



**Planet Depos®**  
We Make It *Happen*™

---

# Transcript of Lutz Riechmann, Ph.D.

**Date:** June 19, 2018

**Case:** Celltrion, Inc. -v- Genentech, Inc. (PTAB)

**Planet Depos**

**Phone:** 888.433.3767

**Email:** [transcripts@planetdepos.com](mailto:transcripts@planetdepos.com)

**www.planetdepos.com**

Celltrion, Inc. v. Genentech

IPR2017-01374

Genentech Exhibit 2064



Conducted on June 19, 2018

<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>1 E X H I B I T S (CONT'D.)</p> <p>2 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE</p> <p>3 Exhibit 1003C document previously marked 47</p> <p>4 Exhibit 1003C</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 Exhibit 1001 document filed as exhibit 52</p> <p>7 1049, exhibit stamp reads</p> <p>8 1001</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 Exhibit 1051 Tramontano reference 57</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 Exhibit 1001 document previously marked 88</p> <p>13 Exhibit 1001</p> <p>14 **original exhibits returned with original transcript</p> <p>15 by PLANET DEPOS to WILMER HALE</p> <p>16 (exhibit index concluded)</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>1 of WilmerHale for the patent owner, Genentech. And</p> <p>2 I'm joined today by my colleague, Laura Macro, of</p> <p>3 WilmerHale and Traci Ropp of Genentech.</p> <p>4 MR. CERWINSKI: Rob Cerwinski,</p> <p>5 Goodwin Procter LLP representing Celltrion, the</p> <p>6 petitioner.</p> <p>7 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The court reporter</p> <p>8 today is Rich Germosen representing Planet Depos.</p> <p>9 Would the court reporter please swear</p> <p>10 in the witness.</p> <p>11 (Whereupon, the court reporter</p> <p>12 administered the oath to the witness.)</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 L U T Z R I E C H M A N N, Ph.D.,</p> <p>15 having been first duly sworn or affirmed, was</p> <p>16 examined and testified as follows:</p> <p>17 EXAMINATION BY MR. DANFORD:</p> <p>18 BY MR. DANFORD:</p> <p>19 Q. Good morning, Dr. Riechmann.</p> <p>20 A. <b>Good morning.</b></p> <p>21 Q. We met in the hallway. I'm Andrew</p> <p>22 Danford. I'm one of the attorneys representing</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p>1 -----</p> <p>2 P R O C E E D I N G S</p> <p>3 9:37 a.m.</p> <p>4 New York, New York</p> <p>5 -----</p> <p>6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Stand by, please.</p> <p>7 We are now on the record. Here</p> <p>8 begins tape number one in the videotaped deposition</p> <p>9 of Lutz Riechmann, Ph.D., in the matter of</p> <p>10 Celltrion, Incorporated versus Genentech,</p> <p>11 Incorporated PTAB, in the United States Patent and</p> <p>12 Trademark Office for the Patent Trial and Appeal</p> <p>13 Board, case number IPR2001701373 and 01374.</p> <p>14 Today's date is Tuesday, June 19,</p> <p>15 2018. The time on the video monitor is</p> <p>16 approximately 9:37 a.m. The videographer today is</p> <p>17 Chris Johnson representing Planet Depos.</p> <p>18 This video deposition is taking place</p> <p>19 at 620 Eighth Avenue, New York, New York.</p> <p>20 Would counsel please voice identify</p> <p>21 themselves and state whom they represent.</p> <p>22 MR. DANFORD: This is Andrew Danford</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <p>1 Genentech. It's nice to meet you.</p> <p>2 A. <b>Same here.</b></p> <p>3 Q. Let's just start by handing you a</p> <p>4 couple of exhibits.</p> <p>5 (Whereupon, Lutz Riechmann reply</p> <p>6 declaration, is received and marked as Exhibit 1143</p> <p>7 for Identification.)</p> <p>8 BY MR. DANFORD:</p> <p>9 Q. I've given you first here an exhibit</p> <p>10 that's been marked as number 1143 in the 1373IPR.</p> <p>11 Exhibit 1143 is a copy of your reply</p> <p>12 declaration from the 1373IPR; correct?</p> <p>13 A. <b>That's correct.</b></p> <p>14 (Whereupon, Exhibit 1143 in 1374IPR,</p> <p>15 is received and marked as Exhibit 1143 for</p> <p>16 Identification.)</p> <p>17 BY MR. DANFORD:</p> <p>18 Q. Let me hand you another exhibit which</p> <p>19 has also been marked as exhibit 1143. This is</p> <p>20 exhibit 1143 in the 1374IPR.</p> <p>21 A. <b>(Reviews.)</b></p> <p>22 Q. This 1143 exhibit is your</p>

