

Leader®

P.O. Box 224
Lewis Center, OH 43035
USA

614 890.1986 VOICE
614 864.7922 FAX



Senator Dick Durbin D-IL, Chairman
United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary
711 Hart Senate Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dec. 22, 2021

Senator Chuck Grassley R-IA, Ranking Member . . . and Others¹
United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary
152 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mssrs. Chairman and Ranking Member:

Opposition to, complaint about, and request for an impartial investigation² of the nomination of Judge Leonard P. Stark to the Federal Circuit

On behalf of the hundreds of shareholders of Leader Technologies, Inc., Columbus, Ohio (“Leader”), we oppose the nomination of Judge Leonard P. Stark to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (“Federal Circuit”).

We experienced profound corruption from this judge who was evidently being directed by his British Pilgrims Society handlers who manage the “British Patent Pool” Crown monopoly just recently discovered and associated with Judge Stark’s hidden father, Walter Stark.

We demand an impartial investigation into the widespread conspiracies against Leader Technologies’ social networking invention by the courts, agencies and regulatory bodies with a stake in the *Leader v. Facebook* social networking patent infringement litigation.³ We demand that the investigators be arm’s length, non-lawyer Americans.

The indictable evidence we provide is incontrovertible. **If this Committee cannot find its moral backbone in this matter, then they never will on any subject related to protecting American inventors from these judicial predators.** In that case, we demand

¹ cc. to all other Judiciary Committee members, chief justice of the Supreme Court, chief judges of the 1-10th Federal Circuit Courts, U.S. Attorney General, Attorneys General of each U.S. State, presidents of each U.S. State bar association, Judicial Watch, Freedom Watch, American Center for Law and Justice, Gateway Pundit, ZeroHedge, Big League Politics, Revolver, Tucker Carlson, Joe Rogan, Alex Jones, Daily Caller, Leader Technologies shareholders and others.

² Impartial, arm’s length *We The People* citizens from Main Street with no direct financial stake in the patenting process, and specifically not Senior Executive Service employees and staff, lawyers, auditors, lobbyists, bankers, academics, NGOs, career bureaucrats, technologist who benefit from Judge Stark’s British Patent Pool Crown monopoly activities and associations.

³ [Petition for Writ of Certiorari](#) *Leader Technologies, Inc., v. Facebook, Inc.*, No 12-617 (US Nov., 16, 2012).

an independent tribunal of average Americans who are not lawyers, lobbyists or politicians. The future of inventor patent rights hangs in the balance.

In order to avoid even the appearance of impropriety, we demand that members of this Committee recuse themselves if they have relationships to the conspiring parties.

Since the Judiciary is fully compromised in this matter, under fraudulent concealment we therefore further demand that this committee take steps to prosecute and punish the perpetrators, and compensate Leader for the damages pursuant to the [First Amended Miller Act Notice](#) served on the Executive on Apr. 25, 2019.⁴

These facts show the profound obstruction of justice allowed by Judge Stark's court in *Leader v. Facebook*. The fact is, Judge Stark had no business touching *Leader v. Facebook*.

1. Judge Stark's failed to disclose the identity of his father, Walter Stark, who managed the "British Patent Pool," "Canadian Patent Pool" and "Australian Patent Pool" Crown monopoly on radio, television, telecommunications and Internet through Hazeltine Corporation

In his confirmation hearing, Judge Stark failed to disclose his deep family associations with the "British, Canadian and Australian Patent Pool" Crown monopolies. His father, Walter Stark, managed the British "Patent Pool" monopoly for Hazeltine Corporation and its successors and beneficiaries, including General Electric (GE), AT&T, Westinghouse, Western Electric, Marconi Wireless, United Fruit Company (C.I.A.), NBC, GEC-Marconi Space, British Aerospace (BAE), Radio Corporation of America (RCA), Emerson, SERCO, QinetiQ, Philips, Magnavox, Rank, Toshiba, Netflix and Apple.⁵ This conduct drips with judicial fraud against the court.




Figure 1: Walter Stark, father of Leonard P. Stark. Chief Counsel of Hazeltine Corporation and successors who are beneficiaries of the British Patent Pool Crown monopoly, including Leonard Stark (see severance package, SEC))

VI. Hazeltine filed numerous patent infringement suits against manufacturers who refused to sign its license agreement.

Figure 2: [S. Res. 48 on S. 789, S. 1809. S. 1899 Pt. 1. \(Jun. 1-3, 1965\)](#). Hearings, Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, 89th Congress, 1st Session. Parts 1-3. GPO, PDF p. 25. GPO.

⁴ [FIRST AMENDED MILLER ACT NOTICE. \(Apr. 25, 2019\)](#). Leader Technologies, Inc. to U.S. Executive Donald J. Trump pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3131 et seq.

⁵ Hazeltine Corporation was the exclusive licensee of "neutrodyne" radio technology to government, military and commerce as the radio, TV and telecommunications industries were developing worldwide. That exclusivity was granted to the British Crown's Patent Pool and was judged to be an anti-trust monopoly by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1965.

XI. Hazeltine's method of placing its patents in the foreign pools—the use of exclusive license agreements either directly with the Pool as in Canada or through a pool member, as in England, or through a subsidiary, as in Australia—is the traditional means employed in the formation of illegal cartels and it is no defense to say that the particular exclusive licenses to which Hazeltine was a party did not in and of themselves impose the illegal restriction. The character and effect of a conspiracy are not to be judged by dismembering it and viewing its separate parts but only by looking at it as a whole.

Figure 3: [S. Res. 48 on S. 789, S. 1809. S. 1899 Pt. 1. \(Jun. 1-3, 1965\)](#). Hearings, Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, 89th Congress, 1st Session. Parts 1-3. GPO, PDF p. 32. GPO.

Typed COPY: “Hazeltine's method of placing its patents in the foreign pools—the use of exclusive license agreements either directly with the Pool as in Canada or through a pool member, as in England, or through a subsidiary, as in Australia—is the traditional means employed in the formation of illegal cartels...”⁶

Remarkably, Judge Stark was and remains silent about his father's legal activities for Hazeltine and his British Crown connections surrounding the British Patent Pool monopoly with its legion of Rhodes Scholars to draw upon.

EVEN AN ETHICAL NOVICE CAN SEE THAT THIS IS A DISCLOSABLE, MATERIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST!

Stark's matriculation and unprecedented access to British leaders during his two years at Oxford University as a Rhodes Scholar, given his father's intimate association with British patent monopolies, and given the Rhodes Scholars' close association to the Pilgrims Society was a failure to disclose material background before allowing him to run patent litigation in Hazeltine's spheres of influence in communications, telecom and Internet.

2. Judge Stark failed to disclose Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's pre-trial contracts with Facebook's Dmitri Shevelenko for an “election winning template”

Judge Stark failed to disclose Hillary Clinton's pre-trial contracts with Facebook to build an “election winning template” starting on Sep. 26, 2009.⁷ Neither did Judge Stark disclose the

⁶ [S. Res. 48 on S. 789, S. 1809. S. 1899 Pt. 1. \(Jun. 1-3, 1965\)](#). Hearings, Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, 89th Congress, 1st Session. Parts 1-3. GPO.

⁷ [U.S. Dept. of State Contract. \(Sep. 26, 2009\)](#). U.S. Dept. of State Contract. (Sep. 26, 2009). Facebook pages to build an international community to discuss relevant issues of the day. Contact: Dmitry Shevelenko. Facebook Contract SAQMMA09M1870, *Judicial Watch v. U.S. Dept. of State*, Case No. F-2013-06356, Doc. No. C05516677, 04/03/2014. See also [U.S. Dept. of State Contract. \(Sep. 30, 2010\)](#). U.S. Dept. of State Contract. (Sep. 30, 2010). Facebook pages to build an international community to discuss relevant issues of the day. Contact: Dmitry Shevelenko. Facebook Contract SAQMMA09M1870, *Judicial Watch v. U.S. Dept. of State*, Case No. F-2013-06356, Doc. No. C05516676, 04/03/2014. See also [Dmitry Shevelenko biography](#). LinkedIn Profile, accessed Apr. 28, 2016.

obstruction of justice in *Leader v. Facebook* of his political mentors Barack Obama, Joe Biden, David Kappos and Eric Holder.

This conduct is evident obstruction of justice by a government official in an active litigation.

3. Judge Stark failed to disclose Hillary Clinton's pre-trial promotion of Facebook for "E-diplomacy"; Secretary Hillary Clinton promoted use of Facebook for "E-diplomacy" during pre-trial⁸

Judge Stark failed to disclose that his political mentor, Hillary Clinton, was engaging with Facebook during pre-trial to implement "E-diplomacy," even advertising special Facebook email addresses for U.S. Embassies worldwide.

On Mar. 21, 2009, & Apr. 06, 2009, Patent attorney Hillary Clinton promoted Facebook as her new "E-diplomacy" tools.

This conduct is evident obstruction of justice by a government official in an active litigation.

4. Judge Stark failed to disclose that USPTO Director David J. Kappos started a Facebook page during pre-trial, even while Facebook prosecuted patent reexamination against Leader during the litigation

On Apr. 01, 2010, the USPTO joined Facebook.⁹ On May 14, 2010 they made their first post.¹⁰ On May 20, 2010, Director David J. Kappos, former chief intellectual property counsel for IBM, issued a press release announcing his USPTO Facebook page.¹¹

David J. Kappos started his USPTO Facebook page during the pre-trial, even though Facebook had filed a patent reexamination at the USPTO during pre-trial.¹²

This conduct is evident obstruction of justice by a government official in an active litigation.

Judge Stark was silent about his father's influence over patenting and his biases toward companies associated with Facebook. He was also silent about the obstruction of justice in *Leader v. Facebook* of his political mentors including Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, Joe Biden, Eric J. Holder, Jr. and David J. Kappos.

5. Judge Stark failed to disclose his relationship with Barack Obama *vis a vis* Facebook bias. At the point that he was nominated by Barack Obama Stark should have immediately recused himself from *Leader v. Facebook*

⁸ <https://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/library/2009-03-21-Hillary-Clinton-AP-New-Media-US-Dept-of-State-v-Judicial-Watch-Case-No-F-2014-20439-Doc-No-C05760569-11-30-2015-Mar-21-2009.pdf>

⁹ [David J. Kappos. \(Apr. 01, 2010\)](#). United States Patent and Trademark Office joined Facebook, p. 66. USPTO.

¹⁰ [David J Kappos. \(Apr. 14, 2010\)](#). United States Patent and Trademark Office joined Facebook, p. 66. USPTO.

¹¹ Press Release. (May 20, 2010). USPTO Launches Page on Facebook. USPTO. See also [David J Kappos. \(May 20, 2010\)](#). United States Patent and Trademark Office joined Facebook, p. 65. USPTO.

¹² [Facebook. \(Filed Jul 02, 2009\)](#). Order Remanding Appeal to Examiner App No 90 010,591 US Pat No 7,139,765 *Leader Technologies*, Examiner Deandra M. Hughes. USPTO.

Judge Stark failed to disclose that in pre-trial Barack Obama had nominated him to be a Delaware District Court judge. Since Obama had an extensive Facebook presence,¹³ this means that Judge Stark himself was aiding in the obstruction of justice in *Leader v. Facebook* by pointing out that Obama's Facebook bias would certainly affect his objectivity.

Stark did not disclose this conflict of interest to us in our *Leader v. Facebook* patent infringement lawsuit. Dubiously, Judge Stark was shoehorned in two weeks before the trial where Leader proved that Facebook infringes its invention of social networking on 11 of 11 claims.

This conduct is evident obstruction of justice by a government official in an active litigation.

6. Judge Stark failed to speak up *sua sponte* when the "lost" Zuckerberg computers were "found" in another case, esp. considering that Stark was in charge of managing the discovery process in *Leader v. Facebook*. He had a duty to call out fraud on his court, whenever it is discovered. In this case however, he was perpetrating the fraud, so he would of course, be silent. The Federal Circuit Judges Moore, Lourie and Wallach certainly had a duty to call out Facebook's fraud on the court.

Leader appealed at least four times for relief in the Facebook stonewalling of providing the Zuckerberg computer devices that Facebook's first attorney, White & Case LLP, lied and said were "lost," only to be discovered in the Facebook forensic expert deposition of Bryan J. Rose in *Paul D. Ceglia v. Mark Elliot Zuckerberg*. Remarkably, Facebook's appeal attorney in *Leader v. Facebook* was Thomas G. Hungar, Gibson Dunn LLP,¹⁴

These depositions in 2012 prove that the 28 Zuckerberg computer devices were in the custody of Facebook attorney Gibson Dunn LLP during *Leader v. Facebook*, and were never "lost." In the appeal, Gibson Dunn did not disclose their fraud. Leader made four attempts with Stark to get access to them. Stark evidently was committed to the Facebook stonewall.¹⁵

[Bryan J. Rose. \(July 18, 2012\)](#). Deposition of Facebook forensic expert, *Paul D. Ceglia v. Mark Elliot Zuckerberg*, 1:10-cv-00569-RJA (W.D.N.Y. 2010).

[Michael F. McGowan. \(July 19, 2012\)](#). Deposition of Facebook forensic expert, *Paul D. Ceglia v. Mark Elliot Zuckerberg*, 1:10-cv-00569-RJA (W.D.N.Y. 2010). ("There were approximately -- approximately 28 devices belonging to Mr. Zuckerberg that were presented to us for examination." Tr. 61:15-18; "We were paid -- we conducted this work for Gibson, Dunn on behalf of Facebook, I believe it's Facebook that's paying our bills.")

¹³ [Barack Obama. \(Jan. 01, 2007\)](#). Facebook Pages, Profile aka Obama For American (OFA) to Nov. 01, 2013 (capture date) from Jan. 01, 2007.

¹⁴ [Lakshmi Arunachalam, Ph.D. \(Sep. 05, 2012\)](#). MOTION TO COMPEL EACH MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT TO DISCLOSE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST. Federal Circuit.

¹⁵ [Analyst. \(Apr. 1, 2015\)](#). CHRONOLOGY OF FACEBOOK STONEWALLING PERMITTED IN STARK'S COURT: Facebook told Leader Technologies that the Ceglia-requested 2003-2004 Zuckerberg evidence was "lost" / then instructed Zuckerberg not to answer questions about 2003-2004. Leader Technologies.

7. Hazeltine Corporation: The Center of the Stark Ethical Storm

Judge Stark is a beneficiary of Hazeltine. The Hazeltine Corporation encompasses major swaths of the American radio, television, telecommunications and social networking corporate infrastructures.

In his Senate confirmation disclosures, Judge Stark failed to disclose his father, Walter Stark, and Walter's biography. This non-disclosure was a material omission and a fraud on the American People.

Walter Stark was a principal executive in the British, Canadian and Australian "Patent Pool" Crown monopoly that was judged to be an anti-trust monopoly by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1965.

American Professor Hazeltine had exclusively licensed his critical "neutrodyne" noise reduction invention to a British Commonwealth (England, Canada, Australia) "Patent Pool" monopoly that forced American companies in radio, television, and Internet to license the entire "British Patent Pool," even if they only needed one of them. This subverted American sovereignty and restrained trade.

These British pool companies and their successors include, but are not limited to: General Electric (GE), AT&T, Westinghouse, Western Electric, Marconi Wireless, United Fruit Company (C.I.A.), NBC, GEC-Marconi Space, British Aerospace (BAE), Radio Corporation of America (RCA), Emerson, SERCO, QinetiQ, Philips, Magnavox, Rank, Toshiba, Netflix and Apple.

Some of these companies are 100% controlled by the British Crown through a "Golden Special Share." The barons, lords and knights who lead these companies swear their allegiances to the British Monarch, not to America.¹⁶

These British companies have been given unconscionable control of America's infrastructure via contracts facilitated by members of the Senior Executive Service (SES). The SES, or at least its paymasters in the Department of Justice ("DoJ"), claim independence from the Executive Branch, even though they are paid through the DoJ.

¹⁶ British Oath of Allegiance to the Monarch: These men have pledged oaths of allegiance to the Queen substantially in this form: "*I, NAME, do swear that I will be faithful and bear true Allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, Her Heirs and Successors, according to the Law. So help me GOD.*" Some British citizens consulted discount these awards by the Queen as somewhat meaningless, while others did not. The point to be made here is less about opinions on royal orders, and more about whether these men take seriously their oath to Queen and God. It is certain that British courts consider these oaths to be legally binding. Since these are binding legal oaths, it is certain that they run Serco, and its subsidiaries in America, with loyalty to the Queen over the U.S. Constitution. These oaths are similar in principle to swearing to tell the truth so help you God before testifying in court. See [Promissory Oaths Act 1868](#); [\(Jul. 31, 1868\)](#); 1868 c. 72 (Regnal. 31_and_32_Vict). Legislation.gov.uk.

