

From: BJPDavis@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

A settlement in this case should force Microsoft to desist in its practices which eliminate the competitive nature of our free market system. Instead, the settlement is actually a \$1 billion dollar promotion of Microsoft software products targeted at the K-12 education system.

Microsoft has been found to engage in monopolistic practices with respect to hardware vendors, discouraging them from allowing the installation of competitive products in systems preloaded with a Microsoft operating system. Microsoft has provided a mediocre product, restricted consumer choice, overcharged for unneeded features, and prevented consumers from removing the unwanted portions of the system.

I oppose the settlement because it is completely biased toward the introduction of Microsoft software products to our underprivileged K-12 schools, and because it provides for basically no other alternatives than the use of Microsoft software products. This is basically a \$400 promotion of Microsoft products.

Further analysis of the settlement shows the mismatch between complaint and settlement. Class plaintiffs claimed (among other issues) that consumers had been overcharged for Windows, yet the settlement proposal returns nothing to those consumers and merely entrenches the Microsoft monopoly further. While we support Microsoft's stated goal of helping underprivileged schools, that goal is best accomplished by giving schools unrestricted grants for use as they need, not "donations" biased toward the use of Microsoft products.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barbara J. Davis
6575 Sunburst Drive
Portage MI 49024
616-327-5894
BJPDavis@aol.com

CC: attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw