

EXHIBIT A

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

TIM and PENNY PATERSON,)
 husband and wife and the)
 marital community thereof,)
)
 Plaintiffs,)
)
 vs.) No. 2:05-CV-01719-TSZ
)
 LITTLE, BROWN AND COMPANY, a)
 Massachusetts state)
 corporation, TIME WARNER)
 BOOK GROUP, a Delaware state)
 corporation, HAROLD EVANS)
 ASSOCIATES LLC, a New York)
 state limited liability)
 company, HAROLD EVANS and)
 DAVID LEFER,)
)
 Defendants.)

DEPOSITION UPON ORAL EXAMINATION OF
TIM PATERSON

9:41 A.M.

JANUARY 18, 2007

8420 DAYTON AVENUE NORTH

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

REPORTED BY: CHERYL J. HAMMER, CCR License No. 2512

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 2

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S):

D. MICHAEL TOMKINS
Tomkins Nakkour & Associates
8420 Dayton Avenue North
Seattle, Washington 98103

FOR THE DEFENDANT(S):

BRUCE E.H. JOHNSON
Davis Wright Tremaine, LLP
1501 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2600
Seattle, Washington 98101

ALSO PRESENT: KAUSTUV DAS; DIETRICH BIEMILLER

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 13

1 and Microsoft, which I believe was addressing --
2 attempting to address the issue of getting these
3 latest versions. I'm not even exactly sure how those
4 pieces were supposed to have fit together.

5 Q. Have you ever been a party to a lawsuit?

6 A. Not other than this one, of course, and as
7 trustee of Paterson Lori trust.

8 Q. That's the Yakima lawsuit?

9 A. Right.

10 Q. Have you ever testified in court?

11 A. Yes, in the Seattle Computer case.

12 Q. Any other times that you've testified in
13 court?

14 A. No. A traffic ticket once.

15 Q. I assume that you haven't been involved in
16 any criminal proceedings of any nature, correct?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Could you briefly state your educational
19 background for the record.

20 A. I have a bachelor's degree in computer
21 science. I took some graduate school but didn't
22 complete any degree.

23 Q. What year did you get your bachelor's
24 degree?

25 A. 1978.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 14

1 Q. That was from the University of Washington?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Was that with honors or with any particular
4 distinction?

5 A. Magna cum laude. I guess I should
6 specifically say it's a bachelor of science degree.

7 Q. Any other degrees that you have?

8 A. No.

9 Q. Prior to going to the University of
10 Washington, where did you attend school, high school
11 or --

12 A. Ingraham High School in Seattle.

13 Q. So you grew up in Seattle?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Born here?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. What year were you born?

18 A. 1956.

19 Q. Are you married?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. How long have you been married?

22 A. Eighteen and a half years.

23 Q. I notice that your wife is listed as Penny
24 Paterson in the complaint.

25 A. Yes.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 15

1 Q. I'm just curious to know if you are aware
2 of any factual information she has that may relate to
3 this lawsuit or whether she's simply listed given that
4 there's a marital community involved.

5 A. Strictly due to marital community.

6 Q. Do you have any children?

7 A. I have two stepchildren.

8 Q. Have you been married before?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. When was that?

11 A. 1979 to 1984.

12 Q. What was the name of your wife?

13 A. Judy, Judy Paterson while married.

14 Q. Did that end in dissolution?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Do you know where the dissolution was
17 filed?

18 A. Seattle.

19 Q. So technically, you would have been a party
20 to that, quote, lawsuit, unquote, correct?

21 A. I don't know. Is that a lawsuit? We
22 simply got one attorney for the both of us and made an
23 agreement, so...

24 Q. I won't quibble with you. I assume there's
25 a court document somewhere that reflects the

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 16

1 dissolution, correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Any other marriages?

4 A. No.

5 Q. When you were an undergraduate at the
6 University of Washington, did you take any graduate
7 level courses?

8 A. I may have. I don't recall. I did take
9 graduate level courses after graduating and I don't
10 remember if I took some before as well or not.