8. British SERCO & QinetiQ: Controls major American infrastructure; relies on the British Patent Pool monopoly

For example, British SERCO via its wholly-owned U.S. subsidiary has contracts to manage 58 U.S. air traffic control towers, at least 11 contracts with the U.S. Army, Navy, SPAWAR, Intelligence, Air Force, Coast Guard, Marines, US Border Patrol as well as the Transportation and Commerce Departments, FEMA Regions 2 and 9,¹⁷ FCC, FTC, FAA,¹⁸ DOJ, DOS, DHS, ERO, ICE, GSA, USPTO,¹⁹ prisons, Obamacare,²⁰ Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp, U.S. military boot camps,²¹ Chicago, Colorado, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Georgia. Just recently, SERCO was awarded a critical contract to run the U.S. Navy's space wars satellite and space system in Diego Garcia in the middle of the Indian Ocean.²² Thus, SERCO and its controllers in the C.I.A. and MI6, along with Goldman Sachs, manage the *.io crypto coin domain.²³

Serco was founded in 1929 as RCA Services Limited, a UK division of the Radio Corporation of America and initially provided services to the cinema industry. Following the takeover of

¹⁷ [Serco, Inc. \(Awarded Dec. 20, 2017\)](#). \$610000000 PA-TAC FEMA Region 09, Fed. Proj. Sol. No. HSFE80-17-R-0004-DHS-FEMA. GovTribe. (FEMA Region is 150 Tribal Nations, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Guam, American Samoa, Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, Republic of Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia).; [Alan Hill, press officer. \(Jan. 02, 2018\)](#). Serco Awarded \$600 Million Single Award ID IQ INDEF DUR INDEF QTY Contract to Support FEMA Region 02 Disaster Recovery [Press release], Serco. (FEMA Region 02 is Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, North and South Dakota, and Montana).

¹⁸ [Serco . \(accessed May 17, 2018\)](#). Transportation Market, p. 4. Segment Serco Inc. Online. ("We operate 63 Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Visual Flight Rules Air Traffic Control Towers in the United States.").

¹⁹ BRITISH SERCO CONTROLS THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE; SERCO, INC (USA). is a wholly-owned subsidiary of SERCO GROUP PLC (UK) controlled by the British Crown: [Press Release. \(May 17, 2006\)](#). Serco Awarded Milestone Contract with the Commonwealth of Virginia. Serco.; [Press Release. \(Nov. 30, 2015\)](#). Serco Awarded \$95 Million Patent Classification Contract with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Serco.; [Press Release. \(Mar. 19, 2013\)](#). Serco Processes 2 Millionth Patent Application for US Patent and Trademark Office [Press release]. Serco.; [Alan Hill, press officer. \(Nov. 15, 2018\)](#). Serco Processes 4 Millionth Patent Application for U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Serco.

²⁰ [Sarah Kliff. \(Jul. 16, 2013\)](#). Meet Serco, the private firm getting \$1.2 billion to process your Obamacare application. The Washington Post.

²¹ <https://www.fbcovr.com/docs/library/2018-04-11-Serco-Inc-Plc-Contracts-GSA-Apr-11-2018.pdf>

²² [Press Release. \(Apr. 06, 2020\)](#). Serco Awarded New \$57 Million U.S. Space Force Contract to Support Deep Space Surveillance System. SERCO.

²³ SERCO was founded by Sir Geoffrey E. Pattie, member of the British Pilgrims Society and Privy Council.; [Serco, Inc. \(May 05, 2018\)](#). Federal Contracts Overview. USA Spending.; [GSA. \(May 01, 2018\)](#). SERCO All Federal Agency Prime Contracts between Sep. 30, 2005 to May 01, 2018, *.csv. USA Spending. Check Downloads folder.; [SERCO GROUP PLC, Duns No. 928859149 \(accessed Feb. 14 2020\)](#). ALL CONTRACTS, 1681 pgs. FPDS.; [Serco Group Plc SUBSIDIARIES. \(2016\)](#). Annual Report and Accounts 2016. Reg. No. 02048608. Serco.; SERCO has received over \$9.5 billion U.S. federal contracts. [PDF](#) | [Excel](#)-downloads directly to your Downloads folder)

RCA by General Electric in late 1985, RCA Services Limited was bought out by its local management. It changed its name to Serco in 1987 and has been a London Stock Exchange listed company since 1988. These associations prove that Walter Stark's Hazeltine Corporation was an integral part of the British Patent Pool monopoly with SERCO and its predecessors.

Lockheed Martin officers James B. Comey²⁴ and S. Bradford "Brad" Antle²⁵ very evidently orchestrated the creation of SI International, Inc. in 1998 to acquire top secret U.S. military contracts that were then sold in 2008 to Serco (UK) who was a partner with Lockheed in AWE Management Limited (Atomic Weapons Establishment)(UK)²⁶ along with British Nuclear Fuels Limited in which the British Crown has a "Golden Share" and 100% control.²⁷ This makes all of Lockheed's and Serco's U.S. contracts in an absolute conflict of interest for both British and U.S. interests. In short, both the American and British peoples have been sold out to these globalist transnationalist corporatist entities.

Sir Roy A. Gardner, Knight Commander of the British Empire, is SERCO chairman. Rupert C. Soames, OBE (Order of the British Empire) is SERCO CEO. Both men swear an Oath of Allegiance to the Monarch, not the American Republic.²⁸

This nondisclosure by Stark of his father Walter's intimate relationships to Crown corporations is evident obstruction of justice by a government official in an active litigation.

British QinetiQ was funded in 2002 by the Carlyle Group in London for the British Monarch who holds a "special preferred share" giving the monarch 100% voting control of the company.²⁹ QinetiQ's directors have included Sir Jonathan Richard Symonds;³⁰ C.I.A.

²⁴ [JAMES B. COMEY. \(Sep. 15, 2012\)](#). Testimony, Senate Judiciary Committee, 113th Congress. U.S. Senate.

²⁵ S. Bradford "Brad" Antle founded SI International, Inc. in 1998 to acquire top secret U.S. military contracts that were then sold in 2008 to SERCO. See Philip Waller. (Aug. 27, 2008). UPDATE 2-Serco H1 profit up 21 pct, buys SI International. Reuters. See also

²⁶ [AWE MANAGEMENT LTD. \(Dec. 13, 1999\)](#). Ownership Return of Allotment re. Lockheed, Serco and British Nuclear Fuels. Reg. No. 36645711, p. 2. Companies House.

²⁷ [Philip Waller. \(Aug. 27, 2008\)](#). Serco H1 profit up 21 pct, buys SI International. Reuters. See also [Ashlea Higgs. \(Aug. 27, 2008\)](#). British buying spree, Serco buys SI International for \$423 million.

²⁸ See [Promissory Oaths Act 1868. \(Jul. 31, 1868\)](#). 1868 c. 72 (Regnal. 31_and_32_Vict). Legislation.gov.uk.

²⁹ [QINETIQ INC., QINETIQ GROUP PLC. \(accessed Feb. 14, 2020\)](#). ALL CONTRACTS incl. subsidiaries, Vendor DUNS 037967101, Global DUNS 733131788FPDS, CSV database dump, 1723 pgs. FPDS.; QinetiQ has received over \$8.5 billion U.S. federal contracts. ([PDF](#) | [Excel](#)-downloads directly to your Downloads folder).

³⁰ [SIR JONATHAN RICHARD SYMONDS.\(Feb. 02, 2003\)](#). Appointment of director, director of ASTRAZENECA PLC, ASTRAZENECA UK LIMITED, ASTRAZENECA TREASURY LIMITED, ASTRAZENECA LIMITED, QinetiQ Holdings Limited, Co. No. 4586941, Form 288a. Companies House (UK).

director George Tenet;³¹ Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Edmund P. Giambastini Jr.³² and Glenn A. Youngkin (now Virginia governor).³³

9. Evidence:

Federal Circuit was formed to strengthen the British Patent Pool monopoly

In 1982, the Federal Circuit became a “choke point” for all patent appeals. Instead of patent appeals being handled by the various Circuits in a more pluralistic way, patent appeals were funneled into a single, monolithic, banker-lawyer court with no accountability to *We The People*. The patent lawfare “patent pool” wagons were circled around the Federal Circuit. It is evident that the nomination of Leonard P. Stark is intended to further consolidate this patent appeal power controlled by the British Monarch’s Court, where rulings against “subjects” cannot be challenged e.g., the persecution of Julian Assange.

