

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ECTO WORLD, LLC and SV3, LLC,
Petitioner

v.

RAI STRATEGIC HOLDINGS, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2024-01280
U.S. Patent No. 11,925,202

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 11,925,202**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. §42.8(A)(1)).....	2
III.	GROUND FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. §42.104(A)).....	4
IV.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. §42.104(B)).....	4
	A. Citation of Prior Art.....	4
	B. Statutory Grounds for the Challenge.....	5
V.	THE '202 PATENT	5
	A. Overview	5
	B. Applicant Admits that the Claimed Features Were Well-Known	6
	C. Prosecution History Summary	7
	D. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	8
	E. Claim Construction.....	8
	1. “wicked into contact with the electrical resistance heater”	9
	2. “smoking article”	10
VI.	OVERVIEW OF THE APPLIED REFERENCES	11
	A. Takeuchi	11
	B. Kim.....	12
	C. Pienemann	13
	D. Susa	14
VII.	GROUND OF UNPATENTABILITY.....	15
	A. Ground 1: Takeuchi renders obvious claims 1, 3-15, and 18-29.....	15
	1. Claim 1	15
	(a) [1.P]	15
	(b) [1.a]	19
	(c) [1.b]	22
	(d) [1.c]	25
	(e) [1.d]	27
	(f) [1.e]	31

	(g) [1.f].....	39
	(h) [1.g]	42
2.	Claim 3	44
3.	Claim 4	45
4.	Claim 5	48
5.	Claim 6	49
6.	Claim 7	50
7.	Claim 8	50
8.	Claim 9	51
9.	Claim 10	52
10.	Claim 11	53
11.	Claim 12	56
12.	Claim 13	58
13.	Claim 14	58
14.	Claim 15	60
15.	Claim 18	61
16.	Claim 19	62
17.	Claim 20	62
18.	Claim 21	62
19.	Claims 22-29	63
B.	Ground 2: The combination of Takeuchi and Pienemann renders obvious claims 6, 7, 14, 15, and 18-29.	63
1.	A POSA would have been motivated to combine Takeuchi and Pienemann.	63
	(a) Takeuchi’s liquid container & Pienemann’s wrapper.....	64
	(b) Takeuchi’s control circuit & Pienemann’s additional control/regulating capabilities	66
	(c) Takeuchi’s flavor-generating devices & Pienemann’s removable end caps.....	68

2.	Claim 6	71
3.	Claim 7	71
4.	Claim 14	72
5.	Claim 15	72
6.	Claim 18	73
7.	Claims 19-29	73
C.	Ground 3: The combination of Kim and Pienemann renders obvious claims 1-30.	73
1.	A POSA would have been motivated to combine Kim and Pienemann.	73
	(a) Kim's technique of activating the heater & Pienemann's puff detector and electronic circuit 32	74
	(b) Kim's porous chip & Pienemann's removable/replaceable and wrapped substrate portion	76
	(c) Kim's device & Pienemann's removable end cap and mouthpiece	78
2.	Claim 1	80
	(a) [1.P]	80
	(b) [1.a]	81
	(c) [1.b]	82
	(d) [1.c]	83
	(e) [1.d]	84
	(f) [1.e]	86
	(g) [1.f]	91
	(h) [1.g]	92
3.	Claim 2	93
4.	Claim 3	94
5.	Claim 4	94
6.	Claim 5	96

7.	Claim 6	97
8.	Claim 7	97
9.	Claim 8	97
10.	Claim 9	97
11.	Claim 10	98
12.	Claim 11	99
13.	Claim 12	99
14.	Claim 13	102
15.	Claim 14	102
16.	Claim 15	102
17.	Claim 16	103
18.	Claim 17	103
19.	Claim 18	104
20.	Claim 19	105
21.	Claim 20	105
22.	Claim 21	106
23.	Claims 22-30	106
D.	Ground 4: The combination of Kim, Pienemann, and Susa renders obvious claims 1-30.	107
1.	A POSA would have been motivated to combine Kim, Pienemann, and Susa	107
2.	Claim 1	108
	(a) [1.P]	108
	(b) [1.a]-[1.g]	109
3.	Claims 2-30	109
VIII.	DISCRETIONARY CONSIDERATIONS STRONGLY FAVOR INSTITUTION.	109
A.	The Petition should not be denied under <i>Fintiv</i>	109
B.	The <i>Advanced Bionics</i> two-part framework strongly favors institution.	110

IX.	CONCLUSION	112
X.	CLAIMS APPENDIX.....	113

PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 11,925,202 to Robinson et al. ("202 patent")
1002	'202 Patent Prosecution History
1003	Declaration of Dr. Seetharama Deevi
1004	U.S. Patent No. 6,155,268 to Takeuchi ("Takeuchi")
1005	<i>Intentionally Left Blank</i>
1006	International Patent Application Pub. No. WO2000/028843 to Pienemann [Certified Translation] ("Pienemann")
1007	U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2006/0016453 to Kim ("Kim")
1008	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Dr. Seetharama Deevi
1009	Reynolds' Motion for Temporary Relief [Public Version], Certain Disposable Vaporizer Devices; Inv. No. 337-TA-1410
1010	Declaration of Dr. Robert Sturges, <i>RJ Reynolds Vapor Company et al v. Fontem Holdings I BV et al.</i> , IPR2018-00627, EX1002
1011	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>RJ Reynolds Vapor Company et al v. Fontem Holdings I BV et al.</i> , IPR2018-00627, Paper 2
1012	<i>Intentionally Left Blank</i>
1013	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>RJ Reynolds Vapor Company v. Fontem Holdings I BV</i> , IPR2016-01527, Paper 1
1014	Initial Determination, <i>Certain Tobacco Heating Articles and Components Thereof</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-1199 [Public Version]
1015	Declaration of Charles Clemens, <i>Philip Morris Products SA v. RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-01602, EX2010
1016	Declaration of Dr. Robert Sturges, <i>RJ Reynolds Vapor Company v. Fontem Holdings I BV</i> , IPR2016-01270, EX1009
1017	Institution Decision, <i>Philip Morris Products SA v. RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-01602, Paper 9
1018	EP Patent Appl. No. 0845220 to Susa ("Susa")

Exhibit No.	Description
1019	P.M. Ling and S.A. Glantz, “Tobacco industry consumer research on socially acceptable cigarettes,” <i>Tobacco Control</i> 14 , e3 (2005) (http://www.tobaccocontrol.com/cgi/content/full/14/5/e3) (“Ling”)
1020	U.S. Patent No. 2,104,266 to McCormick (“McCormick”)
1021	U.S. Patent No. 1,775,947 to Robinson (“Robinson”)
1022	U.S. Patent No. 3,200,819 to Gilbert (“Gilbert”)
1023	U.S. Patent No. 3,258,015 to Drummond et al. (“Drummond”)
1024	U.S. Patent No. 4,079,742 to Ranier et al. (“Ranier”)
1025	U.S. Patent No. 4,819,665 to Roberts et al. (“Roberts”)
1026	U.S. Patent No. 5,666,977 to Higgins et al. (“Higgins”)
1027	U.S. Patent No. 5,743,251 to Howell et al. (“Howell”)
1028	U.S. Patent No. 6,234,167 to Cox et al. (“Cox”)
1029	CN Patent No. 2719043Y to Hon Lik (“Hon”)
1030	U.S. Patent No. 2,057,353 to Whittemore (“Whittemore”)
1031	U.S. Patent No. 4,765,347 to Sensabaugh et al. (“Sensabaugh”)
1032	U.S. Patent No. 11,758,936 to Robinson et al.
1033	U.S. Patent No. 11,785,978 to Robinson et al.
1034	U.S. Patent No. 10,231,488 to Robinson et al.
1035	U.S. Patent No. 9,901,123 to Robinson et al.
1036	U.S. Patent No. 9,801,416 to Robinson et al.
1037	U.S. Patent No. 8,899,238 to Robinson et al.
1038	U.S. Patent No. 8,079,371 to Robinson et al.
1039	U.S. Patent No. 7,726,320 to Robinson et al.
1040	U.S. Patent No. 7,992,626 to Tilton et al.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ecto World, LLC and SV3, LLC (“Petitioner”) petitions for IPR of claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent 11,925,202 to Robinson *et al.* (“the ’202 patent”), titled “Tobacco-Containing Smoking Article.”

The ’202 patent claims an “electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article.” EX1001, ’202 patent, 32:58-59. However, the patent admits that every feature recited in the claims was known well. Section V.B. The only purported advancement over these well-known devices was to allegedly replace known cartridges that contained an aerosol-forming liquid with a cartridge containing both aerosol-forming liquid **and tobacco**. *Id.*, 22:19-26.

However, there are two problems with this alleged point of novelty. First, a cartridge containing both aerosol-forming liquid **and tobacco**—is not claimed. Second, even if this alleged point of novelty was claimed, the prior art discloses and/or renders obvious smoking articles containing tobacco, as well as every other feature recited in the claims.

Petitioner is concurrently filing a PGR petition. If the Board agrees with the prior art grounds in the petitions, Petitioner requests institution and consolidation of the instant petition and the PGR. Granting institution of both petitions allows for the most efficient use of judicial resources without unjustly depriving Petitioner of the ability to challenge the patent for at least two reasons. First, if the Board cannot

determine until the FWD whether the patent claims are PGR eligible, but has already denied institution of the IPR, Petitioner will unjustly be forbidden from challenging the patent at the PTAB. Second, Petitioner has purposely filed identical prior art grounds in the PGR and this IPR knowing that one of the two proceedings must fail under the law. Thus, as there are identical issues except which proceeding type is proper, neither the Board nor Patent Owner (“RAI”) is prejudiced by instituting and consolidating the proceedings. And this avoids Petitioner being unjustly deprived of challenging the patent at the PTAB.

As explained in the PGR, Petitioner believes that the claims lack written-description support in the specification, as well in the identical specifications of the parent/grandparent applications. Thus, the claims have an effective filing date of March 31, 2023 (filing date of the ’202 patent). However, Petitioner cannot foresee all evidence that RAI may provide during trial that might dissuade the Board from finding the patent PGR eligible. So until the Board can make a final determination regarding PGR eligibility, both the PGR and this IPR should remain active.

Thus, Petitioner respectfully requests that both the concurrently-filed PGR and the instant IPR be instituted.

II. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. §42.8(A)(1))

REAL PARTY-IN-INTEREST: The real parties-in-interest are Petitioner Ecto World, LLC d/b/a Demand Vape, and SV3, LLC d/b/a Mi-One Brands.

RELATED MATTERS: The '202 patent is the subject of *Certain Disposable Vaporizer Devices* (Inv. No. 337-TA-1410), filed June 11, 2024.

The '202 patent claims the benefit of U.S. Patent No. 9,901,123 ("the '123 patent"), which was at issue in the following litigation proceedings:

Case	Court	Case No.	Filed	Status
<i>Philip Morris Products SA v. RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc.</i>	PTAB	IPR2020-01602	September 18, 2020	Final Written Decision issued March 30, 2022
<i>Philip Morris Products SA v. RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc.</i>	PTAB	IPR2020-00919	May 8, 2020	Institution denied November 16, 2020
<i>Certain Tobacco Heating Articles and Components Thereof</i>	ITC	337-TA-1199	April 8, 2020	Final Determination issued September 29, 2021
<i>Philip Morris Products S.A. v. RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc.</i>	CAFC	22-1846	May 31, 2022	Final Written Decision in IPR2020-01602 affirmed; Mandate issued October 23, 2023
<i>Philip Morris Products S.A. v. ITC</i>	CAFC	22-1227	December 7, 2021	Judgment in 337-TA-1199 affirmed; Mandate issued May 22, 2023
<i>RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc. et al v. Altria Client Services LLC et al.</i>	EDVA	1:20-cv-00393	April 9, 2020	123 patent dismissed from suit May 5, 2020

Petitioner is concurrently filing a Petition for Post-Grant Review of the '202 patent (PGR2024-00049).

LEAD AND BACKUP COUNSEL: Under 37 C.F.R. §§42.8(b)(3) and 42.10(a),
Petitioner appoint **Ryan C. Richardson** (Reg. No. 67,254) as lead counsel; and
Daniel E. Yonan (Reg. No. 53,812), **Kyle E. Conklin** (Reg. No. 59,425), and
Christopher R. O'Brien (Reg. No. 63,208) as back-up counsel, all at the address:
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC, 1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor,
Washington, DC, 20005, phone (202) 371-2600, and facsimile (202) 371-2540.

SERVICE INFORMATION: Petitioner consent to electronic service by email at:
rrichardson-PTAB@sternekessler.com, **dyonan-PTAB@sternekessler.com**,
kconklin-PTAB@sternekessler.com, **cobrien-PTAB@sternekessler.com**, and
PTAB@sternekessler.com.

