of the following provides otherwise: the United States Constitution; a federal statute; these rules; or other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court. Irrelevant evidence is not admissible.

Rule 902. Evidence that is Self-Authenticating.

The following items of evidence are self authenticating;they require no extrinsic evidence of authenticity in order to be admitted:

(1) *Domestic Public Documents That Are Sealed and Signed.* A document that bears: (A) a seal. (2) *Domestic Public*

Documents That Are Not Sealed but Are Signed and Certified. A document that

bears no seal if: (A) it bears the signature of an officer or employee of an entity named in *Rule 902(1)(A)*; and (4)

Certified Copies of Public Records. A copy of an official record – or a copy of a document that was recorded or filed in a public office as authorized by law – if the copy is certified as correct by: (A) the custodian or another person authorized to make the certification; or (B) a certificate that complies with Rule 902(1), (2), or (3), a federal statute, or a rule prescribed by the Supreme Court. **(8)**

Acknowledged Documents. A document accompanied by a certificate of acknowledgment that is lawfully executed by a notary public or another officer who is authorized to take acknowledgments.

Fed.R.Evid. Rules 901(a) and 104(b) allow evidence to be admitted on a prima facie showing of relevancy and authenticity.

OTHER RULES AND STATUTES

US Code 2011- Title 28 , Para. 455p.17-21

a)Any justice , judge , or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might be reasonably questioned .

28 U.S. Code § 1443 - Civil rights casesp.1 - 23

Any of the following civil actions or criminal prosecutions, commenced in a State court may be removed by the defendant to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending:

- (1) Against any person who is denied or cannot enforce in the courts of such State a right under any law providing for the equal civil rights of citizens of the United States, or of all persons within the jurisdiction thereof;
- (2) For any act under color of authority derived from any law providing for equal rights, or for refusing to do any act on the ground that it would be inconsistent with such law.

U.S.C.§ 1343.....p.1 - 23

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action authorized by law to be commenced by any person:

- (1) To recover damages for injury to his person or property, or because of the deprivation of any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, by any act done in furtherance of any conspiracy mentioned in section 1985 of Title 42;

(2) To recover damages from any person who fails to prevent or to aid in preventing any wrongs mentioned in section 1985 of Title 42 which he had knowledge were about to occur and power to prevent;

(3) To redress the deprivation, under color of any State law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution of the United States or by any Act of Congress providing for equal rights of citizens or of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States;

(4) To recover damages or to secure equitable or other relief under any Act of Congress providing for the protection of civil rights, including the right to vote.

(b) For purposes of this section—

(1) the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a State; and

(2) any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia

42 U.S.C. § 1982 : US Code - Section 1982: Property rights of citizens1-23

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964p.1-23

42 U. S. C. § 2000d. Section 602 authorizes federal agencies

"to effectuate the provisions of [§ 601] ... by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability," 42 U. S. C. §2000d-1, and the DOJ in an exercise of this authority promulgated a regulation forbidding funding recipients to "utilize criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin " 28 CFR § 42.104(b)(2) (2000). See also 49 CFR § 21.5(b)(2) (2000)

42 U.S.C. § 2000d-7 : US Code - Section 2000D-7: Civil rights remedies equalization - Section 2000D-2 Judicial review; administrative procedure provisions

Right of Recoveryp.18-19;22-23

(2) Disability In an action brought by a complaining party under the powers, remedies, and procedures set forth in section 706 or 717 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 [42 U.S.C. 2000e-5, 2000e-16] (as provided in section 107(a) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12117(a)), and section disparate impact) under section 791 of title 29 and the regulations implementing section 791 of title 29, or who violated the requirements of section 791 of title 29 or the regulations implementing section 791 of title 29 concerning the provision of a reasonable accommodation, or section 102 of the Americans with

Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12112), or committed a violation of section 102(b)(5) of the Act, against an individual, the complaining party may recover compensatory and punitive damages as allowed in subsection (b) of this section, in addition to any relief authorized by section 706(g) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, from the respondent .

42 U.S. Code § 1981 - Equal rights under the law.....p. 1-23

(a) Statement of equal rights

All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and extractions of every kind, and to no other.

(b) “Make and enforce contracts” defined For purposes of this section, the term “make and enforce contracts” includes the making, performance, modification, and termination of contracts, and the enjoyment of all benefits, privileges, terms, and conditions of the contractual relationship.

(c) Protection against impairment .The rights protected by this section are protected against impairment by nongovernmental discrimination and impairment under color of State law.

42 U.S. Code § 1982 - Property rights of citizens p.1-23

All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property.

42 U.S. Code § 1983 - Civil action for deprivation of rightsp.1-23

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer’s judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.

42 U.S. Code § 1988 - Proceedings in vindication of civil rightsp.1-23

(a) Applicability of statutory and common law

The jurisdiction in civil and criminal matters conferred on the district courts by the provisions of titles 13, 24, and 70 of the Revised Statutes for the protection of all persons in the United States in their civil rights, and for their vindication, shall be exercised and enforced in conformity with the laws of the United States, so far as such laws are suitable to carry the same into effect; but in all cases where they are not adapted to the object, or are deficient in the provisions necessary to furnish suitable remedies and punish offenses

against law, the common law, as modified and changed by the constitution and statutes of the State wherein the court having jurisdiction of such civil or criminal cause is held, so far as the same is not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, shall be extended to and govern the said courts in the trial and disposition of the cause, and, if it is of a criminal nature, in the infliction of punishment on the party found guilty.