Conducted on June 19, 2018

<p>9</p> <p>1 declaration -- your reply declaration from the</p> <p>2 1374IPR; correct?</p> <p>3 <b>A. Yeah.</b></p> <p>4 Q. And your reply declaration from the</p> <p>5 1373IPR is substantively the same as your</p> <p>6 declaration from the 1374IPR; correct?</p> <p>7 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>8 Q. And other than really the case</p> <p>9 numbers, you're not aware of any differences between</p> <p>10 the two documents; correct?</p> <p>11 <b>A. That's correct.</b></p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Well, let's just pick up your</p> <p>13 1373 declaration then, and if you could turn to page</p> <p>14 21 of the exhibit, looking at the very bottom</p> <p>15 numbers, that's your signature on that page;</p> <p>16 correct?</p> <p>17 <b>A. Yeah.</b></p> <p>18 Q. And you signed this declaration on</p> <p>19 May 25, 2018; correct?</p> <p>20 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>21 Q. Have you reviewed exhibit 1143 since</p> <p>22 you signed it?</p>	<p>11</p> <p>1 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>2 <b>A. And in the table, I refer there to</b></p> <p>3 <b>exhibit 1063 Chothia 1985 at 660, and that should</b></p> <p>4 <b>have been Chothia &amp; Lesk 1987.</b></p> <p>5 Q. Okay.</p> <p>6 <b>A. Which I think was exhibit 1062 if I'm</b></p> <p>7 <b>correct. That was on page 906 maybe, I think 906.</b></p> <p>8 Q. Okay. We'll come back to that later</p> <p>9 today then.</p> <p>10 Approximately how many hours did you</p> <p>11 spend preparing your reply declarations?</p> <p>12 <b>A. I don't remember.</b></p> <p>13 Q. More or less than 50 hours?</p> <p>14 <b>A. Less than 50 hours I think, yeah.</b></p> <p>15 Q. Was it more or less than 30 hours?</p> <p>16 <b>A. Don't know. Could be in that range,</b></p> <p>17 <b>yeah.</b></p> <p>18 Q. When did you start working on your</p> <p>19 reply declaration?</p> <p>20 <b>A. I don't recall.</b></p> <p>21 Q. Was it after Genentech submitted its</p> <p>22 patent owner response and the declaration of Dr. Ian</p>
<p>10</p> <p>1 <b>A. This? This same --</b></p> <p>2 Q. Yeah. Have you reviewed your reply</p> <p>3 declarations --</p> <p>4 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>5 Q. -- after you signed it?</p> <p>6 And are you aware of any errors or</p> <p>7 inaccuracies in your reply declaration?</p> <p>8 <b>A. Yes, I noticed one typo and one wrong</b></p> <p>9 <b>reference.</b></p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Why don't you point me to</p> <p>11 that. You can start with the typo if you want.</p> <p>12 <b>A. It's somewhere where it should say</b></p> <p>13 <b>"that" -- no, "than" rather than "that." So</b></p> <p>14 <b>something is better than something else. Do you</b></p> <p>15 <b>want me to find that or --</b></p> <p>16 Q. No, that's fine.</p> <p>17 <b>A. Yeah, I thought so. But, yes, wrong</b></p> <p>18 <b>references is paragraph 25.</b></p> <p>19 Q. Okay.</p> <p>20 <b>A. Which is on page 13 or the bottom</b></p> <p>21 <b>number of 14. There discuss a prior art reference</b></p> <p>22 <b>for residue 78H.</b></p>	<p>12</p> <p>1 Wilson in these proceedings?</p> <p>2 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>3 Q. Did you talk with anyone other than</p> <p>4 counsel for Celltrion about the opinions set forth</p> <p>5 in your reply declarations?</p> <p>6 <b>A. No.</b></p> <p>7 Q. What did you do to prepare your reply</p> <p>8 declaration?</p> <p>9 <b>A. I read your response. I read Ian</b></p> <p>10 <b>Wilson's declaration. I read my first declaration</b></p> <p>11 <b>again, and I read petitioner's reply. I think</b></p> <p>12 <b>that's what it's called.</b></p> <p>13 Q. Did you do any literature searches as</p> <p>14 part of preparing your reply?</p> <p>15 <b>A. Yeah, I mean, I do that -- it comes</b></p> <p>16 <b>up all the time, so I guess I did, but I -- it's not</b></p> <p>17 <b>something which I particularly take note of it. I</b></p> <p>18 <b>do it because when I read something and there is a</b></p> <p>19 <b>reference where I don't remember what it is, I start</b></p> <p>20 <b>doing a literature search at that moment because I</b></p> <p>21 <b>have to find it because not all the references are</b></p> <p>22 <b>obviously given.</b></p>

