Exhibit 11

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

PHILIP MORRIS PRODCUTS S.A.,

Counterclaim Plaintiff,

v.

June 13, 2022

9:23 a.m.

R.J. REYNOLDS VAPOR COMPANY,

Counterclaim Defendant.

VOLUME 4 - MORNING SESSION
TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEONIE M. BRINKEMA,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:

Maximilian Antony Grant, Esq.

Latham & Watkins LLP (DC) 555 11th Street, NW Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20004-1304 202-637-2200

Email: Max.grant@lw.com

Clement Joseph Naples, Esq.

Latham & Watkins, LLP 885 Third Avenue 25th Floor New York, NY 10022 212-906-1200

Email: Dement.naples@lw.com

Gregory K. Sobolski, Esq.

Latham & Watkins, LLP 505 Montgomery Street Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94111-6538 202-637-2267

Email: Max.grant@lw.com



That was not an opposed jury instruction. That was an agreed instruction, but for the record, is either side objecting to that being the way in which claim construction is handled in this case?

MR. GRANT: Your Honor, the only objection I want to ensure that's preserved for the record is one that's in our written motion, and that's in a proposed jury instruction, which is the two findings that Judge O'Grady made, which is, of course, experts get to talk about plain meaning. However, he found twice that plain meaning of "blind hole" does not exclude and includes structures that have open sides, and so we filed a motion on that.

They shouldn't be entitled to argue contrary to that finding. We've included a jury instruction, and I do believe that if they argue that in closing, we will have preserved the issue. That's the only claim construction issue that I see as requiring preservation.

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from Reynolds on that.

MR. MAIORANA: Thank you, Your Honor. So this issue about the disclaimer is what we talked about on Friday, that the file history has been put before all these witnesses with no objection from anyone. And then you'll recall Mr. Grant came up after Mr. Kodama's direct, and said he had an evidentiary issue and started arguing an objection that wasn't made, and I raised Local Rule 83.1(j) saying he needs to do the cross.



.3

It's the same exact issue we've already presented to Your Honor, and Your Honor has already denied it. So this -- now they filed a motion -- I understand they want to preserve the objection, but now we have to respond to a motion on an argument that we already won, and I think it's not a good use of the Court's time.

With respect to the plain and ordinary meaning, certainly, as you know, Your Honor, we presented claim construction arguments to Judge O'Grady in the Markman proceeding, so we would like to preserve that we have made those claim constructions and that Judge O'Grady found that the claim terms all have their plain and ordinary meaning. For purposes of appeal, we want to preserve that objection, but we don't have an objection to proceeding under Judge O'Grady's Markman order, as you've said.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I've expressed my discomfort, but, again, I feel that has been the law of the case for some time, and both sides have an objection to the case going in the jury in the format that it's going to go.

Both sides should think about what that means down the road because one of you, I'm assuming -- well, it's possible you could both lose, that's actually maybe more than just possible. But anyway, I mean, you could have the jury find in either side's favor, but of course, that opens up still the right to appeal, and this is a wide-open issue in the appellate record, all right? And so I just think both sides should be thinking about that.



.3

If there were a way of cleaning up that record, I would be willing to entertain that. Otherwise, that's how it goes to the jury, all right?

MR. MAIORANA: And given that all the evidence is in, Your Honor, I don't see a practical way to clean that issue up. I completely concur with Your Honor's concern, and given that claim construction is de novo, it's going to be considered by the Court of Appeals at the Federal Circuit de novo, but we have the order from Judge O'Grady that we had to present the evidence based on that. Certainly we want to preserve our objections to that, and we certainly don't concede or acquiesce to what Mr. Grant just said, that Judge O'Grady said a blind hole can never have open sides. That's for the jury to decide. That's a question of infringement, which is what Judge O'Grady said, and I just want to make sure I'm not acquiescing to Mr. Grant's statement.

THE COURT: I'll look at the papers. Obviously, I want to give it careful attention, so the plan is to reconvene at 2:00, and again, that should give again, especially my court reporter, an opportunity so the transcript issue will not be a problem in terms of what was raised earlier, all right? All right. We'll see you back at 2:00.

(Thereupon, a luncheon recess was had beginning at 12:09 p.m.)

.3



DOCKET

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.

