

Patent Owner's Preliminary Reply  
U.S. Patent No. 12,171,916

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TERUMO BCT, INC.,

Petitioner

v.

HAEMONETICS CORP.,

Patent Owner

---

Case No. PGR2025-00078

U.S. Patent No. 12,171,916

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY REPLY**

**List of Exhibits**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description of Document</b>
<b>2022</b>	Joint Disputed Claim Terms Chart, <i>Haemonetics Corp. v. Terumo BCT, Inc.</i> (D. Colo. Feb. 3, 2026), D.I. 77

Petitioner's inconsistent claim construction positions warrant denial of institution. The Petition fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(3), which requires a petitioner to state "[h]ow the challenged claim is to be construed" and, where a limitation is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(f), to identify the corresponding structure in the specification. This defect goes to Petition sufficiency at the threshold, not to competing merits arguments.

Petitioner argued that the claims "should be construed in accordance with the ordinary and customary meaning" and relied on that plain-and-ordinary-meaning construction to map the prior art to the challenged claims. Pet. at 18. In the district court litigation, however, Petitioner has asked the court to construe 7 separate terms, *5 of which Petitioner argues are indefinite*. EX2022. Regarding the "control system"/"controller" limitations, Petitioner argued these were governed by § 112(f) and indefinite for lack of corresponding structure. *Id.* at 19-42. Although Petitioner raised other § 112 issues in its PGR Petition, it did not contend that *any* limitations were indefinite nor that the "control system"/"controller" limitations are means-plus-function terms or indefinite under § 112(f). The Petition is silent as to any such construction.

Petitioner cannot maintain, without explanation, that the same claim language is indefinite in district court yet sufficiently definite and structurally understood to support detailed prior art mappings before the Board—particularly

in post-grant review, where indefiniteness challenges are expressly available. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 321(b). The Petition stands on the premise that a person of ordinary skill would understand the limitations under their plain meaning; Petitioner’s district court positions repudiate that premise.

The Board and Director have repeatedly held that such unexplained inconsistencies justify denial of institution. In *Revvo Technologies v. Cerebrum Sensor Technologies*, the Director made clear that when a petitioner takes alternative claim construction positions before the Board and a district court, it must, “at a minimum, explain why alternative positions are warranted.” IPR2025-00632, Paper 20 at 3–4 (Nov. 3, 2025) (precedential); *see also id.*, Paper 36 at 3 (Jan. 26, 2026) (“Simply put, you can’t have it both ways and certainly not without a sufficient explanation.”). In *Tesla v. Intellectual Ventures II*, the Board denied institution where a petitioner argued plain and ordinary meaning in its petition while asserting indefiniteness in district court, holding that “petitioner is required to explain” the differing positions. IPR2025-00340, Paper 18 at 2–4 (Nov. 5, 2025) (informative). The Director has since applied the same reasoning to vacate or deny institution in similar circumstances. *See Generac Power Sys., Inc. v. Champion Power Equip., Inc.*, IPR2025-00805, Paper 40 at 4 (Feb. 3, 2026); *Revvo Technologies, Inc. v. Tire Stickers LLC*, IPR2025-00631, Paper 34 (Feb. 3, 2026).

This case presents the same defect—and an additional one. Section 42.204(b)(3) requires a petitioner to address § 112(f) constructions in the petition itself. The Board has denied institution where a petitioner advocates plain and ordinary meaning before the Board but asserts a means-plus-function construction in district court without addressing § 112(f) in the petition. *See Revvo*, IPR2025-00632, Paper 36 at 2; *Cambridge Mobile Telematics, Inc. v. Sfara, Inc.*, IPR2024-00952, Paper 12 at 8 (informative); *10X Genomics, Inc. v. President & Fellows of Harvard College*, IPR2023-01299, Paper 15 at 13; *Orthopediatrics Corp. v. K2M, Inc.*, IPR2018-01546, Paper 10 at 10–12.

Petitioner’s attempt to characterize this as an “outer bounds” dispute is misplaced. This is not about whether the Board must construe each claim term to resolve the prior art analysis, but about petition sufficiency. Having affirmatively invoked indefiniteness, including § 112(f) and alleged lack of corresponding structure, in district court, Petitioner was required under § 42.204(b)(3) to address that construction in the Petition itself. *Revvo* and *Tesla* do not hinge on whether a district court position is broader or narrower, or whether a term is “in controversy” for prior art mapping purposes, but on whether materially different positions are advanced without explanation. Here, none was provided. The Board should not be required to reconcile mutually exclusive constructions or overlook a petition that fails to comply with the governing regulations. Institution should be denied.

Patent Owner's Preliminary Reply  
U.S. Patent No. 12,171,916

Respectfully submitted,

/Erik B. Milch/

Erik B. Milch (Reg. No. 42,887)  
Proskauer Rose LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20004  
Tel: (202) 416-6800  
emilch@proskauer.com

Dated: February 23, 2026

*Attorney for Patent Owner*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), I hereby certify that on February 23, 2026, I caused a complete copy of Patent Owner's Preliminary Reply regarding U.S. Patent No. 12,171,916 and all exhibits, to be served on the Petitioner as follows:

*Via and Electronic Mail to Petitioner's attorneys of record:*

John M. Caracappa, Reg. No. 43,532  
jcaracappa@steptoe.com

Katherine D. Cappaert, Reg. No. 71,639  
kcappaert@steptoe.com

Matthew Y. Sim, Reg. No. 77,422  
msim@steptoe.com

Scott Chappell, Reg. No. 76,333  
schappell@steptoe.com

STEPTOE LLP  
1330 Connecticut Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 429-3000  
Fax: (202) 429-3902

/Erik B. Milch/  
Erik B. Milch (Reg. No. 42,887)