11 Q. That's actually a good question to move
12 towards. Subsequent to your graduation at the
13 University of Washington, I assume you took some sort
14 of education of some kind?

15 A. I continued for two more quarters at the
16 University of Washington for the subsequent fall and
17 winter quarters in graduate school.

18 Q. So that would have been in 1979, 1978 to
19 1979?

20 A. Yeah, let's see. Right, right. Fall
21 quarter would have been 1978 and the winter quarter
22 would have been '79.

23 Q. What department were you enrolled in?

24 A. Computer science.

25 Q. Were you enrolled in a degree program?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 24

1 -- it was easy. I was able to call Paul Allen and ask
2 if he wanted me to work there and he simply said yes.
3 So it was easy. It was work I knew was up my alley
4 because I had worked with those people and it was my
5 kind of -- my kind of work. I expected to enjoy it.
6 So it seemed like a good fit for me.

7 Q. What were your duties while you were at
8 Microsoft during that period?

9 A. Initially, I worked on the adaptation of
10 DOS to the IBM PC before it was released. Then when
11 that was complete, I worked on the 16-bit basic
12 compiler, specifically the run time for the compiler,
13 with two other guys, and then when that was complete,
14 we started a project on an update, a new version of
15 DOS for the IBM PC

16 Q. The initial adaptation of DOS to the IBM PC
17 that you worked on, do you remember what version of
18 DOS you were working on at that point?

19 A. Well, when I left Seattle Computer
20 Products, I believe I considered DOS to be about done
21 with what I had intended to accomplish and I simply
22 numbered it 1.00 at that time and so that's what we --
23 that's what at Seattle Computer Products it was being
24 called.

25 At Microsoft, I continued to add features

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 25

1 to it, and had I used the same techniques, the same
2 style I had done at Microsoft or -- excuse me -- I had
3 done at Seattle Computer, I would have continued to
4 bump the number slightly as I made a change here and a
5 change there, but IBM was going to ship it as their
6 version 1.00 and that was all there was to that. So I
7 guess there was essentially different numbers being
8 used by different people for the same product.

9 Does that answer the question that you were
10 looking for?

11 Q. It would be useful, I guess, to discuss
12 briefly the various versions of DOS and I'm not sure
13 when you'd like to do that, but we have things like
14 Q-DOS, 86-DOS and the like. Could you briefly provide
15 kind of a summary of the history of DOS?

16 A. Okay. The best way to look at the name
17 Q-DOS is as a code word, an internal development term,
18 as Chicago is used for Windows 95. It was never
19 intended to be -- the product was never labeled that
20 as sold. When it came time to sell it, we chose --
21 Rod Brock and I kind of sort of brain-stormed and
22 decided to settle on 86-DOS. So that was the official
23 label when it was shipped.

24 IBM had no trouble deciding what they were
25 going to call it. They were going to call it IBM

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 26

1 Personal Computer DOS. It's the same product.
2 Microsoft chose to call the same thing MS-DOS. So
3 these reflect the timeline of when companies chose a
4 name for marketing purposes of the same product.

5 Q. What types of changes were there to the
6 product during that time, if any?

7 A. Between the time that -- when Seattle
8 Computer first shipped 86-DOS to when I left Seattle
9 Computer, I continued to make what I considered
10 technically as substantial internal improvements.
11 Users may not notice any difference, but programmers
12 would notice significant improvements.

13 So while the only one selling it was
14 Seattle Computer and calling it 86-DOS, it went
15 through fairly hefty internal improvements.

16 Once I was at Microsoft and making -- the
17 changes were relatively minor, in my opinion, and so
18 what IBM shipped as PC-DOS 1.0 was not any
19 significantly different than what Seattle Computer had
20 used.

