UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
90/015,441	08/09/2025	10330582	BECC.P0002US.CIP.C1RE	9847

129381 7590 10/06/2025

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP - BCI
98 San Jacinto Blvd., Suite 1100
Austin, TX 78701

EXAMINER
HUGHES, DEANDRA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3992	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/06/2025	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

CYTEK V. BECKMAN
PGR2025-00084
BECKMAN 2034

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

COOLEY LLP
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington DC 20004

EX PARTE REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. *90/015,441* .

PATENT UNDER REEXAMINATION *10330582* .

ART UNIT *3992* .

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified *ex parte* reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a reply has passed, no submission on behalf of the *ex parte* reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

Order Denying Request For Ex Parte Reexamination	Control No. 90/015,441	Patent Under Reexamination 10330582	
	Examiner DEANDRA M HUGHES	Art Unit 3992	AIA (FITF) Status No

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The request for *ex parte* reexamination filed 08/09/2025 has been considered and a determination has been made. An identification of the claims, the references relied upon, and the rationale supporting the determination are attached.

Attachments: a)☑ PTO-892, b)☑ PTO/SB/08, c)☐ Other: ____

The request for *ex parte* reexamination is DENIED.

This decision is not appealable (35 U.S.C. 303(c)). Requester may seek review by petition to the Commissioner under 37 CFR 1.181 within ONE MONTH from the mailing date of this communication (37 CFR 1.515(c)). **EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE SUCH A PETITION UNDER 37 CFR 1.181 ARE AVAILABLE ONLY BY PETITION TO SUSPEND OR WAIVE THE REGULATIONS UNDER 37 CFR 1.183.**

In due course, a refund under 37 CFR 1.26 (c) will be made to requester:

a) ☐ by Treasury check or,

b) ☐ by credit to Deposit Account No. ____ , or

c) ☐ by credit to a credit card account, unless otherwise notified (35 U.S.C.303(c)).

/DEANDRA M HUGHES/ Reexamination Specialist, Art Unit 399		

cc: Requester (if third party requester)

DENIAL OF REQUEST FOR *EX PARTE* REEXAMINATION

Acknowledgements

1. This is a Denial of the Request for *Ex Parte* Reexamination of claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26 of U.S. Patent No. 10,330,582 ("582 Patent") issued Jun. 25, 2019 and filed on Jun. 30, 2017 as U.S. application No. 15/638,461 ("'461 Application"), titled " FLOW CYTOMETER."

2. The '582 patent is the subject of co-pending litigation, namely, *Beckman Coulter, Inc. v. Cytek Biosciences, Inc.* No. 1:24-cv-00945-CFC-EGT (D. Del filed June 5, 2025) in the U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware. ("the litigation")

3. Examiners do not find any previous and/or co-pending *Ex parte* reexaminations or supplemental examinations for the '582 Patent.

4. Examiners do not find any post grant proceedings for the '582 Patent.

5. Claims 1-3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26 have been requested for *Ex Parte* Reexamination. These claims are grouped as follows:

- Claims 1, 2, 3, and 6;
- Claims 14, 15, 17, and 18; and
- Claims 20, 21, 23, 25, and 26.

Evidence Considered

6. The following is the evidence considered in this order:

- US Patent Application Publication No. 2015/0115174 A1 to Yong Qin Chen filed Nov. 26, 2014 and published April 30, 2015. ("Chen");
- USP 6,139,800 to Chandler filed Jun. 22, 1998 and published Oct. 31, 2000; ("Chandler");

- USP 6,683,314 to Oostman, Jr. et al. filed Agusut 28, 2001 and published Jan. 27, 2004 ("Oostman");
- https://web.archive.org/web/20100620044720/http://jp.hamamatsu.com/products/sensor-ssd/pd078/pd079/pd082/index_en.html ("Hamamatsu");
- USP 6,542,306 to Timothy D. Goodman filed March 16, 2001 and published April 1, 2003 ("Goodman");
- USP 8,284,402 to Erich Frazier et al. filed February 26, 2010 and published October 9, 2012 ("Frazier").
-