10. Unresolved Justice:

Federal Circuit corruption in *Leader v. Facebook*

Judges who are Facebook beneficiaries could not run an unbiased court

The three-judge Federal Circuit panel in the *Leader v. Facebook* appeal comprised:

- a. Kimberly A. Moore (now chief judge),
- b. Alan D. Lourie and
- c. Evan J. Wallach.

Chief Judge Randall R. Rader assigned these judges. All three of these judges held substantial Facebook financial interests. They were notified of their conflicts during the *Leader v. Facebook* appeal. However, they failed to recuse themselves and reverse the judgment against Leader.³⁴ The evidence is overwhelming. The *Leader v. Facebook* judges

³¹ [GEORGE TENET. \(Oct. 24, 2006\)](#). Appointment of director, director of the C.I.A. (1996-2004), QinetiQ Group Plc Co. No. 4586941, Form 288a. Companies House (UK).

³² [EDMUND P. GIAMBASTINI JR. \(Feb. 08, 2008\)](#). Appointment of director, vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (2005-2007), QinetiQ Group Plc Co. No. 4586941, Form 288a. Companies House (UK).

³³ [GLENN A. YOUNGKIN \(now Virginia governor\). \(Feb. 28, 2003\)](#). Resolutions, American who was secretary and director who set up QinetiQ with British Monarch's Special Share (100% control.), QinetiQ Group Plc, Co. No. 4586941. Companies House (UK).

³⁴ Judge Moore held up to \$1 million each in Vanguard and Fidelity. Judge Wallach held up to \$450,000 in Fidelity and an IRA in General Electric—one of the Walter Stark British Patent Pool beneficiaries. Judge Lourie held up to \$14 million in Vanguard and T. Rowe Price. Young Judge Stark held up to \$260,000 in Fidelity. Fidelity made its first investment in Facebook on Jun 1, 2011—during the appeal—and invested \$818 million in the Facebook initial public offering (IPO)—the largest mutual fund investor. Vanguard, Fidelity and T. Rowe Price are among the largest owners of Facebook today. Their original investments in Facebook occurred during *Leader v. Facebook* pendency.

Chief Justice Roberts, who declined Leader’s Petition for Writ of Certiorari, held up to \$350,000 in Blackrock, \$1.75 million in Fidelity, \$250,000 in Microsoft, \$45,000 in T. Rowe Price, \$500,000 in Vanguard. British Patent Pool beneficiary Barclays holds a near-20% stake in Blackrock. Vanguard holds 7% of Blackrock’s stock and 7.3% of IBM (IBM Eclipse Foundation that distributed as “open source” Leader’s valuable inventions, facilitated by Magistrate Stark).

were “all in” beneficiaries in Facebook. For example, Kimberly A. Moore was specifically called out in this pleading, but the court waived it away.³⁵

Federal Circuit Chief Judge Randall R. Rader was subsequently forced to resign in a “your friend for life. rrr” scandal.³⁶ He was caught conspiring behind the scenes with Silicon Valley attorney Edward Reines, Weil Gotschal LLP, who made an appearance in *Leader v. Facebook*. Rader was forced to resign over this corruption, but the court’s denial of Leader’s appeal was not set aside.³⁷

11. American-British “special relationship: Rooted in the British Patent Pool Crown monopoly

Remarkably, on Apr. 08, 2010, just three months before our trial, the top secret 64-year old “special relationship” Mar. 05, 1946 intelligence-sharing agreement between Britain and America was released simultaneously in London and Washington, D.C.³⁸

In classically deceptive tyrant language, this “special relationship” agreement had been hidden from the whole world for 64 years:

“It will be contrary to this agreement to reveal its existence to any third party whatever.”

Judges Stark, Moore, Lourie, Wallach and Roberts need to disclose what they were told about that agreement vis a vis *Leader v. Facebook*, and Hillary Clinton’s secret contracts with Facebook and intention to use Facebook for propaganda, and with regard to ethics disclosure information.

12. Stark’s Rhodes Scholarship: British Pilgrims Society Grooming

Judge Stark “as a Rhodes Scholar He studied at Oxford University [1991-1993]. He has authored numerous academic and scholar publications including a book on British politics which he wrote in his spare time in between classes at Oxford.” (U.S. Senate, 2010).³⁹

³⁵ [Lakshmi Arunachalam. \(Jul. 27, 2021\)](#). Renewed Motion for Leave to File Amicus Curiae re. Judge Kimberly A Moore’s financial conflicts of interest re. Facebook, starts at p. 22. Federal Circuit.

³⁶ [Ashby Jones. \(Jun. 13, 2014\)](#). Judge [Randall R.] Rader, Author of Controversial Email to Lawyer [Edward Reines, Weil Gotschal], to Resign from Bench. Law Blog.

³⁷ [Lakshmi Arunachalam PhD. \(Sep. 17, 2012\)](#). Response to Request Of Fed. Cir. Bar Assoc. Request For Reissue re. Leader v. Facebook No. 2011-1366 Fed. Cir., including entry of Edward R. Reines, Weil Gotschal & Manges LLP, pp. 29-30. Federal Circuit.

³⁸ [TOP SECRET \(Mar. 05, 1946\)](#). BRITISH-U.S. COMMUNICATION INTELLIGENCE AGREEMENT, NSA DocID 3678942, Ser. XILH, Box 47, TSC release approved Apr. 08, 2010, Executive Order 12958 et seq. NSA.

³⁹ [S. Hrg. 111-695, Prt. 6. \(Apr. 22, 2010\)](#). Leonard P. Stark Senate Confirmation Hearing, PDF p. 38. CHR-111shrg66693. See also [Leonard P. Stark. \(Jun. 01, 1966\)](#). Choosing a Leader: Party Leadership Contests in Britain from Macmillan to Blair, accessed Dec. 06, 2021. Amazon.

It is a notorious fact of history that the Rhodes Scholarship was established and managed by the various Lords Rothschild to recruit new blood to the British Pilgrims Society 200-year Rhodes plan for a new world order modelled on an Imperial corporatist model that relies on endless funds from the Bank of England and bottomless legal protection from the Monarch's court, whose business cannot be questioned.

Rhodes Scholar student Stark was given almost unprecedented access to British politicians, ladies and lords in his research during his two-years matriculation. With this new revelation of his father, Walter Stark, it is inconceivable to a reasonable person that Leonard Stark was not being groomed by the Pilgrims Society leader MP Sir Geoffrey A. Pattie and his father's associates in the British Patent Pool monopoly.

While Stark studied at Oxford, Privy Councilor Pattie⁴⁰ was Chairman of Marconi Electronic Systems Ltd.—one of the beneficiaries of the British Patent Pool monopoly that his father, Walter, was managing in the U.S.

Pattie was also the founder of SERCO that emerged out of RCA Limited beginning on Aug. 21, 1986.⁴¹ In 1984 he was the minister in charge of the “privatization” of British Telcom, the state telecommunications monopoly.⁴² As Minister of State for Industry, Defence [sic] and Information he managed the Queens's Golden Share controls over all major strategic industries between 1979-87.

In 1994, Pattie also became Chairman of the Intellectual Property Institute (IPI) in London.⁴³ IPI engaged British lords and sirs along with selected private corporations, including members of the British Patent Pool monopoly like GEC plc, Thorn EMI plc, as well as COVID toxin manufacturers Zeneca Group plc, Wellcome Foundation and Glaxo Holdings plc, as well as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).

Trump-Russia Hoax perpetrated by Pilgrims Society British Patent Pool principals

In 2005, Pattie founded Strategic Communications Laboratories Limited (SCL Group Limited) and subsidiary Cambridge Analytica that became a prime contributor to the Trump-Russia hoax in conspiracy with former MI-6 chief Sir Richard Dearlove and Robert Hannagan, chief of GCHQ (British controller of the NSA) who is notoriously known for installing surveillance at Trump Tower to collect dirt.

⁴⁰ [Sir Geoffrey E Pattie](#). Biography and Timeline.

⁴¹ Pattie juggled interlocked companies named SERC-Alvey, Dealmove, Serco Group Plc, Serco Limited, General Electric, BAE and R.C.A. Limited, among others.

