CD CHUCK DAVIS, P.C.
[illegible]

December 17, 2001

Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney, Suite 1200
Antitrust Division, Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530

Re: Microsoft vs. Public

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my frustrations which again, today, have been piqued by the United States Government.

I would like to suggest three parts of what I think should be included in any effective remedy:

1) Bajon the U. S. Government and state governmental agencies from requiring us to use Microsoft products to conduct business in the United States;

2) Prohibit manufacturers from preloading any operating system on their products;

3) Include ALL offenders in the remedy.

As for part one: We are required by the Congress to deposit our taxes with the IRS electronically. The only viable provision the IRS has made to accomplish this feat requires us to use Windows. Additionally, today I received notice from the U. S. Postal Service that they will no longer publish the national zip code directory in hardcopy but we can order an electronic version – of course the electronic version (of which all businesses will require at least one copy) only works on Windows. This amounts to a direct U. S. Government subsidy of Microsoft and requires all businesses to "invest" in Microsoft crapware – supporting their monopolistic empire. The court should put a stop to this nonsense by requiring U. S. and state governmental agencies to release all software in form that is free of dependence upon the presence of the Windows API – software that can run on a variety of computing platforms. If the Government wants to use Microsoft products that is up to the people the Government hires to make those decisions – but government employees should not be allowed to require those of us in business to use Microsoft products if we citizens choose to use other computing environments. No use of the Windows API should be allowed in governmental software releases. Please require the government to release all future applications for multiple

[illegible] of two years to eliminate calls to the Windows API.

Part two: If manufacturers were required to ship their product "[illegible]" a whole new economic boom would ensue. [illegible] choice of operating system and software applications. [illegible] in the IBM [illegible] settlement of past decades. This would mean all software [illegible] developers would have an equal opportunity to gain market [illegible]. Furthermore, I can think of no other single action which would [illegible] of both hardware and software [illegible]. If [illegible] would choose to install [illegible] other providers. This would stimulate competition in the [illegible] I have heard suggested. Microsoft would have to compete on an even playing [illegible] all other providers.

Finally, the manufacturers were the other side of the [illegible] IBM, Compaq, Gateway, Dell and Micron (and all the others) all know the [illegible] to sign anyway. They were complicit in the illegal activities of Microsoft and should [illegible] in the pain. They should be at least required to refund, to any customer who [illegible] of the Windows licenses they forced unwilling customers to purchase in order to [illegible] products. This action would put businesses [illegible] if they contribute to the illegal actions of other businesses (a legal position [illegible] and promoted by Congress at every session).

Please include in the [illegible] to be conducted in the United States with both federal and state government [illegible] Microsoft-free environment. The government should not be allowed to [illegible] Microsoft products in order to conduct business in the United States. Currently the U.S. Government is anticompetitive — one segment uses Microsoft for monopolist tactics while the rest of the government requires us to purchase Microsoft products. Only the Government can [illegible] be that disoriented!

Thank you for any relief you choose to provide U.S. [illegible] businesses.

Very truly yours,

Chuck Davis, CPA