Proposed Substantial New Questions of Patentability ("SNQ")

7. The following are the proposed SNQs.

1) As to claims 1-3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26, Chen is alleged to present a SNQ.
2) As to claims 1-3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26, the combination of Chandler and Goodman is alleged to present a SNQ;
3) As to claims 3 and 26, the combination of Chandler, Goodman, and Hamamatsu is alleged to present a SNQ;
4) As to claims 1-3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26, the combination of Oostman, Goodman, and Frazier is alleged to present a SNQ;
5) As to claims 3 and 26, the combination of Oostman, Goodman, Frazier, and Hamamatsu.

Effective Filing Date

8. The '582 Patent is a continuation of App. No. 14/555,102 ("'102 Application"), which was filed on Nov. 26, 2014, now Pat. No. 9,746,412, which was published Aug. 29, 2017. The effective filing date is **Nov. 26, 2014**.

Third Party Requester ("3PR") argues the continuity is broken because the instant claims introduce the claim term "*curved mirror*" and the parent application does not disclose a generic curved mirror, but a concave mirror. See Request 26-33. In other words, 3PR alleges that the broadest reasonable interpretation ("BRI") of the claim term

"*curved mirror*" covers both a "*concave mirror*" and a "*convex mirror*" and because the '102 Application (i.e., Chen) does not describe a "*convex mirror*," the continuity is broken and Chen is available as prior art.

Examiners disagree because claims are read as a whole. When the claims are read as a whole, the words of claim themselves limit the "*curved mirror*" to a "*concave mirror*," which is clearly supported by the '102 Application and Chen is not available as prior art.

Specifically, claim 1 requires, *inter alia*, "*a curved mirror configured to reflect the portion of the collimated beam received from the optical element to produce the 1st image*." Because a "*convex mirror*" is not capable of being "*configured to reflect the portion of the collimated beam received from the optical element to produce the 1st image*," it is clear from the words of the claim itself that the BRI of "*curved mirror*" does not cover a "*convex mirror*" because a "*convex mirror*" would not "*produce the 1st image*," as claimed.

Similarly, claim 14 requires, *inter alia*, "*an optical relay element arranged to receive the collimated beam, the optical relay element configured to extend the collimated distance of the collimated beam, wherein the optical relay element comprises a curved mirror or a concave-shaped dichroic filter configured to produce a 2nd image*." Because a "*convex mirror*" is not capable of being "*configured to extend the collimated distance of the collimated beam*," it is clear from the words of the claim itself that the BRI of "*curved mirror*" does not cover a "*convex mirror*" because a "*convex mirror*" would not "*produce the 2nd image*," as claimed.

Likewise, claim 20 requires, *inter alia*, "*an optical relay element arranged near the 1st image, the optical relay element configured to receive light from the collimating optical element and to project a 2nd image; wherein the size of the 1st image is substantially the same as the size of the 2nd image, and wherein the optical relay element comprises a curved mirror or a concave-shaped dichroic filter.*" Because a "*convex mirror*" is not capable of being "*configured to receive light from the collimating optical element and to project a 2nd image; wherein the size of the 1st image is substantially the same as the size of the 2nd image*" it is clear from the words of the claim itself that the BRI of "*curved mirror*" does not cover a "*convex mirror*" because a convex mirror would not "*project a 2nd image; wherein the size of the 1st image is substantially the same as the size of the 2nd image,"* as claimed.

For the above reasons, Examiners maintain the effective filing date is **Nov. 26, 2014** because the '102 Application provides sufficient disclosure to show possession of claims 1-3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26 at the time of filing.

