

Petition for Post-Grant Review  
of U.S. Patent 8,933,395

Filed on behalf of Inguran, LLC  
d/b/a Sexing Technologies

By: Kirt S. O'Neill  
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP  
300 Convent Street, Suite 1600  
San Antonio, TX 78205-3732  
Ph: 210-281-7000  
Fax: 210-224-2035  
Email: koneill@akingump.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

INGURAN, LLC d/b/a SEXING TECHNOLOGIES,  
Petitioner

v.

PREMIUM GENETICS (UK) LTD.,  
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent 8,933,395  
Appln. No. 14/169,927 filed January 31, 2014  
Issued January 13, 2015

Title: MULTIPLE LAMINAR FLOW-BASED PARTICLE AND CELLULAR  
IDENTIFICATION

---

Petition for Post-Grant Review  
Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 321-328 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.200 *et seq.*

**Table of Contents**

I.	COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW .....	1
A.	Certification of Petitioner’s Standing to Request Post-Grant Review Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.201 .....	1
B.	Time for Filing Petition for Post-Grant Review of U.S. Patent Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.202.....	2
C.	Identification of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b) and Relief Requested.....	2
D.	Eligibility of Challenged Claims for Post-Grant Review .....	3
E.	Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	4
F.	Fee for Post-Grant Review Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(b).....	5
II.	SUMMARY OF THE ’395 PATENT DISCLOSURE AND ALLEGED INVENTIONS.....	5
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....	9
IV.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	9
V.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS HAVE AN EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF JANUARY 31, 2014.....	10
A.	The Challenged Claims Are Not Entitled to the Filing Dates of Any Related Applications That Fail to Disclose the Claimed Invention.....	11
B.	The Subject Matter of Claim 1 Was Not Disclosed in Any Related Applications.....	12
C.	The Subject Matter of Claim 2 and Its Dependent Claims Was Not Disclosed in Any Related Applications.....	18
D.	References Patent Owner Attempted to “Incorporate by Reference” Do Not Give The Challenged Claims an Effective Filing Date Earlier Than January 31, 2014 .....	22
VI.	SUMMARY OF THE PRIOR ART.....	23
A.	Mueth – U.S. Patent 7,355,696 .....	23
B.	Durack – PCT Publication No. WO 2004/088283 .....	24
C.	Frontin-Rollet – PCT Publication No. WO 2005/075629 A1 .....	25
D.	Wada – U.S. Patent No. 6,506,609 .....	26
E.	Kachel.....	27

VII. IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE OF THE  
CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE '395 PATENT IS  
UNPATENTABLE .....28

A. Ground 1: Indefiniteness of Claims 1-14 of the '395 Patent .....28

B. Ground 2: Claims 1-13 Are Anticipated Under § 102(a)(1) By  
U.S. Patent 7,355,696 (“Mueth”) .....31

C. Ground 3: Claim 14 Is Rendered Obvious by Mueth Alone or in  
View of Durack .....43

D. Ground 4: Claim 1 Is Anticipated Under § 102(a)(1) By  
Frontin-Rollet .....45

E. Ground 5: Claim 1 Is Anticipated Under § 102(a)(1) By Durack.....50

F. Ground 6: Claims 2-14 Are Rendered Obvious by the  
Combination of Wada, Durack and Kachel.....57

G. Ground 7 – Lack of Enablement of Claims 1-14 of the '395  
Patent .....73

VIII. CONCLUSION.....80

**EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
Ex. 1001	U.S. Patent Number 8,933,395 to Mueth <i>et al.</i> (the “’395 Patent”)
Ex. 1002	Declaration of Dr. Giacomo Vacca
Ex. 1003	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Giacomo Vacca
Ex. 1004	U.S. Patent Application No. 13/412,969, issued as Patent No. 8,653,442
Ex. 1005	PCT Publication No. WO 2004/088283 (“Durack”)
Ex. 1006	Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 11 <sup>th</sup> Ed. (2007)
Ex. 1007	PCT Publication No. WO 2005/075629 (“Frontin-Rollet”)
Ex. 1008	U.S. Patent No. 7,355,696 (“Mueth ’696”)
Ex. 1009	U.S. Patent No. 6,506,609 (“Wada”)
Ex. 1010	U.S. Patent No. 5,135,759 (“Johnson”)
Ex. 1011	“Sex Preselection: High-Speed Flow Cytometric Sorting of X and Y Sperm for Maximum Efficiency,” L.A. Johnson and G. R. Welch, <i>Theriogenology</i> , Vol. 52, Issue 8, 1323–1341 (1999) (“Welch”)
Ex. 1012	“Uniform Lateral Orientation Caused by Flow Forces of Flat Particles in Flow-Through Systems,” V. Kachel <i>et al.</i> , <i>Journal of Histochemistry and Cytochemistry</i> , Vol. 25, Issue 7, pp. 774-780 (1977) (“Kachel”)
Ex. 1013	File history of ’395 Patent (U.S. Patent Application No. 14/169,927)
Ex. 1014	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/399,386
Ex. 1015	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/435,541
Ex. 1016	U.S. Patent Application No. 10/630,904, issued as Patent No. 7,241,988
Ex. 1017	U.S. Patent Application No. 10/867,328, issued as Patent No. 7,150,834
Ex. 1018	U.S. Patent Application No. 10/934,597, issued as Patent No. 7,118,676
Ex. 1019	U.S. Patent Application No. 11/543,773, issued as Patent No. 7,402,131
Ex. 1020	U.S. Patent Application No. 12/213,109, issued as Patent No. 7,699,767
Ex. 1021	U.S. Patent Application No. 12/659,277, issued as Patent No. 8,158,927

...

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac</i> , 344 F.3d 1234 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	74
<i>Automotive Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. BMW of North Am., Inc.</i> , 501 F.3d 1274 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	74
<i>Boston Scientific Corp. v. Johnson &amp; Johnson</i> , 647 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	17
<i>Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.</i> , 576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	22
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	29
<i>Hyatt v. Boone</i> , 146 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	12
<i>In re Vaeck</i> , 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	73, 79
<i>In re Wands</i> , 858 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	73, 74
<i>Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.</i> , 766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	28
<i>LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Res. Mapping, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	77
<i>Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	12
<i>MagSil Corp. v. Hitachi Global Storage Techs., Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	77

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.