III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. §42.104(A))

The undersigned and Petitioner certify that the '202 patent is available for
IPR. Petitioner is not barred or estopped from requesting IPR on the grounds
herein.

IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. §42.104(B))

A. Citation of Prior Art

All of the following references are prior art as of the '202 patent's earliest
possible priority date—October 18, 2006—to which, as explained in the
concurrently-filed PGR, the '202 patent is not entitled.

Takeuchi (EX1004) issued on December 5, 2000. Takeuchi is prior art
under §§102(a) and (b).

Pienemann (EX1006) published on May 25, 2000. Pienemann is prior art under §§102(a) and (b).

Kim (EX1008) was filed on July 22, 2004, and published on January 26, 2006. Kim is prior art under §102(a).

Susa (EX1018) published on March 6, 1998. Susa is prior art under §§102(a) and (b).


B. Statutory Grounds for the Challenge

Ground	Basis	Claims	References
1.	§103	1, 3-15, and 18-29	Takeuchi
2.	§103	6, 7, 14, 15 and 18-29	Takeuchi & Pienemann
3.	§103	1-30	Kim & Pienemann
4.	§103	1-30	Kim, Pienemann, & Susa

V. THE '202 PATENT

A. Overview

The '202 patent discloses a “smoking article” that “may include a cigarette incorporated within an electrically powered aerosol generating device.” EX1001, Abstract, 19:58-59, 21:4-12, 22:14-40, 24:50-54, 28:1-8, 29:14-20, FIG. 3.



The smoking articles in Figures 1-2 operate similarly to the article in Figure

3. *Id.*, FIGS. 1-3, 19:49-53, 22:9-40, 24:60-25:4, 25:38-41, 26:47-49, 27:45-51.




FIG. 1




FIG. 2

The claims recite a smoking article in terms of the concepts identified in the following section. But as explained by Dr. Deevi, each of these concepts, and combinations thereof, were well-known before the '202 patent. EX1003, ¶¶71-108.

B. Applicant Admits that the Claimed Features Were Well-Known

The claims recite: a “smoking article,” “an outer housing” having “an air passageway,” “a mouthpiece,” “an electrical power source,” “an electrical resistance heater,” a “storage compartment ... for storage of a liquid aerosol-forming material,” “a controller configured to activate current flow through the electrical resistance heater in response to a draw,” “a sensor adapted for sensing

the draw by a user,” and “an end cap defined at a second of the two ends [of the smoking article].” The patent, however, *admits* that each of these features was known: “smoking article” (EX1001, 19:34-48); “outer housing” (*id.*, 20:1-4); “mouthpiece” (*id.*, 24:20-29); “power source” (*id.*, 20:38-43); “electrical resistance heater” (*id.*, 21:58-61); “storage compartment” (*id.*, 22:19-26, 22:46-49); “controller” (*id.*, 20:55-60); “sensor” (*id.*, 20:64-21:4); and “end cap” (*id.*, 20:20-23). EX1003, ¶¶53-57.

The only purported advancement was to replace a known, publicly available storage compartment (e.g., cartridge) that contained an aerosol-forming liquid with a cartridge containing both aerosol-forming liquid **and tobacco**. *Id.*, 22:9-23:34.

However, this alleged point of novelty is not claimed, and even if it was, the references asserted disclose and/or render obvious smoking articles containing tobacco, as well as every other feature recited in the claims. EX1003, ¶58.

C. Prosecution History Summary

The application that became the '202 patent issued after very limited examination. EX1002, 175. In the only office action, all pending claims were rejected for nonstatutory double patenting over ancestor patents. *Id.*, pg. 176-79. In response, Applicant filed a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejection. *Id.*, 299-306. The Examiner then issued a notice of allowance on September 21, 2023, and a second notice of allowance on December 13, 2023. *Id.*,

pg. 310, 372-81, pg. 397. But, the claimed concepts were well-known before the '202 patent, and as such should not have been allowed.

D. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art

A person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSA”) would have a bachelor’s degree in electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, chemistry, physics, or an equivalent field, as well as least 3-4 years of industry experience, or a master’s degree in the above fields, and 1-2 years of industry experience. Such a POSA would have been familiar with electrically powered smoking articles and/or the components and underlying technology used therein. EX1003, ¶63.

E. Claim Construction

In an *inter partes* review, claims are “construed using the same claim construction standard that would be used to construe the claim in a civil action under 35 U.S.C. 282(b).” 37 C.F.R. §42.100(b). All claim terms must be given their ordinary and customary meaning as understood by a POSA at the time of the invention in light of the specification and the prosecution history of the patent. *Id.* Petitioner affirmatively set forth a proposed construction for a single claim term and set forth a contingent proposed construction for a second term, as explained below. Petitioner submits that all other claim terms should receive their plain and ordinary meaning in the context of the '202 patent specification. EX1003, ¶66. Additionally, even if other terms end up being expressly construed in another

proceeding, such express constructions are not necessary here, as they are not needed to resolve a controversy in this proceeding. *Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.*, 200 F.3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

1. “wicked into contact with the electrical resistance heater”

In addition to being recited in the '202 patent, the term “wicked into contact” is recited in other related patents. For example, the term is recited in U.S. Patent No. 9,901,123 (“the '123 patent,” a grandparent to, and sharing the same specification as the '202 patent), which was the subject of IPR2020-01602. In that proceeding, the Board determined that this term should be construed to mean “wicked into contact (1) with the heater, or (2) with an area in close proximity to, and exposed to the heat produced by, the heater.” *Philip Morris Products SA v. RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc.* IPR2020-01602, Paper 32, 10, 15. The Board also explicitly found that “wicked into contact” does not “require[] that the liquid mixture [] be brought into contact with the electrical resistance heater solely by wicking.” *Id.*, 14.

The Federal Circuit affirmed. *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc.*, No. 22-1846, 2023 WL 5970786 at *1 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 14, 2023). RAI also indicated that if this terms needs to be construed, it also believes that Board’s construction from IPR2020-01602 is correct. EX1009, Reynolds’ Motion for Temporary Relief, 28.

Therefore, this term should be construed as consistent with the Board's construction in the IPR2020-01602 to mean "wicked into contact (1) with the heater, or (2) with an area in close proximity to, and exposed to the heat produced by, the heater."

2. *"smoking article"*

RAI canceled all claims of the original application that matured into the '202 patent and subsequently added a new, broader set of claims that removed any mention of "tobacco." EX1002, 4-6. RAI did this such to assert the '202 patent against vaporizer devices, which are not devoid of tobacco. As explained, in the concurrently-filed PGR, this broader set of claims lacks written description support in the specification, thereby rendering the challenged claims invalid under §112.

If the Board disagrees with Petitioner and finds that the challenged claims have not been impermissibly broadened, then the claims necessarily must be limited to a "tobacco containing smoking article." Such a construction is commensurate with: (i) the title of the '202 patent; (ii) the entirety of the specification (e.g., EX1001, Abstract, 1:28-29, 4:46-8:38); (iii) the figures; (iv) the alleged point of novelty; and (v) the claim scope in at least seven of the parent/grandparent patents to the '202 patent.

Therefore, if the Board finds that the challenged claims have not been impermissibly broadened, the term "*smoking article*," as recited in each of the

challenged claims, should be construed to mean “tobacco containing smoking article.”

VI. OVERVIEW OF THE APPLIED REFERENCES

A. Takeuchi

Like the '202 patent, Takeuchi describes a device 10 “for enjoying simulated smoking . . . by heating a liquid.” EX1004, Takeuchi, 1:3-8, 3:31-50, 5:28-49, 7:60-63, 8:5-10, 8:55-58, 9:5-7, 9:23-44; FIGs. 1, 8.




FIG. 1




FIG. 8

B. Kim

Like the '202 patent, Kim describes a “device, which, in response to an electric power suppl[y] and suction by a user, evaporates nicotine mixture and delivers them to the user.” EX1007, Kim, Abstract, ¶¶[0012], [0015], [0018]-[0019], FIG. 1.





FIG. 1

C. Pienemann

Pienemann describes a “system for supplying an inhalable aerosol” that “contains a substrate portion (1”) and an inhaling device.” EX1006, Certified English Translation of Pienemann, Abstract, 8:26-29, 9:30–32, 10:17-31, FIG. 5. The substrate 1 “contains an aerosol-forming material 2 surrounded by an electrically conductive wrapper 3.” *Id.*, 5:5-20, 6:1-9, FIGS 1a-c.

Fig. 5



D. Susa

Susa is directed to “a flavor generation article employed for enjoying inhalation of a flavor and simulated smoking and, more particularly, to a flavor generation article used for generating the flavor as an inhalation target by heating a liquid material with an electric heater.” EX1018, ¶¶ [0001], [0024], FIG. 1. Susa explains that “a tobacco component, e.g., a tobacco extracted component or a tobacco smoke condensate component, may be contained in the liquid material

36.” *Id.*, ¶[0028].




FIG. 1

VII. GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY

Claims 1-30 are unpatentable for at least the reasons set forth below.

EX1003, ¶¶130-359.

A. Ground 1: Takeuchi renders obvious claims 1, 3-15, and 18-29.

1. Claim 1

(a) [1.P]¹

RAI admits that [1.P] was well-known before the patent’s earliest priority date. Section V.B; EX1001, 14:29-38. Additionally, RAI’s own expert in a prior IPR admitted that “Electronic Cigarettes (‘e-cigarettes’) were well-known ... since

¹ See the claim appendix for a full recitation of each claim.

at least the mid-1990s, as demonstrated by, for example, the ... **Takeuchi** reference[.]"² EX1010, Sturges Declaration, ¶16-17; EX1013, IPR2016-01527 Petition, 32. For similar reasons, Takeuchi discloses element **[1.P]**. EX1003, ¶131.

Takeuchi discloses this limitation in two different embodiments—e.g., as illustrated in Figures 1 and 8.³ Both embodiments disclose “**a flavor-generating device for** enjoying inhalation of flavor or for enjoying **simulated smoking.**” EX1004, 1:3-5, 4:26-29; 8:49-51; EX1003, ¶132.

² Emphasis added unless otherwise stated.

³ Takeuchi explains that features disclosed in its multiple embodiments “can be combined appropriately depending on the object of the flavor-generating device.” EX1004, 11:1-6.




FIG. 1




FIG. 8

If the term “*smoking article*” is construed to mean “tobacco containing smoking article” (see Section V.E.2), Takeuchi still discloses this limitation. Indeed, “where the device is used as a simulated smoking article, it is possible for the liquid flavor source 34 to contain **tobacco components** such as **tobacco extracts** and a **tobacco smoke condensate**.” EX1004, 5:43-46; EX1003, ¶133.

Takeuchi also discloses that devices 10 and 100 are both “*electrically-powered*”: “**electric power** is supplied from a power source 44.” EX1004, 6:12-14. Devices 10 and 100 are configured to be “*aerosol-generating*”: “in order to add

smoke to the flavor, it is possible for the liquid flavor source 34 to contain a **substance forming aerosol** when heated.” EX1004, 5:33-35, 10:5-13; EX1003, ¶¶134-36.

(b) [1.a]

RAI admits that [1.a] was well-known before the patent’s earliest priority date. Section V.B. Additionally, RAI admitted in multiple prior IPRs that “**Takeuchi discloses a housing**, i.e., casing 12.” EX1011, IPR2018-00627 Petition, 27; EX1013, 33 (RAI admitting that “Takeuchi discloses a housing having an upper chamber 121 and a lower chamber 122”). For similar reasons, Takeuchi discloses [1.a]. EX1003, ¶137.

Indeed, Takeuchi’s casing 12 represents “*an outer housing having two ends*,” as illustrated in Figure 1. EX1004, 4:30-32; EX1003, ¶138.




FIG. 1

Similarly, Takeuchi discloses that device 100 also includes a casing surrounding “the upper chamber 121 and the lower chamber 122,” and “*having two ends*,” as illustrated in Figure 8. EX1004, 8:59-62; EX1003, ¶139.