⁴² [John Lamb. \(Jul. 04, 1986\)](#). Cuts at SERC halt Alvey research [research was transferred to SERCO for General Electric, ICL, STC, Ferranti, Racal, British Telecom and Plessey]. New Scientist.; See also [Serco Group Plc Co. No. 02048608. \(Aug. 21, 1986\)](#). Formation name was Dealmove Limited, Certificate of Incorporation and other records. Companies House (UK); [RCA Limited. \(Jul. 29, 1987\)](#). Change of Name to Serco Limited Co. No. 00242246. Companies House(UK); [Serco Group plc Co No 02048608. \(Mar 15 1988\)](#). Full Group Accounts (bought RCA Limited from General Electric (GE) Corporation of the United States. Companies House (UK).

⁴³ [Geoffrey E. Pattie. \(Jan. 01, 1995\)](#). The Intellectual Property Institute Co. No. 01557489 - A selection of documents registered before 1 January 1995, Sir Geoffrey E. Pattie, Chairman. Companies House (UK).

Remarkably, just 12 days after Professor James P. Chandler, III participated in an important Leader Technologies product design meeting, Sir Geoffrey was given a dubious ISSA award in Washington, D.C. on Jun. 20, 2000, along with his fellow Pilgrims Society members Caspar Weinberger, and Gen. Alexander Haig.⁴⁴ See Figure 4 following.



Figure 4: THE SCENE OF THE CRIME: Jun. 08, 2000 Leader Technologies invention design storyboard session attended by Leader intellectual property legal counsel, Professor James P. Chandler, seated, right rear, white shirt, nearest to yellow wall. Standing in back of photo, left to right, Jeffrey R. Lamb, and Michael T. McKibben, Leader Technologies' co-inventors. Chandler was a former chief advisor to the Federal Circuit in the early 1990's just as Bill & Hillary Clinton were being enthroned.

Leader Technologies had a solemn right to investigate Judge Stark's background for conflicts of interest before accepting him as a judge in *Leader v. Facebook*. His silence evidently biased the litigation against Leader. In fact, all the judges were deafeningly silent about their Facebook conflicts of interest.

⁴⁴ [Sir Geoffrey Edwin Pattie. \(Jun. 20, 2000\)](#). Silver Star Award The ISSA Awards, International Strategic Studies Association, ISSA, Wayback Machine, posted Aug. 18, 2000, event on Jun. 20, 2000.

This anti-American dynamic among Stark, Federal Circuit, Supreme Court and U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) is on full display in the *Leader v. Facebook* corruption.

The USPTO is now fully controlled by the British Crown Companies SERCO and QinetiQ. It appears that our law makers are unaware that the Department of Commerce ceded control of the patent application process to the British since 2006.⁴⁵

In order for the patent system to operate properly in our Republic, the courts must have non-lawyer judges who apply the law and precedents fairly and impartially. We must have judges who are loyal to the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights and not those of their imperial British “Inner Temple” handlers who have sworn allegiance to the British monarchy.

13. Stark: Obama appointee

Judge Stark was assigned by 23-year veteran Judge Joseph J. Farnan to handle pre-trial discovery issues as a magistrate in the *Leader v. Facebook* case. Notably, on October 15, 2010—10 weeks after the *Leader v. Facebook* trial—Stark was summarily elevated to Delaware district court judge.⁴⁶

Quid pro quo corruption oozes from every pore of these events.

In *Leader v. Facebook* (split jury verdict on Jul. 19-27, 2010), we proved to a jury on 11 of 11 claims that Facebook is infringing our patents for the framework and apps of social networking.⁴⁷

Those claims were the meat of the trial in a battle of technical experts:

For Leader: Paul J. Andre, King & Spaulding, Carnegie Mellon and UC Berkeley.

For Facebook: Michael G. Rhodes, Cooley Godward, White & Case, UCalgary and UPenn.

Despite Leader unequivocally proving Facebook’s infringement, **Magistrate Stark circled the wagons and protected Facebook anyway.**

14. Stark’s failed jury instructions: No well-settled *Pfaff* and *Group One* jury instructions for evaluating on-sale bar

⁴⁵ See [Press Release. \(May 18, 2006\)](#). Serco Awarded Milestone Contract with the Commonwealth of Virginia.; [Press Release. \(Mar. 19, 2013\)](#). Serco Processes 2 Millionth Patent Application for U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Serco.; *See also*: [Press Release. \(Nov. 30, 2015\)](#). Serco Awarded \$95 Million Patent Classification Contract with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.; [Press Release. \(Nov. 15, 2018\)](#). Serco Processes 4 Millionth Patent Application for U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Serco.

⁴⁶ [Sean O’Sullivan. \(Oct. 16, 2010\)](#). Delaware's latest federal judge Leonard Stark gets warm welcome. *The News Journal*.

⁴⁷ [Petition for Writ of Certiorari, *Leader Technologies, Inc. v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. 12-617 \(U.S. Nov. 16, 2012\)](#).

Two weeks before trial, Stark allowed Facebook to change its claim from “noninfringement” (that Leader had invented nothing and was a greedy gold digger fleecing an innocent corporation) to “on-sale bar” (that Leader’s invention is novel and nonobvious, but they tried to sell it too soon). Given the central role of Facebook in global censorship and surveillance, Facebook was crying crocodile tears.

Primarily, “on-sale bar” was developed to stop pharmaceutical companies from extending the life of a patent by selling the invention *before* filing a patent, thus extending the life of the profit making. “On-sale bar” is a silly notion in the software business given the pace of innovation. Nonetheless, the U.S. Supreme Court and Federal Circuit have well-settled evidence tests in *Pfaff*⁴⁸ and *Group One*⁴⁹ to prove or disprove on-sale bar.

However, **Stark failed to instruct the jury on the *Pfaff* and *Group One* evidence tests.** To our knowledge this was the only time in the history of these precedents that these well-tested evidence tests for on-sale bar were ignored by a federal judge.

At minimum, Judge Stark breached the Rules of Professional Conduct and the Code of Conduct for United States Judges in his deficient *Leader v. Facebook* jury instruction.

15. No conflicts-of-interest and beneficiary disclosures of his father, Walter Stark, and

16. Walter Stark’s interlocking associations among Hazeltine Corporation, RCA, SERCO, General Electric, GEC-Marconi, NBC, British Aerospace (BAE), Westinghouse, Western Electric and the British Patent Pool Crown anti-trust monopoly

Magistrate Stark had a legion of conflicts of interest in *Leader v. Facebook* that should have precluded any involvement by him in the litigation. Instead, he was silent.

Magistrate Stark is a two-year British Rhodes Scholar (1991-93) whose thesis was on British politics.⁵⁰ The Rhodes Scholarship is notoriously known to be an intelligence grooming and recruiting ground for the British government controlled by the Pilgrims Society which controls the Crown and Privy Council.

Then-magistrate Stark failed to disclose in his 2010 Senate confirmation the identity of his father, Walter Stark, and likely grandfather, Kimball Houton “Henry” Stark.

Walter’s employer, Hazeltine Corporation was called out by Congress in 1935 for the monopolistic licensing practices in conspiracy with British RCA.⁵¹ By 1965, Hazeltine was

⁴⁸ *Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, Inc.*, 525 U.S. 55 (1998).

⁴⁹ *Group One, Ltd. v. Hallmark Cards, Inc.*, 254 F.3d 1041 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

⁵⁰ "Do rules matter? : leadership selection in British parties, 1963-93" by American Rhodes Scholar Leonard P. Stark (1991-93) is available at Oxford University, Bodleian Library, per Dr Richard Allen FRHistS, Archivist, Magdalen College. Efforts to obtain a copy of the Stark thesis were referred to the "Rare Books" section. The library requires permission from the former student (Leonard P. Stark) before a digital copy can be obtained.

⁵¹ [H.R. 4523, Part III. \(Beginning Feb. 11, 1935\)](#). Pooling of Patents. Committee on Patents, Feb. 11, 14, 20, 25, 28; Mar. 7; Oct. 15-18; Dec. 2-6, 9, 10, 12, 1935. 74th U.S. Congress.

convicted of violating the Sherman and Clayton Acts for monopolistic practice in conspiracy with a British Patent Pool consisting of English, Canadian and Australian segments.⁵²

Walter Stark was a long-time senior vice-president, director and chief counsel for Hazeltine Corporation, a defense electronics company that is now part of British Aerospace (BAE Systems Inc.) according to U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission records.ⁱ

In 1965, Hazeltine Corporation was convicted of anti-trust violations under the Sherman and Clayton Acts for aligning with the "British Patent Pool" that created a global monopoly on all communications including telephone, radio and TV.

