

IN THE COURT OF CITY CIVIL JUDGE AT BANGALORE

O. S. No: 0004961/2018

PLAINTIFF / INVENTOR: Srinivas Devathi, Aged 41 years,
S/O. Late D. Satyanarayana,
Residing at No. 63, 11th 'B' Cross, 3rd Main,
Prashanthnagar, Bangalore – 560079, India
Mob: (91) – 903-589-4251

- V/S -

DEFENDANTS:

1. Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc., A Johnson & Johnson company,
1125, Trenton-Harbourton Road,
Titusville, NJ – 08560, USA
Ph. No: 001-908-722-5393
Represented by its J&J CEO: Mr. Alex Gorsky, Mr. Joaquin Duato
Janssen CEO: Mr. Tom Heyman, and Director Mr. Mike Comprelli
2. HSBC Bank, USA, (Formerly Household),
452, Fifth Avenue, New York City, NY – 10018, USA
Ph. No: 001-212-525-5000
Represented by its USA CEO: Mr. Patrick Burke,
Director Ms. Heidi Pote
3. Capgemini US LLC, (Formerly Kanbay),
79, Fifth Ave, Suite 300, New York, NY - 10003, USA
Ph. No: 001-212-314-8000
Represented by its CEO: Mr. Paul Hermelin, Mr. Thierry Delaporte,
Mr. Aiman Ezzat and Mr. William (Bill) Schreiner
4. Hulsey Hunt & Parks P.C.
919, Congress Ave, Suite 919, Austin, TX – 78701, USA
Ph No. 001-512-478-9190
Represented by Mr. Bill Hulsey

Under order VII Rule 1 & 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the Inventor most respectfully submits as follows:

1. The address of the Inventor for communications is as stated above. The addresses of defendants for issue of notice, summons and warrant from this Hon'ble court is as stated in the cause title above.
2. Out of the four defendants, three of which are large American corporations and one IP patent law firm based in USA.
3. While these organizations are large, specific people within Defendant 1 are Michael Comprelli, Randy McDaniels, Kevin Shea, Scott Wearley, Larry Jones, Arun Bhaskar-Baba. Defendant 1 were Inventor's client (while being employed with Defendant 3), from November 2006 to January 2010. Inventor worked onsite at Defendant 1's offices in NJ, USA.
4. Specific people within Defendant 2 are Heidi Pote, Chris Anetz, Manoj Panwar and other team members. Defendant 2 were Inventor's client (while being employed with Defendant 3), from October 2000 to June 2006. Inventor worked at Defendant 2's offices in NJ, USA, from October 2000 to June 2006.
5. Defendant 3 was the employer of Inventor. Specific people within Defendant 3 are William (Bill) Schreiner, Joseph Moye, Roy Stansbury, Scott Sweet, Robert Haarsgaard, Jeffrey Deyerle, John Buly and Barry O'Brien. Inventor worked as employee of Defendant 3 from October 2000 to January 2010.
6. It must be noted that nothing as serious as this happens within large corporations without the knowledge of the company CEO and executive teams.
7. Defendant 4 is an IP law firm who facilitated the filing of Inventor's national stage and global (PCT) application for his invention of 'Vehicle color change technology'.
8. The Inventor invented the 'Vehicle surface color change technology'. This technology is extremely transformative concept/technology to the world and would attract large amounts of wealth as Royalty (as per an estimate multiple Trillions of Dollars) from across the globe, from all 156 plus PCT countries, where the invented technology IP rights could be enforced.
9. Such wealth amassed by one Indian citizen would make him the richest man in the world and would drive a lot of growth and development work in India. The first part was perceived as a threat by Mr. Bill Gates and Mr. Warren Buffet (who held the richest men positions then) and Mr. Jeff Bezos (Current richest man). They may have also provided external support and encouraged the activities of Defendants 1, 2 and 3. Mr. Bill Gates and Mr. Warren Buffet visited India in 2010, when Inventor left USA and moved back to India. Mr. Jeff Bezos starts Amazon India a few years later. Defendants 1, 2 and 3 also wish to keep America as the richest country in the world and not give any growth / progress prospects to India or an Indian citizen. In such an effort they may have also engaged and used power from the current and previous USA Presidents.
10. Defendant's 1, 2 and 3 had previously targeted the Inventor when he invented another concept called 'Hands Free Shopping ®' in year 2004. This 'Hands Free Shopping' concept and related exclusive legal rights for all of USA were owned

by Inventor for many years and the Defendant's 1, 2 and 3 relentlessly targeted and blocked the Inventor from launching this business in USA.

