

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

PRATT RETAIL SPECIALTIES, LLC,	)	
	)	
	)	
Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	C.A. No. 1:24-cv-01073-RGA
	)	
PROAMPAC HOLDINGS INC.,	)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	)	
Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff.	)	

**PROAMPAC HOLDINGS INC.’S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES
TO PLAINTIFF PRATT RETAIL SPECIALTIES, LLC’S FIRST
SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-17)**

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 26.1 of the Court’s Local Rules, Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff ProAmpac Holdings Inc. (“ProAmpac”) by and through its undersigned counsel, responds to Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant Pratt Retail Specialties, LLC (“Pratt” or “Plaintiff”) First Set of Interrogatories (the “Interrogatories”) as follows:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

ProAmpac makes the below general responses and objections (“General Objections”). These General Objections are hereby incorporated into each specific response. The assertion of the same, similar, or additional objections or partial responses to individual Interrogatories does not waive any of ProAmpac’s General Objections.

ProAmpac’ investigation and search for information or documents in response to Pratt’s Interrogatories is ongoing. ProAmpac specifically reserves the right to supplement and amend these responses, as permitted by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Local Civil Rules of the United States District Court for the District of Delaware.

ProAmpac_00000026.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

Describe in detail all facts and circumstances under which Defendant first became aware of the Patent-in-Suit, including the date(s) when this occurred, the source of the information, the identity of the person(s) who received the information on behalf of Defendant, when and how Defendant first obtained a copy of the Patent-in-Suit, and any actions taken by Defendant or any of its directors, officers, or employees as a result, and identify each person with knowledge of the foregoing and all communications and documents materially concerning the foregoing.

RESPONSE:

ProAmpac objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks attorney-client communications, attorney work product or other privileged materials. ProAmpac objects to this Interrogatory, including the phrase “actions taken” and “materially concerning,” as vague and ambiguous. ProAmpac further objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, seeking certain information or documents not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and/or not proportional to the needs of the case to the extent it seeks “all communications and documents materially concerning....” ProAmpac further objects to this Interrogatory as premature and untimely to the extent that it demands that ProAmpac identify any expert testimony or opinion, damages positions, or other legal positions or documents and information associated with any of the foregoing prior to any applicable date set forth in the Court’s Scheduling Order and Amended Scheduling Order (D.I. 23; D.I. 42).

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, ProAmpac responds as follows:

ProAmpac first became aware of the Patent-in-Suit on September 26, 2024. On that day,

Megan Costa DeLeon, Partner at Akerman LLP, emailed ProAmpac's in-house counsel Ryan Green to inform him that Pratt had filed a lawsuit for patent infringement against ProAmpac the previous day. Ms. DeLeon provided Mr. Green with a copy of Pratt's Complaint and the case docket. The Patent-in-Suit was attached to the Complaint. ProAmpac did not have knowledge of the Patent-in-Suit prior to September 26, 2024. Upon information and belief, Pratt did not mark its products with the Patent-in-Suit prior to September 26, 2024, and is therefore not entitled to any damages prior to that date.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), documents and information responsive to this Interrogatory may be derived or ascertained at least from documents bates numbered ProAmpac_00000953; ProAmpac_00000954–ProAmpac_00000955; ProAmpac_00000956–ProAmpac_00000985.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9:

Identify all opinions, evaluations, analyses, or reverse engineering reports, whether written or oral, formal or informal, that Defendant has prepared, requested, received, or is aware of regarding the Patent-in-Suit, including date, author(s), addressee(s), recipient(s), and whether it relates to infringement or non-infringement, validity or invalidity, enforceability or unenforceability, or any other affirmative defense or a valuation of the Patent-in-Suit.

RESPONSE:

ProAmpac objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks attorney-client communications, attorney work product or other privileged materials. ProAmpac further objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, seeking certain information or documents not relevant to any party's claims or defenses and/or not proportional to the needs of

The competitive injuries ProAmpac has suffered because of Pratt's filing of this lawsuit can be found in ProAmpac's First Amended Answer and Counterclaims (D.I. ECF 52), ¶¶78-83 of ProAmpac's Counterclaims (incorporated herein by reference).

Dated: August 27, 2025

BLANK ROME LLP

/s/ James G. Gorman III

James G. Gorman III (No. 6284)

Gregory P. Ranzini (No. 6624)

1201 N. Market Street, Suite 800

Wilmington, DE 19801

Telephone: (302) 425-6400

Facsimile: (302) 425-

6464james.gorman@blankrome.com

gregory.ranzini@blankrome.com

Domingo M. Llagostera (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Texas Bar No. 24070157

717 Texas Ave, Suite 1400

Houston, Texas 77002

Telephone: (713) 632-8682

Facsimile: (713) 228-6605

domingo.llagostera@blankrome.com

Megan R. Wood (admitted *pro hac vice*)

DC Bar No. 1024203

1825 Eye Street NW

Washington, DC 20006

Telephone: (202) 420-2753

Facsimile: (202) 420-2201

megan.wood@blankrome.com

Attorneys for ProAmpac Holding Inc.