IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT
CASE No. 20-2297

NAGUI MANKARUSE,

Plaintiff-Appellant

V.

INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware company, ACER AMERICA, CORPORATION, a Delaware company, DANIEL PATRIC DOCTER, an individual, ANDY D. BRYAN, an individual, and MATTHIEW ROBERT HULSE, an individual, and DOES 1 through 10 inclusive,

Defendants, Appellees

ON APPEAL FROM THE RULING OF THE CENTRAL DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION THE HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER

FORMAL REPLY BREIF OF NAGUI MANKARSUE, APPALLANT

NAGUI MANKARUSE
Applicant and Plaintiff, Pro Se
19081 Carp Circle
Huntington Beach, CA 92646
Telephone: (714)840-9673
FAX: (714)846-5012
Email: mankaruse@aol.com

RECEIVED
DEC 11 2020
United States Court of Appeals
For The Federal Circuit

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT
CASE No. 20-2297

NAGUI MANKARUSE,

Plaintiff-Appellant

V.

INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware company, ACER AMERICA, CORPORATION, a Delaware company, DANIEL PATRIC DOCTER, an individual, ANDY D. BRYAN, an individual, and MATTHIEW ROBERT HULSE, an individual, and DOES 1 through 10 inclusive,

Defendants, Appellees

ON APPEAL FROM THE RULING OF THE CENTRAL DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION
THE HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER

FORMAL REPLY BREIF OF NAGUI MANKARSUE, APPALLANT

RECEIVED
DEC 11 2020
United States Court of Appeals
For The Federal Circuit

NAGUI MANKARUSE
Applicant and Plaintiff, Pro Se
19081 Carp Circle
Huntington Beach, CA 92646
Telephone: (714)840-9673
FAX: (714)846-5012
Email: mankaruse@aol.com

RELATED CASES

1- **Case No. 20-2297 Nagui Mankaruse v. Intel Corporation**
2- **Case No. 20-2309 Nagui Mankaruse v. Raytheon Com**

THIS REPLY

The CASE LAWS Sighted in this Reply are Applicable also to the filed OPENING BRNIEF filed earlier.

This reply included the same reply on both cases and filed in both cases with each case separately.

The references sighted here are from three sources:

1. **References to documentation INTEL Appendix cited by NAGUI MANKARUSE used NMI before the Number.**
2. **References to documentation RAYTHEON Appendix cited by NAGUI MANKARUSE used NMR before the Number**
3. **References to documentation Appendix cited by INTEL CORPORATION used NM before the Number.**
4. **References to documentation Appendix cited by RAYTHEON COMPANY used NM before the Number.**

RTABLE CONTENTS

Page

Table of Authorities.....4

Introduction.....8

Due Process.....9

Summary of the Argument.....10

Argument.....15

Conclusion.....29

Declaration of Nagui Mankaruse.....31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Case No.	Cases	Page(s)
0	**Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp. 337 U.S. 541,69 S. Ct. 1221,93 L. Ed. 1528 (1949)**	18
1	**Cruz v. Beto, 405 U.S. 319, 321 (1972)**	33
2	**Drake v Penske Truck Leasing Co., 2013 U.S.Dist. LEXIS 130851**	5
3	**Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67,81 (1972)**	5
4	**Estelle v. Williams, 425 U.S. 501,503 (19 76)**	7
5	**Escobedo v. Applebees. 787 F.3d 1226**	39
6	**Adkins v. E. l. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 33 187 F.3d 1226**	36
7	**BE & K Constr. Co., 536 U.S. at 525**	32
8	**Bryant v. New York State Educ. Dep't., 692 F.3d 202, 218 (2d Cir. 2012)**	5
9	**Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817 (1978)**	9
10	**Bracy v. Gramley, 520 U. S. 899, 117 S. Ct. 1793, 138 L. Ed. 2d 97 (1997)**	36
11	**Carey v. Piphus, 435 U.S. 247, 259 (1978)**	4
12	**Ex parte Hull, 312 U.S. 546 (1941)**	9
13	**English-Speaking Union v. Johnson , 353 F.3d 1013**	16
14	**Fla. Bar v. Went For It, Inc., 515 U.S. 6]8,636 (1995)**	32
15	**Flowers v. Turbine Support Division, 507 F.2d 1242, 1244 (5th Cir. 1975)**	39
16	**Ginelli v. Los Angeles Fire Dep't 1994 U.S. App. LEXIS 34697**	39
17	**Harbury, 536 U.S. at 4 15 & n.12**	32
18	**Haynes v. Scott, 116 F.3d 137, 139-40 (5th Cir. 1997)**	39

19	**Hicks v. Collins,** **1995 U.S. App. LEXIS 42374**	39
20	**Hudson v. Palmer.** **468 U.S. 517,523 (1984)**	32
21	**In re Winship,** **397 U.S. 358, 364 (1970)**	7
22	Heffron v. International Soc. for Krishna Consciousness, Inc. 452 U. S. 640,649 (1981)	27
23	Jews for Jesus, 482 U. S., at 576	27
24	Kia P. v. McIntyre, 235 F. 3d 749, 759 (2d Cir. 2000)	6
25	Kentucky v. Whorton, 441 U.S. 786 (1979)	7
26	Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343, 406 (1996)	32
27	Lane v. Brown, 372 U.S. 477	36
28	Marshall v. Jerrico, Inc., 446 U.S. 238, 242 (1980)	5
29	Millsap v. Wilson, 1997 U.S. App. Lexis 42081	16
30	Montanye v. Haymes, 427 U.S. 236, 244 (1976)	33
31	Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989)	2
32	Nelson v. Adams. 529 U.S. 460 (2000)	5
33	Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health & Fitness, Inc" 134 S. Ct. 1749,1757 (2014)	32
34	Ortwein v. Schwab, 134 S. Ct. 1749, 1757 (2014)	33
35	Prof. Real Estate Invt'rs, Inc . v. Columbia Pictures Indus., Inc., 508 U.S. 49, 56-57 (1993)	32
36	Pell v. Procunier, 417 U.S. 817, 828 (1974)	33
37	Reed Amar, Of Sovereignty and Federalism, 96 YALE L.J. 1425, 1485-86 (1987)	31