FIG. 8

If RAI argues that device 100's casing does not constitute "*an outer housing*," because such casing is described as defining two "separate chamber[s] unlike the device shown in FIG. 1 wherein one casing is partitioned by the partition wall 13 into the two chambers" (EX1004, 8:59-62), such an argument would fail for at least two reasons. First, when reviewing the validity of U.S. Patent No. 9,901,123 (a grandparent to the '202 patent and sharing the same specification), the ITC found that it is a "false premise that the claimed 'tubular outer housing' must

be a single structure and cannot be comprised of multiple components or sub-structures.” EX1014, Initial Determination, 28. Second, even if the claimed “*outer housing*” did require a single unitary structure, which it does not, a POSA would have found it obvious to implement device 100’s casing as a single unitary structure. Indeed, Takeuchi discloses that while some features are described in different embodiments, “these features can be combined appropriately depending on the object of the flavor-generating device.” EX1004, 11:4-6. And because a single structure casing is already disclosed in the Figure 1 embodiment, a POSA would have found it obvious to combine such a feature with the remaining features of Figure 8, at least because doing so would not impact the functionality of device 100. EX1003, ¶140; *Boston Scientific v. Cordis*, 554 F.3d 982, 991 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (“Combining two embodiments disclosed adjacent to each other in a prior art patent does not require a leap of inventiveness”).

(c) [1.b]

RAI admits that [1.b] was well-known before the patent’s earliest priority date. Section V.B. Additionally, Takeuchi discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶142.

Takeuchi discloses that devices 10 and 100 each include “*a mouthpiece*”—**mouth piece 16** and **mouthpiece 161**, respectively. EX1004, 4:41-43, 9:9-15. RAI similarly admitted in a prior IPR that “Takeuchi discloses a ‘mouth piece 16 ...’”

EX1011, 28. As shown in Figures 1 and 8, mouth piece 16 and 161 are “*defined at one of the two ends*” of device 10 and 100, respectively. EX1003, ¶143.




FIG. 1




FIG. 8

If RAI argues that mouth piece 16 and/or mouthpiece 161 do not satisfy [1.b], because they are disclosed as being “detachably inserted” into their respective casing (EX1004, 4:41-43, 9:9-12), such an argument would be flawed. Indeed, the '202 patent discloses that “mouth-end piece 120, which is **typically removable**, can be maintained in place by friction fit, a threaded screw mechanism that cooperates with a complementing threaded mechanism that is secured to the outer container, or the like.” EX1001, 24:16-20; EX1003, ¶144.

(d) [1.c]

RAI admits that [1.c] was well-known before the patent's earliest priority date. Section V.B. Additionally, Takeuchi discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶146.

As discussed for element [1.P], devices 10 and 100 each include “*an electrical power source arranged within the outer housing*”: “electric power is supplied from a **power source 44** detachably **mounted within** the lower chamber 122 of the **casing 12**.” EX1004, 6:12-14; 9:1-5. RAI similarly admitted in a prior IPR that “Takeuchi discloses a battery (‘power source 44,’ ... within the housing (‘casing 12’).” EX1011, 33; FIGs. 1, 8; EX1003, ¶147.




FIG. 1




FIG. 8

(e) [1.d]

RAI admits that [1.d] was well-known before the patent's earliest priority date. Section V.B. Additionally, Takeuchi discloses this limitation under two different, but equally applicable interpretations. EX1003, ¶149.

First, Takeuchi discloses “an *electrical resistance heater*” in the form of heater 42 that “consists of a tubular body mounted to the capillary tube 36” (implemented in device 10), and plate-like heaters 421 and 422 “mounted to the

plates 361 and 362” that define liquid passageway 371 (implemented in device 100). EX1004, 6:7-12, 9:29-34; EX1003, ¶150.

Takeuchi also discloses that heater 42 and plate-like heaters 421 and 422 are each “*configured for electrical connection with the electrical power source*”: “**An electric power is supplied from a power source 44 detachably mounted within the lower chamber 122 of the casing 12 to the electric heater 42.**” EX1004, 6:12-14, 9:5-7; EX1003, ¶151.

Heater 42 and plate-like heaters 421 and 422 are each clearly implemented “*within the outer housing*” of device 10 and 100, respectively. EX1003, ¶152.




FIG. 1




FIG. 8

Takeuchi also discloses the claimed “*electrical resistance heater*” in the form of the combination of both heater 42 and capillary tube 36. Indeed, RAI took the position in a prior IPR that an atomizer (i.e., heater) includes “at least both the components that cause atomization and the mechanism that transfers liquid from the ‘liquid-supply’ to those components.” EX1011, 18. After taking this position, RAI then concluded that “Takeuchi teaches an atomizer including both ... (‘heater

42’) and ... ‘capillary tube 36.’” EX1011, 42. Petitioner will refer to this interpretation as “RAI’s Heater Interpretation.” EX1003, ¶¶152-53.

(f) [1.e]

RAI admits that [1.e] was well-known before the patent’s earliest priority date. Section V.B. Additionally, Takeuchi discloses this limitation under two different but equally applicable interpretations. EX1003, ¶154.

First, Takeuchi discloses [1.e] in the form of both liquid container 32 and capillary tube 36 (implemented in device 10). Takeuchi also discloses [1.e] in the form of both liquid container 32 and plates 361 and 362 that define liquid passageway 371 (as implemented in device 100). Under this interpretation, any compartment that stores liquid represents the claimed “*storage compartment*.”⁴ EX1003, ¶155.

Takeuchi’s “**liquid container 32 hous[es] a liquid flavor source 34 [and] is fixed within the lower chamber 122 of the casing 12.**” EX1004, 5:28-30, 9:23-26. Liquid flavor source 34 is also housed within capillary tube 36 after being brought

⁴ If it is argued that the claimed “*storage compartment*” requires more than storing a liquid—e.g., that it must be replenishable—Takeuchi’s liquid container 32 would still disclose the claimed “*storage compartment*” because liquid container 32 “can be replenished” and/or is “exchangeable.” EX1004, 7:18-30, 9:23-26, claim 9.

into “capillary tube 36 by the capillary force of capillary tube 36 as show in FIG.

2A.” EX1004, 7:57-59.⁵ Air passageway 371 (defined by plates 361 and 362)

functions in a substantially similar manner to capillary tube 36, due to the similar

capillary force that is exerted within air passageway 371. EX1004, 9:26-38;

EX1003, ¶156-57.

Figures 1, 8 show the claimed “*storage compartment defined within the outer housing*” under this first interpretation. EX1003, ¶158.

⁵ RAI’s expert admitted in a prior IPR that “a ‘storage’ body” is disclosed by a structure where “liquid is stored during the transport process,” because “storage and transport are not mutually exclusive.” EX1016, Sturges Declaration, ¶84.




FIG. 1





FIG. 8

As discussed for element [1.P], Takeuchi also discloses that the liquid being stored is a “*liquid aerosol-forming material*”: “in order to add smoke to the flavor, it is possible for the liquid flavor source 34 to contain **a substance forming aerosol** when heated.” EX1004, 5:33-35, 10:5-13; EX1003, ¶159.

Takeuchi further discloses that “*the liquid aerosol-forming material can be wicked into contact with the electrical resistance heater.*” As discussed in Section V.E.1, “*wicked into contact with the electrical resistance heater*” should be construed to mean “wicked into contact (1) with the heater, or (2) with an area in


close proximity to, and exposed to the heat produced by, the heater.” Takeuchi discloses this under both of these alternatives. EX1003, ¶160.

Takeuchi explains that, regarding Figure 1, liquid flavor source 34 (*“liquid aerosol-forming material”*) is “transported to the outlet port 36[b] of the capillary tube 36 by the **capillary force of the capillary tube 36** as shown in FIG. 2A.” EX1004, 7:57-59. Subsequently, “**liquid flavor source 34 within the outlet port 36a is instantly gasified by the heat generated from the heater 42** as shown in FIG. 2B [(below)] so as to be supplied into the gas passageway 20.” EX1004, 7:60-63; EX1003, ¶161.



Takeuchi similarly explains that, regarding Figure 8, liquid flavor source 34 is transported up liquid passageway 371 by capillary action where “[t]he distal end portion (the outlet portion of the liquid flavor source) of the liquid passageway 371 is heated by plate-like heaters 421 and 422 mounted to the plate 361 and 362, respectively.” EX1004, 9:26-38. Heaters 421-422 are configured “for heating and **gasifying or evaporating the liquid** transported from the liquid container.”

EX1004, 2:14-16. Example interactions between liquid flavor source 34 and heaters 421 and 422 are illustrated below. EX1003, ¶162.



A POSA would have understood that the capillary action that transports liquid flavor source 34 up both capillary tube 36 and liquid passageway 371 is an example of wicking. Indeed, in multiple prior IPRs, both RAI and its experts admitted as much. EX1010, ¶41; EX1013, 63; EX1015, Clemens Declaration, ¶78. As illustrated, the capillary action (wicking) of capillary tube 36 and liquid passageway 371 results in liquid flavor source 34 (“*liquid aerosol-forming material*”) being brought into contact both “(1) with the heater,” and “(2) with an

area in close proximity to, and exposed to the heat produced by, the heater.”

EX1003, ¶163-64.

As also discussed in detail for claim 3, the enclosure of capillary tube 36 and/or liquid passageway 371 formed by plates 361 and 362 can be filled with “bundled fibers.” EX1004, 3:36-50. A POSA would have understood that using bundled fibers to further help transport liquid flavor source 34 through capillary tube 36 and/or liquid passageway 371 also represents an example of wicking.

EX1003, ¶165.

Moreover, a POSA would have understood that heaters 42, 421, and 422 gasifying and/or evaporating liquid flavor source 34 discloses this limitation. In fact, in a prior IPR, RAI confirmed that Takeuchi’s liquid flavor source 34, capillary tube 36, and heater 42 operate in this manner. EX1011, 40; EX1003, ¶166.

Takeuchi also discloses this limitation under a second interpretation (RAI’s Heater Interpretation). As discussed for [1.d], RAI took the position in a prior IPR that the combination of Takeuchi’s heater 42 and capillary tube 36 disclose the claimed atomizer (i.e., heater). EX1011, 18, 42. Under RAI’s Heater Interpretation, liquid flavor source 34 (“*liquid aerosol-forming material*”) stored within liquid container 32 (“*storage compartment*”) contacts capillary tube 36, and the subsequent capillary force of capillary tube 36 results in liquid flavor source 34

being “*wicked into contact*” with heater 42 to become instantly gasified (“*volatilize the liquid aerosol-forming material*”). EX1004, FIG. 1, 7:57-63; EX1003, ¶168.

(g) [1.f]

RAI admits that [1.f] was well-known before the patent’s earliest priority date. Section V.B. Additionally, both RAI and its expert admitted in multiple prior IPRs that Takeuchi discloses this limitation. EX1011, 45-46, 54-55 (admitting same); EX1013, 42 (admitting same); EX1013, 14; EX1010, ¶39.

Indeed, Takeuchi discloses [1.f] in Figure 1. EX1003, ¶170.




FIG. 1

As illustrated, gas passageway 20 (“an air passageway”) extends “*through at least a portion of the outer housing*” (casing 12). Takeuchi also explains that “[t]he **gasified flavor source is mixed with the main air introduced through the air intake port 18** and the squeeze hole 24a into a region around the outlet port 36a of the capillary tube 36 in accordance with the inhaling action of the user and,

then, the mixture is transferred into the inhalation port 22.” EX1004, 8:5-10,
5:1-11, FIG. 8; EX1003, ¶172.




FIG. 8

As illustrated, air guiding path 104 (“an air passageway”) extends “through at least a portion of the outer housing.” EX1004, 9:59-66. Takeuchi also explains that “an aerosol formation efficiency can be more enhanced when the liquid flavor source contains the aerosol generation material, since the **mixing of the gasified flavor source with the air** and the cooling of the gasified flavor source

thereby can be simultaneously effected efficiently by means of the **air stream passing through the air guiding path 104.**” EX1004, 10:5-13; EX1003, ¶174.

(h) [1.g]

RAI admits that [1.g] was well-known before the patent’s earliest priority date. Section V.B. Additionally, Takeuchi discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶176.

Specifically, Takeuchi discloses that “the mouth piece 16 is taken in the mouth of the user for the **inhaling action through the inhalation port 22.** As a result, an inhaling action signal is transferred from the sensor 52 to the control circuit 46. Then, **under the control of the control circuit 46, an electric power is supplied from the power source 44 to the heater 42 so as to turn the heater 42 on.**” EX1004, 7:50-56, 6:55-62. Takeuchi also discloses that control circuit 46 can be implemented using various known components.⁶ EX1004, 6:59-62. Control circuit 46 (“*controller*”) is highlighted in Figures 1, 8. EX1003, ¶177.

⁶ If the claimed “*controller*” is found to constitute means-plus-function language under 35 U.S.C. §112(f), which it should not be, Takeuchi’s control circuit 46 would still disclose and/or render obvious this limitation. Both the claimed “*controller*” and Takeuchi’s control circuit 46 perform this same function in substantially the same way, and produce substantially the same results. EX1003, ¶177; MPEP 2183; *Caterpillar Inc. v. Deere & Co.*, 224 F.3d 1374, 56 USPQ2d




FIG. 1

1305 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Electronic Arts Inc. v. Terminal Reality, Inc.*, IPR2016-00928, FWD, 22-23 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 23, 2017).




