Friday, April 26, 2013

LEADER V. FACEBOOK JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT EXPOSES A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

THEFT OF LEADER TECHNOLOGIES’ PATENT BY FACEBOOK, AND THE EFFECTIVE SANCTIONING OF THAT THEFT BY THE FEDERAL COURTS, HAS EXPOSED A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS SURROUNDING "JUDICIAL IMMUNITY."[1]
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(Apr. 26, 2013) — The Federal Circuit judges held stock in Facebook during the proceedings ("even the smallest financial interest (e.g., ownership of a single share of stock) requires disqualification.").[2]

1. They refused to disclose the Facebook stock holdings of their family members.
2. They ignored well-settled legal precedents (some they themselves wrote).
3. They ignored shocking new evidence that Mark Zuckerberg withheld volumes of evidence in the case.
4. They violated Leader Technologies’ due process rights by creating new arguments and evidence for Facebook in the secrecy of chambers without a hearing.
5. They failed to disclose personal conflicts of interest.
6. They collaborated with Facebook’s law firms; even timing their rulings to accommodate Facebook’s media needs.
7. Their college friends at the U.S. Securities & Exchange Commission issued an exemption from long-standing stock rules in one day that pumped the value of their Facebook holdings in the IPO.

Few Americans know this, but the U.S. Supreme Court decided in 1978...
in *Stump v. Sparkmen* that judges are *immune* from prosecution for their actions, no matter how incompetent, negligent, malicious such conduct might be, *even if the conduct violates the law*. Bottom line attorneys are granting special privileges to other attorneys.[3]

The Supreme Court stated in *Stump* that “Despite the unfairness to litigants that sometimes results, the doctrine of judicial immunity is thought to be in the best interests of ‘the proper administration of justice . . . [for it allows] a judicial officer, in exercising the authority vested in him [to] be free to act upon his own convictions, without apprehension of personal consequences to himself.’”[4] Note is taken of the wiggle language in *Stump* like “sometimes results” and “thought to be.” Who thought it to be in the best interest of justice? Other attorneys and judges? It is inconceivable that the average American citizen knows or understands that the legal class in this country has put itself *above* the U.S. Constitution.

Was this attorney-inspired and attorney-approved exoneration of all sins ever put to a debate among the American people? Not to our knowledge. It appears from the wiggle language that not even the U.S. Supreme Court believed its opinion was just. And yet, the Court has religiously excused fellow judges from misconduct ever since.

**GROWTH OF JUDICIAL CORRUPTION SINCE STUMP**

We believe that *Stump* has caused the justice system to grow more corrupt with each passing year. Judges and unscrupulous attorneys known that judges can *take bribes* and then *make biased decisions* with impunity. Then, if a victim cries foul, they simply run behind the *Stump* curtain for protection. This is intuitively wrong, so why are we letting them get away with it?

**JUDICIAL IMMUNITY CREATES A JUDICIAL ROYAL CLASS THAT EXEMPTS A CLASS OF CITIZENS AND PUTS THEIR RIGHTS ABOVE THE U.S. CONSTITUTION**

The U.S. Supreme Court in 1978 decided that judges can act outside the bounds of fairness and equity and be immune from prosecution for those acts. What other profession enjoys such immunity? Can a policeman shoot someone maliciously? Can a contractor build negligently? Can a regulator take bribes? Can an engineer be absolved from liability for injury caused by substandard parts? Can a doctor intentionally prescribe harmful medicines? None of these professions are immune. Why then, do judges and attorneys get special treatment and exemption from the Constitution that the rest of us must follow?

The concept of judicial immunity is associated with English common law where judges are the King’s delegates for dispensing justice and the assumption that “the King can do no wrong.”[5]

**HOW WOULD THE FRAMERS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIEW OUR JUDGES’ EXEMPTION FROM CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATES?**

John Adams is considered the father of the American Constitution. The U.S. Constitution was written in 1787 using as its model the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 which Adams drafted him himself.[6]

Regarding the accountability of the citizenry (including judges) to the Constitution, Adams’ Article VI is clear:

“No man . . . [shall] have any other title to obtain advantages, or particular and exclusive privileges, distinct from those of the community. (emphasis added)

**STRIKE ONE AGAINST JUDICIAL IMMUNITY.** Judges are not to be given special privileges outside those needed to do their jobs. And even so, those privileges cannot be a license to perform malicious and illegal acts with impunity.

Regarding the ultimate authority to bestow special privileges, such authority rests with the people alone, and not with the U.S. Supreme Court. Adams’ Article V states:

“All power residing originally in the people, and being derived from them, the several magistrates and officers of government, vested with authority,
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**FIVE CRITICAL AFI POSTS ON JUDICIAL COMPROMISE**

Fully updated Mar. 25, 2014 in the wake of the Scribd censorship:

1. **HOW PATENT JUDGES GROW RICH ON THE BACKS OF AMERICAN INVENTORS**
   Patent Office filings are shuffled out the USPTO backdoor to crony lawyers, banks and deep-pocket clients.

2. **WAS CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS BLACKMAILED** into supporting Obamacare by his ethical compromises in *Leader v. Facebook*?

3. **JUSTICE ROBERTS MENTORED** Facebook Gibson
whether legislative, executive, or judicial, are their substitutes and agents, and are at all times accountable to them.” (emphasis added)

**STRIKE TWO AGAINST JUDICIAL IMMUNITY.** The responsibility to establish judicial immunity rests with the people (legislatures) and not with the courts. Here’s the rub: 42% of all Congresspersons and Senators are lawyers.[7] Due to this conflict of interest, when this matter comes to a vote, these attorneys should be required to recuse themselves from voting on this subject.

Interestingly, while Congressional perspectives today are skewed toward attorneys, this was not so true in the 1780’s. The Framers were a much more diverse group of professions. Such diversity would naturally be more reflective of the actual sentiments of the people and help to avoid this evident conflict of interest that exists today.

**STRIKE THREE AGAINST JUDICIAL IMMUNITY.** The idea of a privileged legal class is abhorrent.

Regarding the notion of privilege and exemption from accountability, John Adams’ Article VII says:

“Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity and happiness of the people; and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men.” (emphasis added)

**TODAY’S CONSTITUTIONS CONTINUE TO REFLECT JOHN ADAMS’ PRINCIPLES**

The fundamental principles of equity and fairness before the law pervade American constitutions at all levels of government. Accountability to the people is a sacred principle. So, how does the U.S. Supreme Court in Stump get away with permitting judges to make unfair decisions with impunity? Is that not a right that violates Adams’ Article VII?

According to John Adams ALL decisions are the people’s alone. They are not to be the decisions of a privileged legal class who borrow from rejected notions of English royal privilege and proclaim themselves immune. Ostensibly, we left such monarchical structures behind in the American Revolution. Or did we? However, it does not appear that the Federal Circuit in Leader v. Facebook received that memo.

**U.S. CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE UP THE QUESTION OF JUDICIAL IMMUNITY IMMEDIATELY USING LEADER V. FACEBOOK AS A TEST CASE**

Adams’ Article VI says judges are accountable to the public for impartiality. It “prohibits the improper use of State power for private interests.” Commonwealth v. Ellis, 429 Mass. 362 at 371. Officers of the court “must not appear to be influenced, in his or her exercise of discretion, either by his or her personal interest or by a person or entity to whom the prosecution . . . will bring significant benefit.” Id. at 372.

The Facebook stock held by Leader v. Facebook judges and judicial employees is prima facie evidence that the federal courts made decisions favorable to Facebook and in their private interest.

**SECRET JUDICIAL LOYALTY RACKET VIOLATES THE CONSTITUTIONAL BAN ON PRIVILEGE**

Shielding judges from irrational litigants is reasonable. However, judges who hide behind this privilege to mask self-aggrandizing, malicious and criminal acts is abhorrent to our most fundamental tenants of American democracy. No constitutional authority gives judges the right to take actions outside the law which the rest of us in the community must follow.

**FEDERAL CIRCUIT STEPPED OUTSIDE JUDICIAL IMMUNITY BY HOLDING STOCK IN FACEBOOK**

Even the Stump decision says “a judge is entitled to judicial immunity if he has not acted in clear absence of all jurisdiction and if the act was a judicial one.”

At least two of the Leader v. Facebook three-judge panel held stock in Facebook. Nothing in the Statutes, Rules or Codes of Conduct gives a judge jurisdiction to hold stock in a litigant. In fact, the Code of Conduct states that judges are required to withdraw from a case even with “ownership of a single share of stock.”[8]

1. Americans For Innovation: LEADER V. FACEBOOK JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT EXPOSES A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

3/27

http://americans4innovation.blogspot.com/2013/04/leader-v.html

4. JUSTICE ROBERTS HOLDS substantial Facebook financial interests.

5. JUDGE LEONARD STARK FAILED to disclose his Facebook financial interests and his reliance on Facebook’s Cooley Godward LLP attorneys for his appointment.

BARACK OBAMA’S DARK POOLS OF CORRUPTION

STOP FACEBOOK PROPERTY THEFT

ASK CONGRESS: PASS THE INVENTOR PROTECTION ACT!
Therefore, by (a) holding the Facebook stock without disclosing it, and the (b) ruling in Facebook’s favor anyway, the judges awarded themselves privileges above the community.

CONCLUSION: The Federal Circuit judges and their cronies are claiming royalty status in violation of the Constitution. And, even by the standard in Stump, the judges and their families who hold Facebook stock cannot hide behind judicial immunity since holding stock in Facebook has nothing to do with “the proper administration of justice.”[9]

AMERICAN CITIZENS MUST ACT TO DISMANTLE A ROYAL LEGAL CLASS THAT HAS EMERGED THAT THINKS IT IS NOT ACCOUNTABLE TO ANYONE BUT THEMSELVES

The conduct of the federal courts in Leader v. Facebook is a gift to America. It is a perfect test case since the sins of our judges and Facebook’s unscrupulous law firms are so evident. These judges and their cronies have awarded themselves monopolistic powers in violation of the U.S. and state Constitutions.

Observes of the Leader v. Facebook litigation can only wag their heads in utter disbelief at the haughtiness and arrogance of a judiciary that is breaking the law with impunity. Now we know why. They intended all along to go through the motions of justice, but rule for Facebook no matter what, then rely upon judicial immunity to avoid their day of reckoning.

What they did not predict is that the lay community would not still for this misconduct. The constitutional principle is clear. No class of men and women is above the law or the people. No institution of government is exempt from accountability to the people.

Senator Diane Feinstein was recently asked to investigate the Federal Circuit in Leader v. Facebook. In her response she said that the Senate Judiciary Committee was powerless to investigate under the separation of powers.