Basis of the Substantial New Question of Patentability

9. Under MPEP §2242, for a substantial new question ("SNQ") of patentability to be present, it is only necessary that: (A) the prior art patents and/or printed publications raise a substantial question of patentability regarding at least one claim, i.e., the teaching of the (prior art) patents and printed publications is such that a reasonable examiner would consider the teaching to be important in deciding whether or not the claim is patentable; and (B) the same question of patentability as to the claim has not been decided by the Office in an earlier concluded examination or review of the patent,

raised to or by the Office in a pending reexamination or supplemental examination of the patent, or decided in a final holding of invalidity (after all appeals) by a federal court in a decision on the merits involving the claim.

Relevant Prosecution History (U.S. App. No. 15/638,461)

10. On Jun. 29, 2018, claims 364-389 were examined of which claims 364-373, 376-380, and 382-389 were rejected. Claims 364-389 correspond to the '582 Patent claim numbers as shown in the table.

The claims were rejected as follows:

- claims 364-366, 370-372, 376-380, 383, and 385-389 were rejected as anticipated by Heffelfinger et al. (US 2003/0044967);
- claims 364, 370, 376-378, 380, and 382-387 were rejected as anticipated by Oostman (US 2003/0044967) [sic][1];
- claim 369 was rejected as obvious over Heffelfinger in view of Johnson (US 4,385,234);
- claim 366 was reject as obvious over Oostman;
- claim 367 was rejected as obvious over Oostman in view of Govorkov (US 2005/0002425);
- claim 373 was rejected as obvious over Heffelfinger;

CLAIM	
Final	Original
1	364
2	365
3	366
4	367
	368
5	369
6	370
7	371
8	372
9	373
10	374
11	375
14	376
	377
15	378
16	379
17	380
18	381
19	382
20	383
21	384
22	385
23	386
24	387
25	388
26	389
12	390
13	391

[1] The rejection states the claims are rejected over Oostman (US 2003/0044967) but US 2003/0044967 is to Heffelfinger et al. It is clear this publication number is a typographical error and the intended citation was either Oostman (USP 6,683,314) or its child (USP 7,129,505) because: (1) the body of the rejection maps the claim terms to the reference numbers of Oostman's figure 5 and (2) the citation to Oostman's column and line numbers in the rejection correspond to stated claim limitations. Thus, the rejection is based on Oostman (USP 6,683,314) or its child (USP 7,129,505)

Claims 374, 375, and 381 were indicated as having the allowable subject matter.

As to claims 374-375, it was found that the prior art did not disclose or make obvious the following in combination with the other limitations of the claims.

- "*a 2nd optical filter, the 2nd optical filter arranged between the optical relay and the 1st focusing optical element,*
- *the 2nd optical filter configured to pass light of a 3rd range of wavelengths in the 1st branch of the collimated beam to the 1st focusing optical element,*
- *wherein the 3rd range of wavelengths is a subset of the 1st range of wavelengths; optical filter arranged between the collimating optical element and the optical relay.*"

As to claim 381, it was found that the prior art did not disclose or make obvious the following in combination with the other limitations of the claims.

- *"the optical filter configured to separate the collimated beam into a 1st branch and a 2nd branch,*
- *wherein the 1st branch and the 2nd branch are different colors,*
- *wherein the optical relay receives the 1st branch; and*
- *a 2nd focusing optical element arranged to receive the 2nd branch,*
- *the 2nd focusing optical element configured to focus the 2nd branch to a 2nd semiconductor detector.*"

11. On Feb. 7, 2019, claims 368 and 377 were cancelled and claims 364-367, 369-376, and 378-391 were allowed. The following was the statement of reasons for allowance.

4. Claims 364-367, 369-376, 378-391 are allowable over the prior art.

Independent claims 364 is allowable for reasons of record as presented in applicant's remarks; filed on November 29, 2018, especially pages 11-12, regarding an optical relay element, including a curved mirror, configured to reflect a portion of a collimated beam received from a collimating optical element, as claimed in combination with the rest of the claim limitations, so as to improve structure an operation of a flow cytometer together with individual subassemblies.