FIG. 8

2. Claim 3

Takeuchi discloses claim 3. EX1003, ¶179.

Takeuchi discloses that a “**pore structure** [can be] filled in an enclosure” of capillary tube 36 and/or liquid passageway 371 formed by plates 361 and 362.

EX1004, 3:36-42. “Representative examples of the structure include open-cell foamed structure, and **bundled fibers**.” EX1004, 3:47-50. “The intercommunicating pore structure [(“*fibrous substrate*”)] refers to a structure

having intercommunicating voids or pores through which the liquid may be elevated from the inlet of the passageway which is in fluid communication with the liquid flavor source contained in the liquid container to the outlet of the passageway by the capillary force.” EX1004, 3:42-47. As discussed for [1.e], both capillary tube 36 (implemented in device 10) and plates 361 and 362 that define liquid passageway 371 (as implemented in device 100) can constitute part of the claimed “*storage compartment*.” EX1003, ¶180.

Figure 14 illustrates “intercommunicating pore structure 302 filled in an enclosure 301”—which “may be provided by a tube, or two plates arranged spaced apart from each other.” EX1004, 10:50-57.





FIG. 14

3. Claim 4


Takeuchi discloses claim 4. EX1003, ¶182.

Takeuchi explains that the mixture of the gasified flavor source and main air introduced through the air intake port 18 (“*the aerosol that is produced*”) exists in “a region around the outlet port 36[a] of the capillary tube 36” before “the mixture is transferred into the inhalation port 22.” EX1004, 8:5-10. Takeuchi discloses at least two ways by which this mixture “*passes at least partially through the storage compartment before exiting through the mouthpiece.*” EX1003, ¶183.

First, when “the liquid flavor source 34 within the outlet port 36[b of capillary tube 36] is instantly gasified by the heat generated from the heater 42,” a void is left in the upper portion of capillary tube 36 (a portion of “*the storage compartment*”). EX1004, 7:57-8:1. As shown in Figure 2B, this void is filled by the gasified flavor source and air mixture (“*the aerosol that is produced*”) at least until the upper portion of capillary tube 36 is filled with liquid flavor source 34 again by capillary action (Figure 2C). EX1003, ¶184.



Second, Takeuchi discloses that “intercommunicating pore structure 302 may protrude from the enclosure 301,” and “heater 425 can be provided on the protruded end of the intercommunicating pore structure 302.” EX1004, 10:59-63, FIG. 15. As discussed for claim 3, pore structure 302 represents “*a fibrous substrate*” comprised within “*the storage compartment*.” In this embodiment, the gasified flavor source and air mixture (“*the aerosol that is produced*”) thus “*passes at least partially through the storage compartment [(“pore structure 302”)] before exiting through the mouthpiece.*” EX1003, ¶185.



4. Claim 5

RAI admits that the “*cartridge*” of claim 5 was well-known before the patent’s earliest priority date. Section V.B. Takeuchi also discloses claim 5. EX1003, ¶187.

The patent does not explicitly define a “*cartridge*.” Beyond the “*cartridge*” needing to function as “*the storage compartment*,” the only guidance provided in the patent as to the scope of the claimed “*cartridge*,” is that it can be “removed from the outer housing of the device.” EX1001, 5:57-61, 8:17-23. Takeuchi discloses such a removable cartridge for storing aerosol-forming material. EX1003, ¶188.

Specifically, liquid container 32 in Figure 8 is “**exchangeable**.” EX1004, 9:23-26, claim 9. Therefore, a POSA would have understood that Takeuchi’s liquid

container 32 (at least in the Figure 8 embodiment) discloses this limitation.

EX1003, ¶189.

5. Claim 6

RAI admits that implementing a cartridge “*circumscribed with a wrapping material,*” as recited in claim 6, was well-known before the patent’s earliest priority date. EX1001, 18:19-19:24, 25:27-37. Takeuchi also renders obvious claim 6. EX1003, ¶190.

Liquid flavor source 34 can be at least partially contained using various structures, including “**bundled fibers.**” EX1004, 3:47-50. Additionally, liquid passageway extends from liquid container 32 (e.g., Figure 8) is “fluid-tightly sealed at its sides by a sealing material (not shown) such as a plastic film or a metal foil so as to prevent the leakage or the evaporation of the liquid flavor source from the sides of the plates.” EX1004, 9:45-50 *compare to* EX1001, 18:37-49; EX1003, ¶191.

Therefore, based on the well-known use of various wrapping materials in smoking articles, and Takeuchi’s disclosure of using bundled fibers, plastic film, and/or a metal foil to at least partially contain liquid flavor source 34, a POSA would have found it obvious to implement Takeuchi’s liquid container 32 (at least in the Figure 8 embodiment) being “*circumscribed with a wrapping material.*” EX1003, ¶192.

6. Claim 7

Takeuchi renders obvious claim 7. EX1003, ¶193.

Takeuchi discloses that casing 12 can be made of “plastic.” EX1004, 4:30-32. As discussed for claim 6, Takeuchi also discloses that the liquid passageway extending from liquid container 32 (e.g., Figure 8) can include “a plastic film.” EX1004, 9:45-50. Further, Takeuchi discloses that liquid container 32 is “formed of a transparent or translucent material.” EX1004, 7:36-37. A POSA would have understood that plastic is such a transparent or translucent material. Finally, a POSA would have understood that plastic cartridges were well-known before the late 1990s. EX1003, ¶194.

Therefore, based on the well-known use of plastic cartridges and Takeuchi’s disclosure of using plastic or plastic-like materials for various components within devices 10 and 100, a POSA would have found it obvious to implement Takeuchi’s liquid container 32 (at least in the Figure 8 embodiment) comprising “*a plastic material*,” as recited in claim 7. EX1003, ¶195.

7. Claim 8

Takeuchi discloses claim 8 for the reasons discussed for [1.e]. EX1004, 5:28-30, 7:57-59, 9:23-38; EX1003, ¶196.

8. Claim 9

Takeuchi discloses claim 9 under both the first interpretation of “*electrical resistance heater*” discussed for [1.d] and RAI’s Heater Interpretation. EX1003, ¶197.

That is, heater 42 (implemented in device 10) and plate-like heaters 421 and 422 (implemented in device 100) each separately disclose the “*electrical resistance heater*” under the first interpretation. Takeuchi discloses “*wherein the electrical resistance heater is arranged in contact with the storage compartment*” under the first interpretation, because heater 42 “consists of a tubular body **mounted to the capillary tube 36**” (a portion of “*the storage compartment*”), and plate-like heaters 421 and 422 are “**mounted to the plates 361 and 362**” that define liquid passageway 371 (a portion of “*the storage compartment*”). EX1004, 6:7-12, 9:29-34. The fact that Takeuchi’s heaters are “*arranged in contact with the storage compartment*” is also illustrated in annotated Figures 1, 2A-C, 8, 10, and 11. EX1003, ¶198.

As also discussed for [1.d], the combination of both heater 42 and capillary tube 36 discloses the “*electrical resistance heater*” under RAI’s Heater Interpretation. Takeuchi also discloses “*wherein the electrical resistance heater is arranged in contact with the storage compartment*” under RAI’s Heater Interpretation, because capillary tube 36 “is inserted within the liquid container.”

EX1004, 5:47-49. As shown in Figure 1, when inserted in liquid container 32, capillary tub 36 is “*in contact*” with at least the top edge of liquid container 32, such that capillary tube 36 remains fixed in place during use. EX1003, ¶199.

9. Claim 10

Takeuchi discloses claim 10. EX1003, ¶200.


As discussed for claim 3, Takeuchi discloses that a “**pore structure** [can be] filled in an enclosure” of capillary tube 36 and/or liquid passageway 371 formed by plates 361 and 362. EX1004, 3:62-42. And for the same reasons discussed for claim 3, a POSA would have also understood that this pore structure represents “*an absorbent wicking material configured for transferring the liquid aerosol to the electrical resistance heater.*” EX1004, 3:42-47; EX1003, ¶201.

That is, pore structure 302 implemented within capillary tube 36 and/or liquid passageway 371 formed by plates 361 and 362, as shown in Figures 14- 15, would be “*arranged proximate to*” the electrical resistance heater for the same reasons as discussed for claim 9. EX1004, 6:7-12, 9:29-34. Indeed, pore structure 302 would also be implemented throughout the length of capillary tube 36 and/or liquid passageway 371, and would thus either contact or be in proximity to heater 42 and heater plates 421 and 422. EX1003, ¶201.

10. Claim 11

Takeuchi discloses claim 11 under the first interpretation of “*electrical resistance heater*” discussed for [1.d] and RAI’s Heater Interpretation. EX1003, ¶202.

As discussed for [1.d], heater 42 (implemented in device 10) and plate-like heaters 421 and 422 (implemented in device 100) each separately disclose the “*electrical resistance heater*” under the first interpretation. Takeuchi discloses this limitation under the first interpretation, because in some embodiments, heater 42 can be implemented within capillary tube 36, and plate-like heaters 421 and 422 can be similarly implemented between plates 361 and 362 that define liquid passageway 371. For example, heater 42 can be implemented: (i) as “a rod-like heater 74 [that] is **inserted into the outlet port 36[b] of the capillary tube;**” or (ii) as “a plate-like heater 76 [that] is **inserted into the outlet port 36[b] of capillary tub 36.**” EX1004, 8:22-26. These example implementations for heater 42 are shown in Figures 4- 5. EX1003, ¶203.



Similarly, plate-like heaters 421 and 422 can be “**provided in the opposing surface regions of the plates 361 and 362** defining the liquid passageways therebetween.” EX1004, 10:24-27. This example implementation is shown in Figure 11. EX1003, ¶204.





FIG. 11

As discussed for [1.e], under the first interpretation, capillary tube 36 represents a portion of “*the storage compartment*” in Figure 1, and plates 361 and 362 that define liquid passageway 371 represent a portion of “*the storage compartment*” in Figure 8. Therefore, Takeuchi discloses that both heater 42 and plate-like heaters 421 and 422 can “*extend[] into the storage compartment*” under the first interpretation of “*electrical resistance heater.*” EX1003, ¶205.

As also discussed for [1.d], the combination of both heater 42 and capillary tube 36 discloses the “*electrical resistance heater*” under RAI’s Heater

Interpretation. Takeuchi also discloses claim 11 under RAI’s Heater Interpretation because capillary tube 36 “*extends into the storage compartment*” (liquid container 32), as shown in Figure 1. EX1003, ¶206.




Patent Owner's Heater Interpretation

FIG. 1


11. Claim 12

Takeuchi discloses claim 12. EX1003, ¶207.

As discussed for claim 4, when “the liquid flavor source 34 within the outlet port 36[b of capillary tube 36] is instantly gasified by the heat generated from the heater 42,” a void is left in the upper portion of capillary tube 36, which exists within heater 42. EX1004, 7:57-8:1. As also discussed for claim 4 (and shown in Figure 2B), this void is filled by the passing gasified flavor source and air mixture at least until the upper portion of capillary tube 36 is filled with liquid flavor source 34 again by capillary action (Figure 2C). EX1003, ¶208.



This same passing gasified flavor source and air mixture also fills the void between plate-like heaters 421 and 422 in Figures 10-11. EX1003, ¶209.



A POSA would have understood that the gasified flavor source and air mixture filling the void within heater 42, as well as the void between plate-like heaters 421 and 422 discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶210.

12. Claim 13

Takeuchi discloses claim 13, because **sensor 52 “detect[s] the inhaling action of the user.”** EX1004, 6:46-54, 2:29-33, 6:23-28, FIG. 1; EX1003, ¶211.

13. Claim 14

Takeuchi discloses claim 14 for at least the reasons discussed for [1.g]. EX1003, ¶212.

If RAI argues that “*regulat[ing] the current flow through the electrical resistance heater during the draw...*” (as recited in claim 14) is somehow different from “*activat[ing] current flow through the electrical resistance heater in response to a draw*” (as recited in [1.g]), such an argument would be misplaced. Indeed, in a prior IPR, RAI argued that “‘regulating the current flow through the electrical resistance heater during draw’ means something more than just turning on the heater.” EX1017, Institution Decision, 30. The Board, however, expressly rejected RAI’s argument, finding that the specification of the ’123 patent (and thus the ’202 patent as well) does not support RAI’s argument. EX1017, 30-31; EX1003, ¶213.