42 U.S. Code § 1985 - Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights..... p.1-23

(2) Obstructing justice; intimidating party, witness, or juror

If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire to deter, by force, intimidation, or threat, any party or witness in any court of the United States from attending such

court, or from testifying to any matter pending therein, freely, fully, and truthfully, or to injure such party or witness in his person or property on account of his having so attended or testified, or to influence the verdict, presentment, or indictment of any grand or petit juror in any such court, or to injure such juror in his person or property on account of any verdict, presentment, or indictment lawfully assented to by him, or of his being or having been such juror; or if two or more persons conspire for the purpose of impeding, hindering, obstructing, or defeating, in any manner, the due course of justice in any State or Territory, with intent to deny to any citizen the equal protection of the laws, or to injure him or his property for lawfully enforcing, or attempting to enforce, the right of any person, or class of persons, to the equal protection of the laws;

18 U.S.C. Sec. 1832 - referencing Patent.....p.2-5 ; 9-11

;Theft of trade secrets

*(a) Whoever,
with intent to convert a trade secret,
that is related to or included in a product
that is produced for or placed in interstate or
foreign commerce, to the economic benefit of
anyone other than the owner thereof, and intending
or knowing that the offense will, injure
any owner of that trade secret,
knowingly – (1) steals, or without authorization
appropriates, takes, carries away, or
conceals, or by fraud, artifice, or deception
obtains such information;*

Jurisdictional Statement

IN THE APPEALS COURT FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

Dorothy M. Hartman
Appellant
vs.

Case Number 2021-1535

The United States
Appellant

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from **federal courts** :

The opinion(s) of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit at App Opinion of the U.S. 3rd Circuit Ct. of Appeals , Opinion of the U.S. Court for Federal Claims .

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENTS

For cases from **federal courts** :
Appeals Ct. for the Federal Circuit

. Timely Writs were filed of Certiorari and Mandamus to Supreme Ct. not reviewed , Denied .jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (a).§ 1346(b,) and § 2401(b)

For cases from **federal courts** :

The opinion(s) of the United States Court of Appeals 3rd Circuit

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts** : **United States Court of Appeals 3rd Circuit** Opinion filed April 17 , 2014 Appendix A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on May 2 , 2014 , A timely Petition for Writ of Certiorari is filed with the U.S. Supreme Court on May 8 , 2014 , May 2016

not reviewed and therefore Denied .

Jurisdiction is invoked 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (a).§ 1346(b,)and § 2401(b) §2679

For cases from federal courts :

Opinion below and Order denying Reconsideration on

The U.S. Court for Federal Claims

Has jurisdiction over the Appellant's claims , especially those involving the illegal and unlawful taking of her homes by federal judges in the 3rd Circuit Ct. of Appeals case where there were a number of judges involved in the conspiracy to defame Hartman through publishing falsified court records and allowed the ignoring and disavowing of documents and the governments taking of inventor's property without declaration of Eminent Domain **According to US Code (28 USC §1491), the jurisdiction of the Court "is over claims for just compensation for the taking of private property.**

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

1. The United States Patent and Trademark Office held inventor's patent application for more than 8 years , continuously changing its patent procedures – making ad hoc changes that affected patent prosecution .
2. Although patent application was filed , December 4 , 2004 – a filing date was assigned in March 5, 2007 without acknowledging inventor's priority documents .
3. Inventor's priority documents were filed with the SBIR – The federal government run Small Business Innovation Research program overseen by federal government employees and funded by the National Science Foundation – holder of the NSFnet – a resting place for the Arpanet and old internet or telecom structures .
4. Appellant/Petitioner alleges that government agencies including the NSF , the Department of Commerce , and the United States Patent and Trademark Office participated in stealing her intellectual property first through its violations in robbing the ideas from her proposals on the The Feasibility of Accessing Accessibility with ideas on improving telecom . Even though the proposals that had been submitted to 3 agencies all run by the federal government , U.S. Small Business Administration , Benjamin Franklin Technology Center , and the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce turned her minority business start up Talk Shoppe Inc. an information retrieval company or prototype online 'search engine' down for funding . She alleges that the NSF misappropriated her proposals and trade secrets and had started using the ideas almost immediately .

5. A great deal of the Patent Office's time when dealing with the Hartman patent application for Accessing Accessibility was spent delaying the prosecution illegally . There were numerous ploys by the Patent Office , almost all of them illegal and a violation of the inventor's rights to slow down the application since many changes were made to patent examining procedures while the office held up Hartman's prosecution and did not apply patent examining procedures applicable for her time of filing but rather waited almost 9 years and forced her to literally rewrite all of her claims .

6. The state of Pennsylvania through local judges who illegally defamed Hartman including blacklisting her in legal databases to prevent her hiring a lawyer as well as a core group of judges retaliating against her for filing lawsuits against a Jewish realtor and a homeowners or condominium association that had discriminated and defrauded her in the sale of a condo unit practiced lack of due process . They squashed the subpoena of the housing inspector so that he would not come to court and also dropped the fraud and discrimination charges . Appellant won on a lesser charge of negligence . The lack of due process allowed that case No. 1447 to be the lead in what amounted into a domestic attack of tyranny by government employees including judges and state workers involved themselves in smearing and hurting Hartman including taking her home(s) illegally. This made it easier for those operating in the NSF , USPTO , and the Department of Commerce , especially after the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce that had received one of Hartman's proposals merged with the Department of Commerce in D.C.

Statement of the Facts

1. Dorothy M. Hartman corresponded with the government agencies in reference to submitting proposals reportedly in exchange for funding for her start up business working from home after becoming disabled retired from her teaching job . There is a paper trail of her correspondence with these government employees describing her proposals concerning Accessing Accessibility and ideas on how to improve telecommunications starting in 1990.

2. At the time of Hartman's submission(s) to the government programs overseen and funded by the National Science Foundation today's Internet (called Internet 2) after it had been built by Merit Networks of Michigan having been commissioned by the National Science Foundation starting in 1990

3. The government was in receipt of Ms. Hartman's intellectual property and reviewed it thoroughly with a number of government employees responding to **her . Their letters or affidavits** were basically denials , but Hartman alleges that is not what was going on in the industry and that her ideas were implemented almost immediately even beyond the time that applicants in the program were supposed to be granted time to decide whether or not they would patent their ideas .

4. Hartman's notarized signature appears on her first proposal , dated March 12 , 1990 . Hartman's signature on a certified letter November 13, 1990 to the SBA upon realization that she was being flat out rejected even though she knew that her ideas were good , Hartman sent a letter to Frank Campo stating that since she was being t urned down for funding that her IP not be used to enrich other people .

5. The NSF publishes almost at the same time but without naming a day in November 1990 that someone at Harvard had decided to commercialize or privatize the internet .

