

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION**

RAI STRATEGIC HOLDINGS, INC. AND R.J.
REYNOLDS VAPOR COMPANY

Plaintiffs-Counterclaim
Defendants,

v.

ALTRIA CLIENT SERVICES LLC; PHILIP
MORRIS USA INC.; PHILIP MORRIS
PRODUCTS S.A.

Defendants-Counterclaim
Plaintiffs.

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



**COUNTERCLAIM PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS

SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NO INEQUITABLE CONDUCT1

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS2

 A. Prosecution of U.S. Patent No. 6,803,5452

 B. RJR’s Inequitable Conduct Allegations.....3

 C. RJR’s Allegations and Expert Opinions Regarding The Prior Art At Issue.....5

 1. Allegations Regarding Brooks.....5

 2. Allegations Regarding McCafferty.....6

 3. Allegations Regarding Fleischhauer.....7

 D. RJR Abandoned Its Inequitable Conduct Defense.....9

III. LEGAL STANDARDS9

IV. ARGUMENT10

 A. RJR Abandoned Its Meritless Inequitable Conduct Defense.....10

 B. Summary Judgment Of No Inequitable Conduct Is Warranted On The
 Merits11

 1. Brooks and McCafferty Are Not But For Material.....11

 2. RJR Cannot Show That Specific Intent To Deceive Is The Single
 Most Reasonable Inference.....13

 3. As A Corporate Entity, Philip Morris Incorporated Cannot Commit
 Inequitable Conduct.....17

PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NO INVALIDITY18

I. INTRODUCTION18

II. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS19

III. ARGUMENT21

 A. Liu Is Not Prior Art Under § 102(a) Because It Is Not “By
 Another”.....21

 B. Liu Is Not Prior Art Under Any Other Provision of 35 U.S.C. §
 102.....23

SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON RJR’S FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND ELEVENTH
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES.....26

I. INTRODUCTION26

II. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS27

III. ARGUMENT29

 A. Standard for Summary Judgment on Affirmative Defenses29

 B. RJR Has Abandoned Or Pointed To No Facts To Support Their
 Affirmative Defenses29

CONCLUSION.....30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc. v. Medtronic Vascular, Inc.,
485 F. Supp. 2d 538 (D. Del. 2007) 12

Advanced Tech. Incubator, Inc. v. Sharp Corp.,
No. 2:07-CV-468, 2009 WL 4670435 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 4, 2009) 30

Am. Med. Sys., Inc. v. Laser Peripherals, LLC,
712 F. Supp. 2d 885 (D. Minn. 2010) 14, 16

Avid Sys., Inc. v. Crystal Import Corp.,
603 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 2, 17

Bayer AG v. Schein Pharm., Inc.,
301 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 18, 24, 25

Brucker v. Taylor,
No. 1:16-cv-1414-GBL, 2017 WL 11506332 (E.D. Va. Sept. 1, 2017) 29, 30

CertusView Techs., LLC v. S&N Locating Servs., LLC,
198 F. Supp. 3d 568 (E.D. Va. 2016) 11

Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC v. Ott,
984 F. Supp. 2d 508 (E.D. Va. 2013) 29, 30

E.W. v. Dolgos,
884 F.3d 172 (4th Cir. 2018) 9

Exergen Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.,
575 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 9, 11

IBM v. Priceline Grp. Inc.,
271 F. Supp. 3d 667 (D. Del. 2017) 30

In re Kathawala,
9 F.3d 942 (Fed. Cir. 1993) 19, 24, 25

In re Katz,
687 F.3d 450 (CCPA 1982) 22, 23

Larson Mfg. Co. of S.D., Inc. v. Aluminart Prods. Ltd.,
559 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 11, 12

...

Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.,
79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996) 21

McKesson Automation, Inc. v. Swisslog Italia S.P.A.,
712 F. Supp. 2d 283 (D. Del. May 18, 2010) 17

MeadWestvaco Corp. v. Rexam PLC,
809 F. Supp. 2d 463 (E.D. Va. 2011),
vacated-in-part on other grounds, 731 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 10, 14

Ohio Willow Wood Co. v. Alps S., LLC,
813 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 9, 10, 13

Prowess, Inc. v. RaySearch Labs., AB,
953 F. Supp. 2d 638 (D. Md. 2013)..... 14, 15, 16

South Corp. v. United States,
690 F.2d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1982) 22

TecSec Inc. v. Adobe Sys., Inc.,
326 F. Supp. 3d 105 (E.D. Va. 2018) 11, 29

Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.,
649 F.3d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2011) passim

Trebro Mfg., Inc. v. Firefly Equip., LLC,
748 F.3d 1159 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 22, 23

Va. Innovation Scis. Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
11 F. Supp. 3d 622 (E.D. Va. 2014) 10

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) 21

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) 23

35 U.S.C. § 102(d) 24

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) 23

OTHER AUTHORITIES

MPEP § 2135 19, 24, 25

RULES

FED. R. CIV. P. 11(b) 23

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.