

UNRIVALED
HONOREE



Jonathan Polkes

Partner, Global Co-Chair
of Litigation Practice

White & Case

New York, NY

Jonathan Polkes of White & Case

Lisa Helem, Executive Editor | Andrea Platten, Editor | July 8, 2026

You led the trial team for Regeneron in *Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Amgen Inc.*, winning a \$406.8 million jury verdict in Delaware federal court in May 2025. The jury found that Amgen violated antitrust laws with a bundling strategy tying rebates on blockbuster drugs to purchases of its cholesterol drug, limiting competition from Regeneron's product. Can you tell us about your trial strategy?

This was a complicated antitrust case going before a jury—the jury instructions were 75 pages long. The case involved an anticompetitive bundling scheme in the pharmaceutical industry, the role pharmacy benefit managers play in the healthcare system, request for proposal, contracting and bidding processes, physician behavior, macroeconomics, and how all of that impacts patients.

So our strategy centered on finding the narrative frame for all this complexity. We believed that, at bottom, this case offered the jury a look at an unpoliced and hidden corner of the healthcare system that was being abused and needed fixing. And we empowered the jury to fix it. We explained to the jury that there was much more at stake than simply two big pharma companies facing off against one another over money.

Tell us about some of the challenges you faced in *Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Amgen Inc.* and how you overcame them.

Both sides were operating under a chess clock. We had a carefully thought-out plan for how much of our allotted time to spend on each direct examination and each cross-examination. But over the course of two weeks and dozens of witnesses in a case as complex as this one, those plans go out the window quickly. It's like that Mike Tyson quote: "Everyone has a plan until they get punched in the mouth." So we had to make game-time decisions about how much time to actually spend on each witness, in particular with regard to our cross-examinations of the other side's witnesses. There was one cross-examination that became the game changer. We decided to let it rip for five hours. That totally threw off the schedule for the rest of the trial.

Take us back. When did you first know you wanted to be a trial lawyer?

While at NYU Law, I developed close connections with several professors and refined an interest in courtroom advocacy. After clerking and a few years in private practice, I joined the US Attorney's Office, where I took 20 trials through verdict. I was hooked. When I rejoined private practice, I took on the role as first-chair in a high-stakes trial and have since continued to litigate contentious cases for the past several decades.

What are the major keys to winning over a jury or a judge?

Tell a story. You are dealing with complex legal principles, technical facts, and jury instructions. Most lawyers lose track of what matters and try to present their case like a live version of a summary judgment brief. A jury trial is a completely different medium. Focus only on being comprehensive and systematically getting all the facts into the record and you lose the jury. You have to figure out a way to connect with the jury, how to boil your case down to things that matter to people. Find a way to make your case matter and why the jury should want you to win.

What is the best advice you give young trial lawyers?

Trial law is an art—you don't learn it in a classroom. The only way to learn it is by watching other people do it and then doing it yourself. In the US Attorney's Office we used to say this about trials: "Watch one, do one, teach one."