

EXHIBIT 1

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

PHILIP MORRIS PRODUCTS S.A.,

Plaintiff,

v.

R.J. REYNOLDS VAPOR COMPANY

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-393-LO-TCB

PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED VERDICT FORM

The below verdict form provides questions and instructions that will serve as your verdict in this case. When answering the questions and instructions, 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, Plaintiff Philip Morris Products S.A. may be referred to as "Philip Morris." Defendant R.J. Reynolds Vapor Company may 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. QUESTION NO. 1 – INFRINGEMENT

Do you find that Philip Morris has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Reynolds has infringed any of the following claims? Answer “Yes” or “No” for each claim identified below.

A. U.S. Patent No. 9,814,265

- | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-----|-------|----|
| 1. Claim 1 | _____ | Yes | _____ | No |
| 2. Claim 4 | _____ | Yes | _____ | No |

B. U.S. Patent No. 10,104,911

- | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|-----|-------|----|
| 1. Claim 2 | _____ | Yes | _____ | No |
| 2. Claim 11 | _____ | Yes | _____ | No |
| 3. Claim 12 | _____ | Yes | _____ | No |
| 4. Claim 13 | _____ | Yes | _____ | No |

II. QUESTION NO. 2 – WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT

Do you find that Philip Morris has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Reynolds' infringement was willful?

_____ Yes

_____ No

III. QUESTION NO. 3 – VALIDITY

Do you find that Reynolds has proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims are invalid? Answer “Yes” or “No” for each claim identified below.

A. U.S. Patent No. 9,814,265

1. Claim 1 _____ Yes _____ No

2. Claim 4 _____ Yes _____ No

B. U.S. Patent No. 10,104,911

1. Claim 2 _____ Yes _____ No

2. Claim 11 _____ Yes _____ No

3. Claim 12 _____ Yes _____ No

4. Claim 13 _____ Yes _____ No

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.