

**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

**REYNOLDS'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO
PMI/ALTRIA'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE OPINIONS OF RJR'S EXPERTS BASED ON
REJECTED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	2
LEGAL STANDARDS	10
ARGUMENT	11
I. REYNOLDS’S EXPERTS APPROPRIATELY INTERPRET AND APPLY THE PLAIN AND ORDINARY MEANING OF THE PATENTS.....	11
A. Reynolds’s Experts Do Not Contradict the Court’s Claim-Construction Rulings Because the Court Declined to Construe Any Claims.....	11
B. Reynolds’s Experts Do Not Propose to Argue Claim Construction to the Jury, But Whether the Accused Products Infringe Under the Ordinary Meaning	14
C. Prosecution History Evidence May Be Presented to the Jury on Issues Other Than Claim Construction.....	19
II. THE COURT SHOULD CONSTRUE THE “BLIND HOLE” LIMITATION OF THE ’911 PATENT (OR CLARIFY THAT IT HAS ALREADY DONE SO).....	24
CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac and Ugine</i> , 344 F.3d 1234 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	22
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 2014 WL 660857 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2014)	14, 15, 16
<i>Arason Enterprises, Inc. v. CabinetBed Inc.</i> , No. 16-cv-03001-PAB-NRN, 2019 WL 4597863 (D. Colo. Sept. 23, 2019).....	10, 12, 16
<i>Aventis Pharms. Inc. v. Amino Chems. Ltd.</i> , 715 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	16
<i>Avid Tech., Inc. v. Harmonic Inc.</i> , No. 11-1040-GMS, 2014 WL 7206301 (D. Del. Dec. 17, 2014)	14
<i>Biotec Biologische Naturverpackungen GmbH & Co. KG v. Biocorp, Inc.</i> , 249 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	15
<i>Cave Consulting Grp., LLC v. OptumInsight, Inc.</i> , No. 5:11-cv-00469-EJD, 2015 WL 740379 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2015).....	1, 14
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Bos. Sci. Corp.</i> , 561 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	12, 15
<i>CytoLogix Corp. v. Ventana Med. Sys., Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1168 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	12
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	10
<i>DNT, LLC v. Sprint Spectrum, LP</i> , No. CIV.A. 3:09CV21, 2010 WL 582164 (E.D. Va. Feb. 12, 2010)	1, 11, 14
<i>Exergen Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	12
<i>Fujifilm Corp. v. Motorola Mobility Inc.</i> , No. 3:12-cv-3587, 2015 WL 1265009 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 19, 2015)	14, 15

GPNE Corp. v. Apple Inc.,
108 F. Supp. 3d 839 (N.D. Cal. 2015)21, 23

GPNE Corp. v. Apple Inc.,
830 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....21

Lazare Kaplan Int’l, Inc. v. Photoscribe Techs., Inc.,
628 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....15

Level 3 Commc’ns, LLC v. Limelight Networks, Inc.,
No. 2:07CV589, 2009 WL 10689350 (E.D. Va. June 23, 2009).....20, 22

Liquid Dynamics Corp. v. Vaughan Co.,
449 F.3d 1209 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....12

MarcTec, LLC v. Johnson & Johnson,
664 F.3d 907 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....11

Metaswitch Networks Ltd. v. Genband US LLC,
No. 2:14-CV-00744-JRG, 2017 WL 3704760 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 28, 2017).....14

O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.,
521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....25

Omega Patents LLC v. CalAmp Corp.,
No. 6:13-cv-1950-Orl-40DAB, 2015 WL 12830496 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 23, 2015).....11, 13, 19

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc).....16

PPG Indus. v. Guardian Indus. Corp.,
156 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....22

Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
802 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....10

Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm’t Am., LLC,
669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....15

Tracbeam L.L.C. v. AT&T Inc.,
No. 6:11-CV-96, 2013 WL 12040731 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 6, 2013)2

Wahpeton Canvas Co. v. Frontier, Inc.,
870 F.2d 1546 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....19, 22

Wisconsin Alumni Res. Found. v. Apple Inc.,
905 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....15

YETI Coolers, LLC v. RTIC Coolers,
LLC, No. A-15-CV-597-RP, 2017 WL 404519 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 27, 2017)13

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Federal Rule of Evidence 702.....10, 18

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.