11. In 2007 when Inventor invented the 'Vehicle color change technology', they continued to target his IP (intellectual property) filings related to this technology.
12. The four defendants came together and decided to sabotage and destroy the prospects of Inventor's IP rights across the PCT countries. This was due to their hatred towards Indian citizens living in India and not to allow them to become rich and earn royalty from across the world. This plot of the four defendants is not only damaging to the IP royalty prospects of the Inventor but also damaging to growth and development prospects of India; by blocking the wealth from coming into India.
13. USPTO (United States Patent and Trademark Organization) located in Virginia, USA; is a governmental body of USA, that prosecutes intellectual property and provides grants as patents or trademarks. It must be noted that USA has long moved from Democracy to Capitalism wherein large corporations exercise their power and command on all governmental organizations including their federal government, state governments and White House. Simply put; defendants 1, 2 and 3 can pick up the phone and pass orders to any of the mentioned bodies including USPTO.
14. Defendants 1, 2 and 3 instructed USPTO to issue a patent grant on the invention, as it truly deserved patent rights. Up on instructions USPTO issued a patent grant # 8,910,998 (issued on Dec 16th, 2014 which is enclosed as a document along with this case) to Srinivas S. Devathi, the Inventor and then asked them to issue a sabotaging ISR (International Search Report) on the PCT application # PCT/US2014/046619 (a replica of the same USA national application which was issued as a grant). This was done to destroy the IP grant prospects of the Inventor in rest of the world (includes 155 plus countries). This was done with malicious intent of defendants 1, 2 and 3 to sabotage the IP, its revenue benefits, related royalty benefits to the Inventor who is an Indian citizen; by potentially increasing the chances of rejections on the invention grants in 155 plus countries.
15. USPTO has contradicted themselves by issuing a grant on Inventor's application in USA territory and issuing a sabotaging ISR on the same exact application at PCT (global) level. The prior art cited in the ISR does not appear in the citations in the USPTO patent grant. Nor did the prior art cited in ISR appeared in thorough searches conducted by Inventor and Defendant 4 while filing for the application. Defendant 4 (IP law firm) has the ability to search global IP database to ensure that there is no similar prior art before advising the Inventor to proceed with the application. The prior art searches were thoroughly done and Inventor and defendant 4 were convinced that there is no prior art even remotely close to what Inventor had disclosed as part of his invention. After these checks alone, the national patent application (# 14/227,859) in USA was filed on March 27th, 2014.

The e-mails and search results provided by Defendant 4 are attached with this case.

16. Defendants 1, 2 and 3 ensured that prior art citations were fabricated (created) by USPTO to destroy the prospects of the Inventor in the ISR and his IP rights in 155 plus countries. The prior art citations Cobb and Price were fabricated by USPTO and mentioned in the ISR to deliberately sabotage Inventor's IP prospects elsewhere in the world.
17. Defendants 1, 2 and 3 teamed up with Defendant 4 to not deliver the sabotaging ISR (International Search Report) on time to the Inventor deliberately, breaking the legal protocol IP law firms of USA are bound by. This ISR issued by USPTO is enclosed as one of the documents with this case. It is dated Nov 4th, 2014. The ISR which had a 2-month dead line to respond back to USPTO (chosen ISA - International Search Authority); was not communicated to the Inventor and was only delivered to him after he asked for it several months later; well past the deadline of getting the ISR cleared up or cleaned up. The e-mail correspondence related to this are submitted as documents along with this case. Another possibility is that the fabrication of Cobb and Price (prior arts) took months and the sabotaging ISR was created in months of June / July 2015 and then delivered to Defendant 4. So, when Defendant 4 received it months later, he could NOT have delivered it to me in November or December 2014. This is a more likely possibility, as the USA patent grant that happened in Dec 2014, has no mention of Cobb or Price. Whatever, the case maybe, Defendants ensured that Inventor lost the 2-month window to respond back to USPTO on the sabotaging ISR.
18. If not for the malicious intention of all Defendants, the Inventor would have used the 2-month response window to send a response to USPTO to get a cleaner ISR issued. Inventor would have taken this window to ensure that corrections were communicated back (despite the fabricated / created prior art) to eliminate the bad citations by content in his application. Defendants 1, 2 and 3 ensured that defendant 4 did not even communicate the issue of this ISR to Inventor, thus ensuring no corrective measures / steps were taken in the 2-month window and thus the fabricated / created sabotaging ISR was published by WIPO/PCT for all 156 plus member country PTO's to access. Now the fabricated / created sabotaging prior art and ISR are given to all PTO's in the world thus reducing the prospects of IP grants to the Inventor in these countries.
19. The WIPO Patent scope publication ID for the PCT application is WO2015147900.
20. Inventor is however filing amendments in each PTO to ensure grant is procured at each national stage level. Inventor is attempting to procure IP grants despite the fabricated / created prior art and bad ISR. If a rejection is met with in any national territory, the defendants become responsible and liable for the losses incurred by Inventor and India.

