

**IN THE 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.

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

**REYNOLDS'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF  
RULE 50(b) RENEWED MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW AND  
RULE 59 MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
LEGAL STANDARD.....	1
ARGUMENT .....	1
I. REYNOLDS IS ENTITLED TO JUDGMENT OR A NEW TRIAL ON THE '265 PATENT.....	1
A. The Asserted Claims of the '265 Patent Are Invalid as Indefinite. ....	1
B. The Alto Thermal Resistor Does Not Have “Dimensions Substantially the Same as a Cross-Section of a Cigarette or Cigar.” .....	3
C. The Alto Heater Is Not “Configured to Be Connected to the Mouthpiece.” .....	4
D. The Alto Thermal Resistor Is Not a Metallic Foil or Thin Sheet. ....	8
II. REYNOLDS IS ENTITLED TO JUDGMENT OR NEW TRIAL ON THE '911 PATENT AS TO SOLO G2. ....	8
A. The Asserted Claims of the '911 Patent Are Invalid as Obvious. ....	8
B. PMP Failed to Prove Solo G2 Infringes the '911 Patent. ....	10
1. The Solo G2 does not contain a “blind hole.” .....	10
2. The Solo G2 cavity does not meet the required dimensions.....	12
III. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT A NEW TRIAL DUE TO PMP’S PATTERN OF PREJUDICIAL QUESTIONS AND REMARKS.....	14
CONCLUSION.....	15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Arthur A. Collins, Inc. v. N. Telecom Ltd.</i> , 216 F.3d 1042 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	8
<i>Ball Aerosol &amp; Specialty Container, Inc. v. Ltd. Brands, Inc.</i> , 555 F.3d 984 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	6
<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. Envirochem, Inc.</i> , 264 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	2
<i>Flowers v. Tandy Corp.</i> , 773 F.2d 585 (4th Cir. 1985) .....	8
<i>Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Grp. Int’l, Inc.</i> , 222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	12
<i>Huss v. Gayden</i> , 571 F.3d 442 (5th Cir. 2009) .....	8
<i>In re Mobile Telecomms. Techs., LLC</i> , 265 F. Supp. 3d 454 (D. Del. 2017).....	2
<i>Intell. Ventures I LLC v. Altera Corp.</i> , No. 10-cv-1065, 2013 WL 3913646 (D. Del. July 26, 2013).....	6
<i>Intell. Ventures I LLC v. Motorola Mobility LLC</i> , 870 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	7
<i>Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.</i> , 766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	2
<i>Jeneric/Pentron, Inc. v. Dillon Co., Inc.</i> , 205 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	12, 13
<i>KSR Int’l, Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	9
<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , 580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	15

..

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
<i>Meister v. Med. Eng’g Corp.</i> , 267 F.3d 1123 (D.C. Cir. 2001).....	8
<i>Midwest Athletics &amp; Sports All. LLC v. Ricoh USA, Inc.</i> , No. 2:19-cv-00514, 2020 WL 6158233 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 21, 2020) .....	2
<i>Myco Indus., Inc. v. BlephEx, LLC</i> , No. 2:19-cv-10645, 2020 WL 2897443 (E.D. Mich. June 3, 2020) .....	6
<i>Myrick v. Prime Ins. Syndicate, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 485 (4th Cir. 2005) .....	1
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	1
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	9
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	10, 11
<i>Rasmussen Instruments, LLC v. DePuy Synthes Prod., Inc.</i> , No. 20-cv-11807, 2021 WL 4975286 (D. Mass. Oct. 26, 2021) .....	6
<i>ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> , 594 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	15
<i>Scanner Techs. Corp. v. ICOS Vision Sys. Corp. N.V.</i> , 528 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	10
<i>Southwall Techs., Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co.</i> , 54 F.3d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	12
<i>Univ. of Pittsburgh v. Hedrick</i> , 573 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	12
<i>Varian Med. Sys., Inc. v. ViewRay, Inc.</i> , No. 19-CV-05697-SI, 2020 WL 4260714 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2020).....	2

...

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(continued)**

**Page**

*Waddington N. Am., Inc. v. Sabert Corp.*,  
No. 09-4883, 2011 WL 3444150 (D.N.J. Aug. 5, 2011) .....14

**STATUTES**

35 U.S.C § 112(b) .....1

35 U.S.C. § 298.....15

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 50.....1

Fed. R. Civ. P. 59.....1

# 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.