Exhibit 29

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THE BOARD OF THE TRUSTEES OF
THE LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY,

Plaintiff,

vs. No. C-05-04158 MHP

ROCHE MOLECULAR SYSTEMS, INC.;
ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS CORPORATION;
ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS OPERATIONS,
INC.; ROCHE DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEMS,
INC.,

Defendant.

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM.

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY - RESTRICTED
VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF ALICE WANG, Ph.D.
Redwood Shores, California
Tuesday, August 8 2006

Reported by:
SUZANNE F. BOSCHETTI
CSR No. 5111
Job No. 3-50828

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendants The Board of the Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University, et al.:
COOLEY GODWARD LLP
BY: MAGDALENA STROJWAS WILKINSON
Attorney at Law
Five Palo Alto Square, 3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, California 94306-2155
(650) 857-0663

For Defendants and Counterclaimants Roche Molecular Systems, Inc., et al.:
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP
BY: ROBERT W. STONE
Attorney at Law
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 560
Redwood Shores, California 94065
(650) 801-5001

Videographer:

RAY TYLER
SARNOFF COURT REPORTERS AND LEGAL TECHNOLOGIES
San Francisco, California
(415) 274-9977

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THE BOARD OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY,
Plaintiff,
vs. No. C-05-04158 MHP
ROCHE MOLECULAR SYSTEMS, INC.; ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS CORPORATION; ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS OPERATIONS, INC.; ROCHE DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEMS, INC.,
Defendant.

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM.

Confidential videotaped deposition of ALICE WANG, Ph.D., taken on behalf of Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendants The Board of the Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University, at 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 560, Redwood Shores, California, beginning at 10:02 a.m. and ending at 2:07 p.m. on Tuesday, August 8, 2006, before SUZANNE F. BOSCHETTI, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 5111.

INDEX

could refer to the line number in the left-most column so that I can be sure I'm following along with you.
A. 1351, SK145. And those are the -- okay. I don't quite see this. It's not quite clear here. 1401 --
Q. Mm-hmm.
A. -- there was SK something written there.
Q. And 1451, above 1451 or is that below --
A. 1401.
Q. Okay. I see that.
A. Yeah. And then 1501 is a Rsa. And then also there's, you know, T to A mutation.
Q. Mm-hmm.
A. And then line 1601, SK39.
Q. And when did you select these sequences?
A. When did I select these sequences?
Q. Mm-hmm. You testified that you selected this sequence; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. When?
A. When we start to do the cloning work.
Q. The cloning work --
A. To -- to -- to amplify this portion to put into the vector.

Q. Before you began work with Mr. Casipit on the cRNA standard, you had not worked with these HIV sequences; is that correct?
A. Could you say that again?
Q. Before you began work on this cRNA standard and the plasmid, you had not worked with --
A. Worked with --
Q. -- these sequences?
A. That's right.
Q. So how did you know which sequences to select?
MR. STONE: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. Overbroad.
THE WITNESS: This is the HIV sequence.
BY MS. WILKINSON:
Q. Mm-hmm.
A. So -- so if you want -- you know, I -- I mean, generally the standard curve for HIV, you have to use HIV sequence.
Q. Right. So somebody -- another scientist like yourself who had never worked with HIV before would have the same possible set of sequences to select as primers; is that right?
MR. STONE: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.

Overbroad. Incomplete hypothetical. Lacks foundation. Calls for speculation.
THE WITNESS: I don't quite understand your question.
BY MS. WILKINSON:
Q. I'm trying to understand how you selected the portion of the sequence to focus on.
A. Oh. I don't recall. I don't recall.
Q. Do you recall whether you looked at publications that pointed you to sequences to look at for HIV?
A. I was told by my supervisor that the project, you know, it's for HIV, yeah. So I don't recall because my supervisor gave me the sequence. I don't recall that, yeah.
Q. Is it your testimony that the sequence came from David Mark?
A. I don't recall.
MR. STONE: Objection. Asked and answered.
BY MS. WILKINSON:
Q. Is there anybody else you could have talked with that pointed you to those sequences?
MR. STONE: Objection. Overbroad. Calls for speculation.
THE WITNESS: I don't recall.

BY MS. WILKINSON:
Q. You mentioned mutation --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in this sequence. Was this -- is there any significance to that mutation?
MR. STONE: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MS. WILKINSON:
Q. And what was that?
A. So creating this mutation, we can generate Rsa site. So once the product produced, we can use the Rsa site to cut the fragment to smaller -- to two smaller pieces, and you can separate on the gel.
Q. And why would you want to do that?
A. So this way the standard -- the product generated from the cRNA was different from the product generated from the HIV.
Q. And that would be useful if you amplified your sample and the standard in the same tube; is that right?
A. Yes.
MR. STONE: Objection. Vague and ambiguous, overbroad.
BY MS. WILKINSON:
Q. Did you understand my question?

01:39:39 A. Yes.
01:39:39 Q. Okay?
01:39:40 A. But I mention to you before, the quantitation
01:39:44 has two approaches --
01:39:45 Q. Mm-hmm.
01:39:46 A. -- either internal standard or external
01:39:50 standard. So --
01:39:50 Q. And this aspect of the sequence was useful
01:39:56 to using the standard as an internal control --
01:40:02 MR. STONE: Objection. Misstates --
01:40:02 BY MS. WILKINSON:
01:40:03 Q. Is that right?
01:40:04 MR. STONE: Objection. Misstates her
01:40:05 testimony.
01:40:05 THE WITNESS: Could be used for both.
01:40:05 BY MS. WILKINSON:
01:40:10 Q. How is the mutation aspect used for both?
01:40:16 A. You don't -- okay. You have this -- you have
01:40:19 a choice. If you want it internally, you can do it.
01:40:23 If you want to do it externally, you can also use
01:40:25 this. You don't have to, you know, cut with Rsa
01:40:29 website.
01:40:29 Q. Okay. So the mutation site is not a
01:40:36 feature of the standard that you have to use to do
01:40:42 quantitative PCR; is that your testimony?