Conducted on June 19, 2018

<p>13</p> <p>1 Q. And maybe if we could just turn to</p> <p>2 the back of your reply declaration. I'm just</p> <p>3 looking at the very last page where it says:</p> <p>4 Additional materials considered.</p> <p>5 <b>A. Uh-huh.</b></p> <p>6 Q. Were any of those documents that are</p> <p>7 listed here materials that you identified through a</p> <p>8 literature search?</p> <p>9 <b>A. I remember now the Pauling reference,</b></p> <p>10 <b>that's something I found.</b></p> <p>11 Q. The Pauling reference is exhibit</p> <p>12 1145; right?</p> <p>13 <b>A. That's right, yeah.</b></p> <p>14 Q. And that's one that you found</p> <p>15 yourself; correct?</p> <p>16 <b>A. Yeah.</b></p> <p>17 Q. What about exhibit 1144, which is</p> <p>18 U.S. Patent number 5821337? Did you find that</p> <p>19 patent on your own or was that given to you?</p> <p>20 <b>A. I don't remember.</b></p> <p>21 Q. Before your work on this case, were</p> <p>22 you aware of exhibit 1144?</p>	<p>15</p> <p>1 <b>skilled in the art, but the Goodwin team asked me</b></p> <p>2 <b>where does it actually --</b></p> <p>3 MR. CERWINSKI: I caution you not to</p> <p>4 reveal the substance of any communications with</p> <p>5 attorneys.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>7 <b>A. I just felt it needed -- at that</b></p> <p>8 <b>point it would be suitable to have a reference in</b></p> <p>9 <b>the -- which shows that it was really established as</b></p> <p>10 <b>common knowledge, this distance of two atoms when</b></p> <p>11 <b>they're touching in a protein.</b></p> <p>12 Q. And it's not in something in here you</p> <p>13 called a list of additional materials considered;</p> <p>14 correct?</p> <p>15 <b>A. Say again.</b></p> <p>16 Q. The list that that exhibit 1145 is on</p> <p>17 is titled: Additional Materials Considered;</p> <p>18 correct?</p> <p>19 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>20 Q. And these are materials that are in</p> <p>21 addition to the materials that you considered when</p> <p>22 preparing your original declaration; correct?</p>
<p>14</p> <p>1 <b>A. I don't remember when I became first</b></p> <p>2 <b>aware of it.</b></p> <p>3 Q. Just coming back to exhibit 1145, the</p> <p>4 Pauling book, were you aware of that reference prior</p> <p>5 to your work on this case?</p> <p>6 <b>A. Again, I probably have seen that book</b></p> <p>7 <b>before, but there was a specific point which I</b></p> <p>8 <b>wanted to find kind of the first time kind of</b></p> <p>9 <b>established generally in the literature that the</b></p> <p>10 <b>distance between two atoms when they're touching is</b></p> <p>11 <b>the sum of van der Walls radii.</b></p> <p>12 (Reporter clarification.)</p> <p>13 <b>A. Van der Walls radii. And that was</b></p> <p>14 <b>just Linus Pauling in 1960 when he looked at the</b></p> <p>15 <b>structural data available at that point and he saw</b></p> <p>16 <b>that the distance between two atoms, which are</b></p> <p>17 <b>touching, is in proteins generally about 3 or</b></p> <p>18 <b>3.3-angstrom, something like that.</b></p> <p>19 Q. So this Pauling reference was not</p> <p>20 something that you addressed in your original</p> <p>21 declaration in these proceedings; correct?</p> <p>22 <b>A. It's common knowledge for person</b></p>	<p>16</p> <p>1 <b>A. Correct.</b></p> <p>2 Q. So all of the stuff that was on this</p> <p>3 list was not something that you considered or</p> <p>4 addressed in your original declaration; correct?</p> <p>5 <b>A. That's correct, yes.</b></p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Just going down to exhibit</p> <p>7 1193, that's an article by Foote; correct?</p> <p>8 <b>A. Correct.</b></p> <p>9 Q. Did you find that article through</p> <p>10 your own research?</p> <p>11 <b>A. No.</b></p> <p>12 Q. How did you become aware of exhibit</p> <p>13 1193?</p> <p>14 <b>A. During the preparation for the</b></p> <p>15 <b>first -- for my first deposition.</b></p> <p>16 Q. Before your work on this case, were</p> <p>17 you aware of exhibit 1193?</p> <p>18 <b>A. No.</b></p> <p>19 Q. Exhibit 1194 is an article by</p> <p>20 Kolbinger; correct?</p> <p>21 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>22 Q. Did you find that article through</p>

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.