EXHIBIT 14

LIVENOTE | World Service

Worldwide Deposition Reporting & Legal Videography

United States District Court District Of Massachusetts

**Confidential Pursuant To Section 5(c) of the
Amended Protective Order**

Deposition

Certified Copy

Of

Stuart H. Orkin, M.D.

(Exhibits Have Been Bound Separately)

June 5, 2007

Amgen, Inc.

V.

F. Hoffmann-La Roche, LTD

CONFIDENTIAL

Exhibits 1-21

Volume 1, Pages 1-236

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Civil Action No. 05 Civ. 12237 WGY

AMGEN INC.,

Plaintiff

vs.

F. HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE LTD, ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS GmbH, and HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE INC.,

Defendants

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF STUART H. ORKIN, M.D.

Tuesday, June 5, 2007,9:13 a.m.

Taken at: Bromberg & Sunstein

125 Summer Street

Boston, Massachusetts

*** TRANSCRIPT DESIGNATED CONFIDENTIAL *** **SUBJECT TO A PROTECTIVE ORDER**

> FARMER ARSENAULT BROCK LLC Reporting For: LiveNote World Service 221 Main Street, Suite 1250 San Francisco, California 94105 Phone: 415-321-2300 Fax: 415-321-2301

Reported by: JANIS T. YOUNG, RDR/CRR

6/5/2007

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	Mark H. Izraelewicz, Esq. Kevin M. Flowers, Ph.D., Esq.
4	Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP 233 South Wacker Drive
5	6300 Sears Tower Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
6	312-474-6300 Fax 312-474-0448 mizraelewicz@marshallip.com
7	kflowers@marshallip.com for Plaintiff
8	TOL FLATREIT
9	Vladimir V. Drozdoff, Esq.
10	Kaye Scholer LLP 425 Park Avenue
11	New York, New York 10022-3598 212-836-7629 Fax 212-836-8689
12	vdrozdoff@kayescholer.com for Defendants
13	
14	
15	ALSO PRESENT:
16	
17	Robert Alan Hess, Ph.D., Patent Agent Bromberg & Sunstein LLP
18	
19	Jared Drewniak, Videographer
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

10:33:54 what's been marked as Orkin Exhibit 5 and tell me if 10:34:00 you recognize this document. 10:34:02 I recognize this as the expert report A. Yes. 10:34:08 I submitted in I believe the year 2000. I can check 10:34:20 the signature page and see if that date's correct. 10:34:25 Yes, January 2000. 10:34:28 Q. And if you direct your attention to Page 15 10:34:38 of the report, bearing Bates No. AM-ITC 00857981, is that your signature on that page? 10:34:39 10:34:59 That is my signature. 10:35:05 Doctor, is there anything in this report 10:35:14 that you're aware of today as being inaccurate or 10:35:19 not stating the opinions that you had at the time you signed that report? 10:35:22 10:35:24 A. Well, I'd have to read through the complete 10:35:28 report, but as far as I know, there's nothing that's 10:35:50 inaccurate in the report as of the date I signed it.

Video Deposition of Stuart H. Orkin, M.D.; it bears Bates range AM-ITC 00920915 through 00921111. 10:36:32 (Marked, Exhibit Orkin 6.) 10:36:38 Doctor, I'd like to have you take a look at 10:36:42

MR. DROZDOFF: I'd like the court

reporter to mark the next exhibit as Orkin Exhibit

6. It appears to be a document. It's entitled

that and tell me if you recognize this document.

26

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

27

10:35:51

10:35:55

10:36:16

10:36:20

6/5/2007

6/5/2007

1	A. Yes. I believe this is a transcript of the	10:36:48
2	deposition in 2000.	10:36:56
3	Q. And when you testified in this deposition,	10:36:58
4	you were under oath	10:37:03
5	A. I believe I was.	10:37:04
6	Q just like you are today?	10:37:06
7	A. I believe I was.	10:37:07
8	Q. And you were prepared to give truthful and	10:37:09
9	accurate testimony?	10:37:10
10	A. I was.	10:37:51
11	Q. And, Doctor, I'd like to have you take a	10:37:54
12	look at Page 5 of your expert report from the TKT	10:38:05
13	case, which bears Bates No. AM-ITC 00857971.	10:38:15
14	A. I have that page.	10:38:18
15	Q. And let me direct your attention to	10:38:23
16	Paragraph 10. You state, "I was the project leader	10:38:27
17	on a research project entitled 'Molecular Aspects of	10:38:33
18	Globin Gene Switching and Cloning of Erythropoietin	10:38:35
19	Sequence' which was funded under a grant to	10:38:38
20	Dr. David G. Nathan from the National Institute of	10:38:42
21	Health."	10:38:43
22	A. That's correct; I see that.	10:38:44
23	Q. And can you explain what that research	10:38:48
24	project was?	10:38:51
25	A. This research project was a part of a	
26		
27		