38	Rippo v. Baker, 137 S. Ct. 905	36
39	Rodriquez v. United States, 395 U.S. 327	36
40	Sandstrom v. Montana. 442 U.S. 510, 520-24 (1979)	7
41	Sure-Tan, Inc. v. NLRB, 467 U.S. 883,896-97 (1984)	32
42	Sullivan v. Louisiana, 508 U.S. 275 (1993)	7
43	Taylor v. Kentucky, 436 U.S. 478, 483-86 (1978)	7
44	Troxel v. Granville. 530 U.S. 57,65, 530 U.S. 57, 65,120 S. Ct. 2054, 147 1. Ed. 2d 49 (2000)	6
45	Tenenbaum v. Williams, 193 F.3d 581, 593 (2d Cir. 1999)	6
46	Trinity Indus., Inc. v. Myers & Assocs.. Ltd., 516 U.S. 807,133 1. Ed. 2d 17, 116 S. Ct. 52 (1995)	22
47	Ulster County Court v. Allen, 442 U.S. 140,156 (1979)	7
48	Ward v. Rock Against Racism, 491 U. S. 781, 794 (1989)	20
49	Watson v. Ault, 525 F.2d 886, 891 (5th Cir. 1976)	39
50	White v. Ragen, 324 U.S. 760 (1945)	9
51	Williams v. Kaiser, 323 U.S. 471	36
52	Williams v. Larkin, 421 U. S. 35, 47, 95 S. Ct. 1456,43L. Ed. 2d 71 2 (1975)	37
53	Williams v. Pennsylvania. 579 U. S.136 S. Ct. 1899,195 L. Ed. 2d 132,141 (2016)	37
54	Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 122-23 (2006)	32
55	**Adkins v. E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331**	**36**
57	**BE & K Constr. Co., 536 U.S. at 525**	**32**
58	**Bryant v. New York State Educ. Dep't., 692 F.3d 202, 218 (2d Cir. 2012)**	**5**

59	**Bounds v. Smith,** **430 U.S. 817 (1978)**	9
60	**Bracy v. Gramley,** **520 U.S. 899, 117 S. Ct. 1793, 138 L. Ed. 2d 97 (1997)**	36
61	**Carey v. Piphus,** **435 U.S. 247, 259 (1978)**	4
62	**Williams v. Pennsylvania,** **579 U. S.136 S. Ct. 1899,195 L. Ed. 2d 132,141 (2016)**	37
	AUTHORITIES **US Constitution** **First Amendment** **Fifth Amendment** **Eighth Amendment** **Fourteenth Amendment**	
	FEDERAL STATUTES **28 U.S.C. 1295(a)(l)** **28 U.S.C. 1331** **28 U.S.C. 1338**	
	OTHER RULES **Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(l)**	

INTRODUCTION

Nagui Mankaruse plaintiff appellant in the United States Court of Appeals for The Federal Circuit; appeals several Erred decisions by the United States Court of Central District of California, Southern Division granting several Motions on two separate Patent Infringement cases against Raytheon Company and Intel Corporation, primarily based on the same facts and different applications of the infringed Patents; the US Patent 6,411,512 and CA Patent 2,389,458 is referenced here. The two Orders Granted the two groups of defendants their Motions to declare this plaintiff Nagui Mankaruse a Vexatious Litigant again in January 2020 (INTEL Appx.001-002) and (R Appx.1-6) in Errors and Granted both Raytheon & Intel requests for security bonds amounted to $25,000 each in addition must be paid to proceed with the two actions. Mankaruse to post two bonds by 2/29/2020 or the actions be dismissed. Mankaruse is NOT a Vexation Litigant any more based on the Superior Court of California Order dated August 1, 2019 (NMI Appx.4-10), (NMR Appx.4-10) that DENIED defendants Raytheon Company 3rd

Motion filed within two years. The ruling of 2019 (NMR Appx.4-10) Correcting prior ruling by the same Court on 7/12/1918, (NMR Appx.11-14) Honorable James Crandall presiding in both rulings), the two operating complaints were later dismissed and all dependent Motions were also dismissed. In January 2020 plaintiff submitted reconsideration in Raytheon Case (NMR Appx.57-59), it was not allowed filing in the Court. In February 2020 in the 9th CCA, plaintiff Appellant filed two Notices of Appeal, one for each case 2/21/2020 (NMR Appx.31). Plaintiff filed his Opening Brief On Appeal on 4/28/2020, (NMR (Appx.40) then Intel filed Motion to dismiss 12/10/2019 (INTEL Appx.147-169), Raytheon filed Motion to Declare plaintiff vexatious12/12/2019 (R Appx.109-111). On 8/072020, there is confusing docket entry (NMR Appx.31 item 79) and Confusing item 79 on the same day defendants Intel and Raytheon Cases (NMR 9/22/2020 were transferred to U.S.C.A. Federal Circuit (NMRppx.31)

DUE PROCESS

This plaintiff was not given a fair treatment throgh our normal judicial system so far, preserving his legal and constitutional rights as an American.