Nonetheless, even if something more than turning on the heater in response to a user’s draw was required to satisfy claim 14, which it is not, Takeuchi would at least render obvious this claim. For example, Takeuchi discloses that “the heater can be controlled on the basis of a signal from a sensor for detecting the inhaling action of the user, with the result that the flavor can be supplied to the user **with a high stability**.” EX1004, 2:29-34. A POSA would have understood “high stability” in this context to mean something more than just turning on the heater—e.g., the ability to control the heater such that it remains stable not just at the outset of the user’s draw but during the user’s draw as well. EX1003, ¶213.

This understanding is reinforced by the fact that Takeuchi discloses that “[t]he signal processing and control are performed within the control circuit 46 in accordance with, for example, **a known analog control**, a two-position control or a combination thereof.” EX1004, 6:59-62. A POSA would have understood that known analog circuits in the late 1990s could do more than just turn on a power supply, and instead had the capability to sense current and voltage (via some form of feedback) and regulate the power supply accordingly. EX1003, ¶214.

Therefore, a POSA would have at least found it obvious that Takeuchi’s control circuit 46 had the capability to both turn on heater 42 in response to a user’s draw, and “*regulate the current flow through the electrical resistance heater during the draw*,” as recited in claim 14. EX1003, ¶215.

14. Claim 15

RAI admits that the “*end cap*” was well-known before the patent’s earliest priority date. Section V.B. Takeuchi also discloses claim 15 for at least two independent reasons. EX1003, ¶216.

First, “a removable cap 59 is provided in the exposed end portion of the pouring port 58.” EX1004, 7:22-23. Second, Takeuchi discloses that “[i]t is also possible to arrange an adjusting ring (not shown) having a plurality of openings in a manner to surround the air intake port 18 of the casing 12,” such that “the air flow rate into the gas passageway 20 can be adjusted by adjusting the position of

the adjusting ring relative to the air intake port 18.” EX1004, 4:55-60. As shown in Figure 1 above, both removable cap 59 and air intake port 18 are implemented “*at a second of the two ends*” of device 10. EX1003, ¶217.

15. Claim 18

Takeuchi discloses claim 18 for the same reasons discussed for claim 1. EX1003, ¶219.

Claim 18 is nearly identical to claim 1, but with three minor differences. First, claim 18 omits the “*mouthpiece*” of claim 1 ([1.b]). Second, claim 18 recites “*a liquid storage*” as opposed to the “*storage compartment*” of claim 1 ([1.e]). Third, claim 18 recites “*a puff-actuated controller*” as opposed to just “*a controller*” ([1.g]). None of these differences impact the patentability analysis set forth for claim 1. EX1003, ¶219.

If RAI argues that “*regulat[ing] current flow through the electrical resistance heater during a draw ...*” is somehow different from “*activat[ing] current flow through the electrical resistance heater in response to a draw*” ([1.g]), such an argument would be misplaced, as discussed for claim 14. Nonetheless, Takeuchi would at least render obvious this limitation for the same reasons discussed above for claim 14. EX1003, ¶220.

Therefore, Takeuchi both discloses and renders obvious claim 18 for the same reasons discussed for claims 1 and 14. EX1003, ¶221.

16. Claim 19

Takeuchi discloses claim 19 for the reasons discussed for claim 13. EX1003, ¶222.

17. Claim 20

Takeuchi discloses claim 20. EX1003, ¶223.

The patent does not provide any guidance as to what is meant by “*the puff-actuated controller comprises additional control circuitry.*” EX1003, ¶224. Nonetheless, Takeuchi discloses that “[t]he signal processing and control are performed within the control circuit 46 in accordance with, for example, a known analog control, a two-position control or a combination thereof.” EX1004, 6:59-62. Thus, a POSA would have understood that control circuit 46 can include several different control circuitry components, any number of which could represent the claimed “*additional control circuitry.*” Additionally, Takeuchi discloses that switch 48 is electrically coupled to control circuit 46, and thus also constitutes “*additional control circuitry.*” EX1004, 25-45; EX1003, ¶224.

18. Claim 21

Takeuchi discloses claim 21 for the reasons discussed for [1.b]. Takeuchi discloses that “mouth piece 16 having an inhalation port 22 through which a user inhales a flavor is **detachably inserted into the holder 14.**” EX1004, 4:41-43, 9:9-11; EX1003, ¶225.

19. Claims 22-29

Takeuchi discloses claims 22-29 for the same reasons discussed for their corresponding claims. EX1003, ¶¶226-33.

Claim 22	<i>See claim 8</i>
Claim 23	<i>See claim 3</i>
Claim 24	<i>See claim 4</i>
Claim 25	<i>See claim 9</i>
Claim 26	<i>See claim 10</i>
Claim 27	<i>See claim 11</i>
Claim 28	<i>See claim 12</i>
Claim 29	<i>See [1.b] & claim 15</i>

B. Ground 2: The combination of Takeuchi and Pienemann renders obvious claims 6, 7, 14, 15, and 18-29.

1. A POSA would have been motivated to combine Takeuchi and Pienemann.

A POSA would have been motivated to make three modifications, individually or collectively, to Takeuchi's flavor-generating devices 10 and 100. EX1003, ¶234. First, a POSA would have been motivated to implement Takeuchi's liquid container 32 (at least in the Figure 8 embodiment) using a wrapper material, as taught by Pienemann. Second, a POSA would have been motivated to implement Takeuchi's control circuit 46 having additional control/regulating

capabilities, as also taught by Pienemann. Third, a POSA would have been motivated to modify Takeuchi's flavor-generating devices 10 and 100 to incorporate a removable end cap, as further taught by Pienemann. EX1003, ¶235.

(a) Takeuchi's liquid container & Pienemann's wrapper

Takeuchi discloses that its flavor-generating devices 10 and 100 each include "liquid container 32 [for] housing a liquid flavor source 34." EX1004, 5:28-30, 9:23-26. Takeuchi also discloses that liquid container 32 can be "exchangeable." EX1004, 9:23-26, claim 9. Takeuchi does not explicitly disclose the types of materials that can be used to implement liquid container 32. A POSA would have thus looked to the prior art for guidance on what types of materials could be used for liquid container 32. Pienemann is such a prior art reference. EX1003, ¶236.

Pienemann discloses a "system for supplying an inhalable aerosol [that] contains a substrate portion (1") and an inhaling device." EX1006, Abstract. Pienemann discloses that substrate portion 1 contains an "aerosol-forming material within a wrapper." EX1006, 3:10-14, Abstract. Pienemann explains that the wrapper "may consist of paper ... or a plastic foil also made conductive by additives." EX1006, 6:10-15. Pienemann also explains that substrate portion 1 is configured to be inserted (and removed) from a housing of the inhaling device. *Id.*, 9:4-5, 9:26-29, 10:20-28. A POSA would have therefore recognized that

Pienemann fills in the missing details about how to implement Takeuchi's liquid container 32. EX1003, ¶237.

Based on the teachings of Pienemann, a POSA would have been motivated to implement Takeuchi's liquid container 32 (at least in the Figure 8 embodiment) using a wrapper material. Takeuchi's liquid container 32 and Pienemann's substrate portion 1 are both disclosed as being exchangeable or removable, and are both designed for use within an aerosol-generating inhaling device. *Compare* EX1004, 1:4-9, 4:26-28, 5:33-35, 8:49-51, 10:5-13 *with* EX1006, Abstract, 3:10-14; EX1003, ¶238.

Thus, a POSA would have recognized that Pienemann's teachings are applicable to Takeuchi, and that implementing Takeuchi's liquid container 32 (e.g., Figure 8 embodiment) using a wrapper material would have required minimal modifications. In the combined system, Takeuchi's liquid container 32 (e.g., Figure 8 embodiment) would be implemented using Pienemann's wrapper material—e.g., formed from either a paper wrapper or plastic wrapper. EX1003, ¶239.

Additionally, as Dr. Deevi explains, a POSA would have understood that implementing Takeuchi's liquid container 32 using a wrapper material would have numerous added benefits, and a POSA would not have experienced any unreasonable technical hurdles in implementing this modification. EX1003, ¶240.

As Dr. Deevi also explains, a POSA would have understood that implementing Takeuchi's liquid container 32 (e.g., Figure 8 embodiment) using a wrapper material would merely amount to combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. EX1003, ¶241.

(b) Takeuchi's control circuit & Pienemann's additional control/regulating capabilities

Takeuchi discloses that its flavor-generating devices 10 and 100 each include control circuit 46 that controls “an electric power [] supplied from the power source 44 to the heater 42” in response to an “inhaling action through the inhalation port 22.” EX1004, 7:50-56, 6:55-62. Takeuchi also discloses that the purpose of control circuit 46 is to ensure that flavor is “supplied to the user with a high stability.” EX1004, 2:29-34. However, Takeuchi does not explicitly disclose the types of control operations that can be carried out by control circuit 46 during a user's inhalation in order to ensure a high stability flavor delivery. As Dr. Deevi explains, a POSA would have thus looked to the prior art for guidance on what specific types of control operations could be performed by control circuit 46 to achieve the desired high stability goal. Pienemann is such a prior art reference. EX1003, ¶242.

Like Takeuchi's control circuit 46, Pienemann discloses “a puff detector, which reacts to the pressure change when the user announces air,” and in conjunction with electronic circuit 32, adjusts the power supply in response to the

user's inhalation. EX1006, 11:10-16. Pienemann discloses that the puff detector and electronic circuit 32 can perform a variety of different control operations in response to a user's inhalation, including supplying power to different "zones" along the substrate portion 1, controlling the power "in such a way that the heating power is set to a higher value on the first puff than on the following puffs, as well as to interrupt the power supply after a defined puff time to avoid overheating." EX1006, 11:10-16, claims 17-20. A POSA would have therefore again recognized that Pienemann fills in the missing details about how to implement Takeuchi's control circuit 46. EX1003, ¶243.

Based on the teachings of Pienemann, a POSA would have been motivated to implement Takeuchi's control circuit 46 such that it is capable of carrying out a variety of power supply control operations, including setting the heating power "to a higher value on the first puff than on the following puffs," and "interrupt[ing] the power supply after a defined puff time to avoid overheating." Takeuchi's control circuit 46 and Pienemann's puff detector/electronic circuit 32 are also each designed to control the power supplied to a heater in response to detection of inhalation by a user. EX1004, 7:50-56, 6:55-62; EX1006, 11:10-16, claims 17-20; EX1003, ¶244.

Thus, a POSA would have recognized that Pienemann's teachings are applicable to Takeuchi, and that implementing Pienemann's various power supply

control operations within Takeuchi's control circuit 46 would have required minimal modifications. In the combined system, Takeuchi's control circuit 46 would be implemented with the ability to perform Pienemann's various power supply control operations so as to regulate the power supplied to heater 42 and/or heater plates 421 and 422 during the course of a user's draw, and based on the characteristics of that draw. EX1003, ¶245.

Additionally, as Dr. Deevi explains, a POSA would have understood that implementing Pienemann's various power supply control operations within Takeuchi's control circuit 46 would have numerous added benefits, and a POSA would not have experienced any unreasonable technical hurdles in implementing these modifications. EX1003, ¶246.

As Dr. Deevi also explains, a POSA would have understood that implementing additional power control operations within Takeuchi's control circuit 46 would merely amount to combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. EX1003, ¶247.

(c) Takeuchi's flavor-generating devices & Pienemann's removable end caps

Takeuchi discloses that flavor-generating devices 10 and 100 include various components that are designed to be exchangeable, including liquid container 32, and the battery used for power source 44. EX1004, 6:15-17, 9:23-26, claim 9. However, Takeuchi does not explicitly disclose how a user could access these

internal components to perform the disclosed exchange. As Dr. Deevi explains, a POSA would have thus looked to the prior art for guidance on what modification could be made to Takeuchi such that at least liquid container 32 and power source 44 could be accessed and exchanged. Pienemann is such a prior art reference. EX1003, ¶248.

Pienemann specifically discloses that its inhaling device includes housing 50, which “has a screw-off cap 53 at the front end through which a battery or accumulator 51 can be replaced.” EX1006, 10:18-20. A POSA would have therefore recognized that Pienemann fills in the missing details about how Takeuchi’s devices 10 and 100 could be designed to allow access to the internal components such that they can be exchanged/replaced. EX1003, ¶249.

A POSA would have recognized that Pienemann’s teachings are applicable to Takeuchi, and that implementing Takeuchi’s devices 10 and 100 having Pienemann’s removable end cap would have required minimal modifications. In the combined system, all or a portion of the left side of casing 12 of Takeuchi’s device 10 would be implemented as a removable end cap, as taught by Pienemann. Similarly, all or a portion of the left side wall of upper chamber 121 and the left side wall of lower chamber 122 of Takeuchi’s device 100 would also be implemented as a removable end cap, as taught by Pienemann. A POSA would have understood that the left side portions of Takeuchi’s outer housing side could

each be removably connected to the remainder of their respective housings via a variety of well-known means. EX1003, ¶250.