6.The incidents of fraud and misconduct by the Patent Office is what locked the National Science Foundation theft of the Internet into place . Indefiniteness which is referenced by the patent office numerous times in its Supplementary Appendix to the CAFC trial IN RE DOROTHY M HARTMAN , regarding the United States Patent and Trademark Office is legally incorrect and the entire justification for preventing a patent to Hartman a 'red herring' to hang the patent prosecution in limbo for what would be a patent . This is a violation of the inventor's rights .The Patent Office lists several patents as statutory bars , the Court does not list those as bars . Only one Jafri was listed in 2005 which is the filing time for Hartman's application – the others were added at the end of the prosecution in 2012 too late and a violation – another aspect of the government's theft .

7. While these things were going on Ms. Hartman was being attacked in Pennsylvania with the loss of her homes , defamation , barred from hiring a lawyer , bankruptcy , and personal injury due to medical malfeasance .

This matter regarding the improper handling of her intellectual property by the federal government through the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has been filed with the Court(s) beginning with the following decisions form the Office to deny a patent for Application #11/003123 :

- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Decision; 07/25/2012
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Decision on Request for Rehearing; 09/20/2012

The Patent Office ignored arguments including **Exhibits** submitted to the Office in opposition to the Examiner's Final Office Action in the Appeal Brief submitted to Patent Office on **02/06/2012** - proceeded to deny the Patent contrary to evidence. The following are the reasons given and upheld by the Appellate Court .

“ The specification discloses that these steps are similar to those taken by users of prior-art online databases. Because Hartman has not “clearly distinguish[ed] what is claimed from what went before in the art and clearly circumscribe[d] what is

foreclosed from future enterprise,” see *Union Carbon Co.*, 317 U.S. at 236, the examiner properly rejected these claims as indefinite.”

Pages A000038- A000093 of the **APPELLANT APPENDIX** which shows the **proposals submitted to Federal Government Agencies in 1990-1991** . These proposals were submitted through the **SBIR (Small Business Innovation Research Program)** . Hartman’s proposals were reviewed by all , though not limited to the following federal government employees , Frank Campo ; Don Lonerghan ; James P. McAnulty , Severiano Alonzo ; William H. Harrington ; Phillip A. Singerman ; Shelly Fudge ; Ruth Hill Nesmith ; and William Cooke. The ultimate decision for funding and/or support was that of the National Science Foundation according to the recollection of the Petitioner . The federal government alleges the inventor took her ideas and made them its own . Then violated rules of Eminent Domain by making the internet a utility in 2016 without compensation to the Inventor .

The instant claims 26-60 are not indefinite according to patent law and should not bar a patent. The claims are merely long and not compliant to the standard of a one- sentence structure . This too is fraudulent as this standard was not in force when the Patent Application was filed , initially in December 2004 later amended to March 7 , 2005 . The one sentence standard which it adopted in 2008 during one of the many revisions done by the Patent Office while it held the Petitioner’s patent application for 8 years – an unusually long time . Further claims 26-60 were accomplished by malfeasance as Claims #1-25 including the 4 original claims by the Inventor were illegally removed from application by Patent Office Examiners. Further Petitioner had been denied permission to amend claims around 2008 [See pages A000001 – A000003 APPELLANT APPENDIX , case 13-1070 which give law memoranda regarding indefiniteness of claims . **Note** the *BPAI interpretation regarding indefinite claims p. A000002 - A000003* “ *the Board noted that this Court has in post-issuance patent infringement cases “held that the definiteness requirement ‘ does not compel absolute clarity ‘ and only claims not “ amenable to construction ‘ or “insolubly ambiguous “ are indefinite .*

Several Federal Rules of Evidence were violated :

902- **Evidence that is Self-Authenticating** as the evidence bears names , dated signatures , post marks , and even notary stamps . The Patent Office is in possession of valid and authentic documents that Hartman is the inventor of the process which the federal government instructed Merit Networks and others to build a network which could emulate the changes which she proposed. Hartman presented copies of this correspondence to the Patent Office along with the Patent Application initially filed in 2004. In her correspondence with Mr. Frank Campo and others , Hartman asked that her proprietary information not be shared with others – once she realized that her startup business would not receive funding to hire personnel and other support . Her telecommunications services startup called **Talk Shoppe Inc.** failed as is her current online business failing due lack of funding and support . Letters and correspondence containing post marks and notary stamps were also submitted , but ignored . The Office

ignored signature notarized on Hartman documents presented to the U.S. Small Business Administration [signed and notarized March 12 , 1990] as evidence of the timeline of the invention . Additionally in Pennsylvania the judges printed Talk Shoppe Inc , actually an invention prototype with a negative criminal record . “Outrageous” , alleges Petitioner.

402-General Admissibility of Relevant Evidence ,- All evidence submitted was relevant including historical documents of the status of the structure of the previous telecommunications structure which was based on the Arpanet – was ignored even though it was evidence from literature at large and in the public domain .

Hartman’s claims do not distinguish where the old prior art ended and the instant patent application for the new art begins . Simply because the login consists of typing into a keyboard for a computer and that makes the use of the current internet the same as use of the prior internet is not conclusive that there is no distinction between the use of this Internet and the prior Internet is just not reasonable . The Patent Office was wrong to interpret that the specification of the instant patent application did not specify how the current art differs from the prior art (before 1990) .

. Petitioner seeks that a Patent should be issued immediately . Inventor was the First to Invent and First to File which is indicative of a prima facie patent issue. Inventor should have been allowed to rewrite her initial claims in proper form , her improved drawings that were submitted although never accepted and never published should have been used and a patent issued . Instead she has suffered discrimination , oppression , deprivation , and suffering ?

See Law Memo regarding “indefiniteness “ :

See, e.g., Datamize, LLC v. Plumtree Software, Inc., 417 F.3d 1342, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (“Only claims ‘not amenable to construction’ or ‘insolubly ambiguous’ are indefinite.”)