Hazeltine had exclusively licensed its "neutrodyne" squeal and squawk neutralization technology to the British Patent Pool, forcing all American radio, TV and telecom companies to license from the British Pilgrims Society's monopoly over world communications.

The British Patent Pool includes Marconi Wireless, Marconi Space, British Aerospace (BAE Systems), RCA Limited, GEC, AT&T, Western Electric, BBC, British Telecom, British Admiralty, United Fruit Company and Westinghouse, among others.

After their 1965 conviction, Hazeltine's licenses were buried inside other British Patent Pool members like RCA, Emerson Electronic, BAE Systems. This British monopoly over American radio, TV and telecom companies continues to this day.

In 1989, Walter followed the sale of Hazeltine Corporation to Emerson Electric.⁵³

In 1990, Walter was VP of legal administration, government and defense group, Emerson Electric named ESCO Electric Co. "ESCO (10-K 1999) was incorporated in Missouri in August 1990 as a wholly-owned subsidiary of Emerson Electric Co. ("Emerson") to be the indirect holding company for Electronics & Space Corp. ("E&S"), Hazeltine Corporation, Southwest Mobile Systems Corporation ("Southwest"), Rantec, VACCO and DCSI, which were then Emerson subsidiaries."⁵⁴

From Oct. 1990 to Oct. 1992, Walter Stark was secretary, vice president and general counsel.⁵⁵ From 1992 to 2000 he was senior vice president as well as secretary and general counsel of ESCO Electronics Corp.⁵⁶

⁵² [S. Res. 48 on S. 789, S. 1809, S. 1899 Pt. 1. \(Jun. 1-3, 1965\)](#). Hearings, Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, 89th Congress, 1st Session. Parts 1-3. GPO.

⁵³ [Walter Henry Stark, \(b. Nov. 24, 1943, m. Jun. 25, 1966, d. Oct. 6, 2003\)](#). (Oct. 09, 2003). Obituary, refs. wife Linda Gay Lewis, son Leonard P. Stark, p. C7. St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

⁵⁴ [Walter Stark, Sr. VP, Sec., Gen. Counsel. \(Sep. 30, 1999\)](#). Form 10-K, ESCO Electronics Corporation, pp. 52, 93, 99. SEC Edgar.

⁵⁵ [Walter Stark, Sr. VP, Sec., Gen. Counsel. \(Sep. 30, 1996\)](#). Form 10-K, ESCO Electronics Corporation, pp. 16, 17. SEC Edgar.

⁵⁶ [Walter Stark, Sr. VP, Sec., Gen. Counsel. \(Sep. 30, 1996\)](#). Form 10-K, ESCO Electronics Corporation, pp. 16, 17. SEC Edgar.

On Jul. 22, 1996, ESCO sold 100% of the capital stock of Hazeltine to GEC-Marconi Electronic Systems Corporation ("GEC-Marconi") when Stark was general counsel, vice president and secretary.⁵⁷

In other words, Walter Stark as well as Walter's possible father, Kimball Houton "Henry" Stark, were in bed with the British Pilgrims Society Patent Pool Crown monopoly through most of their careers.

Walter Stark's 1999 separation agreement with Emerson Electric who had purchased Hazeltine Corporation accrued to the benefit of Walters' children, including son Leonard P. Stark, according to U.S. Securities and Exchange records.⁵⁸ This means that Leonard P. Stark continues to be a beneficiary in the entire telecommunications, radio and TV network today. Walter Stark died on Oct. 06, 2003 at age 58.⁵⁹

Leader Technologies' invention of social network operates on the Internet. The Internet uses telecom, radio and TV systems for its backbone.

Therefore, Leonard P. Stark's substantial business interests in telecommunications and radio as a family beneficiary dictated that he disclose his relationships and recuse himself from any litigation involving the companies to which he and his father were beneficiaries.

Stark was deafeningly silent.

Stark's silence means that the Supreme Court should act *sua sponte* and unwind Stark's rulings that were adverse to Leader Technologies. Fraud vitiates judgments, as is well known.

Leader Technologies, Inc. should be protected by this Committee from such judicial criminality as Stark's. The courts must act *sua sponte* (on their own authority) to protect Leader from Stark's judicial tyranny.

His conspiracy with the treasonous British Patent Pool monopoly must be brought to justice. This will unwind his criminality in *Leader v. Facebook* and most if not all of his other judgments in patents since 2000, which he just testified is about 2,400 cases. A fraudster judge cannot be allowed to be on the bench, must less elevated to the Federal Circuit.

See **Exhibit A** for additional detail on Judge Stark's criminal misconduct.

EXHIBIT A

Additional detail on the criminal misconduct of Judge Leonard P. Stark in *Leader v. Facebook*.

⁵⁷ [Walter Stark, Sr. VP, Sec., Gen. Counsel. \(Sep. 30, 1996\)](#). Form 10-K, ESCO Electronics Corporation, p. 16. SEC Edgar.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ [Walter Henry Stark, \(b. Nov. 24, 1943, m. Jun. 25, 1966, d. Oct. 6, 2003\). \(Oct. 09, 2003\)](#). Obituary, refs. wife Linda Gay Lewis, son Leonard P. Stark, p. C7. St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

More on Judge Stark's many frauds, deceptions, withholdings and conspiracies in *Leader v. Facebook*:

1. **During *Leader v. Facebook* trial preparation** between Nov. 2008 to Jul. 2010, **Magistrate Stark failed to stop multiple obstructions of justice** by him and his political handlers. Judges do not have to wait for litigation to act "*sua sponte*" (on the judge's own authority, without prompting) when the public interests are being threatened by publicly evident violations of the law.
2. **Magistrate Stark was silent** about the takeover of the U.S. Patent Office by British SERCO in 2006.⁶⁰ He did not warn Leader about the threat of that bias on his court in *Leader v. Facebook*. Stark was a British Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University (1991-93) and wrote his thesis on "Do rules matter? : leadership selection in British parties, 1963-93".⁶¹ SERCO is controlled by the British Pilgrims Society inside the British Monarchy that controls SERCO through a 100% controlling royal "Special Share" associated with SERCO's 1/3rd ownership of British Nuclear Fuels Plc with Lockheed Martin and the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE).⁶²

These interlocking relationships weld SERCO (and therefore the U.S. Patent Office) to the British Monarchy.

British Pilgrims are notoriously known to have been trustees of the Rhodes Scholarships from inception,⁶³ for which Stark was a beneficiary. These first

⁶⁰ See [Press Release. \(May 18, 2006\)](#). Serco Awarded Milestone Contract with the Commonwealth of Virginia.; [Press Release. \(Mar. 19, 2013\)](#). Serco Processes 2 Millionth Patent Application for U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Serco.; *See also*: [Press Release. \(Nov. 30, 2015\)](#). Serco Awarded \$95 Million Patent Classification Contract with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.; [Press Release. \(Nov. 15, 2018\)](#). Serco Processes 4 Millionth Patent Application for U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Serco.

⁶¹ "Do rules matter? : leadership selection in British parties, 1963-93" by American Rhodes Scholar Leonard P. Stark (1991-93) is available at Oxford University, Bodleian Library, per Dr Richard Allen FRHistS, Archivist, Magdalen College. Efforts to obtain a copy of the Stark thesis were referred to the "Rare Books" section. The library requires permission from the former student (Leonard P. Stark) before a digital copy will be obtained. The requester is required to explain the purpose in requesting the thesis. The email address for the request is oxford.theses@bodleian.ox.ac.uk Request: "Do rules matter? : leadership selection in British parties, 1963-93" by American Rhodes Scholar Leonard P. Stark (1991-93).

⁶² Queen's Golden Control Share. See [AFI. \(Apr. 20, 2018\)](#). The shadow government uses SES, Serco and OPIC as portals into horrific corruption. AFI.

⁶³ [Thomas H. Hardman, ed. pub. \(Jun. 05-26, 1909\)](#). A PARLIAMENT OF THE PRESS - THE FIRST IMPERIAL PRESS CONFERENCE, 1909, Illustrated, with Preface by The Earl of Rosebery, K.G. London: Horace Marshall & Son. Lord Curzon, Oxford Chancellor, co-founder of the British Pilgrims Society, Imperial War Cabinet (1917), speaking at All Souls Library, Oxford ([pp. 78-80](#)): "The academic sanctuary of British law... organized by Harry Brittain, the founder of the Pilgrims Society . . ." "Under the munificent bequest of the late Cecil Rhodes – (cheers) – . . . some 2,000 of them [Rhodes Scholars] scattered throughout the English-speaking world, the overseas Dominions and America as well . . . They will be the creators of public opinion in the Empire and the real Empire-builders of the future."; See also [Rhodes Trust Bill](#). (House of Lords Bill).; [Rhodes Estate Bill](#). (House of Lords Bill).