This plaintiff of several of his rights provided to him by our gret constitution including depriving him and his family of life liberty and our property as established in the fifth and fourteenth amendments.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

REASONS FOR THIS HONORABLE COURT GRANT THIS APPEAL DENYING ALL THE DEFENDANTS MOTIONS

The court review of these two high profile cases DiNovo should Grant this appeal for the following main reasons below with many more compelling reasons in the last 12 years and Since Mankaruse Disclosed his Protected technologies to both Raytheon and Intel.

Table 2

No.	Description	Supportive Evidence	Legal Support	
1	The Defiant Raytheon Sued Nagui Mankaruse for then same issue three times since 7/12/2018, 8/1/2019, 1/22/2020 (Current Action)	NMR & NMI I, II & III	Prohibited By Fifth Amendment of the US Constitution	
2	The Clear Violation of the 1st Amendment of The United States Constitution	Violating the Freedom of Speech of All Americans and the Ability to	Curb the People to Petition the Government for a redress of Grievances	
3	The Superior Court California Ruling relieved the plaintiff Being Vexatious Litigant	Same as #1 Above	Superior Court Order Dated 8/1/2019	

4	**Violation of the United States Constitution 8th Amendment**	**Plaintiff has no ability to provide any Bonds**	**Discrimination and Harassment of Raytheon to its High-Profile Engineer & Inventor Mankaruse , Leaving him live in severe Poverty**	
5	**Intel & Raytheon have Cheated the Courts**	**The negative Court Orders he has are all clear evidenced violation of the laws**	**Two Summary Judgments in the Superior Court before the Defendants disclose any Discoveries,… In clear Violation of CCP 437,…**	
6	**The Clear Errors of the Superior Court Errored Ruling of 2018**	**Same as #1 Above**	**The Cases Have Merits Never advanced beyond The Complaint Phases with Several Years of Litigations**	
7	**The Plaintiff Didn't Exceed the No. of litigations with Such Two High Profile Cases**	**NMI & NMR and Raytheon & Intel Appendix**	**The Convincing Documented Evidences of the Raytheon Total Corruption Litigate this Plaintiff, and more**	

The basis of the appellant constitutional rights as given to all Americans by the founding fathers of this Great Land which is applicable to all Americans as equal under the law all the time. Applicable here are:

First Amendment: 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.

Fifth Amendment: No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand

Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; 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.

Eighth Amendment: Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

These two cases are in the right place to be allowed to proceed, heard and examined and justice has to prevail at all circumstances if our Nation to continue to be the best Nation ever existed on earth. This serious misconduct by Raytheon and Intel must not be rewarded and must be stopped.

Plaintiff's two cases for several years are prevented by these defendants from being heard and examined as the two cases are legitimate and are very much in good standing and expected to prevail in a short quick fair trial. (NM Appx.4-10 including Part D & 11-13, & Item #1) Plaintiff was / is ready at any time and for long time to settle both cases in good faith settlement with 50% of the damages. (R Appx.397-421)

The District Court Erred in his Orders due to the facts not assumed this plaintiff was / is still targeted for several years by Raytheon being terminated his employment without reason after being harassed to death status in 2010 (R Appx.375-394) then, recovered back to work in 2012, terminated his employment after three days from returning to his work, falsely Raytheon

accused being the last engineer in a fake fabricated annual report Ranking Raytheon engineers in the 2014 trial in the Superior Court of California case# 30-2013-00625080-CU-WT-CJC and assigned Mankaruse as the last engineer in the list of that fabricated report presented in the Court Trial against Raytheon after started disclosing the Patented technologies and Intellectual Property subject of this Action in 2008.

Intel has maneuvered all years evade confronting the facts of its illegal use of the Patented technologies and Intellectual Property protected by the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution, the laws of the land and the signed Non-Disclosure agreement with Intel (INTEL Appx.117-120) after disclosing the Patented technologies and Intellectual Property in 2004 and 2007 (INTEL Appx.155-205, 206-256). Then Mankaruse discovered by Chance that Intel is producing and selling CPU Cooler with Intel Logo on it. (INTEL Appx. #208)

TABLE :1

DEFENDANTS GENERATED TABLE WITH PLAINTIFF COMMENTS ON THE LEFT COLUMN COMPLY WITH THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COURT ORDER OF 08/01/2-19 (NM Appx. 0-1)

Pro Se Actions Against Raytheon, et al & Intel et al Determined Adversely to Plaintiff In	
NOT-QUALIFIED **LITIGATED BY ATTORNIES**	**Case Name and N** **o.:** ***Mankaruse v. Raytheon Company et al.*** **Case No. 30-2013-00625080-CU-WT-CJC** **(The "Second Employment Case")** **Date Filed:** **January 17, 2013** **Disposition:** **Jury verdict in favor of Raytheon in December 2014. Court of Appeal affirmed. (RJN ¶ 3, Ex. 4).**
NOT-QUALIFIED **Breach of Contract Case Only** **BC CASE NOT IP CASE** **LITIGATED BY ATTORNY** **Defendants Conspired with my Attorney to Dismiss Conversion Claim With Prejudice**	**Case Name and No.:** ***American Innovation Corp. et al. v. Raytheon Company et al.*** **Case No. 30-2014-00732670-CU-BC-CJC** **(The "First IP Case** **Date Filed:** **July 7, 2014** **Disposition:** **Fraud and deceit claim dismissed with prejudice on Nov. 9, 2016. (RJN ¶ 4, Ex. 5). Plaintiff dismissed his**
NOT-QUALIFIED **Plaintiff Dismissed**	**Case Name and No.:** ***Mankaruse v. Raytheon Company et al.*** **Case No. 30-2016-00841632-CU-IP-CJC** **(The "Second IP Case")** **Date Filed:** **March 18, 2016** **Disposition:** **Plaintiff dismissed the lawsuit on May 16, 2016 (RJN ¶ 6, Ex. 8) after demurrer fully briefed. Case dismissed the day of demurrer hearing.**
NOT-QUALIFIED **Plaintiff Dismissed to File the 2016 Case the next Day on September 30, 2019**	**Case Name and No.:** ***Mankaruse v. Raytheon Company et al.*** **Case No. 30-2016-00860092-CU-IP-CJC** **(The "Third IP Case")** **Date Filed:** **June 27, 2016** **Disposition** **Plaintiff dismissed the case on September 29, 2016. (RJN ¶ 7, Ex. 9).**

