

**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

**OPPOSITION TO PM/ALTRIA'S DAUBERT MOTION TO
EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY OF RYAN SULLIVAN**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
I. THE EXPERTS’ REASONABLE ROYALTY ANALYSES.....	2
II. THE TWO FONTEM AGREEMENTS RELIED UPON BY THE EXPERTS.....	3
III. DR. SULLIVAN’S ANALYSIS AND OPINIONS BASED ON THE MOST COMPARABLE LICENSE AGREEMENT.	5
LEGAL STANDARD.....	7
ARGUMENT.....	8
I. DR. SULLIVAN’S ANALYSIS OF THE FONTEM–RJR V AGREEMENT IS ADMISSIBLE TO ASSIST THE JURY.	8
A. Dr. Sullivan Appropriately Uses The Most Comparable Fontem–RJR V Agreement.....	9
B. Dr. Sullivan Properly Relied On Reynolds’s 2020 Forecasted Sales.	10
II. DR. SULLIVAN PROPERLY DID NOT RELY ON THE PHANTOM [REDACTED] ANALYSIS.....	18
III. DR. SULLIVAN PROPERLY CONSIDERED DESIGN-AROUND OPTIONS.	22
CONCLUSION.....	28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , 757 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2014), <i>overruled on other grounds by Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC</i> , 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	14, 24
<i>Aqua Shield v. Inter Pool Cover Team</i> , 774 F.3d 766 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	25, 27
<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Apotex Corp.</i> , 782 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	27
<i>Baltimore Aircoil Co. v. SPX Cooling Techs. Inc.</i> , No. CCB-13-2053, 2016 WL 4426681 (D. Md. Aug. 22, 2016), <i>aff'd</i> , 721 F. App'x 983 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	10
<i>Baxter Int'l, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , No. 17C7576, 2020 WL 424918 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 27, 2020)	25
<i>Biedermann Techs. GmbH & Co. KG v. K2M, Inc.</i> , No. 2:18cv585, 2021 WL 6034269 (E.D. Va. Dec. 10, 2021)	15
<i>Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Marvell Tech. Grp., Ltd.</i> , No. 09-290, 2012 WL 3686736 (W.D. Pa. Aug. 24, 2012).....	8, 23, 24, 27
<i>Commissariat a L'energie Atomique v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 03-484 KAJ, 2006 WL 8452836 (D. Del. Apr. 13, 2006)	16
<i>Commonwealth Sci. & Indus. Rsch. Organisation v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 809 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	15
<i>Commonwealth Sci. & Indus. Rsch. Organisation v. Mediatek Inc.</i> , No. 6:12-CV-578, 2015 WL 12806515 (E.D. Tex. June 29, 2015)	10
<i>Covidien Sales LLC v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.</i> , No. 1:11-cv-871, 2020 WL 7040643 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 1, 2020).....	25
<i>Datascope Corp. v. SMEC, Inc.</i> , 879 F.2d 820 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	26

DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.,
567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....26

ePlus, Inc. v. Lawson Software, Inc.,
764 F. Supp. 2d 807 (E.D. Va. 2011), *aff'd*, 700 F.3d 509 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....11

Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.,
773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....28

Fresenius Medical Care Holdings, Inc. v. Baxter Intern., Inc.,
No. 03-cv-1431, 2006 WL 1390416 (N.D. Cal. May 18, 2006).....23

Georgia-Pac. Corp. v. U.S. Plywood Corp.,
318 F. Supp. 1116 (S.D.N.Y. 1970).....7

Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prod. Co.,
185 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....26

Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.,
378 F. Supp. 2d 459 (D. Del. 2005).....16

i4i Ltd. P’ship v. Microsoft Corp.,
598 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010), *aff’d*, 564 U.S. 91 (2011)7, 14

LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.,
No. 2:06-CV-348, 2011 WL 197869 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 20, 2011), *objections*
overruled, 2011 WL 13196509 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 28, 2011)27

Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.,
580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....7, 16

Mars, Inc. v. Coin Acceptors, Inc.,
527 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....8, 25

Meyer Intell. Properties Ltd. v. Bodum, Inc.,
690 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....23

Open Text S.A. v. Box, Inc.,
No. 13-cv-04910-JD, 2015 WL 393858 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 29, 2015).....27

Pavo Sols. LLC v. Kingston Tech. Co.,
No. 8:14-cv-01352-JLS-KES, 2019 WL 8138163 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2019).....10

Prism Techs. LLC v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.,
849 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....8, 25

Sherwin-Williams Co. v. PPG Indus., Inc.,
No. 17-1023, 2020 WL 1283465 (W.D. Pa. 2020).....27

Silicon Knights, Inc. v. Epic Games, Inc.,
551 F. App'x 646 (4th Cir. 2014).....8

Smart Skins LLC v. Microsoft Corp.,
No. C15544-MJP, 2016 WL 4148091 (W.D. Wash. July 1, 2016).....26

Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
802 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....7

SynQor, Inc. v. Artesyn Tech., Inc.,
709 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....27

Trans-World Mfg. Corp. v. Al Nyman & Sons, Inc.,
750 F.2d 1552 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....16

Whitserve, LLC v. Computer Packages, Inc.,
694 F.3d 10 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....9

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Fed. R. Evid. 7027

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.