21 Then Microsoft didn't have a product --
22 didn't have an MS-DOS product until a little bit later
23 and the first one shipped was 1.25, which was
24 virtually identical to what IBM called their DOS 1.1,
25 and its improvements were fairly minor.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 27

1 To IBM the big change was handling higher
2 capacity floppy discs. They upgraded the -- the
3 floppy disc hardware was improved and they used the
4 new version of DOS. There was actually no
5 relationship between what kind of floppy disc you use
6 and what version of DOS you had. There needn't have
7 been any relationship, but IBM chose to tie this
8 together, where, okay, we have a new computer with
9 better stuff on it and we'll roll out a new DOS with
10 that. So to them in their version it was the version
11 that could handle a higher capacity floppy disc.

12 Q. What's the earliest source code you have of
13 a DOS version?

14 A. I believe 1.25 is the earliest version I
15 have a copy of.

16 Q. Approximately when would that date from?

17 A. March of '82.

18 Q. Do you know if someone else has earlier
19 source code?

20 A. I strongly doubt it.

21 Q. While you were at Microsoft during this
22 1981/1982 time period, you worked on the Microsoft
23 SoftCard for BASIC?

24 A. Sorry. Could you say that again?

25 Q. While you were at Microsoft, did you work

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 30

1 just for purposes of the record?

2 A. CPM is --

3 Q. Or was.

4 A. Was an operating system from Digital
5 Research for 8080-based micro computers.

6 Q. Do you know whether Microsoft had access to
7 the source code for CPM at the time of that project?

8 A. No, that is, I don't know.

9 Q. Do you know whether Seattle Computer
10 Products had access to the source code for CPM at that
11 time?

12 A. They did not.

13 Q. Did you have access to CPM source code as
14 part of your work on this SoftCard project?

15 A. No.

16 Q. What did you do to prepare for this
17 deposition today, just generally?

18 A. At my attorney's suggestion, I reviewed the
19 deposition I had given for Seattle Computer in '86,
20 and that is all.

21 Q. So no other documents other than that
22 deposition?

23 A. Right.

24 Q. Did you look at your complaint that was
25 filed in this case?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 31

1 A. We looked at it a couple weeks ago. I
2 guess that could have been considered preparation.

3 Q. I assume you met with your attorney as part
4 of this preparation, correct?

5 A. I have met with my attorney. I don't know
6 if I would characterize it as preparation for this
7 deposition.

8 Q. Did you review any of the documents that
9 have been produced in this litigation, either by the
10 defendants or by you?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Which documents were those, if you recall?

13 A. I have spent some time reviewing the
14 chapter of the book that's at issue and the Kildall
15 memoir that appears to be based on.

16 Q. Any other documents that you reviewed as
17 part of this litigation?

18 A. I've probably glanced at quite a few of the
19 documents that I've produced, not specifically
20 thinking of reviewing them.

21 Q. Other than your lawyer, did you talk to
22 anyone as part of your preparation for this
23 deposition?

24 A. No.

25 Q. You used the term Q-DOS. What did that

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 32

1 stand for?

2 A. Quick and Dirty Operating System.

3 Q. Who came up with that name?

4 A. I did.

5 Q. Do you remember when?

6 A. When? Not specifically. We could pin it
7 down to the -- we can talk about the time frame that
8 it was written and assume it was in that time frame.

9 Q. As I understand your testimony earlier,
10 this term Q-DOS was used only internally at Seattle
11 Computer Products?

12 A. Right. Since it appeared in the source
13 code, however, then when other people saw the source
14 code, it had essentially leaked out the use of that
15 term. It was after that that I realized I needed to
16 adjust the source code title as well.

17 Q. Now, over the years have you read books
18 written about the development of DOS?

19 A. I've read a number of articles. I wouldn't
20 say there's any book that is about development of DOS
21 that I know of, if you see what I mean. I've seen
22 various chapters and articles about the development of
23 DOS.

24 Q. But you've read books that include
25 discussions about the development of DOS?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 33

1 A. Yes, that include, yes.

2 Q. Have you seen any movies or television
3 programs that have dealt with that subject?

4 A. In a way; that is, I believe it may have
5 been the show Revenge of the Nerds, which has an
6 extremely brief view of -- you know, a couple of
7 minutes of it are an impression of how DOS got
8 started.

