

**IN THE 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-WEF


PUBLIC VERSION

**DEFENDANT'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
A PERMANENT INJUNCTION OR, ALTERNATIVELY, AN ONGOING ROYALTY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
TABLE OF EXHIBITS	vi
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
I. PMP IS NOT ENTITLED TO A PERMANENT INJUNCTION	2
A. PMP Has Made No Cognizable Showing Of Irreparable Harm	2
1. The asserted harms related to IQOS and ██████ are speculative and irrelevant because these products are not on the U.S. market	3
2. Even if IQOS or ██████ were sold in the U.S. market at some future time, there would be no irreparable harm to PMP	6
3. PMP’s other alleged harms are equally speculative	10
4. PMP’s own actions undercut its claims of irreparable harm	11
5. PMP cannot establish a causal nexus between RJRV’s infringement and PMP’s alleged irreparable harm	12
B. PMP Has An Adequate Remedy at Law	14
C. The Balance of Hardships Favors RJRV	15
D. A Permanent Injunction Would Disserve The Public Interest.....	16
II. THE COURT SHOULD AWARD PMP THE JURY’S ROYALTY RATES.....	19
A. PMP’s Royalty Rate For The ’265 Patent Should Be Rejected.....	20
1. PMP’s proposed royalty rate for the ’265 patent improperly ignores the jury’s royalty rate and the legal requirements of patent damages.....	20
2. Changed circumstances do not justify ignoring the jury’s rate.....	22
3. PMP cannot ignore the jury’s royalty rate by characterizing RJRV’s ongoing infringement as willful	24
4. The <i>Read</i> factors are not relevant	26
B. The Court Should Adopt the Jury’s Royalty Rate for the ’265 Patent	28
C. PMP’s Enhanced Royalty for the ’911 Patent Should Be Rejected.....	30
CONCLUSION.....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>ABS Glob., Inc. v. Inguran, LLC</i> , 2020 WL 2405380 (W.D. Wis. May 12, 2020)	25
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 827 F. Supp. 2d 641 (E.D. Va. 2011)	25, 26
<i>Additive Controls & Measurement Sys., Inc. v. Flowdata, Inc.</i> , 96 F.3d 1390 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	19
<i>Affinity Labs of Tex. LLC v. BMW N. Am., LLC</i> , 783 F. Supp. 2d 891 (E.D. Tex. 2011).....	24, 26
<i>Aland v. U.S. Dep't of Interior</i> , 2022 WL 1539522 (N.D. Cal. May 16, 2022).....	4
<i>Amado v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 517 F.3d 1353 (2008).....	24, 26
<i>Amoco Prod. Co. v. Vill. of Gambell</i> , 480 U.S. 531 (1987).....	2
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. (Apple III)</i> , 735 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	2, 12, 15, 17
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. (Apple V)</i> , 809 F.3d 633 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	14
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. (Apple VI)</i> , 2014 WL 6687122 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2014)	19, 28
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Rec. Prods. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	26
<i>Bianco v. Globus Med., Inc.</i> , 2014 WL 1049067 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 17, 2014) (Bryson, J.).....	11
<i>Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Marvell Tech. Grp., Ltd.</i> , 2014 WL 1320154 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 31, 2014)	29
<i>Celgard, LLC v. LG Chem, Ltd.</i> , 624 F. App'x 748 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	10
<i>Centripetal Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 492 F. Supp. 3d 495 (E.D. Va. 2020)	28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Cioffi v. Google, Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 4011143 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 12, 2017).....	19, 22, 25, 28
<i>City of L.A. v. Lyons</i> , 461 U.S. 95 (1983).....	3, 6
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Bos. Sci. Corp.</i> , 99 F. App'x 928 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	16
<i>Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Buyers Prods. Co.</i> , 717 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	14, 26
<i>eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.</i> , 547 U.S. 388 (2006).....	2, 11
<i>EMC Corp. v. Zerto, Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 1291757 (D. Del. Mar. 31, 2016)	9
<i>EMC Corp. v. Zerto, Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 3434212 (D. Del. Aug. 10, 2017)	22, 25, 28
<i>Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 2017 WL 3034655 (E.D. Tex. July 18, 2017)	19, 22, 26, 28
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	21
<i>Genband US LLC v. Metaswitch Networks Corp.</i> , 2018 WL 11357619 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 22, 2018)	26
<i>Genband US LLC v. Metaswitch Networks Corp.</i> , 861 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	11, 12
<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> , 579 U.S. 93 (2016).....	25
<i>High Tech Med. Instrumentation, Inc. v. New Image Indus., Inc.</i> , 49 F.3d 1551 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	10
<i>Humanscale Corp. v. CompX Int'l Inc.</i> , 2010 WL 1779963 (E.D. Va. Apr. 29, 2010)	9
<i>Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.</i> , 609 F. Supp. 2d 951 (N.D. Cal. 2009)	11
<i>I/P Engine, Inc. v. AOL Inc.</i> , 2014 WL 309245 (E.D. Va. Jan. 28, 2014)	22, 24, 25, 26
<i>i4i Ltd. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 598 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Integra Lifesciences Corp. v. Hyperbranch Med. Tech., Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 4770244 (D. Del. Aug. 12, 2016).....	13
<i>Jiaxing Super Lighting Elec. Appliance Co. v. CH Lighting Tech. Co.</i> , 2022 WL 3371630 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 16, 2022).....	4
<i>Joyal Prods, Inc. v. Johnson Elec. N. Am., Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 512156 (D.N.J. Feb. 27, 2009).....	24, 26
<i>Juno Therapeutics, Inc. v. Kite Pharma, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 2844410 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2020).....	28
<i>Juul Labs, Inc. v. FDA</i> , No. 22-1123 (D.C. Cir.).....	17
<i>Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. Thales DIS AIS USA LLC</i> , 39 F.4th 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2022).....	3, 6
<i>LG Elecs. U.S.A., Inc. v. Whirlpool Corp.</i> , 798 F. Supp. 2d 541 (D. Del. 2011).....	13
<i>Macom Tech. Sols. Holdings, Inc. v. Infineon Techs. AG</i> , 881 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	18
<i>Mass Engineered Design, Inc. v. Planar Sys., Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 6059375 (D. Or. Nov. 19, 2018).....	26
<i>MercExchange, L.L.C. v. eBay, Inc.</i> , 500 F. Supp. 2d 556 (E.D. Va. 2007).....	11
<i>Micro Chem., Inc. v. Lextron, Inc.</i> , 318 F.3d 1119 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	8
<i>MLC Intell. Prop., LLC v. Micron Tech., Inc.</i> , 10 F.4th 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	21
<i>Monsanto Co. v. Geertson Seed Farms</i> , 561 U.S. 139 (2010).....	2
<i>Nichia Corp. v. Everlight Ams., Inc.</i> , 855 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	2
<i>Read Corp. v. Portec, Inc.</i> , 970 F.2d 816 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	26, 27
<i>ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> , 594 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	21
<i>Riverbed Tech., Inc. v. Silver Peak Sys., Inc.</i> , 2014 WL 4695765 (D. Del. Sept. 12, 2014).....	13

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.