

**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.

Case No. 1:20-cv-00393-LMB-TCB

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PHILIP MORRIS'
MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW OF INFRINGEMENT OR,
ALTERNATIVELY, A NEW TRIAL**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARD.....	2
A. Judgment as a Matter of Law	2
B. New Trial Under Rule 59.....	3
C. Infringement.....	3
III. THE COURT SHOULD ENTER JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW THAT THE VUSE ALTO INFRINGES THE '911 PATENT OR, ALTERNATIVELY, GRANT A NEW TRIAL	5
A. There Is No Legally Sufficient Evidence For A Reasonable Juror To Find That The Alto Does Not Meet The “cavity is a blind hole” Element	5
1. Reynolds’ Purported Evidence Of Non-Infringement Contradicts The Law Of The Case	5
2. Mr. Kodama Admittedly Did Not Perform Any Functional Testing.....	8
B. There Is No Legally Sufficient Evidence For A Reasonable Juror To Find That The Alto Does Not Meet The Cross-Sectional Dimension Element	9
C. There Is No Legally Sufficient Evidence For A Reasonable Juror To Find The Alto Does Not Meet The “cavity contains capillary material” Element	14
IV. CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Bennett v. R & L Carriers Shared Servs., LLC</i> , 744 F. Supp. 2d 494 (E.D. Va. 2010), <i>aff'd</i> , 492 F. App'x 315 (4th Cir. 2012).....	3
<i>Callicrate v. Wadsworth Mfg., Inc.</i> , 427 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	3
<i>Edmondson v. Am. Motorcycle Ass'n, Inc.</i> , 7 F. App'x 136 (4th Cir. 2001)	3
<i>Hutchins v. Zoll Med. Corp.</i> , 492 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	4
<i>LifeNet Health v. LifeCell Corp.</i> , 837 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	2, 3
<i>Liquid Dynamics Corp. v. Vaughan Co.</i> , 449 F.3d 1209 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	4, 14
<i>LNP Eng'g Plastics, Inc. v. Miller Waste Mills, Inc.</i> , 275 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	9, 14
<i>Luminara Worldwide, LLC v. Liown Elecs. Co.</i> , 814 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	5
<i>Mannatech, Inc. v. Glycoproducts Int'l, Inc.</i> , No. 06-cv-0471, 2008 WL 2704425 (N.D. Tex. July 9, 2008).....	4
<i>Nuance Commc'ns, Inc. v. Abby Software House, Inc.</i> , No. 08-cv-2912, 2012 WL 1188903 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2012), <i>aff'd sub nom.</i> , 813 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	7
<i>Sardis v. Overhead Door Corp.</i> , 10 F.4th 268 (4th Cir. 2021)	2, 3, 10
<i>Siemens Med. Sols. USA, Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Ceramics & Plastics, Inc.</i> , 637 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	4
<i>SIPCO, LLC v. Emerson Elec. Co.</i> , 980 F.3d 865 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	7
<i>TomTom, Inc. v. Adolph</i> , 790 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	4

Unwired Planet, LLC v. Apple Inc.,
829 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....4, 7

Whitserve, LLC v. Computer Packages, Inc.,
694 F.3d 10 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....5, 8, 14

YETI Coolers, LLC v. RTIC Coolers, LLC,
No. 15-cv-597, 2017 WL 404519 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 27, 2017)4

Other Authorities

FED. R. CIV. P.

50.....4

50(b).....2

59.....3

59(a).....2, 5

59(a)(1)(A).....3, 15

I. INTRODUCTION

A reasonable juror could only find the Alto infringes claims 2, 11, and 12 (which all depend from claim 1) of U.S. Patent No. 10,104,911 (“’911 Patent”) based on the evidence presented at trial and the jury’s contrary finding is against the clear weight of the evidence. Reynolds admitted the Alto meets each limitation of the asserted claims except three: (i) “at least one cavity is a blind hole” (claim 1); (ii) “a largest cross-sectional dimension x . . . of the cavity . . . where x is 0.5 mm, or 1 mm, or between 0.5 mm and 1 mm” (claim 1); and (iii) “at least one cavity contains capillary material” (claim 2). Ex. 1 (Trial Tr. 6/10 a.m.) at 617:15-618:8; 626:4-15. Reynolds’ *sole* purported evidence of non-infringement was the testimony of its technical expert, Mr. Kodama. But that testimony was legally erroneous because it contradicts the law of the case and plain language of the ’911 Patent. Mr. Kodama’s testimony was also untethered to any functional testing of the Alto—indeed, he admitted on cross-examination that he never even “turned on the Alto” let alone performed “any functional testing on the Reynolds products.” *Id.* at 669:5-7; 671:9-13.

For the first disputed element, Mr. Kodama opined that the claimed “cavity” that is a “blind hole” cannot have open sides because Philip Morris purportedly disclaimed such structures during prosecution. That contradicts the express and unequivocal law of the case and, in any event, is legally incorrect. The Court’s claim construction and *Daubert* orders held that there were no disclaimers or other departures from the plain meaning of the term. Mr. Kodama’s testimony is squarely refuted by those rulings and erroneously imported negative limitations from exemplary embodiments into the claims. It was separately contrary to Reynolds’ own technical documents, sworn testimony from Reynolds’ director of vapor product deployment, and unrebutted functional testing that Philip Morris’s technical expert, Dr. Abraham, performed on the Alto to independently show the spaces he identified meet the claim’s requirements literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents (“DOE”), including collecting liquid condensate.

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.