These acts of misappropriation and theft by powerful government agencies of an African American woman’s intellectual property in a move that had brought them wealth and power and are still being violated with impunity . The fact that these acts were fraudulent can be proven by the record and the Office continues in violation . Thus the Petitioner seeks that a Writ of Mandamus issue as the USPTO is a public agency with a public duty to act in accordance with United States rules and statutes concerning patent law and equal protections under the law for the rights for all citizens . It does not have the right to award patents based on “favorites” or priority to white males , other ethnic groups , or corporations while denying patents to worthwhile applicants due to minority status , financial hardship , pro se status or other discriminatory reasons.

Below are some incidents of fraud and acts of malfeasance by the Office according to Petitioner’s recollection :

Unjustifiable Removal of Claims .

Claims #1-25 including original Claims 1-4 of the application] were never withdrawn from this application, but were illegally removed .

The examiner's interpretation was wrong in removing these claims from the application as they were never withdrawn by the Inventor – only added or intended for amendment .

Denial of Corrected Drawings .

'that figures 4-7 are new matter and that paragraphs 61-63 disclosing a customer visiting multiple databases to accomplish transactions' .

False comments by Examiner – Original patent application shows customers visiting multiple databases to accomplish transactions .

Denial of Substitute Specification .

Substitute Specification although received by the Patent Office was never entered . All comments by the Examiner referring to Specification are false and invalid .

Extraordinarily Long Patent Prosecution (8 yrs) with numerous revisions in procedures involving 5 different examiners .

Such a probably unprecedented in patent history .

Denial of Opportunity to amend claims .

Previously discussed .

Violation of Federal Rules of Evidence

The suppression of documents relevant to validity of Inventor's Claims including self – authenticating documents , affidavits , and historical documents . Denying Inventor's Priority documents when they were easily verified since that consisted of government employees who could be certified .

ARGUMENT

The Appellant's claims should be reviewed in their entirety to determine the height and breadth of government corruption that has created such a huge breach of trust for not only the inventor who has been irrevocably injured in many ways as she is elderly and her health severely declined by years of the cruel and inhumane acts of oppression and exploitation , especially when the country has come so far because of her intellectual contributions . Justice should be sought with swiftness and expediency .

STANDARD FOR REVIEW with aforementioned Rules and Statutes

LEGAL STANDARDS

FTCA is the "exclusive means by which a party may sue the United States for money damages ... in tort" (28 USC § 2679. Exclusiveness of remedy). Accordingly, an FTCA action "can be brought only in a United States District Court" (28 USC § 1346(b)). Regarding the timing of filing, FTCA's § 2401(b) states that the action must be brought "within two years after the claim accrues," or "within six months after ... notice of final denial of the claim by the agency".

Both the submission of a timely administrative claim and receipt of a final denial are required for the court to exercise jurisdiction over a tort action under the FTCA. See 28 U.S.C. § 2675(a). ***Pro Se Petitioner / Appellant has exhausted all administrative remedies and therefore is eligible to have her Tort Claims heard . Further she is eligible to have certain Tucker Acts claims heard as well **According to US Code (28 USC § 1491), the jurisdiction of the Court of Federal "is over claims for just compensation for the taking of private property...** *As the Appeals Court for the Federal Circuit has jurisdiction over both federal and state actors including individuals and agencies with liability for harming individuals by violations of constitutional laws . The Court for Federal Claims may transfer its jurisdiction to any of the district courts . Therefore * Hartman petitions that all of her claims should be heard on appeal in the Appeals Court for the Federal Circuit .*

*The **Federal Tort Claims Act** (August 2, 1946, ch.646, Title IV, 60 Stat. 812, 28 U.S.C. Part VI, Chapter 171 and 28 U.S.C. § 1346) ("FTCA") is a 1946 federal statute that permits private parties to sue the United States in a federal court for most torts committed by persons acting on behalf of the United States. Historically, citizens have not been able to sue their state—a doctrine referred to as sovereign immunity. The FTCA constitutes a limited waiver of sovereign immunity, permitting citizens to pursue some tort claims against the government.*

FTCA is the "exclusive means by which a party may sue the United States for money damages ... in tort" (28 USC § 2679. Exclusiveness of remedy). Accordingly, an FTCA action "can be brought only in a United States District Court" (28 USC § 1346(b)). Regarding the timing of filing, FTCA's § 2401(b) states that the action must be brought "within two years after the claim accrues," or "within six months after ... notice of final denial of the claim by the agency".

FTCA's § 2401(b) states that the action must be brought "within two years after the claim accrues," or "within six months after ... notice of final denial of the claim by the agency"

Hartman argues that like Cannon and Grotter , she is a woman and therefore of a protected class . Further she is in a protected class because of her race which is African American and also a handicapped status . Patent Office Applications are predominantly by corporations – many of them composed of more men than women . Hartman argues that because her inventions have had market value – that she has been aggressively discriminated against . Further because she is financially disadvantaged and have had to represent herself Pro Se , she argues that the maltreatment and the discrimination has been particularly harsh . Because the Internet of today was a result of the Federal Government 's use of her proprietary information and intellectual property to transform the telecom networks – and it never acknowledged or compensated her – it has continued to use oppression and suppression of her rights to keep this valuable invention in the hands of the government and rich corporations while subjecting her to dehumanizing and vile treatment .

Like Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003) , Hartman alleges that the respondents have discriminated against her on the basis of race in the violation of the 13th Amendment , the Fourteenth Amendment , Fifth Amendment as well as Civil Rights Laws and statutes including the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as well as 42 U.S. C. She was denied a patent for her invention The Accessing Accessibility Process which she alleges led to the development of the modern day Internet intentionally and deliberately because of her status as an African American Female from a group with a history of enslavement . She alleges also because of a disability handicap which is described by some as a functional nervous disorder and others as “mental illness”, however it does not prevent the Petitioner from fully engaging as a responsible and able- minded adult . Other matters such as race , gender , and even economic class alleges the Petitioner are the primary reasons for the Office’s discriminatory treatment of her . Race is largely used as a “predominant “ factor giving groups which primarily do not belong to classes protected by federal statutes such as white males other ethnic groups and corporations with or without similar credentials highly favored status in granting patents . Hartman alleges that as in Grutter vs. Bollinger , 2003 , the respondents have no compelling interest to justify the use of race , gender or her handicap as criteria to deny her a patent .

