

**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

**R.J. REYNOLDS VAPOR COMPANY'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF ITS
MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT UNDER RULE 54(b)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	2
LEGAL STANDARD.....	4
ARGUMENT	6
I. THE JUDGMENT AS TO PMP’S PATENTS IS FINAL	6
II. THERE IS NO JUST REASON TO DELAY ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT ON PMP’S PATENTS	7
CONCLUSION.....	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>3D Sys., Inc. v. Envisiontec, Inc.</i> , No. 05-74891, 2011 WL 4691937 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 6, 2011).....	10
<i>Augme Techs., Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> , 305 F.R.D. 112 (N.D. Cal. 2012), <i>aff'd</i> , 755 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5, 9
<i>HTC Corp. v. IPCom GMBH & Co., KG</i> , 285 F.R.D. 130 (D.D.C. 2012).....	5, 6, 8
<i>Kearns v. Gen. Motors Corp.</i> , 94 F.3d 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	8
<i>Lucent Techs. Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , Nos. 02-cv-2060-B, 03-cv-0699-B, 03-cv-1108-B, 2007 WL 1306542 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 30, 2007)	6
<i>MCI Constructors, LLC v. City of Greensboro</i> , 610 F.3d 849 (4th Cir. 2010)	5, 6, 8
<i>McKiver v. Murphy-Brown LLC</i> , No. 7:14-CV-180-BR, 2018 WL 10322924 (E.D.N.C. Aug. 31, 2018).....	7
<i>MercExchange, L.L.C. v. eBay, Inc.</i> , 660 F. Supp. 2d 653 (E.D. Va. 2007) (Friedman, J.).....	6
<i>Sun Pharms. Indus. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , No. 07-CV-15087, 2009 WL 3497797 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 29, 2009).....	6
<i>TecSec, Inc. v. IBM</i> , No. 1:10-cv-115, Dkt. 1407 (E.D. Va. July 3, 2019) (O’Grady, J.)	4
<i>TecSec, Inc. v. IBM</i> , No. 1:10-cv-115, Dkt. 800 (E.D. Va. May 29, 2015) (Brinkema, J.).....	4
<i>W.L. Gore & Assocs. Inc. v. Int’l Med. Prosthetics Rsch. Assocs., Inc.</i> , 975 F.2d 858 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	5, 6
<i>WiAV Sols. LLC v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , No. 3:09-cv-447, 2010 WL 883748 (E.D. Va. March 9, 2010) (Payne, J.).....	5, 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

Page

STATUTES

28 U.S.C. §§ 1292.....1

28 U.S.C. § 1659.....2

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b)..... passim

INTRODUCTION

R.J. Reynolds Vapor Company (“RJR”) seeks Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) judgment on all claims regarding Philip Morris Products S.A.’s (“PMP’s”) asserted patents (PMP’s Counterclaims I and III), which were fully resolved in the Court’s Amended Judgment on the jury verdict (Dkt. 1415) and the Court’s March 30th judgment regarding equitable relief (Dkt. 1457). All trial and post-trial proceedings relating to PMP’s patents are now complete and final. There is no just reason to delay appeal of all issues pertaining to PMP’s patents. Indeed, such a delay would be unjust to RJR, since ongoing royalties continue to accrue and there is a risk of piecemeal appeals relating to PMP’s patents—one with respect to the injunction and interrelated merits,¹ and a second appeal for all other issues concerning PMP’s patent claims.

Importantly, the requested Rule 54(b) judgment would permit all issues related to PMP’s asserted patents to proceed immediately to appeal without waiting for adjudication of the claims and counterclaims pertaining to the five remaining RJR and RAI Strategic Holdings (together with RJR, “Reynolds”) asserted patents, all of which have been stayed since December 7, 2020 (and some of which were stayed even earlier in June 2020) in light of other pending proceedings. *See* Dkts. 27, 432. While the Court’s March 30th Order directed that this case be closed and that the order constituted a final judgment for appellate purposes (Dkt. 1456), given that other claims remain pending, Reynolds respectfully submits that the March 30th judgment (Dkt. 1457) does not constitute a final, appealable judgment.

¹ The Court’s denial of PMP’s requested injunction is immediately appealable under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1292(a)(1) and 1292(c)(1). The Federal Circuit may also consider related merits determinations, such as those of validity and infringement, that are intertwined with the merits of the injunction request. Even if PMP were to immediately appeal the denial of its injunction request, Rule 54(b) certification would be still be warranted to clearly ensure that all issues with respect to PMP’s patents could be appealed simultaneously.

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.