Apparently Sen. Feinstein, a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee[10] needs a refresher in Constitutional principles from John Adams, who wrote “‘Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity and happiness of the people; and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men.’” He further wrote:

“Therefore the people alone have an incontestable, unalienable, and indefeasible right to institute government; and to reform, alter, or totally change the same, when their protection, safety, prosperity and happiness require it.

Our members of Congress need to refresh themselves on the Constitution and their duty to protect it. They need to help us take back our democracy from a self-appointed legal-financial royalty that has hijacked the U.S. Constitution. Facebook and their cronies appear to be leading this dismantling of the Constitution. Leader v. Facebook uncovered the corruption; now let’s get on with the nut cutting.”

John Adams is probably rolling in his grave right now.

What are we American citizens going to do about this?

“We have no government armed with power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion . . . Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.” — John Adams, 1879.

John Adams is a signer of the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights and our second President.

* * *

FOOTNOTES:


3 "Judicial immunity." Wikipedia ("Judicial Immunity is a form of legal immunity which protects judges and others employed by the judiciary from lawsuits brought against them for judicial actions, no matter how incompetent, negligent, or malicious such conduct might be, even if this conduct is in violation of statutes."). <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Judicial_immunity>.


Wikipedia states "Historically, judicial immunity was associated with the English common law idea that 'the King can do no wrong.' (Compare Sovereign immunity.) Judges, the King's delegates for dispensing justice, accordingly 'ought not to be drawn into question for any supposed corruption [for this tends] to the slander of the justice of the King.'"


See Judicial Disqualification, supra.

Stump at 365.

U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee <http://www.judiciary.senate.gov/about/members.cfm>.
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83 comments:

K. Craine April 29, 2013 at 6:04 AM
Comment by: Gary

JAMES W. ("Pump and Dump") BREYER, the Queen of the Facebook PUMP AND DUMP scheme, is flying from the chicken coop he made. See this:


(Larry Summers is the King. All hail the king and queen of American corruption.)
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K. Craine April 29, 2013 at 8:02 AM
Comment by: Gary

Apologies to Fenwick & West LLP and Gordon Davidson, Esquire, the Court Jesters of American corruption, otherwise known as attorneys. :-|
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K. Craine April 30, 2013 at 10:59 AM
Comment by: Billy Bob

THE CORRUPTION OF APPLE COMPUTERS HAS BEGUN. Fresh off his ill-gotten billions from the Facebook IPO fraud, Russian oligarch Alisher Asmanov invests $100M in Apple. Priceless.

http://www.cnbc.com/id/100689253

Silicon Valley is about ready to drop into the Pacific ocean under the weight of its sins.
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GIbson Dunn LLP exposed as one of the most corrupt law firms in America

Investigative Reporter Julia Davis investigates Facebook's Leader v. Facebook attorney Gibson Dunn LLP. She credits this firm with the reason why not a single Wall Street banker has gone to jail since 2008. Click here to read her article "Everybody hates whistleblowers." Examiner.com, Apr. 10, 2012. Here's an excerpt:

"Skillful manipulation of the firm's extensive media connections allows Gibson Dunn to promote their causes, while simultaneously smearing their opponents and silencing embarrassing news coverage."

This statement followed right after Davis cited Facebook's chief inside counsel in the Leader v. Facebook case, Theodore Ullyot, who appears to have helped lead the Leader v. Facebook judicial corruption. Interesting word choices associated with Gibson Dunn LLP: manipulation, smear. Attorneys swear a solemn oath to act morally, ethically, and in
Derek Johannas May 1, 2013 at 7:25 AM

I have really struggled with the idea that Facebook ever actually stole anything. The only evidence is that Zuckerberg happened to code Facebook in a way that infringed Leader’s patent. But I really don’t see anything innovative about the technology to begin with. Think about it. The core of Facebook is that you subscribe to another user’s feed so that you see that user’s information, and vice versa. That’s it. It’s pretty damn simple. The reason that Facebook became so popular is that people are inherently narcissistic and curious about what other people are doing. It’s not that there is some innovative technology that didn’t exist before. It’s that people like to gossip, and Facebook was a simple, attractive, easy way to do this.

There were two very interesting comments posted on Donna’s old site:

Hi Donna, actually, I have a PhD in Computer Science and I regret to inform you outright that yes, the initial launch version of Facebook could, in fact, be written in two weeks. These sorts of projects are routinely done in the startup community, it doesn’t take much to get the initial version of Facebook up and going. Absolutely nothing in the ‘white paper’ you linked to even looks /interesting/ let alone useful for constructing a web application like Facebook, which wasn’t really well engineered to begin with.

Can someone please explain to me what amazing technology Facebook was using? It offered nothing in functionality over Friendster/Orkut/MySpace/etc., in fact — it exactly resembled them, except with a great new marketing strategy of making it ‘exclusive’, which worked like gangbusters for Google’s original GMail marketing strategy to build the initial groundswell and hype.

The actual code and technology that drove Facebook early on wasn’t impressive, groundbreaking or amazing in the slightest, it’s the same hacky pile of PHP coded crap that every other web startup back then was using. The success of Facebook was purely through brand marketing and the personal connections Zuckerberg made, not this ridiculous notion that their launch technology was at all innovative. To think otherwise is merely delusional.

Derek Johannas May 1, 2013 at 8:12 PM

Derek is indeed a computer scientist who knows how to code in Java, then he is misrepresenting what we programmers know to be the case. On a good day I can code MAYBE 500 lines of good, debugged code. Then, as each day’s code is added to the previous, new testing creates new debugging requirements. In a week and a half Zuckerberg might have created MAYBE 3,500 lines of code. That is not enough for a fully functioning, large-scale web platform. In any event, Zuckerberg alluded to “other” sources in his Winklevoss testimony.

Derek is attempting to reargue the trial where Leader’s experts PROVED from Carnegie Mellon and UC Berkley that Leader’s invention was innovative over the prior art. I love the way Derek and his ilk always conclude with comments like “delusional.” Remember he is saying that the entire federal trial result regarding two days of prior art testimony and a “battle of experts,” the 3 Patent Office examinations and the fact that Facebook resorted to cartoons at trial to defend itself, are all delusional. Who is the deluded one? Derek, you continue to abuse facts. The defenses of Facebook are all emotional and indicative of co-dependency, not rationality.

K. Craine May 1, 2013 at 12:26 PM

Comment by: Hacky Sacky

Derek’s comment is just idiotic. He said “the actual code and technology that drove Facebook early on wasn’t impressive, groundbreaking or amazing in the slightest, it’s the same hacky pile of PHP coded crap that every other web startup back then was using.” Really now Derek, an invention that 1 BILLION people on the planet now “LIKE” is just more coded crap? That’s just more unconvincing blather from you Facebook lovers who abuse people’s privacy in the name of ‘Engagement’. You people are going to have to be put down like rabid dogs. You’re out of control.
You all are really missing the point.

Was the original Facebook a hacky pile of PHP? Quite simply, yes. Take a look at the original site: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Original-facebook.jpg. Boring, simplistic. Nothing to it beyond the mundane. There is absolutely no innovative technology here. This was an extension of the traditional college facebook where you would gawk at your classmates. But here, you had the opportunity to share content, share gossip, etc. That was the appeal. Add on top of that the face that this all originated at Harvard and was exclusive there for a time and THAT is your recipe for success.

Compare this to the original Leader white papers. No comparison. Completely different markets. Completely different goals. The Leader concept was designed for companies to collaborate on projects internally. The idea that Leader invented "social networking?" Absolutely preposterous. The Leader product was never--and is still not--remotely targeted to the consumer market like Facebook was.

Facebook at its launch was, frankly, pretty damn lame. But it was exclusive. It exploited people's voyeuristic and narcissistic tendencies. THAT is why it was successful. Not the concept. Not the technology. Certainly nothing to do with Leader. If Leader had anything to do with "social networking", we would have seen a competing product from the company 10 years ago. We didn't. We haven't. That speaks volumes.

I have watched this matter devolve from an almost rational debate (circa Donna Kline in February 2012) to the most ridiculous 6-degrees of separation conspiracy theory of all time in the past year or so. This blog seems to center on the theory of "If you repeat a lie often enough, it becomes the truth."

Let's start with the most fundamental lie. "The judges held stock in Facebook." Well, no, they didn't. They held shares in a mutual fund. That happened to have Facebook stock. Look back over the past 50 years. This is not a conflict of interest. The entire system would collapse if mutual fund holdings somehow disqualified judges from ruling on matters. Longstanding ethical rules hold that this is simply not a conflict of interest. Period.

"They ignored shocking new evidence of 28 hard drives..." Well, no, again, they didn't. First off, the way this was presented to the Court of Appeal was entirely improper. It was presented by way of a paid shill--Dr. A.-- who was not a party to this litigation. If there was actual evidence here, it should have been presented by Leader. And it should have been supported by proper evidence, i.e. declarations showing that in the underlying Leader v. Facebook, Facebook claimed under oath that no such evidence existed. This was never done. There was no admissible evidence on which the Court of Appeal could make even a rule. Moreover, this motion should have been brought before the District Court, NOT the Court of Appeal.

"The Court of Appeals violated Leader's due process rights." Sigh. No, again, they didn't. An appellate opinion is based upon the entire record that is put before the court. Here, that record included all of the evidence regarding all of the companies where Leader solicited business. The fact that these companies were not specifically called out in the appellate briefs is not relevant. This information was included in the underlying trial record. And the due process arguments only apply to criminal matters. This was a civil matter. Completely irrelevant.
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Derek Johannas May 1, 2013 at 8:13 PM

I could go on, but you get the point. There was nothing out of the ordinary here. This was not the "greatest theft in the history of mankind." Leader had an idea for a corporate workgroup sharing platform. Great. Zuckerberg had an idea for a completely separate social networking platform. Were there overlap? Yes. But these were completely separate tracks. Leader never intended, nor attempted to enter, the arena of social networking. Facebook was on an entirely different plane and market. It really is just that simple.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 2, 2013 at 9:11 AM

Comment by: Yawn.

If Derek is a 'computer scientist', I'm Donald Duck. This is just more old FB spin barfed out for new readers. The only thing these FB-lovers seem to be good at is pathological lying.

Quack. Quack.
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May 2, 2013 at 9:20 AM

K. Craine

Comment by: law blogger

Notice how Derek, the computer scientist is now spinning Zuckerberg's withholding of 28 Zuckerberg hard drives of evidence. He's clearly a hired legal liar for Facebook.