Further the Petitioner alleges that not only did the Respondents deliberately and intentionally violate federal statutes in order to deny what she contends was a Prima Facie case for the awarding of a patent – but that they used malfeasance and committed criminal acts of fraud and other violations of their own Patent Examination Procedures to ‘ build the case’ for their own federal law violations . Petitioner alleges that not only is the discrimination and disparate treatment intentional but constitutes corruption of the laws of the land and government tyranny . This is in violation of referenced statutes and laws . Unlike the previous cases , the violations and abuses towards Hartman have been repeated multiple times and with the same aggressive violations based on her minority status and in this situation for years – the abuses aggravated by the Office taking advantage of her .

This deliberate discrimination of the Inventor and suppression of the rights and identity of the inventor *simply because it can* violates the constitutional rights of the Petitioner who is being treated as a “slave”. This is racism , oppression , preventing the advancement of a person of color and constitutes governmental tyranny. Further other branches of government including the Department of Justice have been aware of the violations of the Patent Office but has not taken any action to correct the injustice .

In **Cannon v. University of Chicago (1979)**, which re

Like *Cannon vs. University of Chicago* , the Petitioner Hartman is a female belonging to a protected class as well as a minority and handicapped individual placing her into other protected classes as well. Because of he extraordinary length of the patent application prosecution and the delay of justice to the Petitioner – she has also become a member of a fourth protected class because of her age . It is clear that the laws and/or statutes regarding discrimination and civil rights legislation are applicable to persons of her stature . it does constitute a federal agency and a public institution and therefore is bound by other aspects of constitutional and civil law including the United States Code .

The causal relationship that exists between the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the cases cited by the Petitioner in referencing violations under the 1964 Civil Rights Act , both title VI and title IX is the following statute : 13 CFR Part 112 . Below is a description of this rule referencing the SBA which is a funding program through the Federal Government . The USPTO may not make loans or grants but like the SBA it does distribute licenses (which is what a patent is) , it is a government program getting its funding (payroll) directly from the United States Government and like the SBA – its parent is the United States Commerce Department . Therefore the rules as described below for Federally Assisted Programs of the SBA (See entire statute shown on page)ought to apply to the USPTO which already boasts itself as being an equal opportunity employer . It is a public agency of the United States Government and therefore ought to be held to the same restrictions governing Discrimination as other governmental agencies .

13 CFR Part 112 – Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs of the SBA

§ 112.3 Discrimination prohibited.

(a) General. To the extent that this part applies, no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination by any business or other activity...

Petitioner alleges that she has been and still is being discriminated against by the United States Government in regards to her proprietary and intellectual property which it has seized for its own use and use by the public and corporations without appropriate compensation to the owner of the Intellectual property which is in direct violation of the 5th and 14th constitutional amendments as well as other statutes and rules and regulations being expressed in this case where the Inventor is coming to this court(s) seeking justice .

Petitioner alleges that she has been and still is being discriminated against by the United States Government in regards to her proprietary and intellectual property which it has seized for its own use and use by the public and corporations without appropriate compensation to the owner of the Intellectual property which is in direct violation of the 5th and 14th constitutional amendments as well as other statutes and rules and robbing her of millions or perhaps of billions of dollars of compensation as multimillion dollar companies pay her no royalties .

In general , Discrimination is prohibited in government agencies :

NOTE - ALTHOUGH VIOLATION BY THE OFFICE DOES NOT DIRECTLY INVOLVE “ EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES”, IT DOES INVOLVE DENIAL OF OPPORTUNITY TO CONTRACTUAL AND LICENSING OPPORTUNITIES THAT WOULD OFFER OPPORTUNITIES OF UPGRADING AND IMPROVING THE ECONOMIC LIFE OF THE INVENTOR :

Therefore the United States Patent and Trademark Office is not immune to culpability for practicing discrimination and in addition to the United States Code , the Civil Rights Laws of 1964 , title 6 and title 9 should apply making it culpable and liable to lawsuits for intentional Discrimination . Additional its employees are government employees , its commissioners undersecretaries of the U.S. Commerce Department and therefore endowed with additional duties not to violate Conflict of Interest laws involving the United States . The Appellant alleges that is exactly what was done here and that the Washington D.C. and state of Virginia part of the conspiracy involved the National Science Foundation , Department of Commerce , and the United States Patent and Trademark Office . Appellant alleges that while Pennsylvania especially Philadelphia and Harrisburg ‘kept Hartman busy’ with defamation including Libel and Slander , barring her from lawyers , illegal seizure of 2 homes , theft and destruction of 2 automobiles , driving her into bankruptcy , personally injuring her , and driving her into bankruptcy that the D.C. and Virginia connection was ripping off her intellectual property and manipulating her patent applications to strip her of intellectual property . It amounts to illegal takings and devastating damages to the inventor .

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved

U.S. CONSTITUTION : U.S. Const. Amend I ; U.S. Const. Amend VII ;U.S. Const. Amend XIII ; U.S. Const. Amend XIV

AMENDMENT I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

AMENDMENT VII

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

AMENDMENT XIII

SECTION 1.

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

AMENDMENT XIV

SECTION 1.

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Federal Rules of Evidence

Rule 102 – Rule 102 Purpose -

A party may claim error in a ruling to admit or exclude evidence only if the error affects a substantial right of the party and:

- (1) if the ruling admits evidence, a party, on the record:
 - (A) timely objects or moves to strike; and
 - (B) states the specific ground, unless it was apparent from the context; or
- (2) if the ruling excludes evidence, a party informs the court of its substance by an offer of proof, unless the substance was apparent from the context.

Rule 201. Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts.

(b) Kinds of Facts That May Be Judicially

Noticed. The court may judicially notice a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it:

- (2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.

Rule 402. General Admissibility of Relevant Evidence

Relevant evidence is admissible unless any of the following provides otherwise: the United States Constitution; a federal statute; these rules; or other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court. Irrelevant evidence is not admissible.

Rule 902. Evidence that is Self-Authenticating.

