

**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 OPPOSITION TO PHILIP MORRIS'  
MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW OF INFRINGEMENT OR,  
ALTERNATIVELY, A NEW TRIAL**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. LEGAL STANDARD.....	1
III. ARGUMENT.....	2
A. The Evidence Shows That Alto Does Not Meet The Requirement That “At Least One Cavity ... For Collecting Liquid Condensate” Is A “Blind Hole.” .....	2
1. Intrinsic Evidence Was Properly Admitted and Supports the Jury’s Verdict.....	3
2. Reynolds Presented Sufficient Evidence of Alto Function.....	6
B. The Evidence Shows That The Alto Does Not Meet The ’911 Dimensional Requirement.....	8
C. The Evidence Shows That The Alto Does Not Meet The Capillary Material Requirement .....	12
IV. CONCLUSION.....	15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Catalina Lighting, Inc. v. Lamps Plus, Inc.</i> , 295 F.3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	11
<i>City of Richmond v. Atlantic Co.</i> , 273 F.2d 902 (4th Cir. 1960) .....	2
<i>Cobalt Boats, LLC v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , No. 2:15cv21, 2017 WL 6034504 (E.D. Va. Dec. 4, 2017) .....	1
<i>DeMarini Sports, Inc. v. Worth, Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	5
<i>Dotson v. Pfizer, Inc.</i> , 558 F.3d 284 (4th Cir. 2009) .....	1
<i>EEOC v. Massey Yardley Chrysler Plymouth, Inc.</i> , 117 F.3d 1244 (11th Cir. 1997) .....	1
<i>Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1202-WCB, 2017 WL 1050120 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 17, 2017).....	7
<i>Fontem Ventures, B.V. v. NJOY, Inc.</i> , No. CV 14-1645-GW(MRWx), 2015 WL 12743861 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2015) .....	7
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Mustek Sys., Inc.</i> , 340 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	14
<i>Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	12
<i>Jeneric/Pentron, Inc. v. Dillon Co., Inc.</i> , 205 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	8
<i>K-2 Corp. v. Salomon S.A.</i> , 191 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	10
<i>Laitram Corp. v. NEC Corp.</i> , 163 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	12

..

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
<i>Level 3 Commc 'ns, LLC v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> , No. 2:07cv589, 2009 WL 10689350 (E.D. Va. June 23, 2009), <i>aff'd</i> , 374 F. App'x 955 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	4
<i>Mentor H/S, Inc. v. Med. Device Alliance, Inc.</i> , 244 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	1, 12
<i>Nobelpharma AB v. Implant Innovations, Inc.</i> , 141 F.3d 1059 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	1
<i>Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 802 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	7
<i>Tyco Healthcare Grp. LP v. Mut. Pharm. Co.</i> , No. 07-1299 (SRC), 2009 WL 44745 (D.N.J. Jan. 5, 2009).....	11
<i>Wahpeton Canvas Co. v. Frontier, Inc.</i> , 870 F.2d 1546 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	3
<b>OTHER AUTHORITIES</b>	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 50.....	4
Fed. R. Civ. P. 59.....	1

...

## I. INTRODUCTION

The jury verdict that VUSE Alto does not infringe the '911 patent is well-supported by the evidence. As set out below, PMP failed to prove that Alto met at least three requirements of the '911 patent, each of which was required for a finding of infringement, and thus each of these three failures of proof independently supports the jury's verdict. The Court should therefore deny PMP's motion for judgment as a matter of law or a new trial.

## II. LEGAL STANDARD

“A trial court may not appropriately enter [JMOL] unless it concludes, after consideration of the record as a whole in the light most favorable to the non-movant, that the evidence presented supports only one reasonable verdict, in favor of the moving party.” *Dotson v. Pfizer, Inc.*, 558 F.3d 284, 292 (4th Cir. 2009). If the party moving for judgment as a matter of law bears the burden of proof on the claim, the court may only grant the motion if: “(1) the movant has established its case by evidence that the jury would not be at liberty to disbelieve and (2) the only reasonable conclusion is in the movant's favor.” *Nobelpharma AB v. Implant Innovations, Inc.*, 141 F.3d 1059, 1065 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (quoting *Hurd v. Am. Hoist & Derrick, Co.*, 734 F.2d 495, 499 (10th Cir. 1984)). “Courts grant JMOL for the party bearing the burden of proof only in extreme cases.” *Mentor H/S, Inc. v. Med. Device Alliance, Inc.*, 244 F.3d 1365, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *see also*, e.g., *EEOC v. Massey Yardley Chrysler Plymouth, Inc.*, 117 F.3d 1244, 1250 (11th Cir. 1997) (“Were we to accept the EEOC's argument, we would have to take the extreme step of directing a verdict in favor of the party having the burden of proof.”).

A party seeking a new trial under Rule 59 must shoulder a similarly heavy burden. A party is not entitled to a new trial unless that party can show that the verdict (1) was against the clear weight of the evidence, (2) is based on evidence that is false, or (3) will result in a miscarriage of justice. *Cobalt Boats, LLC v. Brunswick Corp.*, No. 2:15cv21, 2017 WL 6034504, at \*2 (E.D. Va.

# 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.