Independent claims 376, 383 are allowable for reasons of record as presented in applicant's remarks; filed on November 29, 2018, especially pages 11-12, regarding an optical relay element arranged to receive the collimated beam, the optical relay element configured to extend the collimated distance of the collimated beam, wherein the optical relay element comprise a curved mirror or a concave-shaped dichroic filter configured to produce a second image, as claimed in combination with the rest of the claim limitations, without significantly expanding the beam diameter.

Examiner cited the following art not relied upon but considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Wells et al. (US 7,113,266 B1);
- Swalwell et al. (US 8,928,881 B2);
- Osamu et al. (JP 55144226A).

--The teachings that form the basis of the SNQ--

12. Based on the prosecution history of the '582 Patent, Examiners consider a teaching of "*an optical relay element, including a curved mirror, configured to reflect a portion of a collimated beam received from a collimating optical element,"* as claimed in combination with the rest of the claim limitations, so as to improve structure an

operation of a flow cytometer together with individual subassemblies of claim 1 (formerly claim 364) to form the basis of an SNQ as to claims 1, 2, 3 and 6.

Based on the prosecution history of the '582 Patent, Examiners consider a teaching of "*optical relay element arranged to receive the collimated beam, the optical relay element configured to extend the collimated distance of the collimated beam, wherein the optical relay element comprise a curved mirror or a concave-shaped dichroic filter configured to produce a 2nd image*" without significantly expanding the beam diameter of claim 20 (formerly claim 383) to form the basis of an SNQ as to claims 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26.

The prior art considered in the prosecution of the '461 Application is:

- Heffelfinger et al. (US 2003/0044967);
- Oostman (USP 6,683,314 or USP 7,129,505);
- Johnson (US 4,385,234);
- Govorkov (US 2005/0002425);
- Wells et al. (US 7,113,266 B1);
- Swalwell et al. (US 8,928,881 B2); and
- Osamu et al. (JP 55144226A).

DENIAL


13. Claims 1-3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26 are requested for reexamination. The request for *Ex parte* reexamination of these claims in view of the proposed SNQs is **DENIED**.

--***SNQ (1) Chen***--

14. Chen is alleged to present a SNQ as to claims 1-3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26.

Chen is the US Patent Application Publication of the parent of the '582 Patent, i.e., the '102 Application. 3PR alleges Chen is available as prior art because the scope of claim term "*curved mirror*" covers both a "*convex mirror*" and a "*concave mirror*" and a "*convex mirror*" is not described in the '102 Application, which breaks the continuity chain. See Request 26-33.

As stated above in the section on the effective filing date, "*convex mirrors*" do not form images and the language of the claims themselves require the claimed "*curved mirrors*" to "*produce the 1st image*," or "*produce the 2nd image*," or "*project the 2nd image*," which necessarily excludes "*convex mirrors*" because "*convex mirrors*" do not produce images. Thus, Examiners do not agree that "*curved mirror*" is not supported by the '102 Application such the continuity chain is broken because the claimed "*curved mirror*" cannot cover "*convex mirrors*" because the claimed "*curved mirror*" is claimed to produce images and "*convex mirrors*" do not produce images. As such, Chen is NOT available as prior art.



Because Chen is not prior art, SNQ (1) is DENIED.

--***SNQs (2)-(5) Chandler/Oostman in view of Goodman***--


15. SNQ (2): The combination of Chandler and Goodman is alleged to present a SNQ as to claims 1-3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26 ("**SNQ (2)**").

SNQ (3): The combination of Chandler, Goodman, and Hamamatsu is alleged to present a SNQ as to claims 3 and 26 ("**SNQ (3)**").

SNQ (4): The combination of Oostman and Goodman is alleged to present a SNQ as to claims 1-3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26 ("**SNQ (4)**").

SNQ (5): The combination of Oostman, Goodman, Hamamatsu, and Frazier is alleged to present a SNQ as to claims 3 and 26 ("**SNQ (5)**").