The following items of evidence are self authenticating; they require no extrinsic evidence of authenticity in order to be admitted:

(1) Domestic Public Documents That Are Sealed and Signed. A document that bears: (A) a seal. **(2) Domestic Public Documents That Are Not Sealed but Are Signed and Certified.** A document that bears no seal if: (A) it bears the signature of an officer or employee of an entity named in *Rule 902(1)(A)*; and (4) **Certified Copies of Public Records.** A copy of an official record – or a copy of a document that was recorded or filed in a public office as authorized by law – if the copy is certified as correct by: (A) the custodian or another person authorized to make the certification; or (B) a certificate that complies with *Rule 902(1), (2), or (3)*, a federal statute, or a rule prescribed by the Supreme Court. **(8) Acknowledged Documents.** A document accompanied by a certificate of acknowledgment that is lawfully executed by a notary public or another officer who is authorized to take acknowledgments. Fed.R.Evid. Rules 901(a) and 104(b) allow evidence to be admitted on a prima facie showing of relevancy and authenticity.

OTHER RULES AND STATUTES

US Code 2011- Title 28 , Para. 455

a) Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might be reasonably questioned .

28 U.S. Code § 1443 - Civil rights cases

Any of the following civil actions or criminal prosecutions, commenced in a State court may be removed by the defendant to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending:

- (1) Against any person who is denied or cannot enforce in the courts of such State a right under any law providing for the equal civil rights of citizens of the United States, or of all persons within the jurisdiction thereof;
- (2) For any act under color of authority derived from any law providing for equal rights, or for refusing to do any act on the ground that it would be inconsistent with such law.

U.S.C. § 1343

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action authorized by law to be commenced by any person:

- (1) To recover damages for injury to his person or property, or because of the deprivation of any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, by any act done in furtherance of any conspiracy mentioned in section 1985 of Title 42;
- (2) To recover damages from any person who fails to prevent or to aid in preventing any wrongs mentioned in section 1985 of Title 42 which he had knowledge were about to occur and power to prevent;
- (3) To redress the deprivation, under color of any State law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution of the United States or by any Act of Congress providing for equal rights of citizens or of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States;
- (4) To recover damages or to secure equitable or other relief under any Act of Congress providing for the protection of civil rights, including the right to vote.

(b) For purposes of this section—

- (1) the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a State; and
- (2) any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia

42 U.S.C. § 1982 : US Code - Section 1982: Property rights of citizens .

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

42 U. S. C. § 2000d. Section 602 authorizes federal agencies "to effectuate the provisions of [§ 601] ... by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability," 42 U. S. C. §2000d-1, and the DOJ in an exercise of this authority promulgated a regulation forbidding funding recipients to "utilize criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin " 28 CFR § 42.104(b)(2) (2000). See also 49 CFR § 21.5(b)(2) (2000)

42 U.S.C. § 2000d-7 : US Code - Section 2000D-7: Civil rights remedies equalization - Section 2000D-2 Judicial review; administrative procedure provisions

Right of Recovery

(2) Disability In an action brought by a complaining party under the powers, remedies, and procedures set forth in section 706 or 717 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 [42 U.S.C. 2000e-5, 2000e-16] (as provided in section 107(a) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12117(a)), and section disparate impact) under section 791 of title 29 and the regulations implementing section 791 of title 29, or who violated the requirements of section 791 of title 29 or the regulations implementing section 791 of title 29 concerning the provision of a reasonable accommodation, or section 102 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12112), or committed a violation of section 102(b)(5) of the Act, against an individual, the complaining party may recover compensatory and punitive damages as allowed in subsection (b) of this section, in addition to any relief authorized by section 706(g) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, from the respondent .

42 U.S. Code § 1981 - Equal rights under the law

(a) Statement of equal rights

All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other.

(b) "Make and enforce contracts" defined

For purposes of this section, the term "make and enforce contracts" includes the making, performance, modification, and termination of contracts, and the enjoyment of all benefits, privileges, terms, and conditions of the contractual relationship.

(c) Protection against impairment

The rights protected by this section are protected against impairment by nongovernmental discrimination and impairment under color of State law.

42 U.S. Code § 1982 - Property rights of citizens

All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property.

42 U.S. Code § 1983 - Civil action for deprivation of rights

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.

42 U.S. Code § 1988 - Proceedings in vindication of civil rights

(a) Applicability of statutory and common law

The jurisdiction in civil and criminal matters conferred on the district courts by the provisions of titles 13, 24, and 70 of the Revised Statutes for the protection of all persons in the United States in their civil rights, and for their vindication, shall be exercised and enforced in conformity with the laws of the United States, so far as such laws are suitable to carry the same into effect; but in all cases where they are not adapted to the object, or are deficient in the provisions necessary to furnish suitable remedies and punish offenses against law, the common law, as modified and changed by the constitution and statutes of the State wherein the court having jurisdiction of such civil or criminal cause is held, so far as the same is not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, shall be extended to and govern the said courts in the trial and disposition of the cause, and, if it is of a criminal nature, in the infliction of punishment on the party found guilty.

42 U.S. Code § 1985 - Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights

(2) Obstructing justice; intimidating party, witness, or juror

If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire to deter, by force, intimidation, or threat, any party or witness in any court of the United States from attending such court, or from testifying to any matter pending therein, freely, fully, and truthfully, or to injure such party or witness in his person or property on account of his having so attended or testified, or to influence the verdict, presentment, or indictment of any grand or petit juror in any such court, or to injure such juror in his person or property on account of any verdict, presentment, or indictment lawfully assented to by him, or of his being or having been such juror; or if two or more persons conspire for the purpose of impeding, hindering, obstructing, or defeating, in any manner, the due course of justice in any State or Territory, with intent to deny to any citizen the equal protection of the laws, or to injure him or his property for lawfully enforcing, or attempting to enforce, the right of any person, or class of persons, to the equal protection of the laws;

(3) Depriving persons of rights or privileges

If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire or go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws;

