

STATE OF WISCONSIN

CIRCUIT COURT  
BRANCH 9

DANE COUNTY

---

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

)

)

Plaintiff,

)

)

v.

)

Case No. 04-CV-1709

)

ABBOTT LABORATORIES, ET AL.,

)

)

Defendants.

)

---

**BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.'S  
RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF STATE OF WISCONSIN'S FIRST  
SET OF CONSOLIDATED DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO ALL DEFENDANTS**

---

Defendant Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. ("BIPI") hereby responds and objects to Plaintiff's First Set of Consolidated Discovery Requests to All Defendants ("Discovery Requests").

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

As to all matters referred to in these responses and objections to the Discovery Requests, BIPI's investigation and discovery continues. The specific responses set forth below, and any production made consistent with the accompanying Discovery Requests, are based upon, and necessarily limited by, information now available to BIPI. BIPI reserves the right to modify or supplement these responses and objections, to raise any additional objections deemed necessary and appropriate in light of the results of any further review, and to present in any proceeding and at trial any further information and documents obtained during discovery and preparation for trial.

## **SPECIFIC RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO DISCOVERY REQUESTS**

### **CONSOLIDATED DISCOVERY REQUEST NO. 1**

**REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1:** At no time has the State of Wisconsin, its Department of Health and Family Services, or any employee thereof, explicitly approved your practice of reporting to First DataBank average wholesale prices (“AWPs”) for your drugs that were not the true average prices charged by wholesalers to their customers for your drugs.

#### **RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Request for Admission No. 1 on the grounds that it is overly broad, not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and the following phrases are vague and ambiguous: “explicitly approved,” “true average prices charged,” and “their customers.” BIPI further objects to this Request on the grounds that it falsely implies that “the State of Wisconsin, its Department of Health and Family Services, or any employee thereof” was supposed to “approve” reporting with respect to AWP. BIPI further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, and misleading to the extent it is based on the false premise that AWPs were intended to equal the “average prices charged by wholesalers to their customers.” BIPI further objects to this Request because it incorrectly assumes that BIPI: (1) is or could be aware of every communication in which the State of Wisconsin, its Department of Health and Family Services, or any employee thereof, may have “explicitly approved” BIPI’s reporting; and (2) has or had knowledge of what wholesalers charged “their customers” for the BIPI drugs at issue in this case. BIPI further objects to this Request to the extent that it is not limited to a particular time frame and/or seeks information relating to BIPI drugs other than those identified in the Stipulation Regarding the Identity of the Proper Defendant and Target Drugs Between the State of Wisconsin and Defendant Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. filed on April 22, 2008 (“BIPI Drug List”).

For the foregoing reasons, and subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI states that it can neither admit nor deny Request for Admission No. 1, as phrased. Subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI states that it has been widely known for decades, including by state Medicaid agencies, such as that in the State of Wisconsin, that published AWP's are not mathematical averages of prices, but rather reimbursement benchmarks that exceed pharmacy acquisition costs. BIPI admits only that, at this time, it is not aware of any instance in which the State of Wisconsin, its Department of Health and Family Services, or any employee thereof, "explicitly approved" BIPI's reporting with respect to AWP. BIPI states that it stopped reporting AWP's to First DataBank in 2002. BIPI denies any remaining facts contained in Request for Admission No. 1.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 1:** If your response to Request for Admission No. 1 is anything other than an unqualified admission, state all bases for your response, including the following:

- (a) identify whether the approval was made verbally or in writing;
- (b) identify the person(s) who approved the practice;
- (c) identify the date(s) on which the approval was made;
- (d) state whether the approval was communicated to you;
- (e) if the approval was communicated to you, state whether the communication was made verbally or in writing;
- (f) if the approval was communicated to you, identify the date of such communication(s);
- (g) if the approval was communicated to you, identify the person(s) who made the communication(s);
- (h) if the approval was communicated to you, identify the person(s) who received the communication(s);
- (i) identify all documents relating to the approval of the practice;
- (j) identify all documents relating to the communication of the approval to you.

**RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Interrogatory No. 1 on the grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome.

Subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and response to Request for Admission No. 1. BIPI states that it stopped reporting AWP's to First DataBank in 2002. BIPI further states that Wisconsin Medicaid had access to extensive information concerning pharmacy acquisition costs, including from sources such as rebate information, reports by federal agencies and third parties, manufacturers, wholesalers, pharmacies, other state entities that purchased pharmaceuticals, other state programs that reimbursed for pharmaceuticals, and many other sources. This information indicated that AWP's are not mathematical averages of prices.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS NO. 1:** Produce all documents identified in your Response to Interrogatory No. 1.

