

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

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

Plaintiffs,

v.

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

Defendants.

Civil No. 1:20cv00393-LO-TCB

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

Counterclaim Plaintiffs,

v.

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

Counterclaim Defendants.

**PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED ANSWER TO DEFENDANT
PHILIP MORRIS PRODUCTS S.A.'S SECOND AMENDED COUNTERCLAIMS**

Plaintiffs and Counterclaim Defendants RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc. (“RAI”) and R.J. Reynolds Vapor Company (“RJR”) (collectively “Counterclaim Defendants”) answer the counterclaims of Defendant and Counterclaim Plaintiff Philip Morris Products S.A. (“PMP”) as follows. Except as expressly stated, Counterclaim Defendants deny each and every allegation in

PMP's counterclaims. Counterclaim Defendants' specific responses to the numbered allegations are set forth below.¹

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Counterclaim Defendants admit that the Counterclaims purport to arise under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, et seq., and to be claims for patent infringement and declaratory judgment of non-infringement and invalidity. Counterclaim Defendants deny that they have infringed any valid and enforceable patent claim or that PMP is entitled to a declaration that Counterclaim Defendants' asserted patents are invalid and not infringed. Counterclaim Defendants deny that PMP is entitled to any relief.

2. Counterclaim Defendants deny PMP's allegation that the PMP Asserted Patents cover inventions including innovative e-vapor technologies. Except as expressly stated, Counterclaim Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 2 and, on that basis, deny them.

3. RJRV markets and sells electronic nicotine delivery systems under the brand names VUSE Solo, VUSE Ciro, VUSE Vibe, and VUSE Alto. Specifically, RJRV markets and sells the Vuse Solo power unit, which includes a USB charging cable; the Vuse Solo flavor pack, which consists of two cartridges containing e-liquid; the Vuse Ciro power unit, which includes a USB charging cable; the Vuse Ciro flavor pack, which consists of three cartridges containing e-liquid; the Vuse Alto power unit, which includes a USB charging cable; the Vuse Alto flavor pack, which consists of two pods containing e-liquid; the Vuse Vibe power unit, which includes a USB charging cable; and the Vuse Vibe flavor pack, which consists of two tanks containing e-liquid. In

¹ For convenience only, this Amended Answer includes headings used in PMP's counterclaims. To the extent that a heading contains any allegation(s) made by PMP, Counterclaim Defendants deny all such allegations.

addition, RJRV sells the Vuse Vibe kit, which includes a Vuse Vibe power unit, a USB charging cable, and one tank containing e-liquid. RJRV specifically denies that it infringes the PMP Asserted Patents. Except as expressly stated, RJRV denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 3.

4. Counterclaim Defendants admit that they have alleged that PMP infringes U.S. Patent Nos. 9,814,268 (“the ’268 patent”); 10,492,542 (“the ’542 patent”); 9,839,238 (“the ’238 patent”); 9,901,123 (“the ’123 patent”); and 9,930,915 (“the ’915 patent”). Counterclaim Defendants admit that proceedings regarding the ’238, ’123, and ’915 patents have been stayed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1659. Except as expressly stated, Counterclaim Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 4.

PARTIES

5. RAI admits that it is a North Carolina corporation with its principal place of business located at 401 North Main Street, Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101. RAI admits that it is an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of Reynolds American Inc., and that Reynolds American Inc. is an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of British American Tobacco, p.l.c., a publicly-traded company on the London Stock Exchange headquartered in London, England. Except as expressly stated, RAI denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 5.

6. RJRV admits that it is a North Carolina corporation with its principal place of business located at 401 North Main Street, Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101. RJRV admits that it is an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of Reynolds American Inc., and that Reynolds American Inc. is an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of British American Tobacco, p.l.c., a publicly-traded company on the London Stock Exchange headquartered in London, England. Except as expressly stated, RJRV denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 6.

7. Counterclaim Defendants are informed and believe that Philip Morris Products S.A. is organized under the laws of Switzerland with its principal place of business located at Quai Jeanrenaud 3, 2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. Counterclaim Defendants admits that PMP's counterclaims purportedly arise under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201, et seq., and the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code, and that federal courts have subject matter jurisdiction over such claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a). Counterclaim Defendants deny that they have committed any acts that give rise to PMP's causes of action for patent infringement.

9. Denied.

10. Denied.

11. Counterclaim Defendants admit that, in their Amended Complaint, they allege that PMP infringes Counterclaim Defendants' U.S. Patent Nos. 9,814,268; 10,492,542; 9,839,238; 9,901,123; and 9,930,915. Except as expressly stated, Counterclaim Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 11.

THE PMP ASSERTED PATENTS

12. Counterclaim Defendants admit that Exhibit A to PMP's answer and counterclaims purports to be a copy of U.S. Patent No. 9,814,265, the content of which speaks for itself. Counterclaim Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 12 and, on that basis, deny them.

13. Counterclaim Defendants admit that Exhibit B to PMP's answer and counterclaims purports to be a copy of U.S. Patent No. 10,555,556, the content of which speaks for itself. Counterclaim Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 13 and, on that basis, deny them.

14. Counterclaim Defendants admit that Exhibit C to PMP's answer and counterclaims purports to be a copy of U.S. Patent No. 10,104,911, the content of which speaks for itself. Counterclaim Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 14 and, on that basis, deny them.

15. The statements in Paragraph 15 set forth PMP's purported characterization of its alleged claims and rights and, as such, require no response from Counterclaim Defendants. To the extent that PMP intends to make any allegations against Counterclaim Defendants in Paragraph 15, Counterclaim Defendants deny them.

16. Denied.

COUNTERCLAIM I: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,814,265
(AGAINST RJRV)

17. RJRV reasserts and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 to 16.

18. Denied.

19. RJRV admits that Claim 1 of the '265 patent recites a "vaporizer device for vaporizing a substance containing at least one active and/or aroma material, comprising." RJRV cannot confirm the source, accuracy, or completeness of the images or annotations in Paragraph 19 and thus lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of any allegations contained therein and, on that basis, denies them. RJRV further responds that Paragraph 19 contains legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent that an answer is required, RJRV denies the statements and allegations in Paragraph 19 and refers to its written discovery responses and to the Rebuttal Expert Report of Dr. Jeffrey C. Suhling Regarding U.S. Patent No. 9,814,265 served March 24, 2021. To the extent that PMP intends to make any other allegations against RJRV in Paragraph 19, RJRV denies them.

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.