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Petitioner alleges that the government tyranny and corruption on all levels , city , state, and federal was put in motion by the action of a core group of ethnic judges acting in tandem to retaliate against Hartman for her lawsuits against Dennis Miltein . Dorothy M. Hartman who is an African-American woman with a Jewish sounding name who filed a lawsuit against Dennis Milstein , Greenwich Walk Homeowners Association , a real Jew . Hartman alleges the judges acting in that case No.1447 in the CCP court in Philadelphia is what put the defamation , hatred , and the fraudulent dismantling of Hartman's life into overdrive and the development of a civil conspiracy that reaches rico claims proportions . It apparently enraged the judges in Philadelphia Pennsylvania that Ms. Hartman who is African-American sued a Jewish Realtor and his condominium association . The judges that Hartman refers to as the 'lynch mob' went immediately into a mode to damage and destroy her life in every way that they could including the deliberate conspiracy to deprive her of two homes , and to conspire with state officers in Harrisburg , Pennsylvania the site of one of her proposals on Accessing Accessibility – the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce. The Defamation took off like wildfire fed by my name being published by the thousands in different forms all over cyberspace aided by Google's [one of the recipients] of the government's give away of Hartman's intellectual property along with many others . Corporations that have grown very rich and successful by selling ads , phones , computers , to the billions of dollars that Hartman's ideas that were used by the NSF to create a successful internet – Hartman alleges are now being used by the government to deny her access to the Internet her very invention .

She alleges that during a deposition by the attorney(s) for the defendants (Dennis aka Howard Milstein and the Greenwich Walk Homeowners Association , a condo association sued by her in 1998 for real estate fraud and racial discrimination)- that she mentioned in the deposition when asked about her home business **Talk Shoppe Inc** . that she had

been instrumental in inventing the Internet . Her name has high recognition as she sued city employees in the referenced case(s) CCP, April Term , 1998 No. 1447 ; EDC No. 99-4695 April 2000 , Hartman vs. Greenwich Walk Homeowners Association before and she has been deliberately sought out by what she alleges is the **“cartel of crooked judges out to lynch me in a hate campaign designed to put the nigger in her place .”**

Petitioner alleges that her entire life is being dismantled and destroyed including her occupation(s)-name and reputation, real estate property , and intellectual property completely devastated by direct and overt racial and disability discrimination and oppression being practiced by those in positions of authority . The attacks on her and her property in Philadelphia are caused by racism and corruption in the municipal government and its employees conspiring to defraud her in real estate property . Harrassing, defrauding , Philadelphia City employees charging her for city services in retaliation to her complaint(s) about that and retaliation regarding an earlier lawsuit Dorothy Hartman vs. Dennis Milstein ,John D’Angelo, Frank Pryor and Greenwich Walk Homeowners Assoc , Case No.1447 Spring Term 1998, CCP, Philadelphia , Pa.. Further officers in the Philadelphia City government property reporting agencies colluded with Bank of America Countrywide Home Loans employees to deny her refinancing on home loans as a result of derogatory and false information reported to databases with falsified information on the Appellant creating “perjured criminal records and false information about addresses , relatives and more resulting in Defamation , Fraud , and Discrimination and theft of her real estate and

She alleges that the conspiracy reaches from Philadelphia , Pennsylvania to Harrisburg , Pennsylvania . She alleges that the smearing and the defamation was continued in Harrisburg by state law officers setting up another set of falsified and perjured records . These records set up to circulate lies about the status of her health . One of the state officers a William Fritz set up an osteopath Dr. Mortimer Strong to publish medical records on Ms. Hartman that she alleges were filled with embellishments and lies that she was a mental patient with other medical histories that were not applicable to her

health problems such as cancer and several mental disorders . The Social Security Administration had already assessed Ms. Hartman's health status and it did not include the slew of lies posted by these state officers who had never seen Ms. Hartman at all and Dr. Mortimer Strong who had only seen Ms. Hartman one time and was not her doctor . The illegal medical records that were infused into the conglomerant that represents Penn Medicine including Pennsylvania Hospital and University of Pennsylvania circulated the records to hundreds of doctors within its community . Making the poisoning of Hartman's name complete with both defaming public records falsely claiming her with 'dui' charges that never happened and defaming hospital records claiming her a mental patient with 3 and 4 mental illnesses , all lies spread by racist crooked judges , Philadelphia city employees because of John D'Angelo and Frank Pryer's influence .Now doctors in Philadelphia and Harrisburg , Pennsylvania State Officers associated with the Professional Licensing Bureau and the Office of Compliance getting into the mix . Ms. Hartman alleges that in this toxic environment that she has been forced to live in due to the power and corruption of government employees acting criminally as the record will show that there are violations of Title 18th Criminal Statutes of Pennsylvania including the following is also being hidden by the State's Attorney General Josh Shapiro as he takes criminal complaints that she files against these people and has his staff convert them into some consumer protection related complaint that is unrelated but specifically address constitutional violations and/ or crimes being carried out against her and he covers up by failing to act on her criminal complaints although he is well aware of her Pro Se status in this matter . Other state officers are also involved in protecting the actions of doctors associated with Penn Medicine whom Hartman alleges may have injured her but the details are being hidden because they are being kept secret by the illegal actions of the Atty. General Josh Shapiro in not investigating and acting on Ms. Hartman's criminal complaints and the State Officers hiding the actions of the doctors from even follow up hearings on her complaints that she is entitled to but have been denied . Therefore the Appellant appeals to this Court that the Pa. Atty General should stop deliberately mishandling her complaints calling them by false names and categories and investigate them for what they are violations of consitutional , civil rights , and violation

of the criminal statutes of Pennsylvania . The Petitioner alleges that the Judge has disqualified himself and should have been replaced and although she complained to the highest levels, this was not done. He ruled on his own disqualification without answering the charges which is all in violation of US Code 2011- Title 28 , Para. 455 . and the rest of the court(s) followed after him .

