ISSN 1526-4823 Volume 2, Issue 1 Spring 2002

# Microsoft Tying and Bundling of Software Design and Technological Tying Doctrine[1]

By Charles M. Lamb and Susan Bongiorno[2]

(This article is copyrighted and should not be reproduced without the author's permission. Please contact the author if you wish to use any portion of this article.)

Introduction
I. Microsoft's Use of Intermediate Technological Tying Tech
II. Microsoft's Tying and Bundling of Software Design
A. Tying Authority Regarding Software Design
B. Tying Authority Regarding Platform Tech Tying
C. Microsoft's Tying and Bundling of Software Design and Technological Tying
1. Microsoft's Tying and Bundling of Software Design and Technological Tying Doctrine
2. Microsoft's Tying and Bundling of Software Design and Technological Tying Doctrine
The Contention that Microsoft's Tying and Bundling of Software Design and Technological Tying Doctrine Violates Section 1 of the Sherman Act
The Contention that Microsoft's Tying and Bundling of Software Design and Technological Tying Doctrine Violates Section 2 of the Sherman Act
Conclusion

## Introduction

The Microsoft Corporation (Microsoft) has bundled applications that consumers demand such as Internet Explorer and Windows Media Player with its Windows operating system software and integrated them into its Windows operating system software. The consumer demand for a consumer-friendly tying doctrine, but the plaintiffs claim such a prohibition is inconsistent with the Sherman Act. The Sherman Act prohibits tying and bundling of software design and technological tying doctrine. The Sherman Act prohibits tying and bundling of software design and technological tying doctrine. In the Court of Appeals decision, the plaintiffs claim such a prohibition is inconsistent with the Sherman Act. The Sherman Act prohibits tying and bundling of software design and technological tying doctrine

**Abstract**

Software patents have been a controversial issue for more than two decades but developments in recent years have made it increasingly difficult for software developers to avoid patents. Software patents are fundamentally flawed in some aspects, e.g. large number of applications, it may give rise to a chilling effect on innovation, and it may be used as a weapon against competitors. Nevertheless, software patents have been granted and upheld by courts in many jurisdictions.

An example is a demand that patents be set aside because the law forces demand for development. Another example is a demand that patents be set aside because the law forces demand for development. Another example is a demand that patents be set aside because the law forces demand for development. Another

[1] *Microsoft II*, 253 F.3d at 34 (*See Conte ex rel. Jacobs v. Microsoft*, 2000 WL 1476567 (D.D.C. Sept. 29, 2000) (*Microsoft I*) (*Conte*) (*Jacobs*) (*Microsoft*) (*Microsoft*) (*Microsoft