8/3/2020

Scheduling Conference

Altria	Group and Juul Labs	8/3/2020
1	Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP	
2	601 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.	
3	Washington, DC 20001-3743	
4	(202) 942-6594	
5	debbie.feinstein@arnoldporter.com	
6		
7	ON BEHALF OF JUUL LABS:	
8	DAVID I. GELFAND, ESQ.	
9	JEREMY CALSYN, ESQ.	
10	JESSICA HOLLIS, ESQ.	
11	Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP	
12	2112 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.	
13	Washington, DC 20037	
14	(202) 974-1690	
15	dgelfand@cgsh.com	
16	and	
17	MICHAEL L. SIBARIUM, ESQ.	
18	Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman	
19	1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.	
20	Washington, DC 20036	
21	(202) 663-9202	
22	michael.sibarium@pillsburylaw.com	
23		
24		
25		

Altria Group and Juul Labs

25

8/3/2020

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	JUDGE CHAPPELL: This is the initial prehearing
4	scheduling conference in Docket Number 9393 in the
5	matter of Altria Group, Inc. and Juul Labs. This
6	prehearing conference is being connected telephonically
7	and is being transcribed by a court reporter who is on
8	the line with us. Will the court reporter state their
9	name for the record.
10	MADAM REPORTER: Sally Jo Quade. Thank you,
11	Your Honor.
12	JUDGE CHAPPELL: I will need everyone to mute
13	your phones when you are not speaking.
14	I need to know, is anyone on this call who is
15	not with one of the parties in this case? Someone from
16	each party needs to let me know. I'll start with the
17	government.
18	MR. VOTE: Your Honor, this is Dominic Vote on
19	behalf of complaint counsel. As far as I'm aware,
20	everybody who has dialed in from our team is from the
21	FTC.
22	JUDGE CHAPPELL: All right, so I'll take that as
23	your appearance, Mr. Vote. Anyone else you want to add
24	to your appearance for the government?

For The Record, Inc. (301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

MR. VOTE: Yes, Your Honor. With me virtually

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- is James Abell and Meredith Levert. Thank you, Your
- 2 Honor.
- JUDGE CHAPPELL: I'll take appearances from the
- 4 respondents, please.
- 5 MR. WOLINSKY: Good afternoon, Your Honor, this
- 6 is Marc Wolinsky from Wachtell Lipton. I am also joined
- 7 by Jonathan Moses, one of my partners, and two of the
- 8 lawyers from Altria in-house legal counsel are also on
- 9 the line.
- 10 JUDGE CHAPPELL: Okay. And Juul?
- 11 MR. GELFAND: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This
- 12 is David Gelfand on behalf of Juul, or JLI as we refer
- 13 to it, and I would like to introduce to Your Honor
- 14 Jeremy Calsyn, and Jessica Hollis, both from my law
- 15 firm. We also have a couple of in-house lawyers from
- 16 JLI on the phone as well. And as far as I know, nobody
- 17 from outside.
- 18 JUDGE CHAPPELL: I need both respondents to
- 19 acknowledge like the government's counsel in that you
- 20 have no one that you have knowledge of that has dialed
- 21 in that is not part of your trial team?
- 22 MR. GELFAND: That is correct, Your Honor.
- 23 MR. WOLINSKY: Your Honor, Marc Wolinsky. The
- 24 same, no one outside the client and lawyers at my firm,
- 25 and also, I should have introduced Debbie Feinstein from

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 Arnold & Porter is on, which I don't anticipate she will
- 2 have a speaking role today.
- 3 JUDGE CHAPPELL: All right. And before anyone
- 4 makes any statements, I will need that person to
- 5 identify him or herself for the court reporter. Madam
- 6 Reporter, can you understand me? You'll know when it's
- 7 my voice?
- 8 MADAM REPORTER: Yes, sir.
- 9 JUDGE CHAPPELL: All right.
- 10 MR. GELFAND: Your Honor, Michael Sibarium from
- 11 the Pillsbury firm, also representing JLI. He's on the
- 12 phone as well.
- 13 JUDGE CHAPPELL: All right.
- MR. GELFAND: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 15 JUDGE CHAPPELL: A letter was received from a
- 16 member of the press regarding access to this phone
- 17 conference. For reasons which are stated in the order
- 18 issued on July 28th, 2020, scheduling this phone
- 19 conference, access to the scheduling conference is
- 20 limited to the parties.
- 21 I could not in fairness allow one member of the
- 22 press to join the phone conference after the public has
- 23 been on notice by the order that this live phone
- 24 conference is not accessible by the public. The purpose
- 25 of this conference is to discuss initial scheduling