01:40:46 A. When we design experiment, we usually try to
01:40:51 design -- try to cover all bases, so that's why, you
01:40:55 know, we -- we put this here. You know, in the future
01:40:59 you can have a choice.
01:41:00 Q. But you could do quantitative PCR without
01:41:05 using this mutation; is that right?
01:41:09 A. Yes.
01:41:10 Q. And you could do -- you could design a
01:41:16 standard that does not have this mutation, right?
01:41:20 MR. STONE: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
01:41:21 Overbroad.
01:41:21 THE WITNESS: Yes.
01:41:23 BY MS. WILKINSON:
01:41:23 Q. You could have designed the sequence to be
01:41:28 identical to the gag gene RNA; is that right?
01:41:32 MR. STONE: Same objections.
01:41:33 THE WITNESS: Yes.
01:41:33 BY MS. WILKINSON:
01:41:35 Q. And that sequence could have been inserted
01:41:37 into a plasmid for use as a standard?
01:41:40 MR. STONE: Same objections. I'll object to
01:41:42 this whole line of testimony as seeking improper
01:41:44 expert testimony.
01:41:49 THE WITNESS: As I said before, okay, so this
01:41:51 just extra effort, try to cover all the bases.

01:41:51 BY MS. WILKINSON:
01:41:58 Q. Right. But you didn't have to go through
01:42:01 that extra effort. You could have done the cloning
01:42:04 with the HIV gag gene sequence?
01:42:08 MR. STONE: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
01:42:09 Misstates testimony.
01:42:12 THE WITNESS: Yes.
01:42:12 BY MS. WILKINSON:
01:42:15 Q. And that sequence could have been
01:42:16 expressed in the commercially available vector; is
01:42:24 that right?
01:42:24 A. Yes.
01:42:24 MR. STONE: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
01:42:25 Overbroad. Calls for speculation.
01:42:28 MS. WILKINSON: Can you please --
01:42:29 THE WITNESS: Yes.
01:42:30 MS. WILKINSON: -- repeat my question?
01:42:39 (Record read as follows:
01:42:39 "QUESTION: And that sequence could
01:42:39 have been expressed in the commercially
01:42:40 available vector; is that right?")
01:42:40 BY MS. WILKINSON:
01:42:40 Q. So the --
01:42:41 MR. STONE: Same objections.
01:42:41 BY MS. WILKINSON:

01:42:42 Q. So the gag gene sequence without a point
01:42:45 mutation could have been inserted into a
01:42:48 commercially available vector at the time that you
01:42:51 did the cRNA work and expressed cRNA to be used as
01:42:57 a standard; is that correct?
01:42:59 MR. STONE: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
01:43:00 Overbroad. Incomplete hypothetical. Calls for expert
01:43:03 testimony. Misstates previous testimony.
01:43:11 THE WITNESS: To me, to design a good
01:43:17 standard, you do need to have that knowledge to design
01:43:20 that.
01:43:20 BY MS. WILKINSON:
01:43:21 Q. That wasn't my question. My question was
01:43:25 you said -- you testified that it was extra effort
01:43:29 to put in this mutation. And my question is:
01:43:32 Could you have expressed the exact sequence of the
01:43:37 gag DNA gene in a commercially available plasmid,
01:43:46 transcribed that into RNA and used that as an
01:43:50 internal standard?
01:43:51 MR. STONE: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
01:43:53 Overbroad. Incomplete hypothetical. Calls for
01:43:56 speculation.
01:44:00 THE WITNESS: It depends on how do you want
01:44:01 to detect that product.
01:44:01 BY MS. WILKINSON:

Q. And it was your testimony that you don't know David Schwartz?
A. Right.
Q. And you didn't give David Schwartz anything?
A. That's right.
Q. Did you review your notebooks in preparation for today's deposition?
A. My notebooks?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. Your Cetus notebooks.
Sitting here today, do you know of any references to Mark Holodniy in any of your Cetus laboratory notebooks?
A. No.
Q. Sitting here today, do you know of any references to quantitative PCR of HIV in any of your Cetus laboratory notebooks?
A. No.
MS. WILKINSON: That's all I have.
MR. STONE: No further questions.
MS. WILKINSON: Thank you very much for your time this afternoon. Appreciate it.
THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

MR. STONE: Let's go off the record.
VIDEO OPERATOR: Okay. Stand by. This concludes today's deposition of Dr. Alice Wang. The number of media used was two. We are off the record at 2:07 p.m.
//
//

I, ALICE WANG, Ph.D., do hereby declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the foregoing transcript of my deposition; that I have made such corrections as noted herein, in ink, initialed by me, or attached hereto; that my testimony as contained herein, as corrected, is true and correct.

EXECUTED this _____ day of _____, 20____, at _____, _____.
(City) (State)

_____
ALICE WANG, Ph.D.

I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to testifying, were placed under oath; that a verbatim record of the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand which was thereafter transcribed under my direction; further, that the foregoing is an accurate transcription thereof.

I further certify that I am neither financially interested in the action nor a relative or employee of any attorney of any of the parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my name.

Dated: _____

_____
SUZANNE F. BOSCHETTI
CSR No. 5111