PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
1232
Gordon v. Microsoft

From: Aaron Reynolds
To: Brad Silverberg
Cc: David Cole; Phil Barrett
Subject: dos detection code.
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 1992 6:33

I forward this mail on under instruction from BradSi. I did not respond to the question. If he calls me on the phone as himself (I have one of those fancy phones) I won't answer. If I get cornered I will say as little as possible and direct him to BradSi.

>From cliffga Tue Feb 18 17:13:32 1992
To: aaronr
Subject: dos detection code.
Date: Tue Feb 18 17:13:55 PDT 1992

I was told that you possesed code that would determine whether or not one was truely running under a version of MS-DOS. This is important to me because I find it nasty to put a DR check in my code, and it just rubs wrong. Thanks for any help you can offer.

cliff garrett

From: Mack Mccauley
To: Brad Silverberg
Subject: RE: FW: cougar plans
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 1992 6:36

He brought up some good points and caused me to think of some others. Bens is now investigating and we should know exactly what is possible (within the constraints) by the end of the week.

> >From bradsi Tue Feb 18 16:00:11 1992
> To: mackm
> Subject: FW: cougar plans
>
> X-MSMail-MailClass: IPM.Microsoft Mail.Note
> X-MSMail-Message-ID: 9EB55078
> X-MSMail-Conversation-ID: 9EB55078
> X-MSMail-Priority: 0002
> Date: Tue Feb 18 1992 15:56:02
>
> be interesting to hear replies to ralph's note.
>
> i particularly agree with ralph's pov regarding KISS and the need to bias the design on single app performance (low overhead)
>
> ---
>
> From: Ralph Lipe
> To: Brad Silverberg
> Subject: Re: cougar plans
> Date: Saturday, February 15, 1992 6:53
>
> Which plans? The entire, overall plan, or the plan for the scheduler?
>
> As far as I can tell, both seem pretty much on a realistic track at this point in time. Everyone seems to be pulling back from the "We're gonna rewrite everything" mentality and is focusing on ideas that should be workable in the near term.
>
> I am somewhat concerned with the statement:
> "We'll use the existing 16-bit User and GDI, thunk them to 32-bit, add threads, and the 32-bit apps will be pre-emptive."
>
> Oh yeah? And excatly what type of thing can one of these pre-emptive puppies do? User thinks it knows who is the active task. If other tasks start calling it, all hell will break loose. If every task is serialized on access to User, the problem disappears. However, the only way that User ever switches tasks is through message traffic. So here's the problem:
>
> | TASK 1 | TASK 2 |
> |---|---|
> | Get a message | zzz |
> | party, party, party | zzz |
> | Call DOS — BLOCK — Switch tasks | zzz |

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
679
C.A. No. 2:96CV645B

MSC 00770478

MX3261516
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

EXH 24 DATE 2/13/02
WITNESS Silverberg
MARY W. MILLER