**RESPONSE:**

BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and response to Interrogatory No. 1. BIPI states that this Request seeks documents or information equally available to Plaintiff or already in Plaintiff's custody or control.

**CONSOLIDATED DISCOVERY REQUEST NO. 2**

**REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2:** At no time has the State of Wisconsin, its Department of Health and Family Services, or any employee thereof, explicitly approved your practice of reporting to First DataBank suggested wholesale prices ("SWPs") for your drugs that were not the true average prices charged by wholesalers to their customers for your drugs.

**RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Request for Admission No. 2 on the grounds that it is overly broad, not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and the following phrases are vague and ambiguous: “explicitly approved,” “true average prices charged,” and “their customers.” BIPI further objects to this Request because it incorrectly assumes that BIPI: (1) is or could be aware of every communication in which the State of Wisconsin, its Department of Health and Family Services, or any employee thereof, may have “explicitly approved” BIPI’s reporting; (2) has or had knowledge of what wholesalers charged “their customers” for the BIPI drugs at issue in this case; and (3) provided a reference price designated “SWP” to First DataBank. BIPI further objects to this Request to the extent that it is not limited to a particular time frame and/or seeks information relating to BIPI drugs other than those identified in the BIPI Drug List. BIPI also objects to this Request on the ground that Plaintiff has no good faith basis in fact for requesting BIPI to admit the facts in this Request and this Request is therefore improper.

Subject to and without waiving its objections, DENIED. BIPI states that it did not provide a reference price designated “SWP” to First DataBank.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 2:** If your response to Request for Admission No. 2 is anything other than an unqualified admission, state all bases for your response, including the following:

- (a) identify whether the approval was made verbally or in writing;
- (b) identify the person(s) who approved the practice;
- (c) identify the date(s) on which the approval was made;
- (d) state whether the approval was communicated to you;
- (e) if the approval was communicated to you, state whether the communication was made verbally or in writing;

- (f) if the approval was communicated to you, identify the date of such communication(s);
- (g) if the approval was communicated to you, identify the person(s) who made the communication(s);
- (h) if the approval was communicated to you, identify the person(s) who received the communication(s);
- (i) identify all documents relating to the approval of the practice;
- (j) identify all documents relating to the communication of the approval to you.

**RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Interrogatory No. 2 on the grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome.

Subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and response to Request for Admission No. 2. BIPI denied Request for Admission No. 2 because BIPI did not provide a reference price designated “SWP” to First DataBank.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS NO. 2:** Produce all documents identified in your Response to Interrogatory No. 2.

**RESPONSE:**

BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and response to Interrogatory No. 2.

**CONSOLIDATED DISCOVERY REQUEST NO. 3**

**REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3:** At no time has the State of Wisconsin, its Department of Health & Family Services, or any employee thereof, explicitly approved your practice of reporting to First DataBank wholesale acquisition costs (“WACs”) for your drugs that were not the true average prices, net of discounts, rebates, chargebacks, and incentives, paid by wholesalers to you for your drugs.

**RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Request for Admission No. 3 on the grounds that it is overly broad, not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and the following phrases are vague and ambiguous: “explicitly approved,” “true average prices,” and “net of discounts, rebates, chargebacks, and incentives.” BIPI further objects to this Request on the grounds that it falsely implies that “the State of Wisconsin, its Department of Health and Family Services, or any employee thereof” was supposed to “approve” reporting with respect to WAC. BIPI further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, confusing, and misleading to the extent it compares WACs with sales prices to wholesalers “net of discounts, rebates, chargebacks, and incentives.” BIPI further objects to this Request because it incorrectly assumes that BIPI is or could be aware of every communication in which the State of Wisconsin, its Department of Health and Family Services, or any employee thereof, may have “explicitly approved” BIPI’s reporting. BIPI further objects to this Request to the extent that it is not limited to a particular time frame and/or seeks information relating to BIPI drugs other than those identified in the BIPI Drug List.

