

Goldwasser, Eugene Ph.D.

2/14/2007

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMGEN INC.,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 vs.) No. 05-12237 WGY
)
 F. HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE LTD., a)
)
 Swiss Company, ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS)
)
 GmbH, a German Company, and)
)
 HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE INC., a New)
)
 Jersey Corporation,)
)
 Defendants.)

Videotaped Deposition of

EUGENE GOLDWASSER, Ph.D., taken before GREG S.
 WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, pursuant to
 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United
 States District Court pertaining to the taking of
 depositions, at Suite 4100, Three First National
 Plaza, in the City of Chicago, Cook County,
 Illinois, commencing at 9:13 o'clock a.m., on the
 14th day of February, 2007.

*** PAGE 119 THROUGH AND INCLUDING PAGE 121 ***

*** WERE DESIGNATED CONFIDENTIAL ***

1 difference in molecular weight?

2 A. Not a discernible difference, no.

3 Q. Okay. So what was your understanding of
4 why the iodination of the epo inactivated it?

5 A. Because as we published some years later,
6 the tyrosine in urinary epo at position 15 was very
7 much involved with the binding to the receptor and
8 therefore the biological activity, and by putting
9 the bulky iodine in, you got -- you changed the
10 structure so that it no longer had any biological
11 activity.

12 Q. And did you know that in 1983?

13 A. No.

14 Q. When did you learn that?

15 A. '97 or something like that.

16 Q. 1997?

17 A. '97 I think.

18 Q. Yeah, okay.

19 A. Whenever we published that paper.

20 Q. Okay. So at the time in the '80s when you
21 were doing this iodination work, could you predict
22 whether a substitution would impact the biological
23 activity of the epo?

24 A. No, you couldn't.

25 Q. Okay. Could you --