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 order. There is no evidence, there is no testimony
- 2 presented. In addition, a transcript of this conference
- 3 will be made available to the public. I've asked that
- 4 the completion of the final transcript be expedited so
- 5 that it will be available to the public as soon as
- 6 possible, and I am told the final transcript will be
- 7 available some time tomorrow.
- 8 Moving on. I need everyone to mute their phones
- 9 when they are not speaking on the conference call. If I
- 10 said that already, I'm reading my agenda backwards.
- 11 Let me talk about the scheduling order. The
- 12 parties provided joint edits to the proposed scheduling
- 13 order my office sent out. I have looked over the joint
- 14 proposal and with one exception, the proposed changes
- 15 are fine. A suggested date fell on a Saturday, March
- 16 20th, that date will be changed to March 19th. I will
- 17 issue a scheduling order incorporating the parties'
- 18 proposed changes shortly.
- 19 Who wants to provide a status on settlement
- 20 discussions?
- 21 MR. VOTE: Your Honor, this is Dominic Vote on
- 22 behalf of complaint counsel. I can start if you would
- 23 like.
- JUDGE CHAPPELL: Go ahead.
- 25 MR. VOTE: We have a date on the calendar

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 scheduled for a very preliminary discussion with
- 2 defendants, and that will be the first discussion we
- 3 will have had. So too early to tell Your Honor where
- 4 that will lead, but certainly we plan to keep the Court
- 5 apprised of any developments on that front.
- 6 JUDGE CHAPPELL: All right. Anything from the
- 7 respondents?
- 8 MR. WOLINSKY: Your Honor, Marc Wolinsky. We're
- 9 on the same page as Mr. Vote.
- JUDGE CHAPPELL: JLI?
- 11 MR. GELFAND: Nothing further from us, Your
- 12 Honor. Same page.
- 13 JUDGE CHAPPELL: I am still getting an echo.
- 14 Everyone on this call who is not speaking, please mute
- 15 your phones.
- 16 Each side may present a brief case overview of
- 17 not more than 10 minutes. If you refer to photos, these
- 18 will not be exhibits and they will not be part of the
- 19 record. The transcript of this conference will be made
- 20 available to the public, so you are instructed not to
- 21 present any confidential information in your overview.
- Government, go first, do you wish to give us an
- 23 overview?
- MR. VOTE: Yes, Your Honor.
- JUDGE CHAPPELL: Go ahead. I'm timing it.

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 MR. VOTE: This case is about the largest
- 2 tobacco company in the United States, Altria, joining
- 3 forces and agreeing not to compete with Juul, the
- 4 dominant e-cigarette company in the U.S. Prior to the
- 5 agreement at issue in this case, the two companies
- 6 competed aggressively with one another in the market for
- 7 closed tank e-cigarettes and consumers benefited
- 8 significantly from that competition.
- 9 But in late 2018, that competition was lost when
- 10 Altria abruptly exited the e-cigarette market and nearly
- 11 simultaneously announced a \$12.5 billion investment in
- 12 Juul, along with a six-year noncompete agreement broadly
- 13 covering the e-cigarette space.
- 14 I would like to start by telling you a little
- 15 bit about the e-cigarette products at issue in this case
- 16 and what we mean by closed tank e-cigarettes. I will
- 17 then turn briefly to the agreements between the parties,
- 18 and then provide some color as to why we allege that
- 19 those agreements have eliminated both current and future
- 20 competition.
- 21 E-cigarettes are battery-powered devices that
- 22 vaporize a liquid solution containing nicotine. There
- 23 are two very different categories of e-cigarettes,
- 24 closed tank systems and open tank systems. Closed tank
- 25 systems, which are the kind of products sold by Juul and

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 Altria, and the ones at issue in our complaint, often
- 2 look a lot like a small USB drive, though some products
- 3 are developed to look like a cigarette.
- 4 But the key fact is this: They use prefilled
- 5 cartridges of e-liquids. Consumers cannot refill them
- 6 with their own liquids.
- 7 JUDGE CHAPPELL: Are you saying tank or take?
- 8 MR. VOTE: Tank, Your Honor.
- 9 JUDGE CHAPPELL: T A N K?
- 10 MR. VOTE: Exactly.
- JUDGE CHAPPELL: Go ahead.
- 12 MR. VOTE: They are typically sold in
- 13 convenience stores, and they used to be available in a
- 14 wide variety of flavors, but now are only available in
- 15 tobacco and menthol flavors. So that's closed tank
- 16 products I'm talking about now.
- 17 By contrast, open tank systems are more
- 18 customizable devices that allow consumers to refill
- 19 whatever e-liquids they prefer. They are typically sold
- 20 in vape shops that also market a wide range of flavored
- 21 liquids that can be used in these devices, among many
- 22 other tobacco products. If you see one on the street,
- 23 the open tank systems are the device that cause a very
- 24 large puff of vapor when you use them.
- Now, our complaint alleges that because of the

