

**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 and Counterclaim Defendants,

v.

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

Defendants and Counterclaim Plaintiffs.

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

REDACTED

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF REYNOLDS'S MOTION TO
EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY OF PAUL K. MEYER**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Factual Background	2
A. Hypothetical Negotiation Framework.....	2
B. Mr. Meyer’s Analysis of the ’545, ’265, and ’911 Patents.....	3
C. Mr. Meyer’s Analysis Of The ’374 Patent.....	7
Legal Standard	10
Argument	11
I. MR. MEYER’S ROYALTY OPINIONS AS TO THE ’545, ’265, AND ’911 PATENTS ARE UNFOUNDED, UNRELIABLE, AND SHOULD BE EXCLUDED.....	11
A. Mr. Meyer Fails To Consider The Most Relevant License Agreement.....	12
B. Mr. Meyer Inappropriately Adopts A Royalty Rate No One Ever Paid.....	16
II. MR. MEYER’S [REDACTED] INCREASE TO THE ’545 ROYALTY RATE IS ARBITRARY.....	20
A. Mr. Meyer’s Reliance On Ms. Ehrlich Is Misplaced.....	20
B. Mr. Meyer Fails To Justify His [REDACTED] Increase.....	21
III. MR. MEYER’S ROYALTY OPINION FOR THE ’374 PATENT IS ARBITRARY AND UNRELIABLE.....	23
A. The [REDACTED] Agreement Does Not Support Mr. Meyer’s ’374 Royalty Rate Opinion.....	23
B. Mr. Meyer’s Alternative Sources For His Royalty Rate Are Improper And Cannot Support His ’374 Royalty Opinion.....	25
C. Mr. Meyer’s Decision To Apportion The Entire [REDACTED] To The ’374 Patent Is Inconsistent With The Underlying Facts.....	28
Conclusion	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Boeing Co. v. United States</i> , 86 Fed. Cl. 303 (2009)	29
<i>Brooke Grp. Ltd. v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.</i> , 509 U.S. 209 (1993).....	10
<i>Cooper v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 259 F.3d 194 (4th Cir. 2001)	10
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	10, 11
<i>Digital Reg of Tex., LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.</i> , No. C 12-1971 CW, 2014 WL 4090550 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2014)	26
<i>E.E.O.C. v. Freeman</i> , 778 F.3d 463 (4th Cir. 2015)	10
<i>ePlus, Inc. v. Lawson Software, Inc.</i> , 700 F.3d 509 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	12
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	21, 29
<i>EVM Sys., LLC v. Rex Med., L.P.</i> , No. 6:13-CV-184, 2015 WL 4911090 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 17, 2015).....	19
<i>Exmark Mfg. v. Briggs & Stratton Power Prod. Grp., LLC</i> , 879 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	21, 30
<i>Fujitsu Ltd. v. Belkin Int’l, Inc.</i> , No. 10-CV-03972-LHK, 2012 WL 5835741 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 16, 2012).....	22
<i>Golden Bridge Tech. v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 5:12-CV-04882-PSG, 2014 WL 2194501 (N.D. Cal. May 18, 2014).....	21
<i>Hanson v. Alpine Valley Ski Area, Inc.</i> , 718 F.2d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	11, 24, 25

In re Innovatio IP Ventures, LLC Pat. Litig.,
 No. 11 C 9308, 2013 WL 5593609 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 3, 2013).....21

In re Koninklijke Philips Pat. Litig.,
 No. 18-CV-01885-HSG, 2020 WL 7398647 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2020).....24

LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.,
 694 F.3d 51 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....11, 12, 13, 25

Limelight Networks, Inc. v. XO Commc 'ns, LLC,
 No. 3:15-cv-720-JAG, 2018 WL 678245 (E.D. Va. Feb. 2, 2018).....29

Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.,
 580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....12

Medtronic, Inc. v. Bos. Sci. Corp.,
 No. CIV 99-1035 RHK/FLN, 2002 WL 34447587, at *12 (D. Minn. Aug. 8,
 2002)28

Microsoft Corp. v. Corel Corp.,
 No. 5:15-CV-05836-EJD, 2017 WL 6492468 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2017)25

MLC Intell. Prop., LLC v. Micron Tech., Inc.,
 10 F.4th 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2021)16

Nease v. Ford Motor Co.,
 848 F.3d 219 (4th Cir. 2017)10

Open Text S.A. v. Box, Inc.,
 No. 13-cv-04910-JD, 2015 WL 349197 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2015).....22, 30

Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google Inc.,
 No. C 10-03561 WHA, 2012 WL 850705 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2012)28

Prism Techs. LLC v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.,
 849 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....25

Rembrandt Soc. Media, LP v. Facebook, Inc.,
 22 F. Supp. 3d 585 (E.D. Va. 2013)11

ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.,
 594 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....11, 12

Riles v. Shell Expl. & Prod. Co.,
298 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....11

Shure Inc. v. ClearOne, Inc.,
No. CV 19-1343-RGA-CJB, 2021 WL 4748744 (D. Del. Oct. 8, 2021)26

Small v. WellDyne, Inc.,
927 F.3d 169 (4th Cir. 2019)10

Speedfit LLC v. Woodway USA, Inc.,
No. 13-CV-1276, 2019 WL 1436306 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 29, 2019).....21

Tyger Constr. Co. v. Pensacola Constr. Co.,
29 F.3d 137 (4th Cir. 1994)10

Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.,
632 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....20, 22

United States v. Baller,
519 F.2d 463 (4th Cir. 1975)10

Whitserve, LLC v. Computer Packages, Inc.,
694 F.3d 10 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....18, 24

Wi-LAN Inc. v. LG Elecs., Inc.,
No. 18-CV-01577-H-BGS, 2019 WL 5681622 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 1, 2019).....24

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 284.....11

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Fed. R. Evid. 7021, 10

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.