Pilgrims Society Rhodes trustees included Lord Milner, Lord Rosebery (former prime minister and N.M. Rothschild & Sons heir), Lord Grey and Alfred Beit.

This relationship biased Stark against Leader since Pilgrims Society bankers were underwriters of Facebook, including UBS, JP Morgan Chase (IPO underwriter), Fidelity (Stark held nine investments in 2009, see below), Ballie Gifford, and HSBC.

3. **Magistrate Stark failed to disclose** QinetiQ Holdings Limited, UK Company No. 4586941, another Monarch-controlled “special share” company, like SERCO, run by British Pilgrims Society members, including future Virginia Governor Glenn A. Youngkin, that was given the contract to provide information technologies services to the US Patent Office.⁶⁴ This contract is an evident compromise of American sovereignty over the inventions of its citizens. Stark did not warn Leader that the Patent Office was compromised by British QinetiQ and SERCO, given that he was aware of Facebook’s patent reexaminations during the trial that were being controlled by his British handlers.

4. **Magistrate Stark was silent** about his relationships within the British Pilgrims Society founded in 1902, including its “New York branch,”⁶⁵ by the most powerful bankers, journalists, attorneys, educators and industrialists in the British Empire, Privy Council, Bank of England and their Wall Street “branch.” Stark is a British Rhodes Scholar—which is a notoriously-known recruiting and training ground for the Pilgrims Society in its objective to promote the political, economic, banking, healthcare, propaganda and war-making interests of the British Crown, exclusively. Notably, his Oxford doctoral thesis was on “British Politics.” Notably, Stark disclosed letters to the editor, but FAILED TO DISCLOSE HIS OXFORD UNIVERSITY THESIS (see above) during his confirmation.⁶⁶

5. **Magistrate Stark was silent** when IBM’s chief counsel David J. Kappos was nominated on Jun. 18, 2009 by Obama to run the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and the risk that posed to the trial, given the Patent Office’s control by his British handlers. On Aug. 07, 2009,⁶⁷ two months later, Kappos was appointed in a rare recess appointment—without full Senate vote. Stark knew that a potential witness in the case, Professor James P. Chandler, III, was Leader’s patent attorney, and Chandler was also IBM’s chief outside intellectual property counsel. During the trial

⁶⁴ [QinetiQ Inc., QinetiQ Group PLC. \(Compiled Feb. 14, 2020\)](#). All Contracts with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. GSA Contract Nos. 000PA199803C43PAPT802587GS35F5518H, DOC40PAPT0402345, DOC43PAPT0406109, 600198507B0440850206, N0001478C0859, N0001483C0324, N0001484C0022, N0001484C0119, N0001484C0211, N0016783D0031, Vendor DUNS 037967101, Global DUNS 733131788FPDS. FPDS. See also [GSA summary](#).

⁶⁵ [Anne Pimlott Baker. \(2003\)](#). *The Pilgrims of the United States: A Centennial History*, ISBN 1-86197-726-3. London: Profile Books.

⁶⁶ [Leonard P. Stark \(April 22, 2010\)](#). Published Writings and Public Statements, S. Hrg. 111-695, Part 6, Questionnaire for Judicial Nominees. Senate Confirmation Hearing. U.S. Senate.

⁶⁷ [Merritt, R. \(Aug. 07, 2009\)](#). Senate confirms ex-IBMer David J. Kappos to head patent office. *EE Times*.; See also [David J. Kappos, 2008 Financial Disclosure](#). OGE Form 278. U.S. Office of Government Ethics.

Facebook filed multiple patent reexaminations at Kappos' Patent Office (they lost each Examiner-managed appeal), until, that is, director Kappos, a political lawyer, not a patent examiner, intervened in an unprecedented act of directorial abuse to summarily invalidate Leader's entire patent—including several dozen claims that were not even the subject of litigation and reexamination previously.⁶⁸ Evidently, Kappos's handlers wanted Leader's patent claims wiped off their map for world communications hegemony.

6. **Magistrate Stark was silent** when on May 16, 2010, Director Kappos reported that he had "divested" his IBM stock and converted his holdings almost exclusively in Vanguard⁶⁹—which is today the controlling shareholder of IBM (7.25%) and was the 9th largest fund purchaser in the Facebook IPO (9.6 million shares). Given the association of IBM with Leader's patent counsel James P. Chandler, III and Kappos, this silence was further obstruction and bias. IBM then facilitated the theft of Leader's invention, in conspiracy with Chandler, through the IBM Eclipse Foundation.

7. **Magistrate Stark was silent** when Secretary of State Hillary Clinton began actively promoting Facebook as a tool of her diplomacy⁷⁰ during the trial preparation. She told the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) ca. Jul. 09, 2009 that:

*"Facebook will become as much a part of the diplomatic lexicon as cables and demarches [political steps or initiatives]."*⁷¹

Hillary Clinton was engaged in a flagrant obstruction of justice in *Leader v. Facebook* as a public official whose duty was not to interfere in ongoing litigation.

Hillary repeated her promotion of Facebook in a speech to the Alliance of Youth Movements Summit in Mexico City, Mexico October 16, 2009:

*"In Columbia, two young college graduates used Facebook to organize 14 million people..."*⁷²

Any reasonable person can see that these public statements by a newly-minted Secretary of State would intimidate an ambitious Magistrate Stark

⁶⁸ [Merritt, R. \(Aug. 07, 2009\)](#). Senate confirms ex-IBMer David J. Kappos to head patent office. *EE Times*.; See also [David J. Kappos, 2008 Financial Disclosure](#). OGE Form 278. U.S. Office of Government Ethics.

⁶⁹ [David J. Kappos. \(May 16, 2010\)](#)^[1]. Form 278 Financial Disclosure. OGE.

⁷⁰ https://www.fbcoverup.com/docs/cyberhijack/cyber-hijack-findings.html#_ftnref309

⁷¹ [Sidney Blumenthal Message, Subj: hrc memo cfr speech 070809](#). (July 09, 2009). United States. Department of State, Judicial Watch v. U.S. State Department (FOIA), Doc. No. C05762671, Case No. F-2014-20439, 10/30/2015.

⁷² [Hillary Clinton. \(Oct. 16, 2009\)](#). Secretary Clinton Addresses Youth Movement Summit in Mexico City, Mexico. Promotes Facebook. YouTube / U.S. Department of State.

who coveted a move up in the Obama White House judicial totem pole (which happened, as soon as he orchestrated the desired outcome in *Leader v. Facebook*).

8. **Magistrate Stark was silent** when on Jun. 03, 2009 Facebook began secret cooperation with the NSA PRISM program—more obstruction of justice in the trial.⁷³
9. **Magistrate Stark’s compromised conduct enabled Facebook to stonewall discovery of Mark Zuckerberg’s (28) computer hard drives from 2003-2004.** Those computers were never produced in the *Leader* litigation—despite clear and persistent demands from *Leader*’s experience patent litigators from King & Spalding LLP. Then, magically, those 28 devices appeared in a subsequent case: *Ceglia v. Zuckerberg (W.D.N.Y. 2010)*. Facebook’s own experts confirmed that the Zuckerberg computer hard drives were in the possession of Facebook’s appeals attorney, Gibson Dunn LLP, during the entire *Leader* case. Stark never acted on Facebook lies and fraud on the court.⁷⁴ We believe those hard drives will prove conspiracy with IBM and the IBM Eclipse Foundation to disseminate *Leader*’s technology broadly across all market segments in Silicon Valley.⁷⁵
10. **Judge Stark was silent** when USPTO director Kappos launched an official USPTO fan page on Facebook on May 14, 2010—just two months before trial.⁷⁶ More obstruction of justice by a federal officer.
11. **Judge Stark was silent** on the issues of obstruction of justice and his involvement as an Obama judge prospect when president-elect Barack Obama launched his Organizing for America (OFA) Facebook page on Jun. 17, 2008—more obstruction of justice in *Leader v. Facebook*, especially since Magistrate Stark was courting the favor of the Obama Administration to get a judge appointment, which he did within days of the end of the *Leader v. Facebook* trial.
12. **Judge Stark failed to disclose his conspiracy with Attorney General Eric Holder and President Barack Obama that very evidently obstructed justice in *Leader v. Facebook*.** On Jan. 20, 2010, Facebook experienced a devastating Markman Hearing in front of Judge Joseph Farnan who had expressed enthusiasm at making *Leader v. Facebook* his final trial before retirement. However, on Jan. 26, 2010—six days later—Judge Farnan suddenly reversed himself and announced his retirement and that he would step down from presiding over the *Leader v.*

⁷³ [Greenwald, G., MacAskill, E. \(Jun. 07, 2013\)](#). NSA Prism program taps in to user data of Apple, [Facebook,] Google and others. *The Guardian*.

