Document 352-2 Filed 04/03/2007 Page 1 of 4

## **EXHIBIT A**

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMGEN INC.,	)
Plaintiff,	) ) )
v.	)
F. HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE LTD, a Swiss Company, ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS GMBH, a German Company, and HOFFMANN LA ROCHE INC., a New Jersey Corporation,	) ) ) ) )
Defendants.	, )

# AMGEN INC.'S [PROPOSED] REPLY TO DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO AMGEN'S MOTION TO DEEM DOCUMENTS AND MEMORANDUM CONFIDENTIAL THAT DEFENDANTS' FILED WITH THEIR MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS IMPROPERLY WITHHELD ON GROUNDS OF PRIVILEGE

Roche misses the point of Amgen's motion completely. Amgen's motion addresses a situation neither contemplated nor addressed by Court's November 30, 2006 Order (Docket No. 159) or the Amended Protective Order (Docket No. 274) - the situation of making public another party's attorney-client privileged and/or work-product protected information prior to the Court resolving the dispute. Both these orders addressed "trade secrets" but did not address one of the oldest privileges for confidential information – attorney-client privilege. Roche has asserted that Amgen waived its attorney-client privilege and work-product privilege in this case. Roche has submitted documents containing what it has alleged contains Amgen's privileged information. Amgen does not agree with Roche's assertions that the documents are privileged however if Roche is correct, the information should enter the public domain only after the Court has resolved Roche's motion.\(^1\) Nor are sanctions warranted because Amgen's motion falls outside of

\_\_\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Roche implies that Amgen has not briefed the Court on why the Court should grant Amgen's motion to deem certain documents Roche filed confidential. That is not true. Amgen's papers filed yesterday contained detailed reasons why the Court should grant its motion. The Court has been briefed of why the documents should be deemed confidential. Roche has been put on notice of the motions and Amgen's bases for the motion.

the Court's November 30, 2006 Order and the Amended Protective Order. Amgen is not harassing Roche (as Roche claims) but is attempting to prevent the premature disclosure of privileged information (if Roche's assertions are correct) into the public domain until the Court has decided the motion.

Amgen respectfully requests the court to order Appendices A, B (Exhibits 1, 3, 6, 7, and 8), C and the Memo as confidential under the protective order and filed under seal until the Court resolves this motion. The Court should deny Roche's request for sanctions.

April 3, 2007

#### Of Counsel:

Stuart L. Watt Wendy A. Whiteford Monique L. Cordray Darrell G. Dotson Kimberlin L. Morley Erica S. Olson AMGEN INC. One Amgen Center Drive Thousand Oaks, CA 91320-1789 (805) 447-5000

Respectfully Submitted, AMGEN INC.,

/s/ Michael R. Gottfried

D. Dennis Allegretti (BBO# 545511) Michael R. Gottfried (BBO# 542156) Patricia R. Rich (BBO# 640578) DUANE MORRIS LLP 470 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 500

Boston, MA 02210

Telephone: (857) 488-4200 Facsimile: (857) 488-4201

Lloyd R. Day, Jr. (pro hac vice) DAY CASEBEER MADRID & BATCHELDER LLP 20300 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 400

Cupertino, CA 95014 Telephone: (408) 873-0110 Facsimile: (408) 873-0220

William G. Gaede III (pro hac vice) McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY 3150 Porter Drive Palo Alto, CA 94304

Telephone: (650) 813-5000 Facsimile: (650) 813-5100

Kevin M. Flowers (*pro hac vice*) MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 233 South Wacker Drive 6300 Sears Tower Chicago, IL 60606 Telephone: (312) 474-6300

Facsimile: (312) 474-0448

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that this document filed through the Electronic Case Filing (ECF) system will be sent electronically to the registered participants as identified on the Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) and paper copies will be sent to those indicated as non registered participants on the above date.

/s/ Michael R. Gottfried
Michael R. Gottfried

MPK 124439-1.041925.0023