What do you call 1,000 Facebook lawyers at the bottom of the ocean? Shame Derek, you can't take any of your ill-gotten gain with you on Judgment Day... and your grave will read: 'He was an expert at cheating, lying and stealing from people.'

Reply Delete

May 2, 2013 at 12:01 PM

Fixit

Comment by: Billy Bob

Re: Derek Johannas. 'They ignored shocking new evidence of 28 hard drives...if there was actual evidence here, it should have been presented by Leader.'

Sorry to burst your bubble, Derek, but Leader's counsel did attempt to present this evidence; unfortunately, Facebook denied the existence of the 28 drives during discovery, claiming it had been earlier destroyed.

Reply Delete

May 2, 2013 at 1:23 PM

K. Craine

Comment by: Justice bought with a price

AFI can confirm from primary sources that when Facebook was asked by Leader Technologies' attorneys to produce all Zuckerberg documents, files and source code from 2003 and 2004, Facebook's attorneys said they were LOST and they produced NOTHING. We now know from the Paul Ceglia's depositions of two Facebook forensic experts McGowan and Rose that those attorneys LIED and that that information was in the possession of Facebook attorneys the entire time. What were they hiding? Must have been important enough to risk criminal actions. Were they hiding Leader's source code in those files?


Reply Delete

May 3, 2013 at 3:07 PM

K. Craine

Comment by: law blogger

Strong intellectual property rights. We welcome commenters and contributors. The Leader v. Facebook patent infringement case first came to our attention after learning that the trial judge, Leonard P. Stark, U.S. District Court of Delaware, ignored his jury's admission that they had no evidence to support their on-sale bar verdict, but the judge supported it anyway.

The judicial misconduct has deteriorated from there, replete with two of the three judges on the Federal Circuit appeal panel, Judges Alan D. Lourie and Kimberly A. Moore, holding Facebook stock that they did not disclose to the litigants, and later tried to excuse through a quick motion slipped in at the last minute by the Clerk of Court, Jan Horbaly, and his close friends at The Federal Circuit Bar Association. (The DC Bar subsequently revealed that Mr. Horbaly is not licensed to practice law in Washington D.C.)

The judges ignored shocking new evidence that Mark Zuckerberg withheld 28 hard drives of 2003-2004 evidence from Leader Technologies that could prove actual theft (and therefore claims even more serious than infringement). In addition, Facebook's appeal attorney, Thomas G. Hungar of Gibson Dunn LLP, has close personal ties to just about every judicial player in this story. The misconduct appears to reach into the U.S. Patent Office through abuse of the reexamination process by Facebook. We will stay focused on Leader v. Facebook until justice is served, but we also welcome news and analysis of intellectual property abuse in other cases as well.

WELCOME TO DONNA KLINE NOW! READERS!

AFI has been supporting Donna and is now picking up the main Leader v. Facebook coverage (she will continue coverage as well).

Anonymous Posts Are Welcomed! Blogger has more posting constraints than Donna's WordPress, but we will continue to welcome anonymous posts. Simply send us an email at amer4innov@gmail.com with your post. Once the moderator verifies that your email address is real, your comment will be posted using your real name or handle, whatever you wish, like John Smith or Tex.

Click here to view a complete Donna Kline Now! posts archive. ❯
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K. Craine  May 4, 2013 at 7:41 AM
Comment by: SuperSleuth

Take a look at this overview of JAMES W. BEYER, leader of the Facebook cabal:


What human being could be in so many places? Wait, maybe he is superhuman! This stinks just looking at it. Taking bets that he intentionally makes things look complicated to discourage regulators, law enforcement and the public from digging underneath this smoke screen. In fact, this chart should be in the dictionary alongside “CORRUPTION SMOKE SCREEN.” Well Mr. Breyer, you’ve pissed us off. We’re digging and coming after you now. When you add LARRY SUMMERS’ and SHERYL SANDBERG’S and YURI MILNER’S layers on top of this, you get the definition of depravity.

This chart just pisses me off and makes me more determined than ever to put these people behind bars for their deceit... along with their corrupt law firms, judges, patent examiners and stock underwriters.
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K. Craine  May 4, 2013 at 8:04 AM
Comment by: SuperSleuth

Just figured out why FOX BUSINESS only pretends to be conservative... look at this bio of JAMES W. BREYER (director of Facebook and its second largest shareholder who cashed out over $6 BILLION of his Facebook stock on Day 3 of the IPO with the public’s money) regarding his directorship at DELL. This little fact does not appear on most of his other bios around the web. Breyer is a DIRECTOR of NEWS CORPORATION that owns FOX. So much for “fair and balanced.” No wonder Fox has ignored the Leader v. Facebook judicial corruption scandal... they’re in Facebook’s camp. Hey conservatives, are you shocked? I am a liberal and this is detestable. They only pretend to investigate the truth, just like we thought. (CNN’s no better.) We have lost an independent investigative press in this country.

http://www.smartmoney.com/barrons/briefingbooks/?page=executives&symbol=DELL

...us citizens are going to have to do it. Let’s support every independent news outlet we can on the left, center and right.
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K. Craine  May 4, 2013 at 8:08 AM
Comment by: SuperSleuth

Just in case Breyer’s DELL bio gets mysteriously edited after my post, here is a cut and paste of it as it is currently displayed:

James W. Breyer Independent Director
Held current title since: 2009 Director since: 2009 Age: 51

Mr. James W. Breyer is no longer Independent Director of Dell Inc., effective Company’s 2013 annual meeting of stockholders. Mr. Breyer has been a Partner of Accel Partners, a venture capital firm, since 1987. Mr. Breyer is also the founder of Breyer Capital, an investment firm, and has served as its Chief Executive Officer since July 2006. Additionally, Mr. Breyer is a co-founder of IDG-Accel China Funds and has served as co-lead on the company’s strategic investment committee since its inception in 2005. Mr. Breyer serves on the boards of directors of News Corporation, Facebook, Inc., Prosper Marketplace, Inc. and Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., where he is the presiding director. From June 2006 to December 2009, Mr. Breyer was on the board of directors of Marvel Entertainment, Inc., and from October 1995 until June 2008, he served on the board of directors of Real Networks, Inc.

http://www.smartmoney.com/barrons/briefingbooks/?page=executives&symbol=DELL
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K. Craine  May 4, 2013 at 8:30 AM
Comment by: SuperSleuth

“CANON 2: A judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all activities.”

Judge Leonard P. Stark, U.S. District Court of Delaware, trial judge in Leader Techs, Inc. v. Facebook, Inc., 770 F. Supp. 2d 686 (D.Del. 2011). Judge Stark heard his jury foreman admit that the jury made the on-sale bar decision without any evidence other than speculation, and yet he supported that verdict anyway. Just months before trial, Judge Stark allowed Facebook to add the on-sale bar claim after the close of all fact
Did you know that JAMES W. BREYER is now bailing from the Wal-Mart and Dell boards of directors too? Hmmmm. He mentions his interest in “international investing.” Prediction: he’ll be moving to a dacha along the Crimean Sea in Russia, or somewhere in the Pacific or Indian Oceans in order to escape American regulators who are starting to investigate his relationships to Larry Summers and the 2008 bail out of his best buddies, Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley. $64,000 QUESTION: did they use Goldman’s and Morgan’s $32 BILLION in US Taxpayer “bailout” money to enable oligarchs Yuri Milner and Alisher Asmanov to purchase over $3 billion of Facebook’s pre-IPO shares. This action pumped the pre-IPO value to $100 billion. The word for this weekend is PUMP AND DUMP.

Also remember, his Wal-Mart board was caught bribing senior officials of the Mexican government. He is surely feeling the heat now... and he’s going to get much more of it in this Leader v. Facebook corruption scandal.

I haven’t decided, I am either going to go take a shower to wash off this corruption filth, or go mow the lawn.


Reply Delete

John Craven May 4, 2013 at 1:46 PM

There reaches a point where you have to look reality in the eye and realize, simply, that it is over. This is the time. This matter is dead, buried, and permanent. For the sake of your immortal soul, move forward and focus your efforts on trying to better society in the future. Social networking already had its epiphany. Who knows what is next on the horizon.

Reply Delete

Jason Bellini May 4, 2013 at 11:24 PM

Extremely well said JC. I for one wish this entire ordeal had unraveled differently. But in the end, Facebook prevailed. We now have a system that has truly revolutionized the planet I for one am now I touch with people I had forgotten about for 25 years. It’s truly amazing, and I am thankful every day for that. I think that Leader had some great ideas and I don’t discount them. But after following this matter for more than 2 years, I still can’t make a connection between Leaders product and what Facebook turned out to be. I look at the white papers that Donna published and I just don’t get it. It looks to me like Leaders product was something for companies to manage projects. Facebook is totally different. It’s a place for people to connect with other students, friends, old acquaintances, etc. I really don’t see the connection. In any event, it is awesome. I love it, and I wish the people at Leader the best too. They seem smart and I am sure there is a lot to do on the Internet.

Reply Delete

Rain Onyourparade May 5, 2013 at 5:41 AM

“John Craven” and “Jason Bellini” (a.k.a. Facebook attorneys) sound like the White House Press Secretary on Benghazi (“We’ve been talking about this for weeks, its time to move on.”) LOL. They are trying to whitewash “guilty on 11 of 11 counts” since they know the “on-sale bar” verdict was an illegal sham bought off with fabricated evidence and crooked Federal Circuit judges, clerk and bar association. Notice how they cannot produce even a shred of evidence to defend themselves?

They’d like our investigation into their wrongdoings to just go away so they can move on. Wrongdoers always want investigators to move on. The more you guys try to gloss over your misconduct, the brighter the light shines on it. 8-O

By the way, who are JAMES W. BREYER’s parents and family? They are not mentioned in any bio that I can find. As much as he is written about on the web, it is strange that no journalist, regulator, official, bank, underwriter has asked and he does not tell.

This deleted JAMES W. BREYER background information reminds me of Yuri Milner’s (DST - second largest Facebook stock holder) curious failure to mention his close association for years with BANK MENATEP’s $10 BILLION Russian mob money laundering and diversion of $5 BILLION in IMF funds in the early 2000’s.

Can anyone find out who his parents and family are?

Reply Delete
To John Craven, let me first say that Leader v Facebook has nothing to do with my immortal soul. Your fellow cronies at Facebook may have bought into the Zuckster’s deity, but as for me, I answer to someone up the food chain a bit. On a personal note, you may want to really get to know Him, since you shall see Him face to face one day; and everything that you have stolen shall be repaid to you in like fashion.