⁷⁴ [Deposition of Michael F McGowan](#), Facebook Forensic Expert, Tr. 66:4, *Paul D. Ceglia v. Mark E. Zuckerberg*, 1:10-cv-00569-RJA (W.D.N.Y. 2010), Jul. 19, 2012; [Deposition of Bryan J. Rose](#), Facebook Forensic Expert, *Id.*, Jul. 18, 2012.

⁷⁵ [The IBM Eclipse Foundation \(Sep. 09, 2008\)](#). Membership Logos [Board minutes]; See also The IBM Eclipse Foundation (Sep. 17, 2008). The Members of Eclipse, Minutes of the Eclipse Board Meeting, [Sep. 17, 2008](#).

⁷⁶ [Kappos, D. J. \(Apr. 01, 2010\)](#). U.S. Patent Office Facebook page launched. USPTO.

Facebook case. Then, in quick succession, on Mar. 17, 2010, Judge Stark was nominated by Barack Obama for a judgeship. On Apr. 22, 2010—just one month later—Magistrate Stark told the Senate Judiciary Committee in his confirmation hearing:

“My obligation is to follow the binding precedents of the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals.”⁷⁷

13. **Stark was maliciously silent** about his conspiracy with Holder, Clinton and Obama (his handlers) then was shoehorned into *Leader v. Facebook* on June 24, 2010—just 25 days before the trial was scheduled to begin date.

14. **Magistrate Stark then ignore his pledge to the Senate** to follow binding precedents. On the day he entered the case, he allowed Facebook to flip-flop its *Leader-invented-nothing* claims to on-sale bar—that Leader’s invention was novel, but that Leader tried to sell it too soon. Then shockingly, he denied Leader’s request to conduct addition discovery on the new claim, **forcing Leader to go to trial without any due process preparation on Facebook’s new flip-flopped claim.**

15. Stark’s denial of due process notwithstanding, **Leader proved nonetheless that Facebook is infringing all 11 of 11 patent claims** asserted by Leader. During trial, Stark allowed Facebook to engage in trial theater using innuendo and a cut-and-paste, redacted affidavit in the absence of real evidence that confused the jury, overriding Leader’s objections.

16. **Stark knew he was ignoring binding precedent.** An on-sale bar claim must be proven with *hard evidence*. More specifically, Stark ignored the well-settled precedents for testing evidence of on-sale bar, namely *Pfaff*⁷⁸ and *Group One*.⁷⁹ *Group One* is a Federal Circuit precedent and *Pfaff* is a Supreme Court one—both precedents that Stark promised the Senate he would follow. Subsequent investigation of on-sale bar litigations shows that *Leader v. Facebook* was to be an outlier -- the first and only on-sale bar litigation that *did not* apply the *Pfaff* and *Group One* tests. Those precedents demanded that Facebook show the actual computer source code that Leader allegedly tried to sell too soon. That was impossible since Facebook did not have Leader’s source code (nor had Facebook produced Zuckerberg’s 2003-2004)—a remarkable bit of juggling by Magistrate Stark in a SOFTWARE infringement case. In other words, Stark thumbed his nose at the entire discovery procedure in favor of Facebook and violated Leader’s due

⁷⁷ [S. HRG. 111-695, PART 6](#) - CONFIRMATION HEARINGS ON FEDERAL APPOINTMENTS, Leonard P. Stark Confirmation Hearing. United States Senate, 111th Congress, 2nd Session, Apr. 22, Apr. 28, and May 13, 2010, Part 6, Serial No. J-111-4, S. Hrg. 111-695, Pt. 6, Y 4.J 89/2, GPO.

⁷⁸ [Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, Inc.](#), 525 U.S. 55 (1998).

⁷⁹ [Group One, Ltd. v. Hallmark Cards, Inc.](#), 254 F.3d 1041 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

process, not to mention *ignored* the unquestioned Federal Circuit and Supreme Court on-sale bar precedents.

17. **The suspicious resignation of Judge Joseph Farnan after the Markman Hearing** should be investigated, not that anyone believes these judicial officers will tell the truth about the Facebook-Pilgrims Society arm twisting behind the scenes.

18. **Magistrate Stark failed to disclose** to the litigants his **substantial Facebook financial interests**. He disclosed eight (8) interlocked investments in Fidelity mutual funds in his holdings in his confirmation financial disclosure on Apr. 22, 2010. Remarkably, his decision to invest heavily in Fidelity was prescient. **Fidelity was the largest mutual fund investor (\$818,228,924)⁸⁰ in the Facebook initial public offering on May 18, 2012.** His holdings violate numerous canons of the Code of Judicial Conduct, including Canon 2: avoid “impropriety and the appearance of impropriety... A judge should neither lend the prestige of the judicial office to advance the private interests of the judge or others nor convey or permit others to convey the impression that they are in a special position to influence the judge.” Notably, when Stark’s conflicting financial interests were discovered and disclosed in the Federal Circuit appeal, the three-judge panel (Laurie, Wallach and Moore) and the chief judge (Randall R. Rader) failed to investigate. Randall R. Rader, subsequently resigned in a scandal involving his evident partiality to a “Your friend for life” Weil Gotschal LLP attorney Edward R. Reines. Reines was assigned by Rader in the *Leader v. Facebook* appeal. Rader’s indiscretion obstructed justice in this case since Reines made an appearance on behalf of Facebook in the *Leader v. Facebook* appeal where each of the judges had significant holdings of Facebook interests.⁸¹

19. **Stark failed to disclose the obstruction of justice** of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s secret contract with Facebook to build “an election winning template.” Facebook’s lead trial attorney, Michael Rhodes, Cooley Godward, was secretly advising Barack Obama, with McBee Strategic, in multiple billions of dollars in energy stimulus funds, including to BrightSource (\$1.6 billion), Solyndra (\$535) and Tesla Motors (\$465 million).

⁸⁰ [S. HRG. 111-695, PART 6](#) - CONFIRMATION HEARINGS ON FEDERAL APPOINTMENTS, Leonard P. Stark Confirmation Hearing. United States Senate, 111th Congress, 2nd Session, Apr. 22, Apr. 28, and May 13, 2010, Part 6, Serial No. J-111-4, S. Hrg. 111-695, Pt. 6, Y 4.J 89/2, GPO.

⁸¹ [AFI. \(Jun. 13, 2013\)](#). Obama colludes with the Facebook Cartel to divest Congress of Constitutional Powers. *Americans for Innovation*.

Conclusion:

Evidently, Barack Obama and numerous of his directors of key Executive branches, including Hillary Clinton (State), Eric Holder (Justice) and David Kappos (USPTO) obstructed justice in *Leader v. Facebook* by their bias toward Facebook and Leader's potential witnesses.

We respectfully request that:

1. Judge Leonard P. Stark not be confirmed to be a member of the Federal Circuit.
2. This Committee take firm steps to root out the corruption we have just shown you in the Patent and Trademark Office, Delaware District Court, Federal Circuit and the Supreme Court.
3. This Committee commence discipline proceedings against Judge Stark, to make right his fraud and the resulting damages he has caused to Leader Technologies' shareholders, as well as those of countless inventors.
4. This Committee demand that the Executive pay Leader Technologies pursuant to their Second Amended Miller Act Notice duly served on the Executive Branch.⁸²

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Michael T. McKibben

Leader Technologies, Inc. and shareholders c/o Michael T. McKibben
Chairman, Inventor of social networking technologies stolen by
the British Patent Pool Crown Monopoly, including Judge Stark, Facebook

⁸² [FIRST AMENDED MILLER ACT NOTICE. \(Apr. 25, 2019\)](#). Leader Technologies, Inc. to U.S. Executive Donald J. Trump pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3131 et seq.