

**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 No. 1:20-cv-00393-LO-TCB

**BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
BY PLAINTIFFS RAI STRATEGIC HOLDINGS, INC. AND
R.J. REYNOLDS VAPOR COMPANY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS	1
A. The '374 Patent	1
B. The '911 Patent	4
C. Willful Infringement	10
SUMMARY JUDGMENT STANDARD.....	12
ARGUMENT	13
I. THE '374 PATENT IS INVALID AS ANTICIPATED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)(1)	13
II. DEFENDANTS CANNOT SHOW THAT ANY OF THE VUSE ALTO, SOLO G1, VIBE, OR CIRO PRODUCTS INFRINGE THE '911 PATENT	18
A. The Solo G1, Vibe, Ciro, And Alto Products Do Not Literally Infringe.....	18
1. Defendants' expert does not—and cannot—offer any literal infringement opinion regarding the Solo G1, Vibe, and Ciro products.....	19
2. The Alto product simply has no “cavity” that is a “blind hole,” and even if it did, the “largest” cross-sectional dimension is far outside the claimed range	20
B. As A Matter Of Law, Defendants Are Barred From Relying On The Doctrines Of Equivalents To Prove Infringement.....	23
1. Prosecution history estoppel and claim vitiation bar Defendants from claiming infringement by Solo G1, Vibe, and Ciro under the doctrine of equivalents.....	23
2. Prosecution history estoppel bars Defendants from claiming infringement by Alto under the doctrine of equivalents, and Dr. Abraham's equivalence opinion creates no genuine issue of fact.....	25
III. DEFENDANTS CANNOT SHOW WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 284.....	26
CONCLUSION.....	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Am. Hoist & Derrick Co. v. Sowa & Sons, Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	13, 14
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Coherus Biosciences Inc.</i> , 931 F.3d 1154 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	18
<i>Applied Material, Inc. v. Tokyo Seimitsu, Co.</i> , 446 F. Supp. 2d 538 (E.D. Va. 2006)	12
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc).....	14
<i>Augustine Med., Inc. v. Gaymar Indus., Inc.</i> , 181 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	15
<i>Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	20
<i>Bayer Healthcare LLC v. Baxalta Inc.</i> , 989 F.3d 964 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	28
<i>Biedermann Techs. GmbH & Co. KG v. K2M, Inc.</i> , No. 2:18-cv-585, 2021 WL 1143767 (E.D. Va. Mar. 25, 2021) (Davis, C.J.)	27
<i>Bushnell Hawthorne, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 1:18-CV-760, 2019 WL 8107921 (E.D. Va. Feb. 26, 2019)	28, 29
<i>Computer Docking Station Corp. v. Dell, Inc.</i> , 519 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	22
<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. FMC Corp.</i> , 569 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	20
<i>Elbex Video, Ltd. v. Sensormatic Elecs. Corp.</i> , 508 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	19
<i>Felix v. Am. Honda Motor Co.</i> , 562 F.3d 1167 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	25

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.</i> , 535 U.S. 722 (2002).....	23, 24
<i>Finnigan Corp. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 180 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	18
<i>Glaxo Wellcome, Inc. v. Impax Labs., Inc.</i> , 356 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	18
<i>Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Products Co.</i> , 339 U.S. 605 (1950).....	26
<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1923 (2016).....	26, 29
<i>Honeywell Int’l Inc. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.</i> , 370 F.3d 1131 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	24
<i>Johnson & Johnson Assocs. Inc. v. R.E. Serv. Co.</i> , 285 F.3d 1046 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	24
<i>K-2 Corp. v. Salomon S.A.</i> , 191 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	18
<i>Key Mfg. Group, Inc. v. Microdot, Inc.</i> , 925 F.2d 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	18
<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	14
<i>Mentor Graphics Corp. v. EVE-USA, Inc.</i> , 851 F.3d 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	27
<i>Moore USA, Inc. v. Standard Register Co.</i> , 229 F.3d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	24
<i>Omega Eng’g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	20
<i>Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Huntsman Polymers Corp.</i> , 157 F.3d 866 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	passim
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Endo Pharms. Inc.</i> , 438 F.3d 1123 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	22
<i>Salazar v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , 414 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	23
<i>Sanofi v. Watson Labs. Inc.</i> , 875 F.3d 636 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	20
<i>Searfoss v. Pioneer Consol Corp.</i> , 374 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	24
<i>SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 930 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	27
<i>Stumbo v. Eastman Outdoors, Inc.</i> , 508 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	26
<i>Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	13, 14, 17
<i>TechSearch, L.L.C. v. Intel Corp.</i> , 286 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	18
<i>TecSec, Inc. v. Adobe, Inc.</i> , No. 1:10-cv-115, 2019 WL 1233882 (E.D. Va. Mar. 14, 2019) (O’Grady, J.)	26, 27, 28
<i>TecSec, Inc. v. Adobe Sys. Inc.</i> , 326 F. Supp. 3d 105 (E.D. Va. 2018) (O’Grady, J.).....	12
<i>Teva Pharm. Indus. Ltd. v. AstraZeneca Pharms. LP</i> , 661 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	13
<i>Texas Instruments Inc. v. Cypress Semiconductor Corp.</i> , 90 F.3d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	26
<i>Tronzo v. Biomet, Inc.</i> , 156 F.3d 1154 (Fed Cir. 1998).....	24

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.