Additionally, as Dr. Deevi explains, a POSA would have understood that modifying Takeuchi's flavor-generating devices 10 and 100 to incorporate removable end caps would have numerous added benefits, and a POSA would not have experienced any unreasonable technical hurdles in implementing these modifications. EX1003, ¶251.

As Dr. Deevi also explains, a POSA would have understood that modifying Takeuchi's flavor-generating devices 10 and 100 to incorporate removable end caps would merely amount to combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. EX1003, ¶252.

* * *

A POSA would have been further motivated to combine Takeuchi and Pienemann because both are in the same general field of aerosol-generating inhaling devices, and address the same problems. EX1004, 1:17-20, 1:34-38, 1:49-51; EX1006, 1:15-18, 2:13-17, 2:29-33, 4:1-5. Accordingly, a POSA would have had a reasonable expectation of success in implementing each of the above three modifications to Takeuchi's devices 10 and 100 based on the teachings of Pienemann. EX1003, ¶253.

2. Claim 6

To the extent that Takeuchi does not itself render obvious that liquid container 32 (at least in the Figure 8 embodiment”) is “*circumscribed with a wrapping material*,” Pienemann discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶254.

As discussed in Section VII.B.1.a., Pienemann discloses that substrate portion 1 is removable from a housing of an inhaling device, and contains an “aerosol-forming material **within a wrapper**.” EX1006, 3:10-14, Abstract, 9:4-5, 9:26-29, 10:20-28. Thus, a POSA would have understood that Pienemann’s substrate portion 1, like Takeuchi’s liquid container 32 (at least in the Figure 8 embodiment) is a “*cartridge*.” EX1003, ¶255.

As discussed in Section VII.B.1.a., a POSA would have been motivated to implement Takeuchi’s liquid container 32 (at least in the Figure 8 embodiment) using Pienemann’s “wrapper.” EX1003, ¶256.

3. Claim 7

To the extent that Takeuchi does not itself render obvious that liquid container 32 (at least in the Figure 8 embodiment, the claimed “*cartridge*”) comprises “*a plastic material*,” Pienemann discloses this limitation. Specifically, Pienemann discloses the wrapper used to circumscribe substrate portion 1 “may consist of ... a **plastic** foil.” EX1006, 6:10-15; EX1003, ¶257.

As discussed in Section VII.B.1.a., a POSA would have been motivated to implement Takeuchi's liquid container 32 (at least in the Figure 8 embodiment) using Pienemann's plastic foil wrapper. EX1003, ¶258.

4. Claim 14

To the extent that Takeuchi does not explicitly disclose that control circuit 46 meets this limitation, Pienemann does. EX1003, ¶259.

As discussed in Section VII.B.1.b., Pienemann discloses that its puff detector and electronic circuit 32 “*regulate the current flow through the electrical resistance heater during the draw*” through a variety of different control operations, including supplying power to different “zones” along the substrate portion 1, controlling the power “in such a way that the heating power is set to a higher value on the first puff than on the following puffs, as well as interrupting the power supply after a defined puff time to avoid overheating.” EX1006, 11:10-16, claims 17-20; EX1003, ¶260.

As discussed in Section VII.B.1.b., a POSA would have been motivated to implement Takeuchi's control circuit 46 such that it is capable of carrying out a variety of Pienemann's power supply regulation operations. EX1003, ¶261.

5. Claim 15

To the extent that Takeuchi does not explicitly disclose that device 10 and/or device 100 includes “*an end cap defined at a second of the two ends*,” Pienemann

does. Specifically, Pienemann discloses that its inhaling device includes housing 50, which “has a screw-off cap 53 at the front end through which a battery or accumulator 51 can be replaced.” EX1006, 10:18-20; EX1003, ¶262.

As discussed in Section VII.B.1.c., a POSA would have been motivated to implement Takeuchi’s devices 10 and 100 having Pienemann’s removable end cap. EX1003, ¶263.

6. Claim 18

The Takeuchi-Pienemann combination discloses claim 18 for the same reasons discussed for claim 18 in Ground 1. To the extent that Takeuchi does not explicitly disclose that control circuit 46 meets this limitation, Pienemann does for the same reasons discussed for claim 14. EX1003, ¶264.

7. Claims 19-29

The Takeuchi-Pienemann combination discloses claims 19-29 for the reasons discussed for claims 19-29 in Ground 1, respectively. EX1003, ¶265.

C. Ground 3: The combination of Kim and Pienemann renders obvious claims 1-30.

1. A POSA would have been motivated to combine Kim and Pienemann.

A POSA would have been motivated to make three modifications, individually or collectively, to Kim’s cigarette substitute device (1). First, a POSA would have been motivated to modify Kim’s technique of activating the heater to use a puff detector, as taught by Pienemann. Second, a POSA would have been

motivated to implement Kim's porous chip 5 to be removable and to use a wrapper material, as taught by Pienemann. Third, a POSA would have been motivated to modify Kim's cigarette substitute device (1) to incorporate a removable end cap, as taught by Pienemann. EX1003, ¶266.

(a) Kim's technique of activating the heater & Pienemann's puff detector and electronic circuit 32

Kim's device (1) includes two metal plates (9-U) and (9-L) that connect when a user presses on the mouth piece (3). EX1007, [0018]-[0019]; EX1003, ¶267.

However, as Dr. Deevi explains, a POSA would have understood that Kim's technique for activating the heater would have been error prone and potentially frustrating to a user. For example, the heater would activate simply if the tip is compressed when the device is in a user's pocket, bag, or held in their hand, frustrating a user. A POSA would have thus looked to the prior art for ways to control the heater that would not be error prone. Pienemann is such a prior art reference. EX1003, ¶268.

As discussed in Section VII.B.1.b. Pienemann discloses a puff detector that performs a variety of different control operations, and in conjunction with electronic circuit 32, adjusts the power supply in response to the user's inhalation. EX1006, 11:10-16, claims 17-20. A POSA would have therefore recognized that

Pienemann would have addressed the problems in Kim's device (1). EX1003, ¶269.

Based on these teachings, a POSA would have been motivated to implement Pienemann's puff detector and electronic circuit 32 in Kim's device (1) to control the power supplied to a heater in response to detection of inhalation by a user. EX1004, 7:50-56, 6:55-62; EX1006, 11:10-16, claims 17-20. And a POSA would have been motivated to implement Pienemann's puff detector and electronic circuit 32 in Kim's device (1) to carry out a variety of power supply control operations, including setting the heating power "to a higher value on the first puff than on the following puffs," and "interrupt[ing] the power supply after a defined puff time to avoid overheating." EX1003, ¶270.

Thus, a POSA would have recognized that Pienemann's teachings are applicable to Kim, and that implementing Pienemann's various power supply control operations within Kim would have required minimal modifications. EX1003, ¶271. In the combined system, Kim's device (1) would be implemented with the ability to perform Pienemann's various power supply control operations so as to regulate the power supplied to heater (8) during the course of a user's draw, and based on the characteristics of that draw. *Id.*

Additionally, as Dr. Deevi explains, a POSA would have understood that implementing Pienemann's various power supply control operations within Kim

would have numerous added benefits, and a POSA would not have experienced any unreasonable technical hurdles in implementing these modifications. EX1003, ¶272-73.

As Dr. Deevi also explains, a POSA would have understood that implementing Pienemann's power control operations within Kim would have merely amounted to combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. EX1003, ¶273.

(b) Kim's porous chip & Pienemann's removable/replaceable and wrapped substrate portion

Kim's device (1) includes a porous plastic chip (5), which may be “manufactured as a slim plate or a rod with a porous polymeric material, preferably in the form of polymeric fibers, and having absorbed therein the volatile liquid composition of mixture of nicotine and volatile palatability enhancing agents.” EX1007, [0015], [0004], [0014], [0017], [0019], Abstract. However, Kim is silent on certain details relating to porous chip (5), including how to install and/or replace the chip, and how to prevent the liquid from seeping out of the chip and into the device. A POSA would have thus looked to the prior art for guidance, including Pienemann. EX1003, ¶274.

As discussed in Section VII.B.1.a., Pienemann discloses a removable substrate portion 1 that contains an “aerosol-forming material within a wrapper.”

EX1006, 3:10-14, 6:10-15, 9:4-5, 9:26-29, Abstract. A POSA would have therefore recognized that Pienemann fills in the missing details about how to implement Kim's liquid containing chip (5). EX1003, ¶275.

Based on the teachings of Pienemann, a POSA would have been motivated to implement Kim's liquid containing chip (5) to be removable and to have a wrapper material. Kim's liquid containing chip (5) and Pienemann's substrate portion 1 are both designed for use within an aerosol-generating inhaling device. *Compare* EX1007, [0004], [0014]-[0015], [0017], [0019], Abstract *with* EX1006, Abstract, 3:10-14; EX1003, ¶276.

Thus, a POSA would have recognized that Pienemann's teachings are applicable to Kim, and that implementing chip (5) to be removable and to have a wrapper material would have required minimal modifications. In the combined system, Kim's chip (5) would have been removable/replaceable—e.g., by providing a pivoting flap having a slot for knob 10—and implemented using Pienemann's wrapper material—e.g., formed from either a paper wrapper or plastic wrapper to avoid the liquid from seeping out into the device and potentially contacting the batteries. EX1003, ¶277.

Additionally, as Dr. Deevi explains, a POSA would have understood that implementing Kim's liquid containing chip (5) to be removable/replaceable would have numerous added benefits, and a POSA would not have experienced any

unreasonable technical hurdles in implementing these modifications. EX1003, ¶278.

As Dr. Deevi also explains, a POSA would have understood that implementing Kim's liquid containing chip (5) to be removable/replaceable and using a wrapper material would merely amount to combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. EX1003, ¶279.

(c) Kim's device & Pienemann's removable end cap and mouthpiece

Kim's device (1) includes batteries (6) and a mouth tip (3). EX1007, [0012], [0016], [0018], [0020], Abstract. However, Kim does not explicitly disclose how a user could access the batteries to replace them once they are dead or how to replace the mouthpiece after extended use. A POSA would have thus looked to the prior art for guidance on what modification could be made to Kim (e.g., how batteries (6) or mouth piece (3) could be accessed and exchanged), and Pienemann is such a reference. EX1003, ¶280.

Pienemann discloses that its inhaling device includes housing 50, which "has a screw-off cap 53 at the front end through which a battery or accumulator 51 can be replaced." EX1006, 10:18-20. Ans "mouthpiece 10' is inserted into a base 42, which is screwed to the housing 40 after insertion of the substrate portion 1' into a smoking device comprising a housing 40." EX1006, 10:1-3. A POSA would have therefore recognized that Pienemann fills in the missing details about how Kim's

device (1) could be designed to allow access to the internal components such that they could be exchanged/replaced using a removable mouthpiece and end cap.

EX1003, ¶281.

A POSA would have recognized that Pienemann's teachings are applicable to Kim, and that implementing Kim's device having Pienemann's removable end cap and mouthpiece would have required minimal modifications. In the combined system, the LED end of Kim's device would be implemented as a removable end cap and the mouthpiece would be removable, as taught by Pienemann. A POSA would have understood that the LED end and mouthpiece of Kim's device could be removably connected to the remainder of housing 2 via a variety of well-known means. EX1003, ¶282.

Additionally, as Dr. Deevi explains, a POSA would have understood that modifying Kim's device to incorporate a removable end cap and mouthpiece would have numerous added benefits, and a POSA would not have experienced any unreasonable technical hurdles in implementing these modifications. EX1003, ¶283.

As Dr. Deevi also explains, a POSA would have understood that modifying Kim's device to incorporate a removable end cap and mouthpiece would merely amount to combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. EX1003, ¶284.

* * *


A POSA would have been further motivated to combine Kim and Pienemann because both are in the same general field of aerosol-generating inhaling devices, and would have addressed similar problems. EX1007, Abstract, ¶¶[0002], [0003]; EX1006, 1:15-18, 2:13-17, 2:29-33, 4:1-5. Accordingly, a POSA would have had a reasonable expectation of success in implementing each of the above three modifications to Kim’s device (1) based on the teachings of Pienemann. EX1003, ¶285.

2. Claim 1

As noted above, RAI admits that each element of claim 1 was well-known and in public use before the patent. Section VII.A.1(a); EX1003, ¶286.

(a) [1.P]

Kim discloses this preamble (e.g, a “**spot-heating cigarette substitute device**”). EX1007, Abstract, [0012]; EX1003, ¶287.