The Court Erred in Granting the Case to Defendants in Summary Judgement. Court Erred Due to Defendants Misleading, Lying and Falsifying Information to the Court. Currently QUALIFIED	**Case Name and No.:** *Mankaruse v. Raytheon Company et al.* Case No. 30-2016-00878349-CU-IP-CJC (The "Fourth IP Case") **Date Filed:** September 30, 2016 **Disposition:** Summary judgment granted for Raytheon on July 12, 2018. Appeal dismissed; motion for reconsideration
NOT- QUALIFIED NOT RELATED TO RAYTHEON Will be in the Supreme Court	**Case Name and No.:** *Mankaruse v. Intel Corporation, et al.* Case No. 30-2016-00884058 **Date Filed:** October 31, 2016 **Disposition:** Intel's demurrer was sustained without leave to amend. (RJN ¶ 12, Ex.
NOT- QUALIFIED NOT RELATED TO RAYTHEON Plaintiff Dismissed	**Case Name and No.:** *Mankaruse v. Intel Corporation, et al.* Case No. 30-2018-00971179-CU-IP-CJ **Date Filed:** February 2, 2018 **Disposition:** Plaintiff dismissed the case on July 17, 2018. (RJN ¶ 10, Ex. 14).
NOT- QUALIFIED NOT RELATED TO RAYTHEON Plaintiff Dismissed	**Case Name and No.:** *Mankaruse v. Intel Corporation, et al.* Case No. 30-2018-00971116-CU-BC-CJC **Date Filed:** February 2, 2018 **Disposition:** Court sustained Intel's demurrer on June 12, 2018. Amended
COURT REIFED PLAINTIFF RELIVFED FROM BEING VEXATIOUS LITIGANT ON 8/01/2019	***Mankaruse v. Raytheon Company, et al.*, Case No. 30-2017-00934796-CU-IP-CJC** **Summary judgment granted for Raytheon on October 3, 2019; Judgment entered. (RJN ¶ 16, Ex. 23.)**

ARGUMENT

How the defendants Raytheon and Intel determined that the litigations of the two lawsuits is meritless before the facts examined and all the evidences

and work of the two opposing parties were examined and heard in open Court trial. The defendants for several years are refusing to submit any Discovery.

Mankaruse designation as vexatious litigant by Superior Court of California on 7/12/2018 was wrong and in Error (NMI Appx. #0-2#14) and was Reversed by the same Court by the Order of August 01, 2019 (Appx. #0, #4-10).

Raytheon designation of Nagui Mankaruse as vexatious litigant now is three times in a row (7/12/2018 Appx.0, 0-2 & 1/2020) is unconstitutional pursuant to the Fifth Amendment and the District Court Granting the defendants motions of 1/21/2020 (INTEL Appx.01-02) for Intel and Raytheon was in Error and must be reversed by this Honorable United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit as a matter of Law.

The lawsuit against Intel was/is legitimate, legal, meritorious, and true. The operating complaint (INTEL Appx.33-116), supported by evidence in the complaint (INTEL Appx. Page, Item #40-44) and additional evidences as supported Hardware lodged in the District Court, pictured (INTEL Appx.217-218) and more than one hundred communication email pages between Mankaruse and Intel in 2004 and 2007 needs to be heard on the merits by a quick trial as a matter of law and justice. (INTEL Appx.155-256)

The lawsuits against Raytheon was/is legitimate, legal, meritorious, and true. The operating complaint, (R Appx.59-89) supported by documental evidence filed 368 pages Under Seal in the District Court Item # needs to be heard on the merits by a quick trial as a matter of law and justice.

The filed litigations and relief by the Superior Court of California Order of 8/1/2019 (NMI Appx.4-10) must be Granted by this Honorable Court in its entirety against the District Court litigations both parties in Intel and Raytheon. The District Court Erred in his decision in both separate litigations and this Honorable Court issue must be corrected by this Courts' opinion.

Not all of the prior cases in Table 1 (NMI Appx.11-13) were litigated before but only two did litigated In Pro Se and the rest of cases in the Table (NMI Apex.11-13) were either litigated cases were litigated by an Attorney or withdrawn or dismissed at the start after it was discovered that the defendants messed it up and corrupted the procedural issues and resisted to litigate the merits. (NMI Appx.4-18)

The allegations of patent infringements and its applications of Intellectual Property technologies for the use to solve Intel products operations (Computer Central Processing Units "CPUs" are documented in the operating complaint (INTELAppx.062-066) and In the Raytheon case evidences filed under seal to present the complete evidences in Raytheon

products available to the plaintiff filed 368 documents Under Seal. The allegations against Raytheon and Intel are true and correct against the two giant corporations according to proof in Discovery of both US Patent 6,411,512 & Canadian Patent 2,389,548 are valid at the time of Infringements (INTEL Appx.48-52) the needs to be quickly heard in two trials as a matter of law and justice.