Scheduling Conference Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

1

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 JUDGE CHAPPELL: Yes, go ahead.
- MR. WOLINSKY: Okay, thank you.
- 3 Your Honor, I want to start with an overview of
- 4 the e-vapor category and then talk about the regulatory
- 5 scheme. The big difference between e-vapor products and
- 6 cigarettes is that e-vapor products do not have many of
- 7 the harmful chemicals generated by burning tobacco and
- 8 that's why the FDA recognizes that they may be less
- 9 harmful than cigarettes.
- 10 You heard about Cigalike products. NuMark sold
- 11 a Cigalike product and it looks like a cigarette. Juul
- is a well-known example of a pod-based product, and as
- 13 you have heard, it looks like a thumb drive. It's
- 14 modern looking. Other products in this category include
- 15 Vuse Alto, which is sold by R. J. Reynolds, NJOY, Ace
- 16 and MyBlu. And those are on the pictures I sent in for
- 17 your reference.
- 18 Turning to the regulatory scheme, e-vapor
- 19 products are highly regulated by the FDA and generally
- 20 must be authorized before they can be sold. To get
- 21 authorization, a manufacturer has to submit what is
- 22 known as a PNTA, or Premarket Tobacco Product
- 23 Application, which I think we're on accord with the FTC,
- 24 this is an extremely expensive, burdensome, and
- 25 years-long process.

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 Under a regulation called the Deeming Rule, the
- 2 FDA allows products that were on the market before
- 3 August 8, 2016, to stay on the market pending the filing
- 4 of a PMTA by a deadline which is met next month, and any
- 5 product not on the market as of 8/8/16 can't be sold
- 6 without authorization. And if a manufacturer wants to
- 7 make certain modifications to the product, it's deemed
- 8 to be a new product, and again, you can't materially
- 9 modify a new -- an existing product without getting PMTA
- 10 authorization.
- 11 In order to get approval, the applicant has to
- 12 show with extensive evidence that it is -- statutory
- 13 language -- "appropriate for the protection of public
- 14 health," because, among other things, it converts
- 15 smokers. If you can't convert smokers, you're not
- 16 likely to reduce the risk to the population and it's not
- 17 in the public interest.
- 18 Your Honor, I wanted to go over some regulatory
- 19 framework, because it is central to understanding why
- 20 the FTC's case is so flawed. You heard from opposing
- 21 counsel that Altria discontinued its e-vapor products in
- 22 the months and weeks before the JLI deal was signed, and
- 23 that is true. What is not true is the allegation in the
- 24 complaint that JLI negotiated to secure Altria's exit in
- 25 order to "eliminate a threat to JLI's market dominance."

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 That allegation is not true for two reasons.
- 2 First, JLI did not secure Altria's exit from e-vapor.
- 3 Altria withdrew its products for its own independent
- 4 reasons, including regulatory reasons. And second,
- 5 Altria's products were not and were never going to be a
- 6 threat to JLI's market dominance.
- 7 The decisions to withdraw the products came at
- 8 two separate times. The final decision to discontinue
- 9 Elite was made in September 2018 after the FDA sent a
- 10 letter to the leading manufacturers highlighting the
- 11 risks of e-vaping and encouraging them to remove their
- 12 flavored products from the market. Before the FDA sent
- 13 that letter, and at a time when JLI negotiations had
- 14 broken off, Altria had already concluded that Elite had
- 15 no future and had begun the process to stop working on a
- 16 PMTA.

Scheduling Conference Altria Group and Juul Labs

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 associated with e-cigarettes. They also didn't have
- 2 nicotine salts and the high levels of nicotine.
- 3 So the FTC is not going to be able to prove that
- 4 there was an implicit or explicit agreement. There is
- 5 an express agreement which the FTC is challenging under
- 6 a rule of reason analysis, as an agreement that as long
- 7 as Altria held a significant investment in JLI in the
- 8 future, it would not develop or acquire new e-vapor
- 9 products.
- 10 This noncompete does satisfy the rule of reason,

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 the PMTA process.
- 2 Finally, a word about remedies. The remedy that
- 3 the FDA is seeking is not going to promote competition.
- 4 NuMark, the MarkTen Elite, and MarkTen products are not
- 5 coming back to the market. As for the future products,
- 6 they are years and years -- if they were to be
- 7 redeveloped, they are years off into the future, and the
- 8 market will be evolving significantly over the coming
- 9 years as PMTA applications are made by other applicants.
- 10 So in conclusion, the FTC's position boils down
- 11 to two ideas. One, that Altria should have continued
- 12 selling products that it concluded could not get FDA
- 13 authorization because they were not effective in
- 14 reducing the risks of smoking. Consumers were not
- 15 benefitting from these consumers. And two, that Altria
- 16 should have continued selling product that had lost
- 17 hundreds of millions of dollars, and was projected to
- 18 lose hundreds more. Again, consumers would not be
- 19 benefited by this money-losing proposition of a product
- 20 that would fail.
- In a case that's governed by a rule of reason
- 22 standard, those positions are decidedly unreasonable.
- 23 Your Honor, if you have any other questions, I'd be
- 24 happy to -- any questions, I would be happy to answer.
- 25 JUDGE CHAPPELL: Thank you. I have none.