SNQs (2)-(5) stand or fall with Goodman. The crux of SNQs (2)-(5) is that Goodman is relied upon to teach the claimed "*optical relay element comprising a curved mirror*" in Goodman. See Request 82-26 and 126-127 citing Figure 1, #24b.



Specifically, Goodman's reflectors, which are alleged by 3PR to read on the claimed "*curved mirror*" are "convex mirrors." See Goodman col.10:18-30.

> The reflective surface can comprise at least one collimating reflector or at least one non-collimating reflector. For example, reflectors 24a-24n can be converging lenses or mirrors, collimating lenses or mirrors, or simple reflecting surfaces. The reflectors are preferably convex spherical surfaces designed to relay the image of the fiber facet down the optical train. The spherical shape allows for relatively easy molding and measuring to check for fabrication errors. The reflectors are designed so that the demultiplexer device can be operated with a non-collimated light beam, with the reflectors controlling the tendency of such a beam to diverge. Thus, the device of the present invention can demultiplex small diameter non-collimated beams, allowing for a further reduction in size of the device.

One of ordinary skill in the art understands "*convex mirrors*" do not form images. See Hecht pg. 185, reproduced below.



Because "*convex mirrors*" do not form images, Goodman's "convex mirrors" cannot reasonably read on the claimed "*curved mirror*," e.g., claim 1: "*a curved mirror configured to…produce the 1st image*;" claim 14: "*a curved mirror…configured to produce a 2nd image*;" claim 20: "*optical relay element configured to receive light from the collimating optical element and to project a 2nd image; wherein the size of the 1st*

image is substantially the same as the size of the 2nd image, and wherein the optical relay element comprises a curved mirror…."

In other words, Goodman teaches "convex mirrors." In contrast, the claimed "*curved mirror*" are described as "concave mirrors." See Examiner Annotated '412 Patent WDM embodiments (#1)-(#3), which are reproduced below.




FIG. 25



concave mirror
910
concave mirror
907
focal location
908
901
light source
902
collimating optical element
903
dichroic filter
focusing lens
905'
906'
focal location
904'
dicrhoic filter
905
lens
906
Examiner Annotated '412 Patent
WDM Embodiment #2

FIG. 27



EXAMINER ANNOTATED
'412 PATENT
WDM EMBODIMENT #3
collimating optical lens
910'
907'
concave mirror

FIG. 28

Because a reasonable Examiner would NOT consider Goodman's teaching of a "convex mirror" to be important in deciding whether claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26 are patentable, SNQs (2)-(5) are DENIED.

35 U.S.C. 325(d)

16. 35 USC 325(d) states in part that "[i]n determining whether to institute or order a proceeding under this chapter, chapter 30, or chapter 31, the Director may take into account whether, and reject the petition or request because, the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments previously were presented to the Office." Thus, in order for the Director to exercise discretion as to whether to Order a reexamination proceeding under chapter, 30, the request must first be determined to be based on the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments that previously were presented to the Office.

Examiners do not find any prior post grant proceedings for the '582 Patent.

Conclusion

17. The patent owner is reminded of the continuing responsibility under 37 CFR 1.565(a) to apprise the Office of any litigation activity, or other prior or concurrent proceeding, involving **Patent No. 10,330,582** throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. The third party requester is also reminded of the ability to similarly apprise the Office of any such activity or proceeding throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. See MPEP §§ 2207, 2282 and 2286.

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) will not be permitted in these proceedings because the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 apply only to "an applicant" and not to parties in a reexamination proceeding. Additionally, 35 U.S.C. 305 requires that reexamination proceedings "will be conducted with special dispatch" (37 CFR 1.550(a)). Extension of time in *ex parte* reexamination proceedings are provided for in 37 CFR 1.550(c).

18. **All** correspondence relating to this ex parte reexamination proceeding should be directed:

Electronically: Registered users may submit via Patent Center at https://patentcenter.uspto.gov/.