Also, John, this matter is far from over. People with more power and influence than you are mobilizing behind the scenes. There is a reason Mr. Breyer is jumping ship now. He hears the growing pitter-patter of question upon question from investigators, and now law makers. Even the media (the ones not bought off...) see this story morphing into a sicker, deep-rooted corruption that Facebook and their cronies law firms and financiers helped create.

Jason Bellini..a.k.a. John Craven perhaps...don't you wish that this entire matter had unraveled differently? Had it done so, you would be begging Leader for a job. So, to say otherwise is just empty blither blather (but, I assume that’s what Facebook pays you to say). Everyone wishes this had turned out differently. Only history will show that there were two warring camps involved --- one who did things correctly and were rewarded with nothing, and the other who started off incorrectly (theft) and continued that wrong path (briber)., using purchased political muscle to garner undue influence and amass filthy fortunes through coercion.

To correct a couple of points (Jason), Mike McKibben never set out to invent “social media”. His platform was designed for collaborative data flow, so that businesses could readily inter-communicate and share ideas. We watched the Lincoln movie last night. Lincoln quoting Euclid: “Things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other.” Boy Blunder turned Leader’s invention into something sophomoric (which is ironic, because he was one when he stole the source code). I would argue that Zuckster built his site because he was a horny, pimp-flecked geek looking to score! Yes, Jason and JC, your Zuckster deity did steal that code and was subsequently found guilty of infringing on McKibben’s data flow patent. That fact that is indisputable; those 11 counts of guilty verdict will never go away.

And might I close with a simple question to the both of you… I really don't care who answers (assuming you're not the same person)? Since you say team Zuckerberg created “social networking”. Since team Zuckerberg revolutionized the planet – an endeavor for which you are so grateful every day... praise be the Zuckster. Since Zuckerber is such an awesome dude!! Why can't that invention stand on its own? Why is Fenwick & West trying so hard the fact that they did not disclose Leader's invention in Facebook's patent filings to the Patent Office? Why did Fenwick's attorney Christopher P. King change his name just for the Zuckster? You people have no defense, just pomposity and bluster. The bigger they are, the harder they fall. Timbrerrrrrrrrr.

The truth is, boys, you need Leader' patent out of the way; you know it, Facebook knows it, and (as of now) the American public are starting to know it.

There does come a time when you have to stare reality in the face...Perhaps team Leader created “social media” first? Euclid: “Things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other.”

Judge Evan J. Wallach, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, member of the three-judge panel in Leader Techs v. Facebook, Inc., 678 F.3d 1300 (Fed. Cir. 2012). Judge Wallach is not a patent attorney. This begs the question as to why a judge with no knowledge of patent law was assigned to the case. Would anyone ask a dentist to perform brain surgery? The Federal Circuit was specially formed to appoint patent-knowledgeable judges to patent cases. There is no evidence so far in the judicial disclosures that Judge Wallach holds stock in Facebook, although when he was asked on a motion to disclose potential Facebook holdings and other conflicts of interest, he refused along with the other judges. See Motion to Disclose Conflicts of Interest. Judge Wallach continued in silence even after Clerk of Court Horbaly failed to provide him with Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam’s motions (according to his Federal Circuit staffer Valeri White), and yet the Clerk signed an order regarding that motion on Judge Wallach’s behalf. See a full analysis of these events at Donna Kline Now! Judge Wallach also failed to police his court’s violation of Leader’s Fifth and 14th Amendment constitutional right to due process when he participated in the
Just one man’s opinion.
8-O
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Delete

Replies

dave123 May 9, 2013 at 7:57 PM
software “copied” from Leader try stolen he stole the idea and the software

Delete

Reply

John Craven May 5, 2013 at 7:11 PM
I hate to be the one always throwing cold water here, but that is my burden. Darren, you claim that theft of leader code was proven. Well, no it wasn’t. Infringement was. This is complete separate from actual copying. There are a million ways to do something that might infringe on a patent, and here Mr. Zuckerberg happened to program the original Facebook in a fashion that infringed on the leader patent. But there has never been a scintilla of evidence to suggest that Mr. Zuckerberg actually copied any Leader code. This is a pure fantasy invented by this blog.

And as to this matter being over? It really is. The media—any media—would have picked up on this years ago if anything were truly afoot. The only person who did was Donna Kline, and the fact that she so abruptly terminated coverage on December 12 (and ha yet to create a post since) strongly, strongly suggests that she was being paid for every post. The courts already ruled here. Congress is not interested. The media is not interested. We really are done folks.

Reply Delete

Darren May 5, 2013 at 9:02 PM
Sorry your burden is so heavy John. You have just confirmed that Mark Zuckerberg has 2 left hands! Wow! It was interesting that you used the term theft. I didn’t use it. Also, as has been written about earlier, there still exist approximately 28 hard drives that the Facebook lawyers said were destroyed and didn’t exist during discovery of the Leader v. Facebook trial that you seem to think are pristine Facebook code and that they don’t contain anything incriminating against Facebook. It was Facebook’s lawyers that have “lied” to the court. The evidence has shown that 11 out of 11 counts of infringement by Facebook. There has not been any evidence that Mark Zuckerberg did not “copy” Leader code, not one bit, other than his lawyers saying he did not infringe and we have seen what their integrity is! Letting an independent party examine the hard drives to show pristine Facebook code would be nice, but, we know that won’t happen! It was interesting that you used the word “Theft!”

1. As for Donna, you might want to ask her before accusing her of anything.
2. As for congress not being interested, then you are a little out of touch.

You still haven’t answered my question in the previous post and you ignored your own mentors’ statements from their Stanford video.

I am glad we didn’t have a lot of people with your defeatist attitude after 9/11. I can just imagine you standing around wringing your hands saying, woe is me and I quote, “For the sake of your immortal soul, move forward and focus your efforts on trying to better society in the future.” Your fellow coworkers might enjoy a little more positive outlook. We will be a lot better off if lawyers, judges and corrupt politicians live up to the oaths that they have sworn to uphold, not scam the public by trying to skate around their oaths.

Just my opinion.
8-O

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 6, 2013 at 6:03 AM
Comment by: Got Z’s Number

John stated ‘here Mr. Zuckerberg happened to program the original Facebook in a fashion that infringed on the leader patent. But there has never been a scintilla of evidence to suggest that Mr. Zuckerberg actually copied any Leader code. This is a pure fantasy invented by this blog.’

Unless the Z-thief himself is writing this statement, then the statement is just fantastical hearsay since he/she could not possibly know what Zuckerberg did or didn’t do (unless s/he was there). And, “never been a scintilla of evidence” is nothing but deception meant to fool those who have not followed the trial. We won’t disturb John’s fabrication of new arguments and evidence for Facebook in the secrecy of judge’s chambers after he had just invalidated Facebook’s sole remaining item of evidence (using disbelieved testimony as ostensible evidence of an opposite). Judge Wallach also failed to police his court when he failed to apply the Supreme Court’s Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, Inc. test for on-sale bar evidence, which included even the Federal Circuit’s own Group One v. Hallmark Cards, Inc. test—a test which Judge Lourie should have advised Judge Wallach to follow since Judge Lourie helped write that opinion. Group One test omission analysis.

Clerk of Court Jan Horbaly, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, clerk who signed all the opinions in Leader Techs v. Facebook, Inc., 678 F.3d 1300 (Fed. Cir. 2012). Clerk Horbaly and his staff obfuscated when the court’s ruling was challenged by an amicus curiae brief revealing clear mistakes of law and new evidence. See analysis of the misconduct and misrepresentations within the Federal Circuit Clerk of Court in Leader v. Facebook. Mr. Horbaly failed to disclose his conflicts of interest and close associations with numerous Facebook attorneys and law firms, as well as his close association with one of Facebook’s largest shareholders, Microsoft, who is a Director of The Federal Circuit Bar Association where Mr. Horbaly is an ex officio officer. Additionally, the DC Bar revealed in a written statement that Clerk Horbaly is not licensed to practice law in the District of Columbia.

[Editorial: What does that make the Federal Circuit with its location within in a stone’s throw of the White House? A self-governing state?]

Judge Randall R. Rader, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, chief judge responsible for the (mis)conduct of his judges and Clerk of Court in Leader Techs v.
darkness with further help to enlighten him since (s)he loves the juvenile Z-boy so.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 6, 2013 at 6:15 AM

Remember folks, Zuckerberg claimed in the Winklevoss testimony to have programmed the entire first Facebook in "one to two weeks" while studying for Spring finals at Harvard in 2004. Leader testified at trial that it took them $10 million and 145,000 man-hours to invent what is now called social networking.

John Craven commented "Mr. Zuckerberg happened to program the original Facebook in a fashion that infringed" is not the least bit credible. Not a single computer scientist consulted by AFI and others believes that Zuckerberg could have produced that much code that quickly. In fact, Zuckerberg said he had "other" sources in the Winklevoss testimony, but, as usual, was vague and obstructive in his answer. We now believe his extolling of hacking was the story fabricated to mask the underlying theft of Leader Technologies source code--proof that the 28 withheld hard drives would prove conclusively. When he finally gets caught, he will then say "I told you I hacked, I didn't lie." Very clever, but lets see if that keeps him and his cronies out of jail.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 6, 2013 at 6:24 AM

Comment by: Judicial Corruption

Be careful investigators and commenters. Seems to me the Facebook lawyers are probing now for new spin arguments. Suggest no one give them any help. They may be making stupid/false statements to bait you. These people are fiendishly deceptive. Some might even say evil in the way they are attempting to dismantle the U.S. Constitution and the rule of law.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 6, 2013 at 6:31 AM

Comment by: Stockanalyst

I hope there is a special place in hell for the Facebook people. Anyone who invests in them isn't much better. "Gee Beaver, I didn't know they were such bad guys, after all, it's just business, right?"