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 MR. GELFAND: Thank you, Your Honor. This is
- 2 David Gelfand on behalf of JLI. Just a few additional
- 3 points.
- 4 First, by way of introduction of my client, JLI,
- 5 it was founded by a couple of Stanford students as a
- 6 startup back in 2007. They were former smokers looking
- 7 to develop alternatives to cigarettes, but it was not
- 8 until 2015 that they actually introduced the products
- 9 that are at issue in this case. So just three years
- 10 before the transaction at issue.
- 11 As Mr. Wolinsky explained, that product hit the
- 12 right cord with adult smokers because it was well
- 13 designed and used proprietary nicotine salt formulation
- 14 that satisfied smokers. It's that product design that
- 15 helped JLI increase its sales.
- 16 The company is greatly proud in the success of
- 17 transitioning smokers away from traditional cigarettes
- 18 and you will hear that's a big part of their mission.
- 19 I don't want to repeat what Mr. Wolinsky said,
- 20 I'll just tell you a couple of things from JLI's
- 21 perspective. First, JLI's witnesses will be adamant,
- 22 Your Honor, that they had no agreement with Altria that
- 23 Altria would cease selling its NuMark products. In
- 24 fact, they didn't see that coming. The FTC's case is
- 25 based on exchanges of term sheets, none of which became

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 agreements. There were various terms that were being
- 2 discussed as possible inclusion in a future transaction
- 3 document.
- 4 Second, the evidence will also be clear that JLI
- 5 viewed the Altria products as competitively irrelevant.
- 6 My client did not adjust their prices, did not adjust
- 7 their competitive strategy because of those products,
- 8 either while they were on the market or as a result of
- 9 Altria's decision to stop selling them.
- 10 Third, JLI had good reason to ask for this
- 11 noncompete that's at the center of some of the complaint
- 12 counsel's allegations. Altria was going to have access
- 13 to very sensitive information, and they were going to be
- 14 providing very important services to JLI to get this
- 15 product approved by the FDA and distributed. And
- 16 because of that, they had good reason to not want Altria
- 17 to be able to dilute its attention, take the
- 18 confidential information they were going to have access
- 19 to and turn around in the market and compete against
- them with new products.
- 21 Fourth, there is cognizable benefit from the
- 22 services that Altria provided to JLI, Your Honor.
- JUDGE CHAPPELL: I don't know if you heard me,
- 24 you have onem uC yy, around ieJhav Tc 11.16 0 0 11.16 114.72 176

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- benefits, including critical assistance on the PMTA
- 2 application, which was recently filed. That application
- 3 was more robust as a result of the assistance that
- 4 Altria provided and more likely to be accepted and
- 5 consumers will benefit from that.
- 6 Finally, the market remains dynamic and
- 7 competitive. Our client sees this every day. As it
- 8 contains in its mission of transitioning adult smokers
- 9 away from combustible cigarettes, they have many other
- 10 products to choose from. The evidence will show that
- 11 consistent with the FDA's regulations, other competitors
- 12 have been successful in going after consumers, the
- 13 market has remained competitive, and other companies
- 14 continue to win business.
- 15 For these reasons, and others that we will
- 16 develop through discovery and in a trial, Your Honor,
- 17 complaint counsel's claims are without merit. Thank
- 18 you.
- 19 JUDGE CHAPPELL: All right. Anything further?
- 20 MR. VOTE: Not from complaint counsel, Your
- Honor.
- MR. WOLINSKY: Your Honor, Marc Wolinsky.
- 23 Nothing from me.
- 24 MR. GELFAND: Nor from me. This is David
- 25 Gelfand, Your Honor. Thank you.

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

```
1
             JUDGE CHAPPELL: Thank you. Hearing nothing
     further, we are adjourned.
              (Whereupon, at 3:36 p.m., the hearing was
 3
     adjourned.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	I, Sally Jo Quade, CERT, do hereby certify that
4	the foregoing proceedings were recorded by me via
5	stenotype and reduced to typewriting under my
6	supervision; that I am neither counsel for, related to,
7	nor employed by any of the parties to the action in
8	which these proceedings were transcribed; and further,
9	that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or
10	counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially
11	or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	SALLY JO QUADE, CERT
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	