

**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.

Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-393-LO-TCB

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF COUNTERCLAIM PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL**

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5(C), Counterclaim Plaintiff Philip Morris Products S.A. ("PMP") hereby moves the Court for leave to file PMP's Opposition to Reynolds' Partial Motion to Stay Injunctive Relief Discovery ("Motion") and Exhibits 2-7 under seal.

All of the materials PMP seeks to file under seal are confidential under the stipulated protective order.

**I. DESCRIPTION OF MATERIALS SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**

PMP seeks leave to file the following document under seal:

- PMP's Opposition to Reynolds' Partial Motion to Stay Injunctive Relief Discovery
- Exhibits 2-7: Reynolds documents marked Confidential and produced under the Protective Order

## II. ARGUMENT

Although there is a general presumption that the public has the right to access documents in the files of the courts, this presumption may be overcome “if the public’s right of access is outweighed by competing interests.” *Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc.*, 218 F.3d 288, 302 (4th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted); *Stone v. Univ. of Md. Med. Sys. Corp.*, 855 F.2d 178, 180 (4th Cir. 1988). To determine whether the interests in sealing the records outweigh the public’s right of access, a court must follow a three-step process: (1) provide public notice of the request to seal and allow interested parties a reasonable opportunity to object; (2) consider less drastic alternatives to sealing the documents; and (3) articulate specific reasons and factual findings supporting its decision to seal. *Ashcraft*, 218 F.3d at 302; *Adams v. Object Innovation, Inc.*, No. 11-cv-272, 2011 WL 7042224, at \*4 (E.D. Va. Dec. 5, 2011), *report and recommendation adopted*, 2012 WL 135428 (E.D. Va. Jan. 17, 2012). All three requirements are satisfied here.

First, the public has received notice of the request to seal and will have a reasonable opportunity to object. In accordance with Local Civil Rule 5 procedures, this sealing motion was publicly docketed, satisfying the first requirement. Counterclaim Defendants will have an opportunity to respond, and once the “public has had ample opportunity to object” to PMP’s motion and “the Court has received no objections,” the first *Ashcraft* requirement may be deemed satisfied. *See GTSI Corp. v. Wildflower Int’l, Inc.*, No. 09-cv-00123, 2009 WL 1248114, at \*9 (E.D. Va. Apr. 30, 2009); *U.S. ex rel. Carter v. Halliburton Co.*, No. 10-cv-00864, 2011 WL 2077799, at \*3 (E.D. Va. May 24, 2011) (“[T]he parties provided public notice of the request to seal that allowed interested parties a reasonable opportunity to object—nearly two weeks.”).

Second, PMP seeks to seal and to redact from the public record only information that the parties must keep confidential by the stipulated protective order. PMP will file publicly a redacted version of the Motion, in addition to a sealed version. This selective and narrow protection of

confidential material constitutes “the least drastic method of shielding the information at issue.” *Adams*, 2011 WL 7042224, at \*4. The public has no legitimate interest in information confidential to PMP/Altria and Counterclaim Defendants. *See Adams*, 2011 WL 7042224, at \*4 (“[T]here is no legitimate public interest in disclosing the proprietary and confidential information of [the defendant] . . . and disclosure to the public could result in significant damage to the company.”). The information that PMP seeks to seal and redact includes confidential, proprietary, and competitively sensitive business information of PMP, Counterclaim Defendants, and/or third parties, each of which could face harm if such information were to be released publicly.

Third, there is support for filing PMP’s Motion under seal, with a publicly filed version containing strictly limited redactions. As an initial matter, the stipulated protective order requires that this information remain confidential. And the redacted portions of the Motion only pertain to this confidential information. Moreover, the exhibits filed under seal contain competitively sensitive business information. Sealing these materials is therefore proper because the public’s interest in access is outweighed by a party’s interest in “preserving confidentiality” of limited amounts of confidential information “normally unavailable to the public.” *Flexible Benefits Council v. Feltman*, No. 08-cv-371, 2008 WL 4924711 (E.D. Va. Nov. 13, 2008), at \*1; *U.S. ex rel. Carter*, 2011 WL 2077799, at \*3.

### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, PMP respectfully requests that the Court grant this Motion and enter the attached proposed Order.

Dated: May 26, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Maximilian A. Grant  
Maximilian A. Grant (VSB No. 91792)  
max.grant@lw.com  
Lawrence J. Gotts (VSB No. 25337)

lawrence.gotts@lw.com  
Matthew J. Moore (*pro hac vice*)  
matthew.moore@lw.com  
Jamie Underwood (*pro hac vice*)  
jamie.underwood@lw.com  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
555 Eleventh Street, N.W., Ste. 1000  
Washington, DC 20004  
Tel: (202) 637-2200; Fax: (202) 637-2201

Clement J. Naples (*pro hac vice*)  
clement.naples@lw.com  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
885 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022-4834  
Tel: (212) 906-1200; Fax: (212) 751-4864

Gregory K. Sobolski (*pro hac vice*)  
Greg.sobolski@lw.com  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel: (415) 391-0600; Fax: (415) 395-8095

Brenda L. Danek (*pro hac vice*)  
brenda.danek@lw.com  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
330 North Wabash Avenue, Suite 2800  
Chicago, IL 60611  
Tel: (312) 876-7700; Fax: (312) 993-9767

*Counsel for Defendant-Counterclaim  
Plaintiff Philip Morris Products S.A.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 26th day of May, 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served using the Court's CM/ECF system, with electronic notification of such filing to all counsel of record:

/s/ Maximilian A. Grant  
Maximilian A. Grant (VSB No. 91792)  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
555 Eleventh Street, N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (202) 637-2200  
Facsimile: (202) 637-2201  
Email: max.grant@lw.com

*Counsel for Defendant-Counterclaim  
Plaintiff Philip Morris Products S.A.*