Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffmann-LaRoche LTD et al Case 1:05-cv-12237-WGY Document 713-4 Filed 07/13/2007 Page 1 of 5

EXHIBIT 3

Dockets.Justia.com

USDC - Depo: Varki, Ajit 6/29/2007 8:03:00 AM 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS 3 4 5 AMGEN INC.,)) 6 Plaintiff,)) 7) Civil Action VS.) 8 F. HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE LTD., a Swiss) No. 05-12237 WGY Company, ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS GmbH,) 9 a German Company, and HOFFMANN-LA) ROCHE, INC., a New Jersey) CONFIDENTIAL 10 Corporation)) 11 Defendants.) 12 13 14 15 DEPOSITION OF AJIT VARKI, M.D. 16 FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 2007 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 **REPORTED BY:** 24 LINDA D. WHITE CSR NO. 12009 25

Amgen v. Roche

Page 1

USDC - Depo: Varki, Ajit 6/29/2007 8:03:00 AM

1	THE WITNESS: I don't think there's my
2	expertise is in suggesting that the lineup be done
3	because, obviously, if you look at something, it
4	looks generally similar and you say it's similar.
5	Or this term "indistinguishable" that's been thrown
6	around. You know, if you take a quick look, you
7	might say, "Oh, those bands are indistinguishable."
8	What I'm saying, based on experience and
9	based on my suspicion about the sulfate, I'm
10	recommending that we do that. So now you have to
11	tell the juror to or probably take this example,
12	which is you know, when you do experiments
13	several times and one shows a definite difference
14	and it's done right, and the other ones give
15	ambiguous results, the rule of thumb is believe in
16	the definite difference. Because the ambiguous
17	results could be because it's an ambiguous
18	experiment.
19	But I think that I would suggest that that
20	exercise is worthwhile on several of these gels. I
21	see this I notice this over and over again in
22	looking at them.
23	BY MR. JAGOE:
24	Q Do you know of any structural differences
25	between recombinant human EPO and EPO produced by
Amgen v. Roche	

USDC - Depo: Varki, Ajit 6/29/2007 8:03:00 AM

- 1 human tumor cells in the prior art?
- 2 MR. LOEB: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
- 3 THE WITNESS: Prior art --
- 4 MR. LOEB: Outside the scope of Dr. Varki's
- 5 expertise.
- 6 THE WITNESS: Prior art prior to 1983?
- 7 BY MR. JAGOE:
- 8 Q Yes.
- 9 A I don't believe I looked into the
- 10 structure of -- I don't recall any preparation that
- 11 was good enough from tumor to, you know, make such a
- 12 determination of sufficient quality. As I did, I
- 13 listed all the ones that I could find.
- 14 Q So your opinion that there are differences
- 15 between the language of Claim 3 of the 933 Patent
- 16 and the human urinary EPO in the prior art, is based
- 17 at least in part on the fact that recombinant EPO is
- 18 from cells grown in monolayer culture and human
- 19 urinary EPO was produced from a kidney in a
- 20 specialized environment; is that correct?
- 21 MR. LOEB: Objection. Mischaracterizes the
- 22 witness' testimony. Monolayer comes from --
- 23 THE WITNESS: My -- I don't think that's the
- 24 primary basis of -- that is what I come back to try
- 25 to explain the differences. Come back to saying,

Amgen v. Roche

USDC - Depo: Varki, Ajit 6/29/2007 8:03:00 AM

- 1 gee, why are they so different?
- 2 And to me the best explanation for that is
- 3 the fact that is -- even known back then -- when
- 4 proteins come from two different cell types, they're
- 5 likely to have different glycosylation.
- 6 So my opinion doesn't start from the
- 7 knowledge that recombinant and kidney, although I
- 8 would place the bet it would turn out to be
- 9 different. And -- but when you actually look and
- 10 see the differences, then you go back and say why.
- 11 Well, the most likely explanation is one is human --
- 12 one is coming from this unknown cells in the kidney,
- 13 and the other is coming from, at that time, CHO or
- 14 COS cell.
- 15 BY MR. JAGOE:
- 16 Q Do you have an opinion as to whether or
- 17 not the claims of the 933 Patent cover structures
- 18 that are the same or similar to the structures of
- 19 EPO produced by human tumors?
- 20 MR. LOEB: Objection. Outside the scope of
- 21 Dr. Varki's expert opinions and vague and ambiguous.
- 22 THE WITNESS: As I said, I did not look at any
- 23 detail and to human -- human tumor EPO, but knowing
- 24 what I know about human tumors and their sialylation
- 25 differences, I might see some differences. But I

Amgen v. Roche