

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MAIA PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

BRACCO DIAGNOSTICS INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2019-00345  
U.S. Patent No. 6,803,046 B2

---

Before SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN, ZHENYU YANG, and  
RICHARD J. SMITH, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SNEDDEN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION  
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review  
35 U.S.C. § 314

## I. INTRODUCTION

Maia Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–19, 21–38, 40–55, 77–102, and 104–105 of U.S. Patent No. 6,803,046 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’046 patent”). Paper 2 (“Pet.”). Bracco Diagnostics Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 9 (“Prelim. Resp.”).

To institute an *inter partes* review, we must determine that the information presented in the Petition shows “a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). After considering the evidence and arguments presented in the Petition and Preliminary Response, we determine that Petitioner has not satisfied its burden under § 314. Thus, we do not institute an *inter partes* review.

### A. Related Matters

The parties identify the following litigation between the parties involving the ’046 patent: *Bracco Diagnostics Inc. v. Maia Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, Case No. 3:17-cv-13151-PGS-TJB, pending in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. Pet. 3; Paper 7.

### B. The ’046 patent

The ’046 patent discloses pharmaceutically acceptable formulations of sincalide. Ex. 1001, 1:5–6. Sincalide “is a synthetically prepared C-terminal octapeptide of cholecystokinin (CCK-8), with the following amino acid sequence: Asp-Tyr(SO<sub>3</sub>H)-Met-Gly-Trp-Met-Asp-Phe-NH<sub>2</sub>.” *Id.* at 1:12–16.

The disclosed formulations “include an effective amount of sincalide, a bulking agent/tonicity adjuster, a stabilizer, a surfactant, a chelator, and a buffer.” *Id.* at Abstract. The ’046 patent also discloses “kits and methods for preparing improved sincalide formulations, as well as methods for treating, preventing, and diagnosing gall bladder-related disorders using sincalide formulations.” *Id.*

### *C. Illustrative Claims*

Independent claims 1, 21, 40, 77 and 104, reproduced below, are illustrative of the challenged claims:

1. A stabilized, physiologically acceptable formulation of sincalide comprising:

- (a) an effective amount of sincalide,
- (b) at least one stabilizer,
- (c) a surfactant/solubilizer
- (d) a chelator,
- (e) a bulking agent/tonicity adjuster, and
- (f) a buffer.

21. A method for making a stabilized formulation of sincalide, said method comprising the step of mixing:

- (a) at least one stabilizer,
- (b) a surfactant/solubilizer,
- (c) a chelator,
- (d) a bulking agent/tonicity adjuster,
- (e) a buffer
- (f) an aqueous solution, and
- (g) sincalide.

40. A kit, comprising:

- (i) a powder mixture comprising (a) sincalide, (b) at least one stabilizer, (c) a surfactant, (d) a chelator, (e) a bulking agent/tonicity adjuster, and (f) a buffer;
- (ii) a container to hold said powder mixture; and

(iii) optionally, a physiologically acceptable fluid.

77. A method for imaging the hepatobiliary system of a subject, said method comprising:

- (a) administering a hepatobiliary imaging agent to said subject;
- (b) before or after step (a), administering to a subject a sincalide formulation comprising: (i) sincalide, (ii) at least one stabilizer, (iii) a surfactant, (iv) a chelator, (v) a bulking agent/tonicity adjuster, and (vi) a buffer; and
- (c) detecting said imaging agent in said subject with a detection device.

104. A method for imaging the hepatobiliary system of a subject, said method comprising:

- a) administering to a subject a sincalide formulation comprising: (i) sincalide, (ii) at least one stabilizer, (iii) a surfactant, (iv) a chelator, (v) a bulking agent/tonicity adjuster, and (vi) a buffer; and
- b) scanning the subject using a diagnostic imaging modality.

#### *D. Evidence Relied Upon*

Petitioner relies upon the following prior art references:

Ex. 1005, Physicians' Desk Reference for Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, 1977/78 (1977) ("PDR").

Ex. 1006, PCT Publication No. WO 00/51629 to Sato (English Translation with affidavit) ("Sato").

Ex. 1017, Nema et al., "*Excipients and Their Use in Injectable Products*," 51 PDA J. OF PHARMA. SCI. AND TECH. 166 (1997) ("Nema").

Ex. 1030, Essentials of Nuclear Medicine Science (Hladik, et al., eds., 1987) ("ENMS").

*E. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability*

Petitioner asserts the following grounds of unpatentability (Pet. 38):

Ground	Claims	Basis	References
1	1–4, 6–11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21–24, 26–31, 33, 35, 36, 40–42, 44–49, 51, 53, 55, and 104	§ 103(a)	PDR and Sato
2	5, 12, 14, 17, 18, 25, 32, 34, 37, 38, 43 50, 52, and 54	§ 103(a)	PDR, Sato, and Nema
3	77–88, 90–95, 97, 99, 100, and 105	§ 103(a)	PDR, Sato, and ENMS
4	89, 96, 98, 101, and 102	§ 103(a)	PDR, Sato, ENMS, and Nema

In support of its patentability challenge, Petitioner relies on the Declaration of Christian Schöneich, Ph.D. Ex. 1003.

II. DISCUSSION

*A. Claim Construction*

For petitions filed after November 13, 2018, such as the case here, we interpret the claims of a challenged patent using the same claim construction standard used in a civil action under 35 U.S.C. 282(b), which is the standard articulated in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc).<sup>1</sup> Under the *Phillips* standard, the “words of a claim are generally

---

<sup>1</sup> The claim construction standard used in an *inter partes* review changed. See *Changes to the Claim Construction Standard for Interpreting Claims in Trial Proceedings Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board*, 83 Fed. Reg. 51,340 (Oct. 11, 2018) (amending 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) effective

# 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.