

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PHILIP MORRIS PRODUCTS, S.A.,  
Petitioner

v.

RAI STRATEGIC HOLDINGS, Inc.,  
Patent Owner

Patent No. 9,901,123

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2020-01602

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	1
II. BACKGROUND .....	3
A. The '123 Patent .....	3
B. The Challenged Claims .....	6
C. Related Proceedings On The '123 Patent.....	8
D. The Asserted Prior Art .....	10
1. Hon '043 .....	12
2. Brooks .....	15
3. Whittemore.....	16
E. Level Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	17
F. Claim Construction .....	17
III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION IN VIEW OF THE PARALLEL ITC PROCEEDING .....	18
IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE THE PETITION IS NOT REASONABLY LIKELY TO SUCCEED. ....	26
A. Petitioner Has Not Shown A Reasonable Likelihood That The Challenged Claims Are Unpatentable Under Ground 1.....	27
1. Petitioner Has Not Shown That Hon '043 Discloses A Rod-Shaped Carrier Device That Is Positioned So That During Draw “the mixture comprising the tobacco extract and the aerosol-forming material can be wicked into contact with the electrical resistance heater and volatilized” .....	28
2. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That It Would Have Been Obvious To Modify Hon '043 With Whittemore.....	32

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
3. Petitioner Has Not Shown That Hon '043 Discloses “a puff-actuated controller within the tubular outer housing and adapted for regulating current flow through the electrical resistance heater during draw” .....	35
4. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That It Would Have Been Obvious To Modify Hon '043 With Brooks .....	36
B. Petitioner Has Not Shown A Reasonable Likelihood That The Challenged Claims Are Unpatentable Under Grounds 2 And 3 .....	39
V. CONCLUSION.....	39

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 at 5-16 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020) (precedential) .....	passim
<i>Comcast Cable Commc 'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00800, Paper 10 (PTAB Oct. 22, 2020) .....	20, 24
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01005, Paper 13 (PTAB Sept. 1, 2017).....	17
<i>Fitbit, Inc. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.</i> , IPR2020-00771, Paper 14 (PTAB Oct. 19, 2020).....	20, 22, 23, 24
<i>Garmin Int'l, Inc. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.</i> , IPR2020-00754, Paper 11 (PTAB Oct. 27, 2020).....	20, 24
<i>Google LLC v. EcoFactor Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00946, Paper 11 (PTAB Nov. 18, 2020).....	20, 24
<i>Google LLC v. Uniloc 2017 LLC</i> , IPR2020-00115, Paper 7 (PTAB March 23, 2020) .....	26
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	26
<i>Jones v. Hardy</i> , 727 F.2d 1524 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	26
<i>Lantz Med., Inc. v. Bonutti Research, Inc.</i> , IPR 2015-00995, Paper 11 (PTAB Oct. 21, 2015).....	31, 37

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
<i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018) (precedential) .....	19, 24, 25, 26
<i>Philip Morris Prods., S.A. v. RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00919, Paper 9 (PTAB Nov. 16, 2020).....	passim
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) .....	17
<i>R.J. Reynolds Vapor Co. v. Fontem Holdings I B.V.</i> (“RJR”), IPR2016-01268, Paper 63 (PTAB Dec. 19, 2017) .....	32, 33
<i>Salpeter v. Arp Wave, LLC</i> , IPR2019-01384, Paper 12 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2020) .....	31, 37
<i>SK Innovation Co., Ltd. v. LG Chem Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-01036, Paper 13 (PTAB Nov. 30, 2020).....	20, 24
<b>STATUTES</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	26
35 U.S.C. § 311 .....	11, 31, 37
35 U.S.C. § 314.....	1, 19, 24
<b>OTHER AUTHORITIES</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....	11, 31, 37
Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (November 2019) (“Practice Guide”), available at <a href="https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/tpgnov.pdf?M">https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/tpgnov.pdf?M</a> URL= .....	20

# 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.