Reply Delete

Rain Onyourparade May 6, 2013 at 6:51 AM

I'll ask again, does anyone know who JAMES W. BREYER's parents are? The absence of this information on the web is curious.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 6, 2013 at 7:39 AM

Here is a comment from Donna Kline's site verifying Darren's comment that not even Zuckerberg and Breyer wanted to call Facebook a "social network" in 2005.

http://donnaklinenow.com/investigation/industry-leader-blasts-facebooks-predatory-conduct#comment-2836

By their own video-taped words, Zuckerberg and Breyer prove these comments from Facebook attorneys to be more lies and misdirection.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 7, 2013 at 1:52 PM

Comment by: kramer heiscool

Zuckerberg is just one dishonest bastard, even when he has no reason to be. Read this HUFFINGTON POST expose on his tactics to bribe politicians who will speak favorably about his causes:

'It works like this: You approach key representatives who are on the fence about voting for comprehensive legislative reform and finance advertisements that portray their stance on any other issue of their choosing. In other words, FWD.us effectively bribes Facebook, Inc., 678 F.3d 1300 (Fed. Cir. 2012). Judge Rader failed to manage his court resulting in a likely situation where his judges never even received briefs that they allegedly ruled on in favor of Facebook. Judge Rader also failed to disclose his conflicting relationships with a Leader principle with whom he may have had deep professional differences during his time at the Senate Judiciary Committee--his former professor of law at George Washington University Law Center, former Leader director Professor James P. Chandler. See analysis of Judge Rader's undisclosed conflicts of interest in Leader v. Facebook. Judge Rader also did not stop his judges from creating new arguments and evidence for Facebook in the secrecy of chambers--after they had debunked all of Facebook's evidence on appeal, which is a clear breach of constitutional due process.

Click here to view a Federal Circuit Leader v. Facebook Conflicts of Interest Map.


NOTICE: Opinion

This is an opinion blog. Any information contained or linked herein should be independently verified and should be considered the sole opinion of the writer. Free Speech and Freedom of the Press are protected by the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and other local, state, national and international laws. Therefore, as with all opinion, such opinion should not be relied upon without independent verification.

This site is a not-for-profit effort focused on education, news, investigation of issues in the public interest, and research, and relies on fair use copyright exemptions under 17 U.S.C. 106(a)-117 of the United States Copyright Act, in addition to any and all other related and relevant privileges to which a fair and reasonable person would attribute to this grassroots effort to root out corruption and promote justice. No rights whatsoever to third party content are claimed or implied.
Americans For Innovation: LEADER V. FACEBOOK JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT EXPOSES A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

14/27

http://americans4innovation.blogspot.com/2013/04/leader-v.html

May 7, 2013 at 5:33 PM

Belinni's comments are getting so ridiculous now perhaps AFI should start censoring his accountability. But, let's not tell them any more about how we will do it, 'cause they are trying to play. As a country we must find the justice and bring the wrongdoers to criminality to stand, no matter how many tricks Facebook's unscrupulous attorneys might attorneys lied about it. That's a criminal act. No freedom-loving people can allow such By the words of Facebook's own experts, Zuckerberg withheld 28 hard drives and his long statutes of limitations. Folks, don't be fooled by "Bellini's" misquoting of the rules. FRAUD, LIES, DECEIT, THEFT, the rules. Outside a courtroom where they have bribed the judges and clerk and play games with You have to laugh at these Facebook lawyers who don't know how to fight in the open response, the new deposition testimony, etc. Facebook's law firms: Black & McConnell (Facebook documents on Fri. Mar. 7, 2014). Regarding Donna Kline, a reporter who so dogedly follows a story for months on end does not suddenly up and quit out of the blue. She claimed that she was going to explore other matters, but as you can see from her blog there hasn't been a single post since December. This signals to me that something very, very sinister was afoot. It would appear that someone was ghost writing all of her posts and that she had been promised some payout in return for posting them. When it became clear that the Leader case had dead ended, I think she bailed because she knew she would never get a payout. Who knows, but this was definitely not the case of an "impartial" reporter following a story, in my opinion. Regarding the 28 hard drives—no, the matter was never properly brought before the District Court or the Court of Appeal. Someone above claimed that Leader brought a motion before the district court but that Leader claimed the drives were lost. That is old news. There was supposedly a revelation that 28 "new" drives had been discovered (although the cited deposition testimony is vague at best and really doesn't support this). My point was that if this evidence was REAL, then a new, separate motion needed to be brought before the district court with proper evience. For example, there would have been attorney declarations attaching the previous motion to compel, Facebook's response, the new deposition testimony, etc. This was never done. That is why I believe the whole thing is hullabaloo. Having Dr. A. mention the 28 drives (in an unapproved amicus brief), without proper evidentiary cites, and in front of the wrong court, provided absolutely no grounds for the Court of Appeal to change its ruling. In fact, it would have been entirely IMPROPER, since the only grounds on which the court of appeal can rule are on the issues raised in the appeal itself, i.e. the on sale bar. The fact that Leader never filed a motion for relief from judgment in the district court demonstrates that the whole 28 hard drive issue is nothing but illusory hot air. Nothing here, folks.

K. Craine May 8, 2013 at 6:19 AM

Comment by: Judicial Corruption

Ms. Kline has a special needs child, and her personal life is none of anyone's business. "Bellini"'s speculation is just poppycock designed to protect criminality. Ms. Kline dug up facts, and those facts have not gone away.

"Mr. Bellini" seems to know volumes about the inner workings of the Federal Circuit and the Rules of Evidence. Could that be because he and his cronies have been corrupting it for a decade? Many are on to you now "Bellini" (aka Jan Horbaly, or Heidi Keefe, or Mark Weinstein, or Thomas Hungar, or Jeffrey Norberg, or Theodore Ullyot, or Samuel O'Rourke, or Michael Rhodes, or Gordon Davidson).

K. Craine May 8, 2013 at 6:49 AM

Comment by: Wolf Man

You have to laugh at these Facebook lawyers who don't know how to fight in the open outside a courtroom where they have bribed the judges and clerk and play games with the rules.

Folks, don't be fooled by "Bellini"s misquoting of the rules. FRAUD, LIES, DECERT, THEFT, CRIMINALITY, RACKETEERING, COLLUSION, COERCION, BRIBERY, CORRUPTION, ETC. have long statutes of limitations.

By the words of Facebook's own experts, Zuckerberg withheld 28 hard drives and his attorneys lied about it. That's a criminal act. No freedom-loving people can allow such criminality to stand, no matter how many tricks Facebook's unscrupulous attorneys might try to play. As a country we must find the justice and bring the wrongdoers to accountability. But, let's not tell them any more about how we will do it, 'cause they are fishing right now.

Belini's comments are getting so ridiculous now perhaps AFI should start censoring his CONNEKTA Affiliates

A. Facebook's law firms:

1. Fenwick & West LLP (Facebook securities and patent law firm; former Leader Technologies counsel; attempted an appearance in Leader v. Facebook; did not seek conflicts waiver from Leader prior to representing Facebook)

2. Cooley Godward LLP (Facebook law firm in Leader v. Facebook; McBee Strategic energy stimulus partner; Obama Justice Dept. advisor; former employer to patent judges)

CORRUPTION WATCH LIST

Faces of the Facebook Corruption (PDF)
(currently being updated after the Fri. Mar. 7, 2014 Scribd censorship of this document):

Here is the cast of characters in Leader v. Facebook. We encourage you to report their corrupt activities to this site and others, like Lawless America. Feel free to communicate anonymously in any way in which you are most comfortable. The attempt of these people and their organizations to corrupt American justice and commerce cannot be tolerated. Vigilance. We will expose them. See Congressional Briefings (currently being updated after Scribd censored the documents on Fri. Mar. 7, 2014).
comments, like the Federal Circuit Clerk of Court Jan Horbaly did of Dr. Arunachalam, and like Facebook is censoring supporters of Leader Technologies, even on Facebook “private chats?”

On second thought, we are better than these people. Let them censor. We will beat them in the open. With truth.

Reply Delete

Rain Onyourparade May 8, 2013 at 7:08 AM
We are learning that the entire Facebook/Obama crowd has mastered the art of MISDIRECTION. It is an age-old warfare tactic to divert your opponent's attention from your real target by creating a diversion to draw people's attention away from what you are doing under the covers. Belkin is a Facebook lawyer hack paid to write some bull, any bull to divert people's attention from the crimes. Let's not be fooled any longer by their immorality.

The post about Zuckerberg's political group FWD.us is enlightening. Operating on the premise that Zuckerberg never had an original thought in his life and has stolen everything, including the Leader Technologies inventions to power Facebook. FWD.us uses Obama's "Forward" theme. Hack. Second, he promises favors using the Facebook platform. Hack. Third, he essentially bribes people to get favors. Hack.

Is he telegraphing how the Obama administration manipulated Facebook users to buy the last election? If so, no wonder Pres. Obama intervened on Facebook's behalf at the US Patent Office (to PROTECT HIS 32 MILLION LIKES ON FACEBOOK), and why the Patent Office just invoked presidential privilege in preventing release of information about Leader Technologies' patent. Hmmm.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 8, 2013 at 8:14 AM
Folks, we are wasting our time and brain cells on these morally bankrupt Facebook attorneys. They are moral and ethical jackals who do nothing but drag victims' carcasses back to their lairs to rot. We've got to clean out our courthouses of these criminals. The smell wafting from the federal courts is nothing but sulfurous decay.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 8, 2013 at 12:43 PM
Cha Cha CHING!! A friend of mine in personnel searched for me on “James W. Breyer” and we discovered that his father is a Hungarian refugee named “John P. Breyer.” Then, the more we dug, the “curiouser and curiouser” (Alice in Wonderland) the connection became. It appears to me that James W. has actively tried to hide who his father is, and that he supposed investing acumen comes from nothing more than following his dad’s instructions. Emailing my discoveries to post the link now. Also interesting is their current activity in Beijing, China, where James W. will join his father who is the current Chairman of IDG Capital Partners. This helps explain why James W. has been trashig US investing… James W. is nothing but a daddy's boy. LOL.

https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B2SfG2nEsMfqVmlGUGVobVF5a2s/edit?usp=sharing

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 8, 2013 at 3:44 PM
Just posted an "Update: May 8, 2013" sidebar (scroll to the top of this pate) about the undisclosed JAMES W. and JOHN P. BREYER connections discovered by ODOREATER. The complete absence of this connection on Muckety.com indicates that these men must conspire with their tech friends to keep their connection hushed up. Muckety.com is normally thorough, but on this connection, they are SILENT. Also, even though JOHN P. BREYER helped start COMPUTER WORLD, there does not appear to be a single picture of him on the web. Somebody please prove this wrong. Let's put a picture to this mysterious person. It's yet another material nondisclosure from this crooked crowd.