Due to the fact that both Intel & Raytheon managed to kill all the litigations, prolonging the time or continue the litigations by side-tracking Courts and missing up the Court consuming years litigating fabricated side-issues or by non-related frivolous litigations in unbelievable deceit, untrue and at all times corrupting plaintiffs councils to destroy the cases before it were started, as a result the plaintiff has to terminate his attorneys one after the other and to litigate his cases as Pro Se.

The documented operating complaints of Intel (INTEL Appx.33-117) and (R Appx.59-89) for Raytheon and associated hardware picture in the case of Intel (INTEL Appx. 217-218), including the lodged hardware of Intel CPU Cooler and Raytheon Missile Defense THAAD Systems, Fire Finder RMI & Sentinel <u>after resolving the very important single question of Raytheon Denial by three top executives of using the patented technologies</u> In the THAAD Systems and Improved Radars show complete documented evidences of how

the parentship and its applications were infringed, it is used to make Intel computers' processors (CPUs) function with greater than 40 times speed before the plaintiff infringed patented technologies and Intellectual Property are used and still in use in all computing machines in the world including super computers.

Regarding Raytheon products that infringed on the plaintiff's two patents US 6,411,512 and CA 2,88 and its Intellectual Property applications in the THAAD Missile Defense Systems has used 3,168 modules in every system infringed on both patents subject to proof by quick discovery and inspection of the property to validate Raytheon denial which can be proved very easily by Yes they have used the technologies or No they have used other technologies as they are claiming, however current public documentations suggested that Raytheon used untheorized technologies pursuant to Raytheon Patent # () and Intel supporting Raytheon in its denials however, they don't know what it is they are talking about because it is secret documents. The documented evidences in Intel are disclosed in Intel operating complaint and Raytheon case available in the 364 pages of documents filed in the District Court under seal due to National Security Issues.

The District Court Erred in Granting both Intel and Raytheon their bundles of frivolous motions (INTEL Appx.) filed in the same time which was

canceled after the motion declaring Nagui Mankaruse as vexatious litigant (INTEL Appx. Page 125-136) while ignored to notice of supported factual evidences that Nagui Mankaruse presented in his defense including but not limited to the State Court order of August 01, 2019 (NMI 4-18) reversing his prior order (Appendix #4-18)

The $25,000 security bonds Ordered to be deposited by the District Court based Raytheon & Intel request in addition of being unconditional in these particular cases, as being documented in plaintiff's Brief and here in this reply. The plaintiff submitted petition for reconsideration () which was not filed but it is even not looked at but rejected.

The Bonds is the name of the game of Raytheon and Intel and the tactics used over and over in the last four years to block litigation proceeding before it starts and used successfully illegally and incurred substantial harm to plaintiff and delays as well as destroying cases by corruption which is the main goals of the defendants.... Mankaruse and his family humiliating themselves living on Social Security income and the support of good friends which Raytheon and Intel knows the details since they are monitoring him and his family's income and almost everything else in their life, have preventing him from getting any employment and killed any offer of employment illegally by Raytheon since his termination from his job at

Raytheon in 2012 by interfering with any job interview process as prior employer.

This Honorable Court should vacate and remand all motions Ordered Granted to the defendants in both cases and remanded to allow the two cases to proceed towards fast-track trials.

Both Intel and Raytheon spending millions of Dollars for years in frivolous litigations to get away with the stolen property, hiring the most expensive law firms in the world and allowing several councils working on the litigation of each case, however if they are truthful in their denials they can get out of that immediately and before even any of the parties getting to the Court either by showing the evidences in Raytheon equipment's that they have used different technologies or negotiate good faith settlement () to pay their dues and be free.

In the case of Intel the infringing equipment's are already in the public domain and pictures of the infringed products are in the operating Complaint (Appendix #) and physically available in any computer all around the world. This is un-American, unethical un-honest behavior by the two giant companies.

Let us face the facts in the court of law to get the truth out, instead of spending years in courts paying very expensive litigation unrelated side-

tracking litigations and councils that costed Intel & Raytheon millions of dollars happily paid to continue frivolous litigations and leaving the Inventors to live in such humiliating and inhuman life to curb his ability for many years.

What is happening to the Americans? Are we starting the destruction of our Nation by ourselves, all civilizations in the history of mankind were destroyed itself from inside, why we do this to our own people??? Its simply destruction of our Nation, once values and principles are gone in any Nation or even the simple unit of the Nation which build the society are the individuals, that Nation is gone; the American people worked hard all over the history of this Nation since its inception fought internal wars to make this Nation the greatest in the history of mankind. Does Intel and Raytheon need $25K each to be honest, it is incomprehensible by any means, but to make it impossible to Mankaruse to get his rights like it is made difficult to him to live with his family with dignity or give up. Americans are the best in the world by their hard work, honesty and their dignity, their freedom and our Constitution, not what is going on these situations and everything else.

Mankaruse is not asking to get any favors or help but asking to get back his stolen property by verified Discovered documented and all evidences from the defendants and also all evidences available to the plaintiff which are disclosed.

The District Court abused his discretion Granting Defendants requested Bonds to kill the Cases, violated his conscience not being Just and Unfair Judgement. District Court all Orders filed by the defendants should be vacated in its entirety and the litigations should be remanded to the district court proceeding towards fair and quick trials.

The District Court didn't yet got any chance to examine the evidences and hear the parties supporting their claims in the Intel and Raytheon high profile cases because litigations never started yet beyond the complaints stage similar to prior litigations in State Court. Mankaruse was presented in the state court by Raytheon as ranked in 2008 as the last engineer at Raytheon of more than 65,000 engineers after disclosing his patented technologies and Intellectual Property solutions to persisting problems to three major missile defense systems that protects our great nation now from hostile missiles.

