### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

	)
AMGEN INC.,	
Plaintiff,	) )
v.	) ) CIVIL ACTION No.: 05-CV-12237WGY
F. HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE LTD,	)
ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS GmbH,	)
and HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE INC.	)
Defendants.	) )

# **Exhibit E in Support of Defendants' Motion to Enforce the** Court's March 27, 2007 Order and to Compel Deposition **Testimony Under Rule 30(b)(6)**

Roche is filing this document in the public record pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Protective Order. Amgen did not file a motion as to why the information is confidential trade secret material within the (4) Court day period of Roche's in camera submission, as required by paragraph 14.

Dated: April 20, 2007 Boston, Massachusetts

/s/ Keith E. Toms\_\_\_

Lee Carl Bromberg (BBO# 058480) Julia Huston (BBO# 562160) Keith E. Toms (BBO# 663369) Nicole A. Rizzo (BBO# 663853) BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP 125 Summer Street Boston, MA 02110

Tel. (617) 443-9292 ktoms@bromsun.com

03099/00501 652289.2

Exhibit E

```
1
                    UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2
                    DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3
4
5
      AMGEN INC.,
                                           )
                                           )
6
                        Plaintiff,
7
                    vs.
                                           ) Civil Action
                                           )
8
      F. HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE LTD., a Swiss ) No. 05-12237 WGY
      Company, ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS GmbH,
                                          )
      a German Company, and HOFFMANN-LA )
9
      ROCHE, INC., a New Jersey
                                           )
      Corporation
10
                                           )
11
                       Defendants.
12
13
14
               DEPOSITION OF THOMAS CHARLES BOONE
15
                     Friday, March 30, 2007
16
17
18
                          - CONFIDENTIAL -
19
20
21
22
23
     Reported by:
     Lynda L. Fenn, CSR, RPR
24
     CSR No. 12566
```

25

1	here to give your personal knowledge and that's all
2	he wants as well.
3	MR. JAGOE: I think its within the topic
4	and that could be resolved later, so we'll just take
5	the testimony now.
6	MR. GAEDE: This is talking about the
7	erythropoietin application. Okay. He has been
8	excluded from talking about erythropoietin. He's
9	talking about other two examples of proteins that
10	were produced at Amgen. All right?
11	And your topics do not even ask
12	about do not even ask about the prosecution
13	history or the application the prosecution of
14	these patents, so it's entirely outside of the
15	scope. Not even close.
16	You can explain to Judge Young how a
17	question here in 1988 ties to a specific science as
18	noticed in your topics. I'd like to hear the
19	explanation now.
20	MR. JAGOE: Can you answer the pending
21	question?
22	MR. GAEDE: If we keep going down this
23	path we will adjourn this deposition and seek a

MR. JAGOE: Are you instructing him not to

protective order.

24

1 answer? 2 MR. GAEDE: No, he can answer the 3 question. 4 MR. JAGOE: All right. Then let's just 5 have the question -- I understand your threat. 6 MR. GAEDE: No, no. I'm putting you on 7 notice. 8 MR. JAGOE: Okay. I understand. 9 MR. GAEDE: And I find it -- I find it very surprising that you are not even attempting to 10 11 stay within the confines of good faith of those 12 topics. 13 MR. JAGOE: I told you my understanding of 14 the topic was that it was related to all recombinant 15 expression of glycoproteins other then EPO prior to 1985 and I think we've established now that t-PA was 16 17 such a protein. MR. GAEDE: The face of your topics as 18 19 drafted by your firm says, "All efforts by Amgen," 20 Topic 3. Topic 4 says, "All efforts by Amgen." 21 It says nothing in your topics about 22 efforts by other parties. 23 MR. JAGOE: Can I have the answer to the 24 question?

MR. GAEDE: If you can.

25

1	THE WITNESS: I don't know what was meant
2	by the word "numerous."
3	BY MR. JAGOE:
4	Q My question is: Does Amgen have any
5	information about numerous let me start again.
6	Does Amgen have any information about
7	mammalian cells capable of effecting glycosylation
8	of expressed polypeptides that were known prior to
9	1984 other than COS, Chinese hamster ovary cells and
10	293 cells?
11	MR. GAEDE: Objection; the question as
12	phrased is argumentative. Counsel is reading from
13	Exhibit No. 20, a document from the prosecution
14	history, and therefore the question is outside the
15	scope and also calls for a legal conclusion.
16	THE WITNESS: I don't know what was the
17	knowledge of other people at Amgen in this time
18	frame regarding expression of proteins in mammalian
19	cells.
20	BY MR. JAGOE:
21	Q In your current state of preparation as a
22	30(b)(6) witness, you can only identify CHO cells,
23	COS cells and 293 cells as being used at Amgen to
24	obtain glycosylated polypeptides prior to 1985?
25	A That's not true. Also made proteins in