Kim's device (1) is "*electrically-powered*": "device (1) ... is comprised of ... three 3 Volt mini-battiest (sic) (6)" EX1007, [0012], Abstract, [0018], [0019]. Device (1) is further configured to be "*aerosol-generating*": "in response to an electric power supplies and suction by a user, evaporates nicotine mixture and delivers them to the user." EX1007, Abstract, [0019]. EX1003, ¶288.

(b) [1.a]

Kim discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶290.

Kim's device (1) includes "a housing (2) in the form of an elongated tube, a mouth tip (3), an LED (Light Emitting Diode) (4)." EX1007, [0012], [0013], [0016], [0020]; EX1003, ¶291.




FIG. 1

(c) [1.b]

Kim discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶293.

Device (1) includes “a mouth tip (3)” defined at one of the two ends.

EX1007, [0012], [0016], [0020]; EX1003, ¶294.




FIG. 1





FIG. 6

(d) [1.c]

Kim discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶296.

As discussed for element [1.P], Kim’s device (1) includes “*an electrical power source arranged within the outer housing.*” EX1007, [0012], Abstract, [0018], [0019], [0020]; EX1003, ¶297.



(e) [1.d]

Kim discloses this limitation in two ways. EX1003, ¶299.

First, Kim discloses “an electric shorting connector (8)” that is “comprised of two electric wires (7-U) whose ends are spaced 0.01 mm part (8-1) on a non-conductive ceramic support (8-2) plate of 1.0 mm thickness, 1.0 mm width and 5 mm length.” EX1007, [0015], [0018], [0019]; EX1003, ¶300.

Second, Kim discloses an “electric heating coil (8-3) ... instead of the shorting connector.” EX1007, [0015], [0020]; EX1003, ¶301.

Both electric shorting connector (8) and electric heating coil (8-3) are “*configured for electrical connection with the electrical power source*”: “When a habitual smoker put the cigarette substitute device (1) of the current application between his lips and presses the lipping tip (3) of the device, the two metal plates

(9-U) and (9-L) of the on/off electric connector (9) is connected. Then the electric circuit is connected through the electric wires (7-U) and (7-L), three batteries (6), and the red color LED (4).” EX1007, [0018]; EX1003, ¶302.





FIG. 1



(f) [1.e]

Kim discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶304.

Porous chip (5) may be “manufactured as a slim plate or a rod with a porous polymeric material, preferably in the form of polymeric fibers, and having absorbed therein the **volatile liquid composition of mixture of nicotine and volatile palatability enhancing agents.**”⁷ EX1007, [0015], [0004], [0014], [0017],

⁷ If it is argued that the claimed “*storage compartment*” requires more than storing a liquid—e.g., that it must be replenishable—the Kim-Pienemann combination would still disclose this limitation because the combination would have included a removable/replaceable porous chip (5) as discussed in Section VII.C.1.b.

[0019], Abstract. Figures 1 and 4-5 illustrate porous chip (5) within housing (2).

EX1007, FIGS. 1, 4-5; EX1003, 305.




FIG. 1




FIG.4





FIG. 5



As discussed in Section V.E.1, this limitation should be construed to mean “wicked into contact (1) with the heater, or (2) with an area in close proximity to, and exposed to the heat produced by, the heater.”

Kim’s porous chip (5) similarly causes the liquid aerosol-forming material to be “*wicked into contact with the electrical resistance heater.*” Chip (5) is in the form of either “an electric shorting connector (8)” that is “comprised of two electric wires (7-U)” or “electric heating coil (8-3).” EX1007, [0015]. The “heat from the spark evaporates the mixture of the Nicotine and volatile palatability enhancing agents out of the porous chip (5) from the pores (5-1)” such that “[a]s the smoker puffs, the evaporated mixture is delivered to the smokers mouth by the air stream which comes from the out side through the porous hemi circle (11).” EX1007, [0019]. Initially, the porous chip (5) is placed at the most rearward of the device such that the nicotine mixtures absorbed at the most front side of the porous chip evaporates and is consumed first and as the mixture is consumed, a user slides knob (10) to the front side of the device (2) to make the unevaporized mixture with the sparking spot (8). EX1007, [0019]; EX1003, ¶307.

A POSA would have understood that the porous chip (5), which may be polymeric fibers, thus wicks the aqueous mixture into contact with the heater (8), or with an area in close proximity to, and exposed to the heat produced by, the

heater (8). And a POSA would have understood that heater (8) evaporating the aqueous mixture discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶308-10.

(g) [1.f]

Kim discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶311.

Kim's device includes a porous hemi-circle (11) air inlet. EX1007, [0013], FIG. 2; EX1003, ¶312.





FIG. 2

When the “two metal plates (9-U) and (9-L) of the on/off electric connector (9) [are] connected,” “heat from the spark evaporates the mixture of the Nicotine and volatile palatability enhancing agents out of the porous chip (5) from the pores

(5-1).” EX1007, [0018]-[0019]. Thus, “[a]s the smoker puffs, **the evaporated mixture is delivered to the smokers mouth by the air stream which comes from the out side through the porous hemi circle (11).**” EX1007, [0019]; EX1003, ¶313.



(h) [1.g]

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶314.

As explained above, the Kim-Pienemann combination includes a controller configured to activate current flow through the electric circuit and heater (8) in

response to a draw on the electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article.⁸ Section VII.C.1.a. EX1003, ¶315.

3. Claim 2

Kim discloses claim 2. Figure 1 illustrates porous chip (5) (“*storage compartment*”) arranged within the housing (2) and proximate the mouth tip (3) (“*mouthpiece*”). EX1007, [0012], FIG. 1. Indeed, Kim teaches positioning the chip (5) proximate the mouth tip (3) via knob (10). EX1007, [0019]; EX1003, ¶316.

⁸ If the claimed “*controller*” is found to invoke §112(f), which it should not be, the Kim-Pienemann controller would still disclose and/or render obvious this limitation. Both the claimed “*controller*” and the Kim-Pienemann controller perform the same function in substantially the same way, and produce substantially the same results. EX1003, ¶315; MPEP 2183; *Caterpillar*, 224 F.3d 1374, 56 USPQ2d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Electronic Arts*, IPR2016-00928, FWD, 22-23 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 23, 2017).




FIG. 1

4. Claim 3

Kim discloses claim 3. Kim's porous chip (5) may be a porous polymeric material in the form of polymeric fibers. EX1007, [0015] *compare to* EX1001, 22:26-32 (describing fibers of polyethylene terephthalate); EX1003, 317.

5. Claim 4

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses claim 4. EX1003, ¶318.

In Kim-Pienemann, “heat from the spark evaporates the mixture ... out of the porous chip (5) from the pores (5-1).” EX1007, [0018]-[0019]. Thus, “[a]s the smoker puffs, the evaporated mixture is delivered to the smokers mouth by the air stream which comes from the out side through the porous hemi circle (11).” EX1007, [0019], Abstract, [0014], [0015]. A POSA would have thus understood that the air passes from the porous hemi circle (11) through the chip (5), where it is

then combined with the mixture of the Nicotine and volatile palatability enhancing agents that has been evaporate by the heater to produce an aerosol which passes to the front edge of the chip and to the mouthpiece. EX1003, ¶319.




FIG. 1




FIG. 4





FIG. 5



6. Claim 5

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses claim 5. EX1003, ¶320.

As noted above, the patent does not explicitly define a “*cartridge*” and merely states that it can be “removed from the outer housing of the device.” EX1001, 5:57-61, 8:17-23. Nonetheless, the Kim-Pienemann combination discloses this limitation because it would have included a removable/replaceable porous chip (5) (Section VII.C.1). EX1003, ¶321-22.

7. Claim 6

RAI admits that implementing smoking materials “*circumscribed with a wrapping material*,” as recited in claim 6, was well-known and in public use before the patent. EX1001, 18:19-19:24, 25:27-37. Additionally, the Kim-Pienemann combination discloses a wrapping material around the porous chip (5) to prevent leakage. Section VII.C.1; EX1003, ¶323.

8. Claim 7

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses claim 7. EX1003, ¶324. In particular, Kim states that the chip (5) may be a “porous plastic chip.” EX1007, [0020].

9. Claim 8

Kim discloses claim 8 for the reasons discussed for [1.e]. EX1007, [0004], [0014]-[0015], [0017], [0019], Abstract; EX1003, ¶325.

10. Claim 9

Kim discloses claim 9 for the reasons discussed for [1.d]. For example, the heat from the electric shorting connector or coil (8) “evaporates the mixture ... out

of the porous chip (5) from the pores (5-1).” EX1007, [0019]. A POSA would have understood, or at least found it obvious, for the heater to be arranged in contact with the chip (5). EX1007, [0015]. EX1003, ¶326.




FIG. 5

11. Claim 10

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses claim 10. EX1003, ¶327.

As noted above, porous chip (5) (e.g., a porous polymeric material and “[d]isposed within the porous chip” is electric shortening connector or coil (8). EX1007, [0015]. The heat from the electric shorting connector or coil (8) “evaporates the mixture ... out of the porous chip (5) from the pores (5-1) therein.”



EX1007, [0019]. A POSA would have thus understood that the connector or coil (8) (“*heater*”) is arranged proximate to Kim’s polymeric fibers. EX1003, ¶327.

12. Claim 11

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses claim 11. As noted above, “[d]isposed within the porous chip (5)” is an electric shortening connector or coil (8). EX1007, [0015]; EX1003, ¶328.

13. Claim 12

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses claim 12. “Disposed within the porous chip (5)” is an electric shortening connector or coil (8) and the heat therefrom “evaporates the mixture ... out of the porous chip (5) from the pores (5-1).” EX1007, [0015], [0019]. A POSA would have understood that air passes from porous hemi circle (11) through the chip (5) and coil (8) (“*heater*”) to produce the aerosol which then passes to the front edge of the chip and to the mouthpiece. As such, a POSA would have thus understood that the connector or coil (8) (“*heater*”) is configured to allow airflow there through (e.g., via hole 5-2) to mix to form the aerosol. EX1003, ¶329.







FIG. 5



14. Claim 13

Pienemann discloses that “control can be carried out, for example, via a puff detector, which reacts to the pressure change when the user announces air and causes the power supply to one of the zones 13 or 15 via a switching device.”

EX1006, 11:10-13. For at least the reasons discussed in Section VII.C.1, a POSA would have been motivated to implement Pienemann’s puff detector in Kim. Thus, the Kim-Pienemann combination, which includes the puff detector, discloses this limitation. EX1003, ¶330.

15. Claim 14

For at least the reasons discussed in Section VII.C.1, and for claim 14 in Ground 2, it would have been obvious to modify Kim to incorporate Pienemann’s puff detector and electronic circuit 32 and control functionality. The Kim-Pienemann combination thus this limitation. EX1003, ¶331.

16. Claim 15

Pienemann discloses that its inhaling device includes housing 50, which “has a screw-off cap 53 at the front end through which a battery or accumulator 51 can be replaced.” EX1006, 10:18-20. For at least the reasons discussed in Section VII.C.1, a POSA would have been motivated to implement the LED end of Kim’s device 1 with Pienemann’s removable end cap. EX1003, ¶332. Therefore, the Kim-Pienemann combination renders obvious claim 15. *Id.*

17. Claim 16

Kim discloses that the device (1) includes batteries (6) that are proximate the LED end, as shown in Figure 1. EX1007, [0018]; FIG. 1. And for at least the reasons discussed in Section VII.C.1, a POSA would have been motivated to implement the LED end of Kim's device 1 having Pienemann's removable end cap. Therefore, the Kim-Pienemann combination renders obvious claim 16. EX1003, ¶333.




FIG. 1

18. Claim 17

Kim discloses claim 17. For example, Kim states that the “housing (2) is preferably manufactured of a stiff plastic sheet with a diameter, length and weight which approximate the size of a conventional combustible cigarette, and with the appropriate color and texture, a white paper like look with proper commercial trade

mark on it, to present the same appearance as a conventional combustible cigarette.” EX1007, [0012]; FIG. 1; EX1003, ¶334.




FIG. 1

19. Claim 18

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses claim 18 for the same reasons discussed for claims 1 and 14. EX1003, ¶335.

Claim 18 is nearly identical to claim 1, but with three minor differences as described. Section VII.A.15. None of these differences impact the patentability analysis set forth above for claim 1. EX1003, ¶336.

If RAI argues that “*regulat[ing] current flow through the electrical resistance heater during a draw ...*” (as recited in claim 18) is somehow different from “*activat[ing] current flow through the electrical resistance heater in response to a draw*” (as recited in [1.g]), such an argument would be misplaced, as discussed above for claim 14. Nonetheless, even if “*regulat[ing] current flow*

through the electrical resistance heater during a draw” was construed to mean something different, which it should not be, Pienemann would still disclose this limitation for the same reasons discussed in Section VII.C.1 above. EX1003, ¶337.

20. Claim 19

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses claim 19 for the reasons discussed above for claim 13. EX1003, ¶338.

21. Claim 20

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses claim 20. EX1003, ¶339. The patent does not provide any guidance for this limitation. Section VII.A.17. Nonetheless, a POSA would have understood that that Pienemann’s puff detector/controller 32 (“*the puff-actuated controller*”) include several different control circuitry components, any number of which could represent the claimed “*additional control circuitry*.” Additionally, switch 23 is electrically coupled to the puff detector, and thus also constitutes “*additional control circuitry*.” EX1006, 11:10-13; EX1003, ¶340-41.

As discussed in Section VII.C.1, it would have been obvious to modify Kim to incorporate Pienemann’s puff detector/electronic circuit 32 and control functionality. EX1003, ¶342.

22. Claim 21

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses claim 21 for the reasons discussed for [1.b], and as described in Section VII.C.1.c, a POSA would have made Kim's mouthpiece attachable to the outer housing. EX1003, ¶343.

23. Claims 22-30

The Kim-Pienemann combination discloses claims 22-30 for the reasons discussed above. EX1003, ¶¶344-52.

Claim 22	<i>See claim 8</i>
Claim 23	<i>See claim 3</i>
Claim 24	<i>See claim 4</i>
Claim 25	<i>See claim 9</i>
Claim 26	<i>See claim 10</i>
Claim 27	<i>See claim 11</i>
Claim 28	<i>See claim 12</i>
Claim 29	<i>See [1.b] & claim 15</i>
Claim 30	<i>See claim 17</i>

D. Ground 4: The combination of Kim, Pienemann, and Susa renders obvious claims 1-30.

1. A POSA would have been motivated to combine Kim, Pienemann, and Susa

If the term “*smoking article*” is construed to mean “tobacco containing smoking article” (see Section V.E.2), then a POSA would have been motivated to incorporate a tobacco component in the Kim-Pienemann device, as taught by Susa. EX1003, ¶353.

Kim’s porous chip (5) has “absorbed therein the volatile liquid composition of mixture of nicotine and volatile palatability enhancing agents.” EX1007, [0015], [0004], [0014], [0017], [0019], Abstract. However, Kim does not provide additional detail regarding the liquid mixture (e.g., how to achieve a desired nicotine concentration or flavor agents, or a source of the nicotine). As Dr. Deevi explains, a POSA would have thus looked to the prior art for guidance on this issue. Susa is such a prior art reference. EX1003, ¶354.

Like Kim, Susa discloses a container 32 for storing a liquid material 36 for generating a flavor to be inhaled but further explains that “a tobacco component, e.g., a tobacco extracted component or a tobacco smoke condensate component, may be contained in the liquid material 36.” EX1018, 6:18-25. A POSA would have therefore recognized that Susa fills in additional details about the volatile liquid composition absorbed into Kim’s liquid containing chip (5) (e.g., nicotine

concertation and/or flavor agents, and nicotine source). And based on the teachings of Susa, it would have been obvious for the volatile liquid composition absorbed into Kim's liquid containing chip (5) to contain a tobacco component to supply the nicotine in the mixture. EX1003, ¶355.

A POSA would not have experienced any unreasonable technical hurdles in combining Susa's teaching of a liquid containing a tobacco component with Kim to achieve nicotine in the volatile liquid composition. Indeed, a POSA would have known from Kim alone that the nicotine in the volatile liquid composition could come from tobacco. As Dr. Deevi also explains, a POSA would have understood that implementing Kim's liquid containing chip (5) with a tobacco component would merely amount to combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. EX1003, ¶356.

2. Claim 1

(a) [1.P]

If the term "*smoking article*" is construed to mean "tobacco containing smoking article" (see Section V.E.2), the Kim, Pinemann, and Susa combination discloses this preamble because it would have been obvious for Kim's volatile liquid composition to include a tobacco component as taught by Susa. Section VII.D.1; EX1003, ¶357.

(b) [1.a]-[1.g]

The Kim, Pienemann, and Susa combination disclose the remainder of claim 1 for the reasons discussed for claim 1 in Ground 3. EX1003, ¶358.

3. Claims 2-30

The Kim, Pienemann, and Susa combination disclose the remainder of claims 2-30 for the reasons discussed for claim 1, and for claims 2-30 in Ground 3, respectively. EX1003, ¶359.

VIII. DISCRETIONARY CONSIDERATIONS STRONGLY FAVOR INSTITUTION.

A. The Petition should not be denied under *Fintiv*.

The '202 patent has never been asserted in district court. Instead, the patent has only ever been asserted in *Certain Disposable Vaporizer Devices* (Inv. No. 337-TA-1410), which is currently pending before the International Trade Commission. As explained in the June 21, 2022 Memorandum: Interim Procedure for Discretionary Denials in AIA Post Grant Proceedings with Parallel District Court Litigation ("June 2022 Memo"), "[t]he PTAB will not discretionarily deny petitions based on applying *Fintiv* to a parallel ITC proceeding." June 2022 Memo, 7, 9. Therefore, this Petition should not be denied under *Fintiv*. *Unified Patents, LLC v. Causam Enterprises, Inc.*, IPR2022-00404, Paper 10, 3-4 ("we decline to exercise discretion to deny institution under *Fintiv*" based on the parallel ITC proceeding).

B. The *Advanced Bionics* two-part framework strongly favors institution.

Applying the two-part framework from *Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH* demonstrates that denial under §315(d) is not appropriate. IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 at 8-9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020) (precedential). Under part one, the same or substantially the same art or arguments were *not* previously presented to the Office, ending the inquiry in favor of institution.

Even though Takeuchi, Kim, and Pienemann are listed on the face of the patent, the Examiner was not afforded the opportunity to seriously consider any of these references, as they were buried in a massive IDS dump of over 1,000 references. Following the submission of this unwieldy number of references, the Examiner stated: if applicant is “aware of any particular reference or portion of a reference in the list which the examiner should take pay [*sic*] particular attention to it is requested that it be specifically pointed out in response to this Office Action.” EX1002, 0174. Applicant ignored this request. As a result, none of these references (let alone in the combinations presented herein) were applied in any office action during prosecution of the patent. In fact, the Examiner did not issue a single art-based rejection.

The “new, noncumulative prior art asserted in the Petition” therefore strongly favors institution of IPR. *Oticon Medical AB v. Cochlear Ltd.*, IPR2019-

00975, Paper 15 at 20 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2019) (§§II.B and II.C precedential).

Should RAI attempt to analogize the art and arguments presented herein to any art or arguments previously considered during prosecution of any related application(s), Petitioner reserves the right to respond.

IX. CONCLUSION

For the reasons above, *inter partes* review and cancellation of claims 1-30 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Ryan C. Richardson, Reg. No. 67,254/

Ryan C. Richardson (Reg. No. 67,254)
Attorney for Petitioner Ecto World, LLC and
SV3, LLC

Date: August 13, 2024

1101 K Street, N.W., 10th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 371-2600

X. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. **[1.P]** An electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article comprising:

[1.a] an outer housing having two ends;

[1.b] a mouthpiece defined at one of the two ends;

[1.c] an electrical power source arranged within the outer housing;

[1.d] an electrical resistance heater positioned within the outer housing, the electrical resistance heater being configured for electrical connection with the electrical power source

[1.e] a storage compartment defined within the outer housing, the storage compartment being configured for storage of a liquid aerosol-forming material and being arranged such that the liquid aerosol-forming material can be wicked into contact with the electrical resistance heater to volatilize the liquid aerosol-forming material;

[1.f] an air passageway through at least a portion of the outer housing, the air passageway being arranged so that air drawn into the outer housing combines with volatilized liquid aerosol-forming material to produce an aerosol that can be drawn into the mouth of a user of the electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article through the mouthpiece; and

[1.g] a controller configured to activate current flow through the electrical resistance heater in response to a draw on the electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article.

2. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, wherein the storage compartment is arranged within the housing proximate the mouthpiece.

3. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, wherein the storage compartment comprises a fibrous substrate.

4. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, wherein the aerosol that is produced passes at least partially through the storage compartment before exiting through the mouthpiece.

5. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, wherein the storage compartment is configured as a cartridge.

6. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 5, wherein the cartridge is circumscribed with a wrapping material.

7. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 5, wherein the cartridge comprises a plastic material.

8. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, wherein the storage compartment is configured as a container for holding liquid.

9. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, wherein the electrical resistance heater is arranged in contact with the storage compartment.

10. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, wherein the electrical resistance heater is arranged proximate to an absorbent wicking material configured for transferring the liquid aerosol-forming material to the electrical resistance heater.

11. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, wherein at least a portion of the electrical resistance heater extends into the storage compartment.

12. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, wherein the electrical resistance heater is configured to allow airflow therethrough.

13. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, further comprising a sensor adapted for sensing the draw by a user on the electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article.

14. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, wherein the controller is configured to regulate the current flow through the electrical resistance heater during the draw on the electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article.

15. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, further comprising an end cap defined at a second of the two ends.

16. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 15, wherein the electrical power source is arranged within the housing proximate the end cap.

17. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 1, wherein the electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article is generally rod-shaped.

18. **[18.P]** An electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article comprising:

[18.a] an outer housing;

[18.b] an electrical power source arranged within the outer housing;

[18.c] an electrical resistance heater positioned within the outer housing, the electrical resistance heater being configured for electrical connection with the electrical power source

[18.d] a liquid storage arranged within the outer housing such that liquid aerosol-forming material in the liquid storage can be wicked into contact with the electrical resistance heater to volatilize the liquid aerosol-forming material;

[18.e] an air passageway through at least a portion of the outer housing, the air passageway being arranged so that air drawn into the outer housing combines with volatilized liquid aerosol-forming material to produce an aerosol that can be drawn into the mouth of a user of the electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article; and

[18.f] a puff-actuated controller configured to regulate current flow through the electrical resistance heater in response to a draw on the electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article.

19. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, wherein the puff-actuated controller comprises a sensor that senses the draw on the electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article.

20. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, wherein the puff-actuated controller comprises additional control circuitry.

21. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, further comprising a mouthpiece attached to the outer housing.

22. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, wherein the liquid storage is configured as a container in which the liquid aerosol-forming material can be stored.

23. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, wherein the liquid storage is configured as an absorbent fibrous material.

24. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, wherein the aerosol that is produced passes at least partially through the storage before exiting through the electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article.

25. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, wherein the electrical resistance heater is arranged in contact with the liquid storage.

26. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, wherein the electrical resistance heater is arranged proximate to an absorbent wicking material configured for transferring the liquid aerosol-forming material to the electrical resistance heater.

27. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, wherein at least a portion of the electrical resistance heater extends into the liquid storage.

28. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, wherein the electrical resistance heater is configured to allow airflow therethrough.

29. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, wherein the outer housing comprises a mouthpiece defined at a first end thereof and an end cap defined at a second end thereof.

30. The electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article of claim 18, wherein the electrically-powered, aerosol-generating smoking article is generally rod-shaped.

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMITATION,
TYPEFACE REQUIREMENTS, AND TYPE STYLE REQUIREMENTS**

1. This Petition complies with the type-volume limitation of 14,000 words, comprising 13,998 words, excluding the parts exempted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a).

2. This Petition complies with the general format requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a) and has been prepared using Microsoft® Word 2016 in 14-point Times New Roman.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Ryan C. Richardson, Reg. No. 67,254/

Ryan C. Richardson (Reg. No. 67,254)
Attorney for Petitioner Ecto World, LLC and
SV3, LLC

Date: August 13, 2024

1101 K Street, N.W., 10th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 371-2600

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e), 42.105(a))

The undersigned hereby certifies that on August 13, 2024, true and correct copies of the foregoing **PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 11,925,202** and all associated exhibits were served in their entirety on the following parties via U.S.P.S. Priority Mail Express®:

WOMBLE BOND DICKINSON (US) LLP
ATTN: IP DOCKETING
P.O. Box 570489
ATLANTA, GA 30357-0037
UNITED STATES
Correspondence Address of Record for U.S. Patent No. 11,925,202

David M. Maiorana
JONES DAY
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1190
Additional Address Known to Petitioner as Likely to Effect Service

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Ryan C. Richardson, Reg. No. 67,254/

Ryan C. Richardson (Reg. No. 67,254)
Attorney for Petitioner Ecto World, LLC and
SV3, LLC

Date: August 13, 2024

1101 K Street, N.W., 10th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 371-2600