had decided that Hartman's property was to be taken by what some nicknamed the **'starve the beast' program in the city of Philadelphia designed to illegally seize property from blacks** . The Appellant/Petitioner had filed that document with the Comptroller of the Currency listing particularly individuals , agencies , dates , and times of a series of harassment , real estate violations including vandalism , threats and intimidation , illegal acts including charges of fines and fees by the city of Philadelphia agencies- as she realized over time that with no investigations ever done no matter how many 911 calls she made to the police that basically she was without the protection of law as often the police themselves were involved in the dirty tricks especially as involved the theft and total destruction of one of her automobiles even a it was parked in front of her home .**ignored in its entirety by each Philadelphia Court with Judge Paul Diamond and Judge Idee Fox leading the way for her dismissal from the federal court to be remanded to the state court and her property removed by a criminal court judge , Paula Patrick . The Appellant set up as a criminal by falsified public records to have her home illegally confiscated in asset seizure .**

Essentially this is where the Appellant finds herself before this court today without protection by law because the crimes are coming from the top and the authorities themselves . Why ? Because the Internet and Worldwide Web represents trillions of dollars of commerce . Why ? Because since becoming a UTILITY according to Barack Obama and the Department of Commerce the Internet has become the platform and the arm of the federal government . Government leaders even talk to each other and argue with each other through social media . The theft of Ms. Hartman's property – all of its illegal takings of her homes and her intellectual property have become a wealth and power grab for the government . In its stead it devastated Ms. Hartman's rights as a

human being in simply taking everything by force , might , and cruelty and no regard to her rights to be acknowledged or compensated all of this led by judges in Philadelphia Pennsylvania who allowed the Greenwich Walk Homeowners Association to offer her \$3500 in settlement for all of the harm it did to her in the condominium complex and when she would not accept it went on to strip her of everything that she and her family worked for over a lifetime and to make her wealth their wealth without compensation and their motivations , racial hatred , excessive greed , and their sense of entitlement to White and Jewish Superiority . The Appellant deserves to be made whole and asks that this case proceed to have the merits of the case heard so as to resolve what is Just and proper in this case according to law – not politics and racial hatred .

.

42 U.S. Code § 1985 - Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights

(2) Obstructing justice; intimidating party, witness, or juror

If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire to deter, by force, intimidation, or threat, any party or witness in any court of the United States from attending such court, or from testifying to any matter pending therein, freely, fully, and truthfully, or to injure such party or witness in his person or property on presentment, or indictment of any grand or petit juror in any such court, or to or if two or more persons conspire for the purpose of impeding, hindering, obstructing, or defeating, in any manner, the due course of justice in any State or Territory, with intent to deny to any citizen the equal protection of the laws, or to injure him or his property for lawfully enforcing, or attempting to enforce, the right of any person, or class of persons, to the equal protection of the laws;

ARGUMENT

She asks the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit to overturn its remove its Mandate and to overturn its affirmation of the Patent Office Decision to deny Patent for the Accessing Accessibility Process on case #13-1070 entered on March 8 , 2013 , Rehearing denied on March 14 , 2013. .Hartman alleges that the Indefiniteness was argued by her but dismissed by both the Court and that the Court did not review Fraud in the Office and that therefore the CAFC Opinion is flawed

42 U.S. Code § 1988 - Proceedings in vindication of civil rights

(a) Applicability of statutory and common law

The jurisdiction in civil and criminal matters conferred on the district courts by the provisions of titles 13, 24, and 70 of the Revised Statutes for the protection of all persons in the United States in their civil rights, and for their vindication, shall be exercised and enforced in conformity with the laws of the United States, so far as such laws are suitable to carry the same into effect; but in all cases where they are not adapted to the object, or are deficient in the provisions necessary to furnish suitable remedies and punish offenses against law, the common law, as modified and changed by the constitution and statutes of the State wherein the court having jurisdiction of such civil or criminal cause is held, so far as the same is not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, shall be extended to and govern the said courts in the trial and disposition of the cause, and, if it is of a criminal nature, in the infliction of punishment on the party found guilty.

Referencing the 3rd Circuit Ct. of Appeals ,the much aggrieved and injured Appellant also suffering from personal injury by medical malfeasance related to the smearing and defamation not yet fully identified due to the Pennsylvania State Attorney General , State Officers , and the Office of Professional Licenses Compliance Office failure to act to even allow hearings concerning doctors who may have seriously injured her . The Pennsylvania Attorney General Josh Shapiro is obstructing justice by keeping the facts hidden and refusing to file civil or criminal charges and protecting state

officers who were involved in smearing the Inventor . The opinion taking the inventor's home and placing it for sheriff sale was the result of fraud and those associated with the illegal taking including judges involved in the taking that constitutes fraud and therefore should be held accountable both for both constitutional and civil violations of the Appellant. Where violations of Title 18, Criminal Statutes of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania , those in violation should be held accountable .

Appellant alleges that the Court of Federal Claims has jurisdiction over illegal takings .It has jurisdiction on intellectual property regarding the theft of trade secrets and patent applications and especially over the illegal taking of the government of Ms. Harman's Accessing Accessibility Process that when reduced to practice comprises Internet 2 , that the federal government declared a utility in 2016 without Declaration of Eminent Domain and payment to Ms. Hartman who is the bonafide and recognized owner of the property even acknowledged by the Appeals Ct. for the Federal Circuit . The law emphatically states 28 USC § § 1295 (a)(2) (a) (3). Ms. Hartman alleges illegal takings by a group of judges in the 3rd circuit operating through fraud and defamation . Her intellectual property is still being taken or stolen by the government everyday in its use and exportation of the Internet without acknowledging or compensating the inventor . The Appellant argues that not only did the federal government deliberately interrupt Ms. Hartman receiving a patent for the invention asserting 'omnibus' claims and trying to prevent her based on intentional discrimination while at the same time granting extensive power to ecommerce and big technology in developing all of these massive companies based on their ability to absorb and purchase large parts of the cyberspace that Ms. Hartman's invention generates . Yet they pay her no royalties , no nothing and the government maintains default ownership although it did not invent nor create only built based on Hartman's invention and design . Therefore , the Appellant petitions to proceed with the pursuit of justice for her claims.

23

Submitted ,
05/06/2021
Appellant Pro Se
254 So.16th street
Philadelphia , Pa. 19102

Signed "/S/" Dorothy M. Hartman