Reply Delete

John Craven May 8, 2013 at 6:58 PM
3. Blank & Rome LLP (Facebook law firm in Leader v. Facebook; former employer to patent judges)
4. White & Case LLP (Facebook law firm in Leader v. Facebook; undisclosed former employer to Patent Office Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) officer involved in Leader v. Facebook)
5. Gibson Dunn LLP (Facebook law firm in Leader v. Facebook; undisclosed counsel to the Federal Circuit; undisclosed protégé of Chief Justice John Roberts, Jr.; undisclosed former employer to Freevinder ("Preet") Bharara, U.S. Attorney currently persecuting Paul Ceglia in U.S. v. Ceglia (Ceglia v. Zuckerberg))
6. Orrick Herrington LLP (longtime Facebook law firm and destroyer of evidence for the cabal in Winkevoss v. Zuckerberg and ConnectU v. Facebook)
7. Weil Gotshal LLP (Federal Circuit counsel in Leader v. Facebook; Judge Kimberly A. Moore’s undisclosed former client)
8. Latham & Watkins LLP (Facebook Director James W. Breyer’s counsel; Judge Kimberly A. Moore’s husband, Matthew J. Moore’s new law firm)
9. Federal Circuit Bar Association ("FCBA") (Federal Circuit’s bar association; second largest in the U.S.; Facebook’s law firms exert much influence in its policy and activity, incl. Fenwick & West LLP, Gibson Dunn LLP, Orrick Herrington LLP, Weil Gotshal LLP; Facebook’s large shareholder, Microsoft, is a director; Federal Circuit Clerk of Court Jan Horbaly is an officer; FCBA made an appearance in Leader v. Facebook to oppose the amicus curiae (friend of the court) motion of Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam, former Director of Network Architecture at Sun Microsystems, in favor of Leader Technologies and objecting to the evident conflicts of interest within the court itself, her motion was denied, the judges refused to disclose their conflicts which we now know include Facebook and Microsoft stocks)
10. DC Bar Association
11. Perkins Coie LLP (Facebook’s “rapid response enforcement team;” law firm for Obama’s chief counsels; the husband and wife team of Robert F. Bauer and Anita B. Dunn; Bauer was identified on Aug. 1, 2013 as having directed the IRS targeting of the Tea Party)
12. Stroz Friedberg (Facebook’s "forensic expert" who manipulated the data in Paul Ceglia v. Mark Zuckerberg, and who first revealed the existence of 28 Zuckerberg hard drives and Harvard emails that they told Leader Technologies in 2009 were "lost")
13. Chandler Law Firm Chartered (Professor James P. Chandler, III; principal; Leader Technologies patent counsel; adviser to IBM and David J. Kappos; adviser to Eric H. Holder, Jr. and the U.S. Department of Justice; author of the Economic Espionage Act of 1996 and the Federal Trade Secrets Act)

B. Facebook
Jesus Christ what is wrong with you people. You’re now singling out John Breyer as a “Jewish refugee”? And claiming that because James Breyer’s bio doesn’t specifically identify his father that this is evidence of a conspiracy? You just go deeper and deeper into crazy town with every post. And the author of this blog (gee, who could that be) seems to think there is this magical website called “listeveryassociationyouhavewithanyoneuntheworld.com” where one would identify “conflicts.” Completely out of touch with any standards of corporate governance. Tell me exactly where James Breyer had an obligation to tell you the name of his father? And now you are publishing home addresses as well. I don’t know whether to laugh or just shake my head in disbelief. This whole blog is like watching 1st graders play tattle tale on the playground. Time to grow up, kids.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 9, 2013 at 6:08 AM

Comment by: Anonymoose

Note how Craven screams about everything “except the facts” being disclosed and the improprieties they are revealing? Sounds like this Administration in the Benghazi hearings. Their “MISDIRECTION 501 Class” in Law School must have been standing room only. You know you’re on to something when hired liars like Craven starts frothing at the mouth. Reminds me of Hillary yelling “what difference does it make!!!!!” to the Senate Committee. Keep pressing from all directions everyone.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 9, 2013 at 6:40 AM

Comment by: Historian

I note how John Craven tries to take exception to the facts of John P. Breyer’s Hungarian Jewish roots. This is despicable grandstanding since emigration of Hungarian Jews to America in 1956 is notable historically. To have left that fact out would have been intellectually dishonest. It is well known that Adolf Hitler attempted to exterminate ALL Hungarian Jews during WWII, so that fact that the Breyer family survived is notable. The fact that they assumed Christian names like John and James is also notable since Jews often felt pressure to conceal their heritage (who wouldn’t given the madman in Berlin). The Soviet occupation was also a tumultuous time for Jews. It appears that John P. Breyer may have been a part of some 20,000 who fled as antisemitic elements emerged within the Hungarian Uprising movement.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 9, 2013 at 9:21 AM

We have removed the reference to Breyer’s religious background since, while it may be a material historical fact, any attempt by the Facebook crowd to exploit it will just be more smoke and mirrors to mask their misconduct. It has come to our attention today, by contrast, that George Soros is also Hungarian and doesn’t hide his heritage:

attorneys & cooperating judges:

14. Gordon K. Davidson (Fenwick; Facebook’s securities and patent attorney; Leader Technologies’ former attorney)

15. Christopher P. King (aka Christopher-Charles King aka Christopher King aka Christopher-Charles P. King; Fenwick & West LLP)

16. Theodore B. Olson (Gibson Dunn)

17. Thomas G. Hungar (Gibson Dunn)


19. James Cole (Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Dept. of Justice)

20. Tony West (Associate Attorney General, U.S. Dept. of Justice; 2008 Obama California Campaign Manager)

21. Robert F. Bauer (Obama Attorney; White House Chief Counsel; directed IRS targeting of the Tea Party; formerly and currently employed by Perkins Coie LLP, Facebook’s “rapid response enforcement team”)

22. Anita B. Dunn (Obama Attorney; White House Chief Counsel; husband Robert F. Bauer directed IRS targeting of the Tea Party; formerly employed by Perkins Coie LLP, Facebook’s “rapid response enforcement team”)

23. Mary L. Schapiro (former Chairman, Securities & Exchange Commission (S.E.C.); holds investments in 51 Facebook Club basket funds)

24. James “Jamie” Brigagliano (former Deputy Director of the Division of Trading and Markets at the Securities and Exchange Commission; Mary L. Schaprio’s chief lieutenant on “dark pool” rule making)

25. Joseph P. Cutler (Perkins Coie)

26. David P. Chiappetta (Perkins Coie)

27. James R. McCullagh (Perkins Coie)

28. Ramsey M. Al-Salama (Perkins Coie)

29. Grant E. Kinsel (Perkins Coie)

30. Reeve T. Bull (Gibson Dunn)

31. Heidi Keefe (Cooley)

32. Michael G. Rhodes (Cooley; Tesla Motors)

33. Elizabeth Stameshkin (Cooley)

34. Donald K. Stern (Cooley; Justice Dept. advisor)

35. Mark R. Weinstein (Cooley)

36. Jeffrey Norberg (Cooley)

37. Ronald Lemieux (Cooley)

38. Craig W. Clark (Blank Rome)

39. Tom Amis (Cooley / McBe Strategic)

40. Erich Veitenheimer (Cooley / McBe Strategic)

41. Roel Campos (Cooley; former Commissioner of the U.S. Securities & Exchange Commission at the time
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Soros

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 9, 2013 at 9:36 AM

Comment by: Historian

More on Breyer from HBS Press:


http://hbswk.hbs.edu/archive/1798.html

"Intellectual property matters. It's about real property. It's about the ideas that underlie inventions, and what's an invention? This is an area where we need some of our best minds, and we haven't got them. I think we're going to get them, but it's costing us in the interim."

"I'll start from the very beginning, or perhaps, before the beginning. The personal history starts with my parents. My parents are Hungarian immigrants; they left Budapest in 1956 during the revolution, settled in Vienna for one year, and attended University of Vienna. My mother had been a very successful mathematics student in Hungary, and had attended the same college as Andy Grove. My father was an engineer, and he received a scholarship to Yale. They came to the United States in 57, and I was born in New Haven in '61. My parents spent all of their working careers in the high-tech industry in the Boston area. I grew up in Natick and Weston, a couple of towns outside of Boston.

My mother worked for Honeywell for twenty years, and eventually ran their design automation group. My father was at Honeywell as well, but eventually left to join Pat McCown at International Data Group. Both my parents were very much a part of the Route 128 technology world of the mid- to late 70s and early 80s. I grew up with a cultural emphasis on technology, with a focus on Intel because of the Hungarian background of Andy Grove, Les Vadasz, and a number of the people leading Intel."

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 9, 2013 at 9:49 AM

Comment by: Sound-the-alarm

Given all our country's current problems with Chinese hacking, these deep Breyer family connections to the beginnings of the TECH boom in China are disturbing. Why weren't we told about this? Is Facebook going to do one big global tie of American, Chinese and Russian social networks, then start issuing Facebook Credits instead of sovereign currency? Have all our supposed "financial crises" been fabricated?

Reply Delete

Rain Onyourparade May 9, 2013 at 10:16 AM

Wohwa. I go off the grid for a half-day and boom. Notice how Craven is trying to create disreputatory labels around conspiracy and Breyer's religious heritage? Yawn. These guys can only cry WOLF so many times and their meter has expired. They're just picking fights to divert attention. Is it just me or does "Craven" remind you of White Castle sliders?

My takeaways from this new research are that Breyer is a poster child for insider trading -- on a global scale. This guy is not what he seems. If we had known that he and his family have financed most of the current Chinese hackers in one way or another through the 100% of IDG-CHINA deals, would we be feeding him with tens of billions in public money to undermine the U.S. economy using his friends at Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley and the PayPal Mafia?

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 9, 2013 at 10:26 AM

Comment by: SuperSleuth

Hey Facebook boys and girls. When you make your business the abuse of the privacy and property rights of others. When you abuse the good faith of others who have an expectation of privacy and security no matter how sneaky your user agreements are worded, you lose the privilege of expecting others to respect yours. All publicly available information regarding the Facebook "cabal" should be published for easy access. Property records, emails, family names, phone numbers, etc. Let's give these Facebook thieves a taste of their own medicine.

Reply Delete
steve n amy May 9, 2013 at 5:57 PM

Hey kids...Jesus Christ doesn't have anything to do with this subject. This subject is about arrogance, betrayal, fraud, lies, deception, bribery and did I mention arrogance? None of these ever stand the test of time. The truth always wins out no matter how hard you try to manipulate a situation. Telling lies to cover up your other lies never works. So, you kids go play somewhere else. Stay off our playground.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 9, 2013 at 6:54 PM

Comment by: Lisa

Saw PBS news coverage the other day of the Cambodian Khmer Rouge henchmen who are just now confessing to their crimes against humanity after being identified by their victims who lived. The Facebook power-mongers remind me of similar inhumanity. Idi Amin, Pol Pot, Mark Zuckerberg, James W. Breyer, Joseph Stalin ... interesting bedfellows. Is this the legacy the Hungarian refugees of the Uprising would choose? I doubt it. They would be ashamed. Many of them were brave patriots and fine human beings.