For the foregoing reasons, and subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI states that it can neither admit nor deny Request for Admission No. 3, as phrased. Subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI states that it has been widely known, including by the state Medicaid agencies, such as that in the State of Wisconsin, that WAC is a list price for pharmaceutical products that does not include “discounts, rebates, chargebacks, and incentives.” BIPI admits only that, at this time, it is not aware of any instance in which the State of Wisconsin, its Department of Health and Family Services, or any employee thereof, “explicitly

approved” BIPI’s reporting with respect to WAC. BIPI denies any remaining facts contained in Request for Admission No. 3.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 3:** If your response to Request for Admission No. 3 is anything other than an unqualified admission, state all bases for your response, including the following:

- (a) identify whether the approval was made verbally or in writing;
- (b) identify the person(s) who approved the practice;
- (c) identify the date(s) on which the approval was made;
- (d) state whether the approval was communicated to you;
- (e) if the approval was communicated to you, state whether the communication was made verbally or in writing;
- (f) if the approval was communicated to you, identify the date of such communication(s);
- (g) if the approval was communicated to you, identify the person(s) who made the communication(s);
- (h) if the approval was communicated to you, identify the person(s) who received the communication(s);
- (i) identify all documents relating to the approval of the practice;
- (j) identify all documents relating to the communication of the approval to you.

**RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Interrogatory No. 3 on the grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome.

Subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and response to Request for Admission No. 3. BIPI states that this Request seeks documents or information equally available to Plaintiff or already in Plaintiff’s custody or control.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS NO. 3:** Produce all documents identified in your Response to Interrogatory No. 3.

**RESPONSE:**

BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and responses to Interrogatory No. 3.

**CONSOLIDATED DISCOVERY REQUEST NO. 4**

**REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4:** The average wholesale prices (“AWPs”) that you reported to First DataBank for your drugs were not the true average prices charged by wholesalers to their customers for your drugs. Rather, the AWPs that you reported to First DataBank for your drugs were more than the true average prices charged by wholesalers to their customers for your drugs.

**RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Request for Admission No. 4 on the grounds that it is overly broad, not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and the following phrases are vague and ambiguous: “true average prices charged” and “their customers.” BIPI further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, and misleading to the extent it is based on the false premise that AWPs were intended to equal the “average prices charged by wholesalers to their customers.” BIPI further objects to this Request because it incorrectly assumes that BIPI has or had knowledge of what wholesalers charged “their customers” for the BIPI drugs at issue in this case. BIPI further objects to this Request to the extent that it is not limited to a particular time frame and/or seeks information relating to BIPI drugs other than those identified in the BIPI Drug List.

For the foregoing reasons, and subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI states that it can neither admit nor deny Request for Admission No. 4, as phrased. Subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI states that it stopped reporting AWP in 2002. BIPI further states that it generally does not have access to, and is not aware of, the prices paid to wholesalers

by “their customers.” Upon information and belief, BIPI admits that AWP’s were not mathematical averages of prices paid to wholesalers by “their customers” for drugs. BIPI further admits that, at this time, it is not aware of a particular instance in which a wholesaler charged more for a BIPI drug than the AWP BIPI provided for that drug. BIPI denies any remaining facts contained in Request for Admission No. 4.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 4:** If your response to Request for Admission No. 4 is anything other than an unqualified admission, state all bases for your response and identify all documents that support or relate to your response.

**RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Interrogatory No. 4 on the grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome, particularly to the extent it requests that BIPI identify “all documents” that support its response.

Subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and response to Request for Admission No. 4. BIPI states that it stopped reporting AWP’s to First DataBank in 2002. BIPI also refers Plaintiff to the wholesaler transactional data produced by third parties, including wholesalers.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS NO. 4:** Produce all documents identified in your Response to Interrogatory No. 4.

**RESPONSE:**

BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and response to Interrogatory No. 4.

**CONSOLIDATED DISCOVERY REQUEST NO. 5**

**REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5:** The suggested wholesale prices (“SWPs”) that you reported to First DataBank for your drugs were not the true average prices charged by wholesalers to their customers for your drugs. Rather, the SWPs that you reported to First DataBank for your drugs were more than the true average prices charged by wholesalers to their customers for your drugs.

**RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Request for Admission No. 5 on the grounds that it is overly broad, not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and the following phrases are vague and ambiguous: “true average prices charged” and “their customers.” BIPI further objects to this Request because it incorrectly assumes that BIPI: (1) has or had knowledge of what wholesalers charged “their customers” for the BIPI drugs at issue in this case; and (2) provided a reference price designated “SWP” to First DataBank. BIPI further objects to this Request to the extent that it is not limited to a particular time frame and/or seeks information relating to BIPI drugs other than those identified in the BIPI Drug List.

Subject to and without waiving its objections, DENIED. BIPI states that it did not provide a reference price designated “SWP” to First DataBank.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 5:** If your response to Request for Admission No. 5 is anything other than an unqualified admission, state all bases for your response and identify all documents that support or relate to your response.

**RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Interrogatory No. 5 on the grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome, particularly to the extent it requests that BIPI identify “all documents” that support its response.

Subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and response to Request for Admission No. 5. BIPI denied Request for Admission No. 5 because BIPI did not provide a reference price designated “SWP” to First DataBank.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS NO. 5:** Produce all documents identified in your Response to Interrogatory No. 5.

**RESPONSE:**

BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and response to Interrogatory No. 5.

**CONSOLIDATED DISCOVERY REQUEST NO. 6**

**REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6:** The wholesale acquisition costs (“WACs”) that you reported to First DataBank for your drugs were not the true average prices, net of discounts, rebates, chargebacks, and incentives, paid by wholesalers to you for your drugs. Rather, the WACs that you reported to First DataBank for your drugs were more than the true average prices, net of discounts, rebates, chargebacks, and incentives, paid by wholesalers to you for your drugs.

**RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Request for Admission No. 6 on the grounds that it is overly broad, not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and the following phrases are vague and ambiguous: “true average prices,” and “net of discounts, rebates, chargebacks, and incentives.” BIPI further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, confusing, and misleading to the extent it compares WACs with sales prices to wholesalers “net of discounts, rebates, chargebacks, and incentives.” BIPI further objects to this Request to the extent that it is not limited to a particular time frame and/or seeks information relating to BIPI drugs other than those identified in the BIPI Drug List.

For the foregoing reasons, and subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI states that it can neither admit nor deny Request for Admission No. 6, as phrased. Subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI states that it has been widely known, including by the state Medicaid agencies, such as that in the State of Wisconsin, that WAC is a list price for pharmaceutical products that does not include “discounts, rebates, chargebacks, and incentives.” BIPI admits only that, at this time, it is not aware of a particular instance in which the prices paid by wholesalers to BIPI, “net of discounts, rebates, chargebacks, and incentives,” were higher than the WACs BIPI reported for its drugs at issue. BIPI denies any remaining facts contained in Request for Admission No. 6.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 6:** If your response to Request for Admission No. 6 is anything other than an unqualified admission, state all bases for your response and identify all documents that support or relate to your response.

**RESPONSE:**

In addition to its General Objections set forth below, BIPI objects to Interrogatory No. 6 on the grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome, particularly to the extent it requests that BIPI identify “all documents” that support its response.

Subject to and without waiving its objections, BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and response to Request for Admission No. 6. BIPI states that it will make available for inspection and/or copying relevant transactional data sufficient to show the price paid to BIPI by wholesalers for the BIPI drugs at issue in this case. BIPI also refers Plaintiff to the wholesaler transactional data produced by third parties, including wholesalers, and documents that are equally available to Plaintiff or already in Plaintiff’s custody or control.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS NO. 6:** Produce all documents identified in your Response to Interrogatory No. 6.

**RESPONSE:**

BIPI incorporates by reference its objections and response to Interrogatory No. 6.

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

BIPI expressly incorporates all of the General Objections set forth below into each response to the Discovery Requests. The inclusion of any specific objection to a Discovery Request is neither intended as, nor shall in any way be deemed, a waiver of any General Objection or any other specific objection made herein or that may be asserted at a later date. In addition, the failure to include at this time any general or specific objection to a Discovery Request is neither intended as, nor shall in any way be deemed, a waiver of BIPI's rights to assert that or any other objection at a later date. Any information provided in response to these Discovery Requests shall be made subject to and without waiver of these General Objections. Furthermore, no objection made herein, or lack thereof, is an admission by BIPI of the existence or non-existence of any information.

1. BIPI objects to each Definition, Instruction, and Discovery Request to the extent it purports to impose on BIPI duties and/or obligations broader than or inconsistent with those imposed by the Wisconsin Rules of Civil Procedure or the local rules or orders of this court.

2. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request to the extent it calls for information or documents not relevant to the issues in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request as vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, not relevant, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence to the extent it is not limited to a particular time frame.

4. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, not relevant, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence to the extent it seeks information pertaining to BIPI drugs other than those identified in the Stipulation Regarding the Identity of the Proper Defendant and Target Drugs Between the State of Wisconsin and Defendant Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. filed on April 22, 2008.

5. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request to the extent it purports to require BIPI to compile, analyze, compute, and/or summarize voluminous data or information for Plaintiff.

6. By responding to Plaintiff's Discovery Requests, BIPI does not waive any objections to the relevancy, materiality, or admissibility of the documents or information sought. BIPI reserves the right to object on any ground to the use of any documents or testimony provided in response to the Discovery Requests at any hearings or at trial.

7. Reference in a response to another response is intended to incorporate both the substantive answer and objections in such other response.

8. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request to the extent it purports to be directed not only to BIPI, but also to its corporate parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, or other entities other than BIPI on the grounds that such an expansive scope is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

9. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request to the extent it seeks information or documents that are exempt from discovery pursuant to the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, critical self-analysis privilege, the consulting expert privilege, third-party

confidentiality agreements or protective orders, or any other applicable privilege, rule, or doctrine. In the event BIPI supplies information or produces any document that is privileged, its production is inadvertent and does not constitute waiver of any privilege.

10. BIPI objects to each document request and interrogatory to the extent it seeks information or documents outside the knowledge of BIPI, its agents or employees, or information or documents not within the possession, custody, or control of BIPI, its agents or employees. BIPI further objects to each document request and interrogatory to the extent it seeks information or documents already in the possession, custody, or control of the Plaintiff.

11. BIPI objects to any implications and to any explicit or implicit characterizations of the facts, events, circumstances, or issues contained in each Discovery Request. BIPI's response that it has or will produce information or documents in connection with a particular Discovery Request, or that it has no responsive information or documents, does not indicate any implication or any explicit or implicit characterization of facts, events, circumstances or issues in a Discovery Request is accurate, relevant to this litigation, or that BIPI agrees with such implication or characterization.

12. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request to the extent that it is argumentative or seeks admissions as to legal conclusions

13. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request to the extent it is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative or calls for information or documents that are obtainable from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive.

14. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it calls for the identification of "each," "any," or "all" documents or items of information when relevant information can be obtained from fewer than "each," "any," or "all"

documents or items of information. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request to the extent it seeks information other than that which can be located upon a search of files or other sources where such information reasonably can be expected to be found.

15. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request to the extent it seeks information or documents irrelevant to Plaintiff's claims, which arise in Wisconsin. BIPI objects to each Discovery Request that is irrelevant to BIPI's dealings in Wisconsin on the grounds that such request is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and does not seek the discovery of information that is relevant to the subject matter of the pending action or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

16. Any documents produced or information provided in response to Plaintiff's Discovery Requests is for use in this litigation and for no other purpose.

17. Any documents produced or information provided in response to Plaintiff's Discovery Requests are subject to the terms of the Protective Order entered in this litigation.

18. BIPI adopts and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, its General Objections to Plaintiff's prior document requests and interrogatories.

19. BIPI objects to Plaintiff's definitions of the terms "you" and "your" as set forth in Definition No. 4 as unreasonably overbroad and as purporting to impose obligations beyond those in the Wisconsin discovery rules.

20. BIPI objects to the definition of "incentive" as set forth in Definition No. 3 on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, ambiguous, and vague. BIPI further objects to this definition to the extent it is not limited to a particular time frame.

21. BIPI hereby incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein any objection or reservation of rights made by any co-defendant in this action to the extent such objection or reservation of rights is not inconsistent with BIPI's position in this litigation.

Dated: June 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ceylan Ayasli Eatherton

Helen E. Witt, P.C.  
Brian P. Kavanaugh  
Elizabeth S. Hess  
Ceylan Ayasli Eatherton  
Kirkland & Ellis LLP  
200 East Randolph Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Tel: (312) 861-2000  
Fax: (312) 861-2200

Mr. Patrick J. Knight  
Gimbel Reilly Guerin & Brown  
Two Plaza East, Suite 1170  
330 East Kilbourn Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI 53202  
Tel: (614) 464-6400  
Fax: (614) 464-6350

*Attorneys for Defendant Boehringer Ingelheim  
Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Ceylan Ayasli Eatherton, hereby certify that on this 16th day of June, 2008, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on all counsel of record by Lexis Nexis File & Serve®.

Dated: June 16, 2008

/s/ Ceylan Ayasli Eatherton  
Ceylan Ayasli Eatherton

VERIFICATION

STATE OF CONNECTICUT )

)SS.

COUNTY OF FAIRFIELD )

Christine G. Marsh, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and states that she is authorized by Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. to verify the foregoing Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.'s Responses and Objections to Plaintiff State of Wisconsin's First Set of Consolidated Discovery Requests to all Defendants and hereby verifies the same; that some of the facts and matters set forth therein are not within her personal knowledge; that the facts and matters set forth therein have been assembled by authorized employees and counsel of Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; and that she is informed that the facts and matters set forth therein are true to the best of Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.'s present knowledge and recollection.

Christine G. Marsh  
Christine G. Marsh

Subscribed and sworn to before me

this 13 day of June, 2008.

Cheryl Bauer  
Type / Print Name

Cheryl Bauer  
Notary Public

My Commission expires: 8/31/12