21. The defendants have potentially stolen Trillions of Dollars from the Inventor or at least reduced his prospects of procuring Patent on his invention in 155 plus other PCT countries in the world.
22. The 'Vehicle color change technology' could further be applied to other surfaces such as electronic devise, electrical home appliance, furniture, walls, shoes or toys. Inventor has PCT applications filed for these sectors. Currently, Inventor is looking to raise funds to enter national stage with these sectors. The following are the WIPO Patent scope publication ID's that are relevant to these other sectors. WO2017144948, WO2017144949 and WO2017144950.
23. The question to be asked is 'What would Trillions of Dollars, do to India?' - For starters, we could build 5 Mega cities (e.g., such as Hong Kong) in India. Improve education, Health care and many other sectors to move India towards becoming a Developed country. There has been an attempt to destroy these prospects.
24. This could be considered as an act to block economic security of India. Even a 'Public Interest Litigation' could be initiated against them, in the interest of 1.25 Billion Indian citizens. This case should be filed under 'Unlawful acts prevention act' to ensure India's national and economic securities are safe-guarded.
25. What Inventor is claiming as part of point 26, ensures that human rights and intellectual property rights of citizens belonging to any of the PCT countries should be upheld and inventions should be enforceable across all PCT countries. And that developed countries, or their corporations should not block, destroy and sabotage prospects of Inventors coming from developing or poor countries.
26. The Inventor claims the following relief as outcome of this case:
 - a. USPTO must withdraw the sabotaging ISR issued on the PCT application # PCT/US2014/046619.
 - b. USPTO must issue a corrected / new / clean ISR, by clearing the references to fabricated prior art (Cobb and Price) to the PCT application # PCT/US2014/046619; and retain only the citations mentioned in the USPTO patent grant 8,910,998. That would be the correct ISR.
 - c. USPTO as the ISA / IPEA on the PCT application # PCT/US2014/046619, must send new communication to all 156 plus PCT countries in the world; to their respective PTO's issuing the corrected new ISR and that the old sabotaging ISR has been withdrawn.
 - d. Further USPTO needs to issue a grant on the Inventor's continuation application in USA, application # 14/535,867.
 - e. Other sector color change technology benefits should be received by the Inventor and/or India for India's national benefit.
27. Inventor states that he is open for 'Arbitration proceedings' related to this matter; however, insists that such an arbitration only be held within India. It effectively means that the defendants and/or their representatives will have to travel to India to enable arbitration in this matter.

PRAYER

The Inventor requests that the Honorable Court pass a judgement and decree in favor of the Inventor against the defendants,

- a) to remove the sabotaging ISR from his PCT application and issue a correct ISR and communicate the same to WIPO and all designated states (PTOs)
- b) to provide the Inventor with the invention enforceability rights as per Patent Cooperation Treaty across all PCT countries, so that he could earn royalty
- c) to issue a grant on USPTO patent application # 14/535,867.

Inventor

Srinivas S. Devathi

Date –

Place – Bangalore, India

VERIFICATION

I, Srinivas S. Devathi, the Inventor, do verify and state that what is stated in paragraphs 1 to 27 above are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Inventor

Srinivas S. Devathi

LIST OF DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED ALONG WITH THIS CASE:

1. The USPTO Patent Grant # 8,910,998 – 15 Pages
2. The Sabotaging ISR on PCT application # PCT/US2014/046619 – 9 Pages.
3. 7 threads of e-mail communications between Inventor and Defendant 4 – 21 Pages.
4. Prior art search results and opinion provided by Defendant 4 – 8 Pages.