EXHIBIT 4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

RAI STRATEGIC HOLDINGS, INC. and R.J. REYNOLDS VAPOR COMPANY,
 	
        Plaintiffs and Counterclaim Defendants,
 	
    v.
 	
ALTRIA CLIENT SERVICES LLC; PHILIP MORRIS USA INC.; and PHILIP MORRIS PRODUCTS S.A.
 	
        Defendants and Counterclaim Plaintiffs.
	Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-393-LO-TCB

REYNOLDS'S PROPOSED VERDICT FORM

When answering the questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the instructions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Court's Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

In the verdict form, Plaintiffs Altria Client Services LLC ("ACS"), Philip Morris USA Inc. ("PM USA") and Philip Morris Products S.A. ("PMP") may be referred to collectively as "PMI/Altria." Defendant R.J. Reynolds Vapor Company will be referred to as "Reynolds."

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case.

I.   U.S. PATENT NO. 10,420,374

Question 1 – Literal Infringement: Do you find that ACS has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Reynolds has literally infringed any of the following claims of the '374 Patent?

Claim 3 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 4 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 5 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 8 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 10 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 16 (independent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 18 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 20 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 24 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 25 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No

Question 2 – Infringement by the Doctrine of Equivalents: Do you find that ACS has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Reynolds infringed by the doctrine of equivalents any of the following claims of the '374 Patent?

Claim 16 (independent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 18 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 20 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 24 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 25 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No

Question 3 – Invalidity: Do you find that Reynolds has proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '374 Patent are invalid as anticipated or obvious?

Claim 3 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 4 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 5 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 8 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 10 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 16 (independent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 18 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 20 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 24 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No
Claim 25 (dependent)	_____Yes	_____No

Answer Question 4 below only if you have found at least one claim of the '374 Patent is infringed and not invalid. If there are no such claims, move on to Part II.

Question 4 – Damages: What sum of money, if any, did ACS prove by a preponderance of the evidence would reasonably compensate it if paid now in cash for any past infringement by Reynolds of the '374 Patent? Provide the amount below in dollars and cents. If you find ACS is entitled to no damages, enter a "0" amount.

$_____

II.   U.S. PATENT NO. 6,803,545

Question 1 – Literal Infringement: Do you find that PM USA has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Reynolds has literally infringed any of the following claims of the '545 Patent?

Claim 1 (independent)	_____	Yes	_____	No
Claim 4 (dependent)	_____	Yes	_____	No

Question 2 – Invalidity: Do you find that Reynolds has proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '545 Patent are invalid for lack of written description?

Claim 1 (independent)	_____	Yes	_____	No
Claim 4 (dependent)	_____	Yes	_____	No

Answer Question 3 below only if you have found at least one claim of the '545 Patent is infringed and not invalid. If there are no such claims, move on to Part III.

Question 3 – Damages: What sum of money, if any, did PM USA prove by a preponderance of the evidence would reasonably compensate it if paid now in cash for any past infringement by Reynolds of the '545 Patent? Provide the amount below in dollars and cents. If you find PM USA is entitled to no damages, enter a "0" amount.

$_____

DOCKET ALARM

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.