

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

BRACCO DIAGNOSTICS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MAIA PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:17-cv-13151-PGS-TJB



OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF  
OF MAIA PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.

Gregory D. Miller  
Jenna Gabay  
RIVKIN RADLER LLP  
21 Main Street  
West Wing – Suite 158  
Hackensack, NJ 07601-7021  
Phone: (201) 287-2474  
Facsimile: (201) 489-0495  
gregory.miller@rivkin.com  
jenna.gabay@rivkin.com

William R. Zimmerman (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON &  
BEAR, LLP  
1717 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Suite  
900 Washington, D.C. 20006  
Phone: (202) 640-6400  
Facsimile: (202) 640-6401  
bill.zimmerman@knobbe.com

*Attorneys for Defendant  
Maia Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*

Thomas P. Krzeminski (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON &  
BEAR, LLP  
2040 Main Street, 14th Floor  
Irvine, CA 92614  
Phone: (949) 760-0404  
Facsimile: (949) 760-9502  
thomas.krzeminski@knobbe.com

Peter Law (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON &  
BEAR, LLP  
12790 El Camino Real  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Phone: (858) 707-4000  
Facsimile: (858) 707-4001  
peter.law@knobbe.com

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	NATURE AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS.....	4
III.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	5
IV.	BACKGROUND .....	5
	A. Technology Overview .....	5
	B. Drug Formulation.....	6
	C. Overview of the '046 Patent.....	6
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PRINCIPLES.....	7
VI.	MAIA'S CONSTRUCTIONS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE INTRINSIC AND AVAILABLE EXTRINSIC EVIDENCE.....	9
	A. "Surfactant" .....	9
	1. Intrinsic evidence .....	11
	a. Claim language .....	11
	b. Specification .....	12
	2. Extrinsic evidence .....	12
	3. Bracco's construction of "surfactant" should be rejected .....	13
	B. "Surfactant/Solubilizer" .....	20
	1. Intrinsic evidence .....	21
	a. Claim language .....	21
	b. Specification .....	23

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(Cont'd)**

	<b>Page No(s).</b>
2. Bracco’s construction of “surfactant/solubilizer” should be rejected.....	24
C. “Buffer” .....	30
1. Intrinsic evidence .....	32
a. Claim language .....	32
b. Specification .....	33
2. Extrinsic evidence .....	33
3. Bracco’s construction of “buffer” should be rejected.....	34
VII. CONCLUSION.....	40

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>Alloc, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 342 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	26
<i>Beacon Adhesives, Inc. v. United States</i> , 134 Fed. Cl. 26 (2017) .....	19, 38, 39
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	25
<i>CAE Screenplates Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH &amp; Co.</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	27
<i>Energizer Holdings, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 435 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	29
<i>Generation II Orthotics Inc. v. Med. Tech. Inc.</i> , 263 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	8
<i>Helmsderfer v. Bobrick Washroom Equip., Inc.</i> , 527 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	19, 38
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	8
<i>Merck &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	22, 24
<i>NeoMagic Corp. v. Trident Microsystems, Inc.</i> , 287 F.3d 1062 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	36
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc).....	7, 8, 25
<i>Praxair, Inc. v. ATMI, Inc.</i> , 543 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	14, 29
<i>SRI Int’l v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. Am.</i> , 775 F.2d 1107 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	15, 27
<i>Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 831 (2015).....	7

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(Cont'd)**

**Page No(s).**

*Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm't Am. LLC*,  
669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....19, 39

*Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*,  
90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....25

*Wilson Sporting Goods Co. v. Hillerich & Bradsby Co.*,  
442 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....9, 16, 35, 36

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

35 U.S.C. § 112.....29

# 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.