Mankaruse also offered the key solutions to make all the computers in the world to run at higher speed with more than 40X () speeds what it was before using his CPU Cooler. Mankaruse and his family humiliated in life from 2008 until today because he is helping our great beloved nation.

The case of ATI v. Altima Computers was a cheat after Council Zuber & Tilleu compromised by Intel which was not a defendant in that case. It was

a big scandal. It is the facts. (Response to the Appellees dated and filed in this Honorable Court

How can these current cases be meritless in the case of Intel Infringement where it is documented and physically available in all computing machines in the world and in all the three advanced military weapons in our arsenal. Americans reward its own people but cannot be understandable to punish its patriotic people that harsh for no cause other than being honest patriotic. Nagui Mankaruse never change.

It is believed that Intel and Raytheon are inditing themselves trying to defend themselves in these cases and its circumstances. If they're honest show the honorable Court the facts in the hardware that is available and documented facts and evidence.

Intel and Raytheon in their Response Brief asserting and confirming the complaints and forgot in the case of Intel there is a claim of induced infringement by Intel also in addition to the claim of infringing all the patents claims as in the complaints and amended complaints. ()

Honesty is part of being true American not to use these cheap tactics of being untruthful.

If both Intel and Raytheon are truthful to themselves, they can be truthful to the courts they must not do that to themselves and be patriotic Americans. God Bless The United States of America forever and ever.

Mankaruse being from the old school he believes anything in life can be honored by the word of mouth while written contracts now a days were cheated even to Courts in this great Nation. If Intel and Raytheon even lie to the Courts, it is our Nation that can be in big trouble.

After the appeals cases were filed by Mankaruse in the 9th Circuit in January 2020, () the two cases were several months waiting to get its turn, Raytheon and Intel filed request to transfer the cases to this honorable Federal Circuit to start the waiting time again (). Mankaruse believe in the US Courts but for some reason or other the defendants requested to transfer to this honorable court (defendants shopping for the courts).

Mr. Valentine Raytheon counsel told Mankaruse in October 9, 2019 in the state court hallway that "as large Law Firm with large defendants like Raytheon they know people in all courts tell them everything".

The State Court Judge Hon. Craig Griffin that signed the Order killing Intel case was moved to satellite Court in Orange County the day after signing that Order.

In Intel complaint the allegations were specified supported against Intel by a specific CPU Cooler that caught with Intel logo in 2015. (Appendix # page)

Raytheon through deceit and false information to the State Court was able to get its motion for summary judgement heard and granted twice in case # (20-2016-00878349-CU-IP-CJC, & 30-2017-00934796-CU-IP-CJC) before any discovery was conducted () which is the reason for their motions granted, it is also against the Fed R. Civ. P.

The State Court Ordered a $10K Bond in 2018 which was a disaster to Mankaruse when he tried to raise the money from friends and family as it is very difficult, humiliating and in-dignifying and it is impossible to be repeated again to cripple the plaintiff by requesting Bonds cannot be posted due absence of any money to post Bond while the defendants Intel & Raytheon have authorized their councils (Mega Law Firms) blank checks. It is unbelievable Intel & Raytheon misconduct happening in California state courts and now in the District Court, shouldn't happen in this Honorable Court.

Mankaruse never filed a lawsuit that is time barred or frivolous but the defendants Raytheon & Intel provide false, fake data and untrue information unchecked to the Courts and it was believed by the courts of the land most of

the time, similar to the employment case # XXX against Raytheon in the State Court litigated by Mankaruse very skilled Attorney, where Raytheon had another mega law firm tried to compromise Mankaruse Attorney it didn't work, the case went dark for about 8 months, in 2014 Raytheon hired another mega law firm with the lead Attorney was able to compromise Mankaruse attorney, while everything was completed through the trial and Mankaruse Attorney during the trial refused to present the data collected through depositions that are the real evidences proving the case in the court in addition he agreed with Raytheon Council during the trial in the court and deleted 7 out of ten claims from the case including Wrongful Termination claim in the Wrongful Termination lawsuit and other independent claims without approval of Mankaruse and his response in the lunch time to Mankaruse "Fire Me" which Mankaruse couldn't do it in the middle of the trial. The three Questions to the jury were (1-Did Mankaruse worked at Raytheon? 2-Did Mankaruse was harassed by Raytheon? 3-Did Raytheon discriminated Mankaruse?) the result was expected.

In that trial Raytheon Attorney's presented falsified tables named "engineers rankings" never heard about by any employees calling them management secret data, in these tables showed Mankaruse ranked the one before the last engineer in Raytheon in 2007 and the last engineer in Raytheon

in 2008 ranking documents, however Mankaruse survived keeping his job since 2004 (2008 the year that Mankaruse provided the patented technologies to Raytheon and TRS solved Fire Finder RMI and the Sentinel Improved radars). (Raytheon had more than 65K engineers in 2008). ()

Mankaruse didn't file the application to be removed from the vexatious list after that Court ruling of 8/1/2019, it is believed that it automatically filed by the Court after Hon. James Crandall ruling of 8//01/2019, Mr. Valentine pushed to keep Mankaruse name in the list after Mankaruse filed the current lawsuit in the District Court as he was planning to file motion to declare Mankaruse as vexatious litigant again which it is illegal (1st, 5th and 8th Constitution Amendments) Mankaruse is complaining from Raytheon and Intel work delaying and harassing misconduct for harming Mankaruse. ()

Nagui Mankaruse have rights in protecting his patented technologies and Intellectual Property by the Law and the Constitution of our Great Nation the United States of America. Mankaruse seeking his rights from this Honorable United States Appeals Court for The Federal Circuit, just the second highest to our Honorable United States Supreme Court. It is our freedom and free speech given to us the American people by our Constitution was prepared and written by this Nation's founding fathers after the

independence of this great Nation on July 4, 1776 founded and was created on September 17, 1787, ratified on June 21, 1788.