6/5/2007

1	actually a criminal offense, isn't it?	11:41:43
2	MR. IZRAELEWICZ: Objection. He's not a	11:41:45
3	lawyer.	11:41:45
4	A. I don't know.	11:41:47
5	Q. Well, Doctor, I'd like you you see the	11:41:49
6	little Panel 18 where it says Certification and	11:41:53
7	Acceptance?	11:41:54
8	A. Okay, yes. I can barely read it.	11:41:57
9	Q. Right, but can you read it enough to read	11:42:00
10	that	11:42:01
11	A. "The best of my knowledge"	11:42:07
12	Q. The last sentence, "A willfully false	11:42:11
13	certification is a criminal offense"?	11:42:13
14	A. I see that.	11:42:14
15	Q. Do you see that? So this program project	11:42:20
16	grant was certified by a representative of	11:42:24
17	Children's Hospital as being true and complete?	11:42:30
18	A. I presume so.	11:42:33
19	Q. And you didn't have any reason to believe	11:42:35
20	that this application was true and complete with	11:42:37
21	respect to your part of the application?	11:42:39
22	A. I think it was true and complete.	11:42:42
23	MR. IZRAELEWICZ: Objection,	11:42:43
24	mischaracterizing the document, "true and complete."	11:42:57
25	Q. Doctor, I'd like to have you turn to Orkin	
26		
27		

6/5/2007

1	Exhibit 6. It's a transcript of your deposition in	11:43:09
2	the TKT case, and I'd like to direct your attention	11:43:20
3	to Page 70 of your deposition. Can you go, please,	11:43:24
4	to Line 8?	11:43:35
5	A. I see that.	11:43:37
6	Q. And this was testimony you gave under oath,	11:43:41
7	wasn't it?	11:43:42
8	A. It was.	11:43:43
9	Q. And you were asked in this deposition,	11:43:47
10	question: "Did you agree with the majority of the	11:43:49
11	site visit committee in 1981 that there was a	11:43:52
12	reasonable chance of success in your attempts to	11:43:54
13	clone erythropoietin?"	11:43:57
14	Do you see that?	11:43:58
15	A. Yes.	11:43:58
16	Q. And you answered, "Well, I think if we	11:44:00
17	didn't think there was a reasonable chance of	11:44:02
18	success, we never would have embarked on the	11:44:04
19	experiments. Doesn't mean certainty, though." Is	11:44:09
20	that your answer?	11:44:10
21	A. That's my answer.	11:44:22
22	Q. And the only qualification you made as to a	11:44:26
23	reasonable chance of success was that it doesn't	11:44:28
24	mean certainty?	11:44:29
25	MR. IZRAELEWICZ: Objection,	
26		
27		

6/5/2007

1	mischaracterizes his testimony.	11:44:32
2	A. As I said I think I answered this	11:44:35
3	previously what a chance of success is to one	11:44:39
4	person can be different than another.	11:44:40
5	Q. Well, at your deposition here, you said it	11:44:43
6	doesn't mean certainty, right?	11:44:44
7	A. That's right. That's, 100 percent it's	11:44:48
8	either 100 percent or zero. Those are the only	11:44:50
9	certainties. Anything in between could be a	11:44:53
10	reasonable chance of success. As I said before, if	11:44:56
11	I thought that the benefit to science or to the	11:45:02
12	field was sufficient, I would consider a few percent	11:45:07
13	a reasonable chance of success for the effort	11:45:10
14	involved.	11:45:12
15	I don't know what the legal definition	11:45:13
16	is, but from a personal standpoint, anything better	11:45:17
17	than zero is reasonable if I think it's important	11:45:20
18	enough.	11:45:22
19	Q. Doctor, do you ever have complete certainty	11:45:24
20	in science?	11:45:32
21	A. Probably not, but you get pretty close.	11:46:24
22	Q. Now, Doctor, in the project that you	11:46:29
23	undertook in connection with your program project	11:46:32
24	grant, your attempt to clone EPO involved not an	11:46:44
25	attempt to clone human erythropoietin, but an	
26		
27		: