

From bradsi Mon Jul 29 11:43:14 1991
To: janc1
Cc: arnej pattys
Subject: Re: Pls review these DRI issues as well
Date: Mon, 29 Jul 91 11:40:25 PDT

We are not going to change our products to work with them and we're not going to help DRI determine what they need to do change their products to support ours.

We can help them at an enduser level but not an internal level. Their os is not supported by us, we have no obligation to help them. If that's not acceptable, maybe we should refund their money and cancel their contract.

>From steveb Sun Jul 28 21:35:21 1991
To: bradsi karlst philba ralphi
Subject: Digital Research
Date: Sun Jul 28 21:35:18 1991

brad pls make sure we are not supporting DRI anywhere in the company with this stuff thx

>From janc1 Mon Jul 29 10:52:04 1991
To: bradsi
Subject: Pls review these DRI issues as well
Cc: janc1
Date: Mon Jul 29 10:51:35 1991

>From dang Mon Jul 29 10:48:47 1991
To: arnej janc1
Cc: brucec jornan pattys theresa
Subject: Digital Research
Date: Mon Jul 29 10:48:09 PDT 1991

One other comment:

The answer to Digital Research's question is essentially the same as one that we have already given to QuarterDeck (makers of QEMM). This is not an issue of changing Windows to work on DR-DOS. It is a general tech question that we can expect from vendors that market DOS extenders.

I agree that we should not support DR-DOS at an end user level, and the burden of support clearly falls on DR with developmental issues. (ie: we should not be expected to change our product to support them) But in this case, withholding information made available on a regular basis to other ISVs, as Arne points out, can and has harmed MS more than the targeted competitor.

Dan

>From arnej Mon Jul 29 08:52:10 1991

Valid comments. We can't expect our engineers to know how to handle "black-list" issues unless we clearly communicate how to handle. From an FTC standpoint situations like this could be very dangerous, and should probably be handled by higher management. In addition what happens if DRI actually buys a Support Advantage contract? Does the sales team know not to sell it to them. If they sell DRI a contract, I cannot see how we can refuse support.

Arne

MS-PCA 1178527
CONFIDENTIAL

X 584923
CONFIDENTIAL

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
406
A. No. Z:96CV645H

EXH 40 DATE 5/17/02
WITNESS Barrett
MARY W. MILLER

From arnej Mon Jul 29 08:53:02 1991
To: dang jancl
Cc: brucer lornam pattys theresa
Subject: RE: FW: Re: Digital Research
Date: Mon Jul 29 08:51:06 1991

Valid comments. We can't expect our engineers to know how to handle "black-list" issues unless we clearly communicate how to handle. From an FTC standpoint situations like this could be very dangerous, and should probably be handled by higher management. In addition what happens if DRI actually buys a Support Advantage contract? Does the sales team know not to sell it to them. If they sell DRI a contract, I cannot see how we can refuse support.

Arne
>From dang Fri Jul 26 15:52:51 1991
To: jancl
Cc: arnej brucer lornam pattys theresa
Subject: RE: FW: Re: Digital Research

Date: Fri Jul 26 16:00:53 PDT 1991

This is interesting, because DR does not have an active Online account. This particular question arrived via fax, and has been handled (up to this point) as we do any other non-paid support customer.

Playing hardball or black-listing our competition is one thing, but we need someone (other than SEDs) to give them the bad news.

This particular problem is a supplemental to a question we fielded in January when they DID have a valid Online account. Above all else this is essentially a bug report and should be treated as one. Whether we act on it is an entirely different matter.

Thanks,
Dan

>From jancl Fri Jul 26 13:16:06 1991
To: dang
Cc: arnej brucer joachink lornam pattys theresa
Subject: FW: Re: Digital Research

Date: Fri Jul 26 13:15:26 1991

Correct, we should NOT help DRI

Jan
>From dang Fri Jul 26 12:09:26 1991
To: jancl
Cc: arnej brucer lornam theresa
Subject: FW: Re: Digital Research
Date: Fri Jul 26 12:02:47 PDT 1991

>From bradsi Fri Jul 26 11:58:46 1991
To: dang marthawh neilsa stevetbo
Subject: Re: Digital Research

Date: Fri, 26 Jul 91 11:48:59 PDT

There should be NO HELP for DRI. They are totally on their own.

Do we know if DR has Win 3.1? They are NOT an official beta tester.

>From ralphl Fri Jul 26 10:26:22 1991
To: bradsi karlst philba steveb
Subject: Digital Research
Date: Fri Jul 26 10:25:45 1991

What is our position wrt helping DR with problems?

>From dang Fri Jul 26 08:48:26 1991
To: greglo ralphl
Cc:
Subject: Re: Loadhi.VxD - Digital Research
Date: Fri Jul 26 08:46:47 PDT 1991

X 584924
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1178528
CONFIDENTIAL

Greg or Ralph.

Didn't I hear a comment one day in either of your offices re this. What should we tell DR?

Thanks,
Dan

>From stevetho Thu Jul 25 11:20:41 1991
To: danq neilsa
Cc: marthawh
Subject: Re: Loadhi.VxD - Digital Research

Date: Thu Jul 25 11:17:03 PDT 1991

These guys need to know what they need to do to get their memory manager to work in 3.1.

Dan- Do you know where we can get this info?

Thanks,
Steve

>From neilsa Mon Jul 22 12:56:59 1991
To: danq stevetho
Cc: marthawh
Subject: Re: Loadhi.VxD - Digital Research

Date: Mon, 22 Jul 91 12:55:56 SPD

There is no loadhi VxD available for Win31 because that functionality has been built directly into VM. The old VxD should detect this and not load on a 3.1 system, which is how it should be. So, it's hard to say what problem they are having ..

I do know that there were problems with OEMM in this area, but I'm not privy to that information...

>From stevetho Mon Jul 22 11:25:51 1991
To: danq
Cc: marthawh neilsa
Subject: Loadhi.VxD - Digital Research
Date: Mon Jul 22 11:25:09 PDT 1991

Hey dude,

A few months ago Neil helped DR with a Loadhi problem with Windows. Well, they got everything working for 3.0 but now they say they break in 3.1. Can you find out if there's a new Loadhi we can ship?

Thanks,
Steve

X 584925
CONFIDENTIAL

MS-PCA 1178529
CONFIDENTIAL