CONCLUSION

This plaintiff over the last several years anytime files Court Case Complaints, automatically never had a chance to get to present his grievances to the Courts, rather is immediately is bombarded with bundles of numerous frivolous Motions including these two cases, please see sample of such behavior (NMI Apdx.VIII & NMR Adx.IV & V.) part of the dockets in the current cases.

For all the above reasons Appellant Nagui Mankaruse pray that his Honorable Court to vacate all defendants' frivolous more than 10 Motions and Ruling are Available in Intel and Ration Filing motions filed and by Raytheon and Intel as documents in the court Dockets and Remand the two Cases to the District Court to proceed in fast-track Trials for the sake of Justice and the Honor of this Great Nation.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 9, 2020

Nagui Mankaruse

NAGUI MANKARUSE
Plaintiff In Pro Se

DECLARATION OF NAGUI MANKARUSE

I, Nagui Mankaruse declares as follows:

It is amazing that Raytheon an its associated defendants whom most of them are high level executive them have confirmed for years that Raytheon didn't infringed on the two patents the subject of the two Cases against and Raytheon products On (R Appd. 372) one page letter to both Mr. and Mrs. Mankaruse, Mr. Keith Peden, Senior Vice President of Corporate Raytheon Company on January 14, 2013 in the second paragraph (six lines) have said: ...responding to our correspondences to Mr. William Swanson, Raytheon Chairman and CEO "As we have previously written to you, to our knowledge, no Raytheon products or programs infringe or have ever infringed any valid claims of the '512 patent...."

Mr. F. Kinsey Haffner, Vice President Raytheon Intellection Property and Licensing, on November 20, 2012 in his one page (R Appendix 373), letter Re: Letters to William Swanson, addressed to Mr. and Mrs. Mankaruse, in the first paragraph said "We have reviewed the letters you wrote to Raytheon Company's Chairman and CEO William Swanson. These letters contained allegations of patent infringements, and thus was referred to the Intellectual Property department within the Office of the General Counsel for investigation. Then proceeded in the second paragraph,

Raytheon is a strong supporter of Intellectual Property rights. We respect other parties' intellectual property and take seriously any allegations of patent infringement. Then proceeded to the third paragraph,

We have reviewed your allegations and conducted an analysis of US Patent, 6,411,512 ("US Patent"), and its prosecution history. We have also researched and reviewed all materials filed with the court in the litigation involving the '512 patent (ATI v. AFTC), District Court, M.D. Florida, Case No. 6:11-cv-113-Orl-22GJK. Then proceeded to the next paragraph,

To our knowledge, no Raytheon products or programs or programs on or ever infringed any claims of the '512 Patent. To the extent that any Raytheon to the extent that any Raytheon products cited by you include liquid cold plate technology, all sales of these products to date have been to the U.S. Government, and are covered by the authorization and Consent Clause, which requires any patent enforcement action be filed against the US Government."

The third letter by Mr. Keith Peden again, dated October 14, 2012 Appx.374, can be reviewed due to the limited space here.

The above Raytheon letters speak for themselves and no mention that I have knowledge of the integument rather I am alleging the infringement subject to proof by Discovery, and Court trials, even simple as stated earlier

in this document. I have state again here that I have no knowledge of the infringement subject to proof in the Court.

In have all approached Intel Corporation first in 2004 introducing my patented technologies of the US Patent 6,411,512 and Canadian Patent 2,289,634 and Intellectual Property Applications to be used to cool the Intel CPU's and make it possible for the computing industries to be able to achieve much higher speeds of today more than 40X (INTEL) the current computing speeds available during 2004. I approached Mr. Daniel Docter an Intel executive in a symposium Conference at California State University Fullerton for small business and we agreed that Intel would be always interested in hearing and using new technologies. Signing 2004 Intel Corporate Non-Discloser Agreement (CNDA) () before engagement in communications with technical executives and engineers at Intel through several months of communications with documented evidences of more than 50 pages of emails and presentations to Intel to transfer the technologies (NMI Appx.). Mr. Docter last email was apologizing that Intel are not able to utilize the technologies and ended the communications (NMI Appx.155-256). In 2007 I have contacted Dr. Craig Barret (Intel Chairman to touch base with him again to be able to use the technologies of the US Patent 6,411,512, I got an invitation to present the technology to Intel executives and engineers with

prototype () at intel campus in Arizona, later communication with 50 pages of emails () with Intel responses verbally was my claims of what this technology can achieve is unbelievable and too good to be true. The 2007 encounter ended again without getting any official engagement in licensing agreement (). In January 2015 by chance I found version of the Device selling on Amazon website, ordered one unit it arrived on February 2015, () it was typically the technologies presented to Intel in 2004 and 2007 with Intel Logo on it (). Approached intel Executives inquired about the issues, no agreement reached (). At the time I thought starting legal solution our Constitution provided to Americans. () We are in this honorable Court struggling with unrelated issues and many years of nonsense litigations that didn't produce anything of value due to several reasons including the illegal defiance of Intel trying to get away illegally with the stolen patented technology using fake maneuvering sharing Raytheon similar lawsuit infringed equipment's independent in its nature where Raytheon lawsuit resulted from similar causes including greed, human nature,...

