Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffmann-LaRoche LTD et al

Exhibit A

Doc. 1248 Att. 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Civil Action No. 97-10814-WGY

AMGEN, INC.,

Plaintiff,

CONFERENCE v.

HOECHST MARION RUSSEL, INC.,

TRANSKARYOTIC THERAPIES, INC.,

Defendants.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

BEFORE: The Honorable William G. Young, District Judge

APPEARANCES:

DAY CASEBEER MADRID & BATCHELDER, LLP (By David M. Madrid, Esq.) 20300 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 400, Cupertino, California 95014 - and -

STUART L. WATT, Of Counsel, Amgen, Inc., One Amgen Center Drive, Thousand Oaks, California 91320-1789, on behalf of the Plaintiff

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP (By Robert S. Frank, Jr., Esq., Eric J. Marandett, Esq. and Mark S. Freeman, Esq.), Two International Place, Boston, Massachusetts 02110, on behalf of the Defendants

> 1 Courthouse Way Boston, Massachusetts

June 6, 2007

the record be reopened that's a question that your Honor has to decide, it has to be briefed. Alternative number one is that you will conclude, as we will urge you, that the record is complete.

THE COURT: Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

substantial disadvantage.

MR. FRANK: And you've said in that event you'll have an afternoon hearing.

I have a question rather than a contention. I suspect that it would be helpful to you if we had briefed the question before we got to the hearing, because you will be recalling evidence that's a year or two old.

THE COURT: You're absolutely right. And I don't press for July. We could do that in September. I don't care when we do that.

MR. FRANK: And all I -- all we would want is the certainty of knowing when it would be rather than, as long as -- it doesn't matter to us, either.

THE COURT: That makes, that makes good sense, in terms of my clerk lineup and staffing for the case, July or September makes no difference to me.

So, even if I keep the record closed, we could find an afternoon in September and argue the matter.

MR. FRANK: With respect -- and the second half is the possibility that you would conclude that the record would be supplemented. And I, I believe here I'm telling

it, and it's going to be a very busy summer for you people.

But I'm not there yet. They must make a motion and support it. You get fourteen days to respond to it. I will decide it on the merits, and then we'll see where we are.

MR. FRANK: Thank you very much, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Let's get the others back in here unless they want more time.

MR. MADRID: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: No, thank you all.

(Pause in proceedings.)

THE CLERK: Five minutes they need.

THE COURT: Five minutes. All right, then I'll

stand in recess. We'll recess.

THE CLERK: All rise. Court is in recess.

(Recess.)

THE CLERK: All rise. Court is in session, please be seated.

THE COURT: Are we agreed?

MS. BEN-AMI: I think, your Honor, we're in agreement on everything germane to the motion and perhaps other things if the Court will approve them.

THE COURT: That's fine. I have an eye appointment this afternoon, so if you could reduce it to writing, I would be very grateful. But that's fine.

MS. BEN-AMI: Okay.

20

you what I think you should want and that's dangerous. But I would, I would urge you not to do what you've suggested. And the reason I would urge that is because of the extreme difficulty, I suggest, of your being able to keep straight in your own mind stuff that is in the record from a year or two ago, and sometimes three or four years ago, and the stuff that you are hearing then currently in September. And I think that risk that you will, that any human being in that situation would get tangled up between the two proceedings is pretty great. And candidly, I would just as soon not impose on my client the cost of sitting here through the Roche trial. And furthermore, we're not, we can't see the Roche record. It's closed to us. So, if we get involved in the Roche proceeding, we're at a pretty

THE COURT: You're arguing and I'm going to cut you off. Explain all that to me as to why, additionally, why I shouldn't reopen the record. If I reopen the record, I've got to figure out a schedule. That's my proposed schedule because I'm, I'm just not going to let anyone go. I'm not going to let Roche go, I'm not going to let TKT go, and Amgen will have long-term leases on apartments and the like here in the Boston area. Because I'm going to be done with this case with a final judgment. But, if we need an evidentiary record, I've got to figure out a way to develop

MR. DAY: Could we put this on the record, your Honor, very quickly? I think we could.

MS. BEN-AMI: It would take two seconds.

THE COURT: Oh, that's fine. I was planning to give you until 4:00, and I don't have to be out of here until 20 after 4:00.

MR. DAY: I don't think it should take more than five minutes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Go right ahead.

MS. BEN-AMI: So --

MR. DAY: So if I could.

MS. BEN-AMI: Okay.

THE COURT: Well, whoever. Ms. Ben-Ami was up. Let's go with her and you can confirm it.

MS. BEN-AMI: Okay.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. BEN-AMI: All right. I understand that our agreement is, as follows.

By June 13th, Roche will respond to the Amgen reports that were put in on June 1st and June 4th, and whatever needs to be done there for any new arguments that have been presented.

On June 20th, Amgen will have up to three reports to respond to the Roche reports.

Are we in agreement so far?

21

23

25