Reply Delete

dave123 May 9, 2013 at 7:50 PM

give me easy access. Property records, emails, family names, phone numbers, etc.?

Reply Delete

Jason Bellini May 9, 2013 at 10:25 PM

This comment has been removed by the author.

Reply Delete

Rain Onyourparade May 10, 2013 at 6:14 AM

We need to pour our collective resources into research on James W. Breyer and the Breyer family. The uniform praise and adulation for them on the web is conspicuous. His web videos are all so smug and carefully controlled. His conduct and that of his PayPal Mafia friends around 2002-2005 (Peter Thiel (Clarium Capital), Reid Hoffman (LinkedIn), Gordon Davidson, Fenwick & West) along with Sheryl Sandberg, Yuri Milner, Marc Andreessen and Larry Summers will be the keys, I think. On a side note, I noted that David Kirkpatrick is one of the CNN journalists on the 10/27/86 article that covered ‘Hungary, Class of ‘56’ Is that the same David Kirkpatrick who shilled for the cabal and wrote THE FACEBOOK EFFECT? Perhaps he knew the Breyer family secrets and that was part of his hush money (make up a story about Zuckerberg’s Harvard origins)?


Reply Delete

Jason Bellini May 10, 2013 at 11:44 AM

Wow. Bravo, bravo. And a slow clap. I think we have finally witnessed the moment when we can unequivocally say that this blog has hit rock bottom. Lisa, aka...M...ha. Let’s not pretend like we don’t know who makes all of the comments on this blog (Steve and Amy excepted).

Are you really placing on parity the torture, murder, and outright genocide of hundreds of thousands of people with the “struggle” of some software company that couldn’t get its product off the ground? Equating unimaginable human suffering, pain, and despair with some chunk of software code that allows for the sharing of pictures of pets in costumes at family reunions? And all of this based on wild, unsupported accusations that there is a worldwide conspiracy afoot (now newly involving the Chinese no less, in addition to the Russians of course, and the entire Obama administration, the federal courts, the Supreme Court, the mainstream media, and every law firm in Silicon Valley). Yep. Makes perfect sense. The whole world is in on it. And society will collapse. Wow.

Reality check folks. This dispute is done, over, and forgotten. Tearing down those who succeeded will not bring you up. That is typical liberal thinking. I’ve seen this before on this blog and on donna’s blog. Nothing that Facebook did EVER impacted Leader. Leader’s market was completely separate and distinct. Facebook has never entered the corporate project collaboration world. It was free for the taking by Leader.

74. James C. Payne (Counsel, Patent Trial and Appeal Board, PTAB)
75. Deandra M. Hughes (Examiner, Leader v. Facebook reexamination)
76. Kathryn Walsh Siehmdel (FOIA Counsel, U.S. Patent Office - bio and conflicts log concealed)
77. Dennis C. Blair (Director, U.S. National Intelligence)
78. Dennis F. Saylor, IV (Judge, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, FISA)
79. James E. Boasberg (Judge, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, FISA)
81. President Barack Obama
82. Lawrence "Larry" Summers
83. James W. Breyer, Accel Partners LLP; Facebook director; client of Fenwick & West LLP since the 1990's; apparently received technology from other Fenwick clients that was shuffled to Zuckerberg, ind. Leader Technologies' inventions)
84. David Plouffe; directed Obama’s 2008 and 2012 campaigns; a self-described “statistics nerd;” likely directed the activities of the Facebook Club; employed Robert F. Bauer, Perkins Coi LLP in 2000 at the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee
85. McBee Strategic (one of the main "private" arms responsible for "rolling out the billions in Obama "green energy" stimulus funds; partnered with Cooley Godward

http://americans4innovation.blogspot.com/2013/04/leader-v.html
Replies

dave123 May 21, 2013 at 5:57 PM
facebook still out buy 5.8 billion
Delete

dave123 May 21, 2013 at 6:27 PM
U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara Statement

U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara outlined the criminal charges filed against six New York state officials, calling today a “sad and disappointing day” for those who still dream of an honest government.

More prosecutors focused on political corruption and the use of more aggressive tactics may have helped lead to recent arrests of lawmakers accused in bribery cases.

Preet Bharara speak for the Supreme Court and Congress???
Delete

Reply
The Big B May 10, 2013 at 9:19 PM
Craven is full of SHIT. Someone should bitch slap you. He knows nothing about this case. Ullyot was at the trial and Zuckerberg was grilled by Leader's lawyer's. His comments are those of a hero worshiper and dolt.
Reply Delete

John Craven May 10, 2013 at 9:32 PM
Big B, Mr Zuckerberg was never deposed in the Leader case, and I understand he never testified (nor appeared) at trial. I honestly don't think he knows anything about this case.
Reply Delete

The Big B May 10, 2013 at 10:26 PM
Craven.....you must be on the east coast since I hear nothing. I have an idea. Maybe we can hook up at the SEC office out your way? I have a pending Whistleblower case involving all you FB scum dogs. Case #TCR 00000000 fill in the blanks and meet me. I'll take that back if doubt we'll ever meet cause your a little puppet with no balls.
Reply Delete

The Big B May 10, 2013 at 10:40 PM
Craven your up ....and your clueless. Just go deal with some grade school kids maybe they'll listen. I've been with Leader since 2003 so go rant elsewhere.
Reply Delete

The Big B May 10, 2013 at 10:53 PM
He was deposed. You really don't belong on this site..... as you know NOTHING. Just go away and stop wasting my time. Go watch FOX News and get a life.
Reply Delete

In your back yard! May 11, 2013 at 9:55 PM
Big B.... you nailed it. Thanks for putting that piece of s--t blow hard in his place. And to top it off your in the Whistleblower program.... very cool. I can find your TCR number no problem I have people in the SEC my friend....and they owe me. This is great thanks for coming out! That FB group is headed down. Watch what goes on in the next 30 days. BREYER your f---d. Screw you Craven!
Reply Delete

Jason Bellini May 13, 2013 at 7:16 PM
You really think the SEC would ever touch this case? Come on now.
Reply Delete

K. Craine May 14, 2013 at 6:38 AM
Back in the world of facts, Jon Stewart's parody of the Facebook/Breyer/Summers/Bellini/Craven-esque diatribes of misdirection are thoroughly out-ted. Why not the SEC? It appears that all the big agencies of this Administration decided to throw out the Constitution, justice in the Leader v. Facebook case among them. The next thing Breyer/Zuckerberg/Summer will attempt is a contrite apology (watch this Stewart video to the end).

http://nation.foxnews.com/irs-scandal/2013/05/14/jon-stewart-destroys-obama-over-irs-scandal&utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+FoxNation+%28Fox+Nation%29

Looks like the Justice Department has been spying on mainstream media. I admit this is speculation, but this could explain why the mainstream media has been so silent on constitutional abuses. The bad boys getting this information use it to blackmail the journalists. What is a fact is that disinformation is an intelligence tactic that appears is being reworked for the Internet Age.

Reply Delete
RUSSIAN AND CHINESE THEFT OF SOCIAL NETWORKING TECHNOLOGY

FBI Agrees that Intellectual Property Theft Is a Top Priority

The FBI's web site states: “But it’s not about picking a pocket or holding up a bank. It’s robbing people of their ideas, inventions, and creative expressions—what’s called intellectual property—everything from trade secrets and proprietary products and parts to movies and music and software.

It’s a growing threat—especially with the rise of digital technologies and Internet file sharing networks. And much of the theft takes place overseas, where laws are often lax and enforcement more difficult. All told, intellectual property theft costs U.S. businesses billions of dollars a year and robs the nation of jobs and lost tax revenues.” [emphasis added]

http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/investigate/white_collar/ipr/ipr

Social Networking is a Top Invention

Social networking is arguably one of the most significant contributions to commerce in our generation. Yet the Russians and Chinese are central figures in the theft of social networking technology. Specifically, they have been involved in the theft of the core technology that is being used as Facebook’s engine.

Both SEC filings and Fortune magazine reported Facebook’s funding and stock ownership by Russians Yuri Milner (CEO of Digital Sky Technologies) and his protege, Alisher Asimov. California based Accel Partners, founded by James W. Breyer, is a key funder and owner of Facebook.

What has not been published to date is the involvement of John Breyer, who is James Breyer’s father and the chairman of IDG, a $2.5B venture group based in Beijing. IDG’s own web site acknowledges John Breyer’s leadership and the involvement of his son’s company, Accel Partners, in IDG.

The U.S. Federal Court system ruled that Facebook infringed on all 11 of 11 patent claims of Leader Technologies’ social network system. The Russians and Chinese have been complicit in funding Facebook directly and/or through Accel Partners. Could we have picked worse thieves of American intellectual property? Perhaps al-Qaeda, Iran, or North Korea?

The result of this theft is that the one billion users of Facebook are using stolen software. Royalties have never been paid to the firm that created the software. The thieves at Facebook have benefited from the intellectual property of others.

What incentives would Leader Technologies or other inventors have to produce new technologies in light of this miscarriage of justice? Would you waste you time, money, and efforts on developing anything that you expected to be stolen? Of course not. What are the implications for our economy if this thievery is allowed to persist?

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 14, 2013 at 9:51 AM

Comment by: The Big B

May 10, 2013 MSN MONEY

"NY Facebook plaintiff seeks halt to criminal case" --- It looks like AFI's discovery that the U.S. Prosecutor, Preet Bharara, in the Facebook v. Ceglia case worked for the law firm representing Facebook (Gibson Dunn LLP) has come home to roost in the Ceglia case. Isn't it interesting that Gibson Dunn also represented Facebook in the Leader v. Facebook appeal at the Federal Circuit where Judge Kim, Judge Moore and Judge Alan Lourie held Facebook stock during the case and didn't disclose it.

http://it.money.msn.com/business-news/newsarticle?feed=AP&date=20130510&id=1646560#symbol=FB

The U.S. Attorney’s "absurd" response is the same sort of BS we read from the Facebook shills like Craven and Bellini on this site.... when they have no facts they just lie and scream "absurd", "ridiculous", etc. That's so convincing.

By the way...... The fact that Craven did not know that Zuckerberg was deposed in Leader v. Facebook discards all his ignorant arguments. He really should put his crayons away.