I was employed by Raytheon as Principal Systems Engineer & Principal Mechanical Engineer since May 10, 2004 doing hard work, doing my job with the best values possible. On August 5, 2008 I was invited to a stand-up meeting in the Radar lab. 9:00-10:00 AM where the Lab. Manager Dennis

Sharp presented serious technical issues preventing the Fire Finder RMI & Sentinel Improved radars from performing its function and order from Raytheon Company President John Colin not to sign any contract with the US Army until these issues can be solved. The two radars supposedly are going to be used in Iraq & Afghanistan to save life of our worriers in the Battlefield. ()

WHO Is Nagui Mankaruse?

I am 76 years old proud Patriotic American engineer, born in Egypt from Christian family, my father practiced law for 50 years since 1936 graduated from the Cairo University Faculty of Law, my mother was home maker, has one sister departed our world on June 1, 2020, smart hard working was deputy principal of high school, my wife Magda is an engineer by education and co-investor with Nagui of the US Patent 6,411,512 and CA Patent 289,634 () subject of the infringement in the two lawsuits against Intel and Raytheon. The Mankaruse are blessed with three smart hardworking children's. Nagui immigrated into the United States of America right after his graduation of first academic undergraduate degree as an engineer to make his lifelong dreams come true first be an engineer, second to live in California and third to work in the Aerospace industry, which achieved all goals in timely manner first thing, by arriving to California, earned advanced degree in mechanical engineering from the University of Southern California (USC) in

Los Angeles while working to support his ambitious education endeavor. I have practiced engineering and still for 53 years after graduating with undergraduate engineering degree, 95% of my experience working in Military / Aerospace including additional 25 years as adjunct engineering professor in the California State University Los Angeles & Fullerton campuses while continuing my career as proud aerospace engineer to maximize my contributions to our beloved society that gave me all the opportunities and support to live in the freedom luxury that been achieved by our founding fathers and enjoyed by all Americans. I enjoyed the freedom that is envy of the world since the first minute I touched this free land of ours. All my life working hard paying back to our great society with my hard work and love to this great Nation and of course to our own children to add to our great society with the love that we've enduring to this nation.

Since then and through the last 51 years of hard work always thinking how to return and give back to this great Nation in any way that we could, we had the Patented technologies and Intellectual Property any time getting chances. Latest my Patented technologies issued on July 11, 2017 US Patent 9, 702,634 titled Waste Heat Recovery and Optimized Systems Performance including several of its trade secrets applications yet to be used in the industry to benefit our great society and add to our great economy.

My grateful attitude to our great Nation never enough and is endless while we are alive, the latest contribution is my innovations procedure; Patent pending and available now for free "Cure Covid-19 Infected Patients Within the Hour Using Heat" (Appendix #).

I am suing Raytheon and Intel simply because I have rights under our constitution to protect my property, I never done any wrong, rather always hard working benefiting our great Nation. Raytheon interference with several opportunities to get employment in good high profile leadership engineering jobs in large companies where Raytheon killed these opportunities several times as an example an opportunity to be employed by Eaton .Corporation as chief engineer in their aerospace division in Irvine, California. Raytheon blown-up this opportunity to make life difficult for me then I can stop looking for work. We are living on social security income now. Mr. Valentine Raytheon counsel told Mankaruse in October 9, 2019 in the state court hallway that "as large Law Firm with large defendants like Raytheon they know people in all courts tell them everything".

It is my great anticipation that this Honorable Court Grant me this Appeal in its entirety in order to get my property back that guaranteed by our rule of law, our constitution and the honest discretion of this Honorable Court.

I declare under the penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States that the above is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Date: December 9, 2020

Nagui Mankaruse

NAGUI MANKARUSE

FORM 19. Certificate of Compliance with Type-Volume Limitations

Form 19
July 2020

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMITATIONS

Case Number: 20-2297

Short Case Caption: Nagui Mankaruse v. Intel Corporation

Instructions: When computing a word, line, or page count, you may exclude any items listed as exempted under Fed. R. App. P. 5(c), Fed. R. App. P. 21(d), Fed. R. App. P. 27(d)(2), Fed. R. App. P. 32(f), or Fed. Cir. R. 32(b)(2).

The foregoing filing complies with the relevant type-volume limitation of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and Federal Circuit Rules because it meets one of the following:

☑ the filing has been prepared using a proportionally-spaced typeface and includes 6,442 words.

☐ the filing has been prepared using a monospaced typeface and includes _____ lines of text.

☐ the filing contains _____ pages / _____ words / _____ lines of text, which does not exceed the maximum authorized by this court's order (ECF No. _____).

Date: 12/09/2020

Signature: Nagui Mankaru

Name: NaguiMankarue

FORM 30. Certificate of Service

Form 30
July 2020

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Case Number 20-2297

Short Case Caption Nagui Mankarluse v. INTEL Corporation

NOTE: Proof of service is only required when the rules specify that service must be accomplished outside the court's electronic filing system. See Fed. R. App. P. 25(d); Fed. Cir. R. 25(e). Attach additional pages as needed.

I certify that I served a copy of the foregoing filing on 12/09/2020

by ☑ U.S. Mail ☐ Hand Delivery ☑ Email ☐ Facsimile
☐ Other: _____

on the below individuals at the following locations.

Person Served	Service Location (Address, Facsimile, Email)
PETER GRATZINGER	350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor, Los Angles, CA 90071-1560; Facsimle: (213) 687-3702
N/A	
N/A	
N/A	
N/A	

☐ Additional pages attached.

Date: 12/09/2020

Signature: Magda Mankaruse

Name: MAGDA MANKARUSE