

**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



**BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PHILIP MORRIS' MOTION FOR A PERMANENT
INJUNCTION OR, ALTERNATIVELY, AN ONGOING ROYALTY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	3
A. Philip Morris’ Smoke-Free Transformation	3
B. Reynolds’ Failed HNBs And Successful But Infringing E-Cigarettes	4
III. LEGAL STANDARD.....	5
A. Permanent Injunctive Relief	5
B. Ongoing Royalty.....	5
IV. ARGUMENT	6
A. The Court Should Permanently Enjoin Reynolds’ Infringement.....	6
1. Philip Morris Will Continue To Suffer Irreparable Harm Absent Enjoining Reynolds’ Infringement	6
a. Past And Future Irreparable Harm Exists	6
b. A Strong Nexus Exists Between The Patented Technology And Demand For Reynolds’ Infringing Products.....	11
2. Philip Morris Has No Adequate Remedy At Law	12
3. The Balance of Hardships Favors A Permanent Injunction.....	14
4. A Permanent Injunction Would Serve, Not Harm, Public Interest.....	16
B. Alternatively, The Court Should Order An Enhanced Ongoing Royalty	18
1. An Ongoing Royalty Is Warranted	18
2. The Ongoing Royalty Rate For The ’265 Patent Should Be 33.5%.....	19
a. The Circumstances Have Fundamentally Changed Since The August 2018 Hypothetical Negotiation	19
b. A 22.3% Baseline Royalty For The ’265 Patent Is Warranted.....	21
3. A 2.5% Baseline Ongoing Royalty For The ’911 Patent Is Warranted.....	25
4. The Ongoing Royalty Rates Should Be Enhanced By 50%	25
V. CONCLUSION.....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commcn’s, Inc.,
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 20, 22, 23

ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Communications, Inc.,
827 F. Supp. 2d 641 (E.D. Va. 2011) 22, 23

Acumed LLC v. Stryker Corp.,
551 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 13, 15

Adasa, Inc. v. Avery Dennison Corp.,
No. 17-cv-1685, 2021 WL 5921374 (D. Or. Dec. 15, 2021) 20

Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. BMW N. Am., LLC,
783 F. Supp. 2d 891 (E.D. Tex. 2011) passim

Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
809 F.3d 633 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 13, 17

Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Rec. Prods. Inc.,
876 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 22, 24, 30

Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod., Inc.,
No. 14-cv-62369, 2017 WL 7732873 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 3, 2017) 25

Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. v. W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc.,
670 F.3d 1171 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 20, 24

Canon Inc. v. UniNet Imaging, Inc.,
No. 11-cv-989, 2012 WL 13024015 (E.D. Va. May 18, 2012)..... 13

Covidien Sales LLC v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.,
No. 14-cv-917, 2014 WL 5242872 (D. Conn. Oct. 15, 2014)..... 10

Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Buyers Prods. Co.,
717 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013) passim

eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.,
547 U.S. 388 (2006) 5

ePlus, Inc. v. Lawson Software, Inc.,
No. 09-cv-620, 2011 WL 2119410 (E.D. Va. May 23, 2011),
modified, 946 F. Supp. 2d 459 (E.D. Va. 2013) 14, 16, 17, 18

<i>Ez-XBRL Sols., Inc. v. Chapke</i> , No. 17-cv-LMB-TCB, 2018 WL 5808724 (E.D. Va. Sept. 25, 2018), <i>report and recommendation adopted</i> , 2018 WL 5809406 (E.D. Va. Oct. 22, 2018).....	16
<i>Fresenius Med. Care Holdings Inc. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> , No. 03-cv-1431, 2008 WL 928496 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 4, 2008)	9, 14
<i>Hybritech, Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 849 F.2d 1446 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	8
<i>I/P Engine, Inc. v. AOL Inc.</i> , No. 11-cv-512, 2014 WL 309245 (E.D. Va. 2014).....	passim
<i>i4i Ltd. P'ship v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 598 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	8, 13, 15
<i>Imperium IP Holdings (Cayman), Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 203 F. Supp. 3d 755 (E.D. Tex. 2016)	27
<i>Johnstech Int'l Corp. v. JF Microtechnology SDN BHD</i> , No. 14-cv-2864, 2018 WL 3036759 (N.D. Cal. 2018).....	14, 15
<i>Joyal Products, Inc. v. Johnson Electrical North America, Inc.</i> , No. 04-cv-5172, 2009 WL 512156 (D.N.J. Feb. 27, 2009).....	23, 28, 29
<i>King v. Herbert J. Thomas Mem'l Hosp.</i> , 159 F.3d 192 (4th Cir. 1998)	18
<i>Kolcraft Enter., Inc. v. Chicco USA, Inc.</i> , No. 09-cv-3339, 2019 WL 4242482 (N.D. Ill. 2019).....	16
<i>Lowe v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i> , No. 18-cv-126, 2018 WL 3748418 (E.D. Va. July 9, 2018)	18
<i>Martek Biosciences Corp. v. Nutrinova Inc.</i> , 520 F. Supp. 2d 537 (D. Del. 2007)	14
<i>Milwaukee Elec. Tool Corp. v. Snap-On Inc.</i> , 288 F. Supp. 3d 872 (E.D. Wis. 2017)	26
<i>Mondis Tech., Ltd. V. Chimei Innolux Corp.</i> , 822 F. Supp. 2d 639 (E.D. Tex. 2011)	21, 26, 30
<i>Monsanto Co. v. Scruggs</i> , 249 F. Supp. 2d 746 (N.D. Miss. 2001)	16
<i>Nevro Corp. v. Stimwave Techs., Inc.</i> , No. 19-cv-325, 2019 WL 3322368 (D. Del. July 24, 2019).....	11

Novozymes A/S v. Genencor Int’l, Inc.,
474 F. Supp. 2d 592 (D. Del. 2007) 7

Presidio Components, Inc. v. Am. Technical Ceramics Corp.,
702 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 1, 7, 8

Read Corp. v. Portec, Inc.,
970 F.2d 816 (Fed. Cir. 1992) 26

Robert Bosch LLC v. Pylon Mfg. Corp.,
659 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 15

Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH v. Glenmark Pharms. Inc., USA,
821 F. Supp. 2d 681 (D.N.J. 2011)..... 14

Smith & Nephew, Inc. v. Synthes (U.S.A.),
466 F. Supp. 2d 978 (W.D. Tenn. 2006) 8

Soverain Software LLC v. J.C. Penney Corp., Inc.,
No. 09-cv-274, 2012 WL 4903268 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 9, 2012) 26

Stryker Corp. v. Zimmer, Inc.,
No. 10-cv-1223, 2017 WL 4286412 (W.D. Mich. July 12, 2017) 27

TEK Glob., S.R.L. v. Sealant Sys. Int’l, Inc.,
920 F.3d 777 (Fed. Cir. 2019) 11, 12, 16

Telcordia Tech., Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,
612 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 19

Trebro Mfg., Inc. v. Firefly Equip., LLC,
748 F.3d 1159 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 7

XY, LLC v. Trans Ova Genetics,
890 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 5, 6, 19, 25

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 154(a)(1)..... 1, 5

35 U.S.C. § 283..... 5, 19

35 U.S.C. § 298..... 27

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act,
Pub. L. 111–31, § 910(c)(1)(A) (2009) 8, 9

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.