Reply Delete
Here is the full MSN Article (some readers are having trouble opening the MSN URL for this article). Full disclosure: Microsoft is one of Facebook’s largest shareholders. Therefore, MICROSOFT HAS A VESTED INTEREST IN DECISIONS IN FACEBOOK v. CEGLIA THAT ARE FAVORABLE TO FACEBOOK. (AFI Editorial Comment: Microsoft will report this case in a way that attempts to skew public opinion in Facebook’s favor. Therefore, readers of MSN MONEY should become experts at reading between the lines.)

CAROLYN THOMPSON. “NY Facebook plaintiff seeks halt to criminal case.” MSN Money, May 10, 2013 4:45 PM ET


BUFFALO, N.Y. (AP) - A lawyer for a New York man who was charged with fraud after filing a multibillion-dollar lawsuit claiming half ownership of Facebook asked a judge Friday to suspend his criminal case to keep it from interfering with the still-pending lawsuit.

Plaintiff Paul Ceglia meanwhile said he believes Facebook Inc. and founder Mark Zuckerberg are behind the federal government's decision to bring the criminal charges against him as a way to undermine his ownership claim.

“They've been pulling every dirty trick out of the bag,” said Ceglia, of Wellsville, who showed off the ankle monitor he must wear while awaiting trial on mail and wire fraud charges filed by the U.S. Attorney’s Office in New York City.

Speaking to reporters after a hearing on the request to halt the criminal case, Ceglia accused the government of granting more favorable treatment to “the richest 1 percent” and suggested federal prosecutors were working in tandem with Zuckerberg, who has been supportive of President Barack Obama. U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara, an Obama nominee, used to work for the law firm representing Facebook, Ceglia said.

“It's almost as if the government is doing the work of Mr. Zuckerberg,” Ceglia's attorney, Joseph Alioto, said.

Both Facebook and federal prosecutors declined to respond.

The government has accused Ceglia of doctoring a software development contract he signed with Zuckerberg in 2003 to make it appear Ceglia would receive half ownership in Facebook in exchange for $1,000 in startup money for the budding company.

That contract, which Ceglia insists is authentic, forms the basis of his 2010 civil suit.

Alioto argued the criminal prosecution in New York City is hindering resolution of the civil case in Buffalo because prosecutors have said they'll view any new filings or correspondence as contributing to a criminal scheme to defraud.

Alioto wants the civil lawsuit to go to trial.

“We are stymied because of this threat,” Alioto told U.S. District Judge Richard Arcara in asking for a preliminary injunction.

He said prosecuting Ceglia criminally for filing a civil lawsuit violates his constitutional rights.

“The First Amendment does not protect fraud. The First Amendment does not protect fabricated documents,” responded Assistant U.S. Attorney Mary Pat Fleming, adding that Ceglia's alleged fraud began before he sued.

Fleming said it is unheard-of for a judge to be asked to step in and halt a criminal prosecution and urged Arcara to stay out of it. "It's difficult to respond to because it's absurd," she said.

Arcara reserved decision.

Also pending before Arcara is whether to accept a magistrate judge's March recommendation to dismiss Ceglia's civil lawsuit. The magistrate, after numerous hearings and thousands of pages of court filings, sided with Facebook in agreeing the case was faked. Ceglia has until Wednesday to respond to the dismissal recommendation.

Copyright 2013 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.
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http://americans4innovation.blogspot.com/2013/04/leader-v.html
FEDERAL CIRCUIT CHIEF JUDGE RANDALL R. RADER DEFENDED BY FACEBOOK'S THOMAS G. HUNGAR IN 2010, BUT DID NOT RECUSE HIMSELF IN LEADER V. FACEBOOK

Just in case you were tempted to give the Federal circuit Bar Association the benefit of the doubt in Leader v. Facebook. Check this out.


Summary: In 2010, Thomas G. Hungar, Gibson Dunn LLP, Facebook's appeals attorney in Leader v. Facebook REPRESENTED the Federal Circuit Bar Association (FCBA) in an AMICUS CURIAE brief to prevent CHIEF JUDGE RANDALL R. RADER, from having to recuse himself.

Here's the motion:

Here's the response:

Here's HUNGAR'S FRIEND OF THE COURT BRIEF:

BOTTOM LINE: RADER, HUNGAR and the FCBA are in bed with each other. Rader was duty-bound to have recused himself in Leader's petition for re-hearing since he was previously ***defended by HUNGAR*** and his BAR ASSOCIATION.

---

What??? The comment above makes absolutely no sense. Judge Rader wasn't on the panel that decided the Leader appeal. He had absolutely nothing to do with it. You're asking a judge who wasn't even assigned to a case to recuse himself from that case? That is just ridiculous. Did it ever occur to you that Judge Rader DID recuse himself from the case and that is why he is not on the panel? That would sure make more sense. In any event, he wasn't on the panel; he didn't decide this case; and these Monday morning quarterback comments about a "conflict" and just nonsensical and hypothetical.

---

We need to clean the justice and political system of you incompetent weasels. As Chief Judge, Rader is responsible for the conduct of his court. Beyond that, we will not help you with Rader's misconduct.

---

Thank you Puff. I can see from the lack of activity here that there is finally some common sense bring realized. I don't want to preach, but moving on is going to be incredible

---

Hey John, you ever see a sailboat without wind? I'll let you mull on that a bit.
Researchers are seeking photos, times, places, local press, dates, links of all the OBAMA RE-ELECTION shindigs sponsored or hosted by any of the people or organizations on the AFI Corruption Watch list.

http://americans4innovation.blogspot.com/2013/04/leader-v.html#corruption-watch

John Craven May 18, 2013 at 1:13 PM

Again, I hate to have to throw water but that is my burden. Facebook has the power of the Supreme Court. You simply cannot beat that. Right or wrong, this matter is simply closed. I am not taking Facebook's side by any stretch, but this is just done. The opinion here was non-precedential, so this was a one time matter. By law, the opinion does not apply to any other matters, so congress is not going to touch this.

Reply Delete

K. Craine May 20, 2013 at 3:13 PM

Comment by: surfer dude

Craven, you are a real psycho. Now you want to sound objective saying "I am not taking Facebook's side by any stretch." ROTFL. In your manipulative psyche you now purport to speak for the Supreme Court and Congress? Wow. How can you stand to keep yourself company? Bro, you need to read history and the Bible before you lose your soul. Wait, perhaps the Gospel according to Jurassic Park is more your speed: "But life finds a way." The truth army is on your tail (and might even be looking at you right now 8-O).
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K. Craine May 23, 2013 at 1:33 PM

Note to Readers: We decided to pause on this post so that readers could absorb the sage words of President John Adams, the primary drafter of the U.S. Constitution. We as Americans must decide whether we want a government that follows and enforces the Constitution, or whether we should just not bother and let our society slide toward tyranny. History's long lesson is that a society that lets its morals decay is a society destined for tyranny.

The abuses of power we are reading about in the news are just more of the same thing we have been observing in Leader v. Facebook. The bad guys are on the move folks. Are the good guys going to step up and fight? Our morality is a choice. What will we choose? What will you choose?

Reply Delete
Americans For Innovation: LEADER V. FACEBOOK JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT EXPOSES A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

Morgan, Jason V.
Morrison, John
Pak, Chung K.
Perry, Glenn J.
Petravick, Meredith C. (bio and conflicts log concealed by FOIA) – Leader 3rd reexam judge
Pettigrew, Lynne
Praiss, Donna
Quinn, Miriam
Reimers, Annette
Saindon, William
Scanlon, Patrick
Siu, Stephen C. – Leader 3rd reexam judge (bio and conflicts log concealed by FOIA)
Smith, James Donald
Smith, Neil
Snedden, Sheridan
Song, Daniel
Spahn, Gay Ann
Strauss, Mike
Timm, Catherine
White, Stacey
Zecher, Michael

Research Tip:
Type any name or subject in the Google search at the top of this webpage. That will show you any relevant links within the sites that we have been following and investigating in the Leader v. Facebook case. Vigilance everyone! Our American Republic is at risk.

The following universities were announced as participants in Ohio State Provost Joseph A. Steinmetz’s corrupt MOOC education initiative named “University Innovation Alliance” (UIA). We have identified the instructions and online forms you need to file a complaint with the participants. MOOC stands for “Massive Open Online Course.”

You should complain about:

1. the intellectual property theft of social networking source code from Leader Technologies, Columbus, Ohio that is the software engine running the UIA;

2. the corruption at Ohio State University and OSU’s collusion with Battelle Memorial Institute which helped steal the software being used by UIA; and

3. the mistreatment of OSU Marching Band Director Jon Waters regarding fabricated Title IX charges that were used to pave the way for Steinmetz to announce UIA.

Universities pride themselves on protection of intellectual property.
Therefore, these universities cannot participate in this abuse of inventor copyrights, patents and trade secrets by The
Ohio State Trustees and Administration. If these universities participate knowingly with Ohio State in its theft of intellectual property, then they are aiding and abetting the theft of intellectual property on a “massive” scale... Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) also known as The Eclipse Foundation.

1. ARIZONA
Arizona State University
https://www.azag.gov/consumer/procedure
https://www.azag.gov/complaints/consumer

2. CALIFORNIA
University of California Riverside
California State System (observer)
http://www.oig.ca.gov/

3. FLORIDA
University of Central Florida
http://www.floridaog.com/
http://www.fldoe.org/ig/complaint.asp
http://app1.fldoe.org/IGComplaint/ComplaintForm.aspx

4. GEORGIA
Oregon State University
http://oig.georgia.gov/
http://oig.georgia.gov/file-complaint

5. INDIANA
Purdue University
http://www.in.gov/ig/2330.htm

6. IOWA
Iowa State University
http://www.state.ia.us/government/ag/file_complaint/online_2.html

7. MICHIGAN
Michigan State University

8. OHIO
The Ohio State University
http://watchdog.ohio.gov/FileaComplaint.asp

9. OREGON
Oregon State University
https://justice.oregon.gov/forms/consumer_complaint.asp
https://justice.oregon.gov/consumercomplaints/

10. KANSAS
The University of Kansas
https://ag.ks.gov/about-the-office/contact-us/email-us

11. TEXAS
The University of Texas
http://www.tdcj.state.tx.us/divisions/oig/oig_fraud.html
https://sao.fraud.state.tx.us/Hotline.aspx

Let's make sure that the "University Innovation Alliance (UIA)" and "Massive Open Online Course" MOOC never get off the ground due to their corrupt foundations.
Americans For Innovation: LEADER V. FACEBOOK JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT EXPOSES A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

RESOURCE:

RECPROCAL LINKS

- Center for Public Integrity
- Center for Self Governance
- Georgia KSCO
- Judicial Watch
- Lawless America
- West New Jersey Tea Party
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