By Mail to: Mail Stop *Ex Parte* Reexam
Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX to: (571) 273-9900
Central Reexamination Unit

By hand: Customer Service Window
Knox Building
501 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

For Patent Center transmissions, 37 CFR 1.8(a)(1)(i)(C) and (ii) states that correspondence (except for a request for reexamination and a corrected or replacement request for reexamination) will be considered timely filed if (a) it is transmitted via the USPTO patent electronic filing system in accordance with 37 CFR 1.6(a)(4), and (b) includes a certificate of transmission for each piece of correspondence stating the date

of transmission, which is prior to the expiration of the set period of time in the Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner, or as to the status of this proceeding, should be directed to Deandra M. Hughes at (571) 272-6982, SPE Hetul Patel (571) 272-4184, or the Central Reexamination Unit at (571) 272-7705.

Signed:

/DEANDRA M HUGHES/
Reexamination Specialist, Art Unit 3992

Conferees:

/Timothy Speer/
Supervisory Patent Reexamination Specialist
Art Unit 3991

Reexamination	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination
	90/015,441	10330582
	Certificate Date	Certificate Number

Requester Correspondence Address: ☐ **Patent Owner** ☑ **Third Party**

COOLEY LLP
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington DC 20004

LITIGATION REVIEW ☑	/DMH/ (examiner initials)	19 September 2025 (date)
Case Name		Director Initials
Beckman Coulter, Inc. v. Cytek Biosciences, Inc. No. 1:24-cv-00945-CFC-EGT (D. Del filed June 5, 2025)		

COPENDING OFFICE PROCEEDINGS	
TYPE OF PROCEEDING	**NUMBER**

/DEANDRA M HUGHES/
Reexamination Specialist, Art Unit 3992

Search Notes	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination
	90/015,441	10330582
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DEANDRA M HUGHES	3992

CPC - Searched*		
Symbol	Date	Examiner

CPC Combination Sets - Searched*		
Symbol	Date	Examiner

US Classification - Searched*			
Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner

* See search history printout included with this form or the SEARCH NOTES box below to determine the scope of the search.

Search Notes		
Search Notes	Date	Examiner
reviewed prosecution history of 15/638,461	09/19/2025	/DMH/
similarity search App. No. 15/638,461	09/19/2025	/DMH/
morelikethis for US 10,330,582	09/19/2025	/DMH/
litigation search	09/19/2025	/DMH/

Interference Search			
US Class/CPC Symbol	US Subclass/CPC Group	Date	Examiner

/DEANDRA M HUGHES/ Reexamination Specialist, Art Unit 3992	

PE2E SEARCH - Search History (Prior Art)

Ref #	Hits	Search Query	DBs	Default Operator	Plurals	British Equivalents	Time Stamp
L1	1	"20150115174".pn.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/08/13 04:59 PM
L2	1	"6683314".pn.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/08/13 05:02 PM
L3	1	"6139800".pn.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/08/13 05:05 PM
L4	1	"10330582".pn.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/08/13 05:09 PM
L5	22	"9746412"	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/09/05 03:12 PM
L6	0	2003/0044967.pn.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/09/08 05:00 PM
L7	1	"20030044967".pn.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/09/08 05:00 PM
L8	2	"6683314".pn. OR "7129505".pn.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/09/08 05:05 PM
L9	1	"20030044967".pn.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/09/08 05:06 PM
L10	1	"6542306".pn.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/09/09 03:36 PM
L11	1	"6542306".pn.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/09/10 05:37 PM
L12	1	"10330582".pn.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/09/19 04:51 PM
L13	7	"curved mirror".clm. AND "collimating".clm. AND "flow cytometer".clm.	(US-PGPUB; USPAT)	OR	ON	ON	2025/09/19 04:53 PM

PE2E SEARCH - Search History (Interference)

There are no Interference searches to show.