1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
2	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION	
3	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES	
4		
5	In the Matter of: )	
6	ALTRIA GROUP, )	
7	a corporation, ) Docket No.	
8	and ) 9393	
9	JUUL LABS, INC., )	
10	a corporation, )	
11	Respondents. )	
12	)	
13		
14		
15	Monday, August 3, 2020	
16		
17	Remote Telephonic Prehearing Conferen	се
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Altria	Group	and	Joul	Labs
/ WILLIA		and	3001	LGDJ

8/3/2020

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	ON BEHALF OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION:
4	DOMINIC VOTE, ESQ.
5	JAMES E. ABELL, III, ESQ.
6	FRANCES ANNE JOHNSON, ESQ.
7	MEREDITH LEVERT, ESQ.
8	Federal Trade Commission
9	499 Seventh Street, S.W.
10	Washington, DC 20024
11	(202) 326-2289
12	dvote@ftc.gov
13	
14	ON BEHALF OF ALTRIA:
15	MARC WOLINSKY, ESQ.
16	JONATHAN MOSES, ESQ.
17	Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz
18	51 West 52nd Street
19	New York, New York 10019
20	(212) 403-1226
21	mwolinsky@wlrk.com
22	and
23	DEBBIE FEINSTEIN, ESQ.
24	ROBERT KATERBERG, ESQ.
25	JUSTIN HEDGE, ESQ.

8/3/2020

## Scheduling Conference Altria Group and Juul Labs

/ IIII C	Stoop and 3001 Labs	0/0/2020
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

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 3 JUDGE CHAPPELL: This is the initial prehearing scheduling conference in Docket Number 9393 in the 4 matter of Altria Group, Inc. and Juul Labs. This 5 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 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

- 1 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.
- 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.
- 25 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.
- 11 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

#### Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 significant differences in these two products, and
- 2 because they're sold in different channels, the
- 3 appropriate relevant market in this matter is limited to
- 4 the sale of closed systems electronic cigarettes in the
- 5 United States.
- 6 Now, until the fall of 2018, Altria had been
- 7 investing heavily and competing vigorously in the closed
- 8 tank e-cigarette market, for years, through a division
- 9 called NuMark, that's N U M A R K. It was spending
- 10 millions of dollars on marketing and research and
- 11 development, and in July of 2018, told investors that
- 12 its NuMark products were getting traction with consumers
- 13 and driving growth. But just a few months later on
- 14 December 7th, Altria publicly announced that it would
- 15 wind down its entire e-cigarette business, and less than
- 16 two weeks after that announced its \$12.5 billion
- 17 acquisition of a 35 percent share of Juul.
- 18 Altria's investment in Juul included a six-year
- 19 noncompete that ended Altria's ability to compete in the
- 20 closed tank e-cigarette market in any meaningful way, as
- 21 well as a services agreement that would allow Altria to
- 22 provide marketing and regulatory support to its new
- 23 e-cigarette partner. In the simplest of terms, Altria
- 24 decided if you can't beat them, join them.
- Now, the fact that Altria exited the market just

### Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 two weeks before closing their massive investment in
- 2 Juul is not just a coincidence. We alleged in our
- 3 complaint, and the evidence will show, that Juul made
- 4 clear, and Altria was fully aware, that there was no way
- 5 this transaction was going to work unless Altria agreed
- 6 to exit the closed tank e-cigarette market and cease
- 7 competing with Juul. And exit the market they did.
- 8 Altria will claim that they shut down the NuMark
- 9 business because it was not successful enough and it
- 10 faced challenges. Certainly all e-cigarette firms have
- 11 faced significant challenges, including regulatory
- 12 challenges, but this justification is pretextual.
- 13 Certainly none of the other closed tank e-cigarette
- 14 suppliers have suggested that they intend to abandon
- 15 this strategically important market as a result of
- 16 regulatory challenges. The bottom line is this: Juul
- 17 communicated and Altria knew that it had to get out of
- 18 the e-cigarette business in order to complete its
- 19 investment in Juul.
- 20 JUDGE CHAPPELL: You have five minutes
- 21 remaining.
- MR. VOTE: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 23 Altria's agreement to invest in Juul and
- 24 withdraw its NuMark products from the market immediately
- 25 eliminated significant competition between two of only a

#### Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 few closed tank e-cigarette suppliers. Altria was
- 2 already competing with Juul on price, offering
- 3 aggressive promotions that directly benefited consumers,
- 4 securing important shelf space at convenience stores and
- 5 working to improve its existing products.
- 6 But in addition to eliminating aggressive
- 7 competition between Juul and NuMark, the six-year
- 8 noncompete provision agreed to by the parties also
- 9 eliminated future competition by putting a grinding halt
- 10 to Altria's significant and ongoing effort to develop
- 11 next-generation e-cigarette products or to explore
- 12 partnerships to bring new e-cigarette products to the
- 13 market.
- 14 Before this transaction, Altria was fully
- 15 committed to competing in the closed tank e-cigarette
- 16 market and had told its investors as much. As any
- 17 reasonable company would, it developed a plan B to make
- 18 sure it was prepared to go on competing if the deal
- 19 negotiations with Juul fell apart. But for its
- 20 investment in Juul, and the accompanying noncompete
- 21 agreement, Altria would undoubtedly be competing
- 22 aggressively in the closed tank e-cigarette market
- 23 today.
- 24 Consumers have now lost over two years of
- 25 head-to-head competition between Altria and Juul and

### Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 they have lost over two years that Altria would have
- 2 spent investing and developing new products. The market
- 3 for closed tank e-cigarettes was already highly
- 4 concentrated before Altria's investment in Juul, and
- 5 whether viewed as a minority acquisition under Section 7
- 6 of the Clayton Act, or a series of illegal agreements
- 7 under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, Altria's investment
- 8 in Juul has eliminated actual and future competition to
- 9 the detriment of consumers, and that competitive harm
- 10 cannot be justified or outweighed by any pro-competitive
- 11 justification offered by defendants.
- 12 I look forward to answering any questions the
- 13 Court may have and presenting this case as efficiently
- 14 as possible. Thank you, Your Honor.
- JUDGE CHAPPELL: Thank you.
- Respondent?
- 17 MR. WOLINSKY: Good afternoon, Marc Wolinsky.
- 18 Your Honor --
- 19 JUDGE CHAPPELL: Are you going to do five
- 20 minutes each or are you doing the whole ten minutes
- 21 yourself? What's your plan?
- 22 MR. WOLINSKY: The plan is for me to use eight
- 23 minutes and Mr. Gelfand to use two minutes.
- JUDGE CHAPPELL: All right.
- MR. WOLINSKY: And may I start now?

#### Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 JUDGE CHAPPELL: Yes, go ahead.
- 2 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
- 12 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.
- 17 Senior leadership recognized that Elite was a
- 18 money loser and that it was not effective in getting
- 19 smokers to stop or reduce their use of cigarettes. The
- 20 FDA's concerns about e-vaping tipped the scales, and
- 21 that's highlighted by the fact that something the FTC
- 22 doesn't recognize, that at the same time Altria
- 23 discontinued Elite, it also discontinued the flavored
- 24 versions of its Cigalike products, including one called
- 25 strawberry brulee. Elite was not a competitive threat

#### Altria Group and Juul Labs

8/3/2020

- 1 to Juul.
- 2 In order to convert smokers to vaping, an
- 3 e-vapor product has to give smokers the nicotine
- 4 satisfaction that they can get from a cigarette. Juul
- 5 figured out how to do that with two products that make
- 6 use of nicotine salts and increased levels of nicotine.
- 7 Elite did not have nicotine salts, had lower levels of
- 8 nicotine, and because of that, it could not compete
- 9 effectively with Juul, and those things could not be
- 10 changed because of the 8/8/16 rule. That's the story on
- 11 Elite and MarkTen.
- 12 Altria did continue to market its remaining
- 13 Cigalike products after the FDA's September 2018 letter.
- 14 The decision to discontinue them was made in early
- 15 December 2018. Even then, the prospect of completing a
- 16 deal with JLI was uncertain, due diligence was still
- 17 under way. But just as with Elite and the NuMark
- 18 flavors, the remaining products were not discontinued to
- 19 placate JLI.
- They admitted the existing product was losing
- 21 popularity, would not have gotten FDA authorization, had
- 22 lost hundreds of millions of dollars and was projected
- 23 to lose another \$235 million over the next three years.
- 24 They were never a competitive threat to JLI, in part,
- 25 because they looked like cigarettes and had the stigma

### 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,
- 11 and it goes back to the regulatory framework. As part
- 12 of the agreement, Altria committed to use its expertise
- 13 to help JLI get FDA authorization, not only for existing
- 14 products, but for new products. To do that effectively,
- 15 Altria needed access to JLI's inside information, and
- 16 the parties both recognized that in order to help JLI be
- 17 more competitive in the future, it made sense that
- 18 Altria would not be able to use -- have access to JLI's
- 19 inside information and use it in developing its
- 20 competing products.
- 21 As to those competing products, at the time
- 22 Altria agreed to stop developing products, it had
- 23 nothing on the board, and any products that it was going
- 24 to develop were years and years off into the future,
- 25 again because of this regulatory framework, because of

### 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.
- 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 one minute remaining.
- 25 MR. GELFAND: Thank you, Your Honor. Cognizable

#### 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
- 21 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
```

# Scheduling Conference 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	