EXHIBIT E

Pages 1 - 53

United States District Court

Northern District of California

Before The Honorable Elizabeth D. Laporte

Oracle Corporation,)

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

SAP AG, et al.,)

Defendants.)

No. C07-1658 EDL

COPY

San Francisco, California Thursday, July 24, 2008

Reporter's Transcript Of Proceedings

Appearances:

For Plaintiff:

Bingham McCutchen

Three Embarcadero Center

San Francisco, California 94111

By: Geoffrey M. Howard, Esquire

Holly A. House, Esquire Zachary Alinder, Esquire

Oracle, USA, Inc.

500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7 Redwood City, California 94070

By: Jennifer Gloss, Esquire

(Appearances continued on next page.)

Reported By:

Sahar McVickar, RPR, CSR No. 12963 Official Reporter, U.S. District Court For the Northern District of California

(Computerized Transcription By Eclipse)

additional delving down is going to be required. In addition to the materials, they gave us some samples; we don't think that materials that they provided us -- the general material -- is comparable to what we have provided. But, in order to really figure out what did additionally we need and from which customers we want to start that process because, obviously, with a limited amount of time we want to focus, as you suggested, on the ones that are most likely to be the hot ones. But, we are still awaiting information from them on that. And, I think we have to just defer a discussion on where we are on that until the next conference on the 28th.

THE COURT: So there was a -- was the prioritized list of customers due on Friday?

MS. HOUSE: Right, per your order. And we got a list, but it was just a non-prioritized alphabetical list of 61 customers with no gradation at all. According to our last conference about, you know, gee, which one -- there is specific language in your order, we called it to their attention. They have come back with a proposal to give us additional information. We'll evaluate that once we get it. I don't know -- I would like to know when I am going to get it.

THE COURT: So what is the story with the holdup on that?

MR. MCDONELL: Yeah, let me tell you the background.

So, the subject here is which customers of SAP will

be subject to discovery, especially as it relates to the causation of damages issue. And, when we were last here, I think I was the one who raised this issue and explained to the Court that there was -- for this discovery to exist at all, the starting point would be, well, did the customer have a TomorrowNow contract at all, and then, if so, did the customer also have an SAP contract? And, you had made some insightful comments about that about, well, how can you -- well, excuse me for --

THE COURT: Groveling?

1.9

(Laughter.)

MR. MCDONELL: Yes, thank you.

You had followed up on what I said, that even within that class of customers for which there is both a TomorrowNow and an SAP contract that there are going to be variations on the theme.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. MCDONELL: And I knew that, generally. And I'm absolutely convinced that there is going to be variations. And you said, well, why don't you give that them that list and annotate it so the clear ones are clear and the fuzzy ones are fuzzy. And I said that is what we will do.

So, we went back and began trying to do that. And, as fate would have it, it's not at all a simple task. In fact, as we thought about it, the things we can do and are proposing

to do are to get objective data points that should assist in this process.

So the things that made sense to us were to get the list of customers and to take all of the customers that we have been able to confirm as both a TomorrowNow and an SAP contract. So, that is the universe.

Then, in terms of trying to get some data with which to do an evaluation of that, it seemed to us the things that made sense would be contract dates -- now, they have all the TomorrowNow contracts, so that is not at issue. The product's at issue. So SAP sells a number of products, and then by giving products that the SAP customer has, they can do whatever mapping they think is appropriate back to the TomorrowNow contract.

Contract dates, if we can get them, and the plot thickens a little bit on that, but we should be able to, and then, dollar volumes of the contracts. And by getting that objective data, then either side can draw whatever conclusions they want about what it all means.

But, we concluded that we didn't think that the right thing to do would be to try to do the subjective qualitative kind of statements about, well, we think this one is a winner and that one is not, because that is what the discovery is ultimately intended to be directed to.

So that is -- I have told counsel that that is what

we are working on. Tougher than we thought. There is no --1 2 THE COURT: How many are we talking about? 3 MR. MCDONELL: Sixty-one. 4 THE COURT: When do you think you can do that? 5 MR. MCDONELL: My goal is to have it done before we 6 are back here on August 28th and to provide them with whatever 7 list we have. And obviously, we have an incentive to get this done. 8 9 THE COURT: That just seems like a long time. Maybe you can do it at least in a rolling fashion. 10 11 What are your thoughts on that? 12 MS. HOUSE: And then, in addition, we need to see the underlying contracts, which we also haven't received. 13 14 Part of the problem is this was all supposed to be 15 the filler information that would then inform our discussion 16 about what additional information we need in order to figure 17 out what really was the motivation behind going to an SAP 18 application. So, every one of these is just a stage to the next 19 20 thing. Obviously, the sooner we can get that underlying 21 information, the soon are we can say, well, gosh, we want to 2.2 start with these top ten and get this kind of e-mail that has

to do with the customer's -- that anything that customer had to

say about TomorrowNow or what, you know, because that is the

piece of the contract that we find the most interesting, how

23

24

25

did the TomorrowNow piece of the puzzle work to entice them 1 into the SAP purchase. 2 MR. MCDONELL: And, I'm not proposing to slow down, 3 in any way, the production of the SAP contracts themselves for 4 5 these 61 customers. So, to the extent that we have obtained the customer files for those 61, and, I believe, it's the 6 majority, by far, we should have them all by next week, I hope, 7 we'll produce those. So we'll get that rolling right away. 8 9 THE COURT: All right. So, produce the actual contracts by next week. Is that --10 11 MR. MCDONELL: Unless, I put my foot squarely in the 12 mouth again --Ms. Freud is closer. 13 MS. FROYD: We have been collecting them from the 14 U.S., and I think will be able to get the vast majority of the 15 North American ones done in the time period. The international 16 17 ones are sort of coming in piecemeal, and will take a bit 18 longer to collect. 19 THE COURT: And what -- how many are U.S.? Unfortunately, I don't have the list in MS. FROYD: 20 front of me. I would say at least half of them are the U.S. 21 All right. All the U.S. customers by 22 THE COURT: the end of next week. 23 And, can you also give the dollar value by the end 24 25 of next week for those customers?

1 MR. MCDONELL: Your Honor, we will try. I just 2 can't promise I can get it done. It's a large company is about 3 the simplest way to say it. THE COURT: I don't want to wait a whole other month 4 5 for this to get going. MR. MCDONELL: Your Honor, I will commit to try to 6 start pushing this information to counsel of -- you know, 7 reasonably promptly after we get it and confirm it, and so 8 forth, but I am doubtful that it will be completed much before 9 10 August 28. But, I understand the need to be working on 11 everything simultaneously here. 12 13 THE COURT: Right. MR. MCDONELL: So, we will push out what we 14 15 reasonably think --THE COURT: All right, I think that is as far as we 16 17 go on that. Search terms? 18 MS. HOUSE: The search terms has been, you know, 19 meet and confer, meet and confer. We have --20 my understanding is we have the latest proposal of what the 21 German terms are going to be, and we are running them. We have 22 been trying to help them. There is another meet and confer on 23 24 Monday. I would say my understanding is that the process has 25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Sahar McVickar, Official Court Reporter for the United States Court, Northern District of California, hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a certified shorthand reporter, and were thereafter transcribed under my direction into typewriting; that the foregoing is a full, complete and true record of said proceedings as bound by me at the time of filing. The validity of the reporter's certification of said transcript may be void upon disassembly and/or removal from the court file.

/s/ Sahar McVickar

Sahar McVickar, RPR, CSR No. 12963
Wednesday, July 30, 2008