9 Q. That was a made-for-TV movie?

10 A. I imagine.

11 Q. Do you remember if you were actually
12 portrayed in that movie or not?

13 A. According to the credits, no. They had a
14 guy that -- the cast listed a player playing Rod
15 Brock. That actor would have looked a lot more like
16 me and could have represented me, but they said he was
17 Rod Brock.

18 Q. Did you provide any input into the
19 production at all?

20 A. No.

21 Q. When Microsoft licensed 86-DOS in early
22 1981, what was the name at that time of DOS that they
23 licensed?

24 A. Seattle Computer Products called it 86-DOS.
25 Microsoft often, Paul Allen in particular, seemed to

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 35

1 Q. When was that and what?

2 A. I wrote a multi-tasking operating system
3 for Z80 in college. I don't recall if it was in
4 graduate school or if it was senior undergraduate.

5 Q. Was that part of a college course that you
6 did that in?

7 A. Yes, it was an operating systems course. I
8 believe it was a graduate level course. I just don't
9 recall whether I had actually slipped it in as a
10 senior or when I was in graduate school and it was the
11 term project for the course.

12 Q. Any other operating systems that you wrote
13 prior to DOS?

14 A. No.

15 Q. What were the features of this
16 multi-tasking operating system that you wrote?

17 A. The description of the operating system was
18 actually provided by the instructor; that is, there
19 was a list of possible -- what term projects that we
20 could do and the projects were fairly specific and one
21 of them was to write an operating system and the
22 operating system was to have the functions with what
23 we called the function P, the function V, start
24 process, I guess an end process or there was something
25 like that and I/O and I could -- so I don't know if

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 36

1 you want me to go into what those things are, but
2 that's what I wrote an operating system with those, I
3 believe, five specific functions and then additional
4 work to sort of test and improve it.

5 Q. What chip would it run on?

6 A. Z80.

7 Q. Or chip set. Z80. What operating system
8 did you base, if any, did you base your operating
9 system on?

10 A. Nothing, just the description provided by
11 the instructor.

12 Q. Did you have a name for this operating
13 system?

14 A. No.

15 Q. Do you still have any source code for that?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Do you know if it still exists somewhere?

18 A. I don't believe so.

19 Q. Do you know whether 86-DOS shared any
20 features with this particular operating system?

21 A. No, it didn't.

22 Q. It did not?

23 A. Huh-uh.

24 Q. Prior to writing 86-DOS, what operating
25 systems did you work with or had you worked with?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 37

1 A. Oh, I had worked with the CDC operating
2 system of the main computer system at the University
3 of Washington, which I believe was called Scope, or at
4 least the interactive form of it. I had used what
5 Crememco called the resident operating system, and I
6 guess before that there was IMZI[phonetic] had what
7 they called the self-contained system and then so from
8 the self-contained system to the Crememco resident
9 operating system to North Star DOS, which was my
10 primary operating system through college, and then at
11 Seattle Computer we started using Crememco C-DOS.

12 Q. Do you remember when you first worked with
13 Crememco's C-DOS at Seattle Computer Products?

14 A. No, not specifically. We also tried out
15 UCSDP system.

16 Q. How about CPM?

17 A. No, not other than -- C-DOS was a CPM
18 look-alike and so CPM programs ran with C-DOS, so we
19 did not use CPM provisional research. We bought this
20 look-alike from Crememco or it came with the computer
21 one or the other.

22 Q. When you say that C-DOS was a CPM
23 look-alike, what do you mean by that?

24 A. It ran all the CPM programs, which in
25 general, we stayed within -- I normally used Crememco

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 38

1 programs, so I wouldn't have cared that it was able to
2 run other -- when I say CPM program, I do not mean a
3 program that is CPM or was written by Digital
4 Research. I mean a program that's required CPM to
5 run. It was typical of word processors or whatever to
6 count on CPM to be there for them to do their job and
7 so C-DOS could be there instead for these same
8 programs to run.

9 (Mr. Biemiller joined the proceedings)

10 MR. TOMKINS: This is Mr. Dietrich
11 Biemiller.

12 Q. (BY MR. JOHNSON) One of the documents that
13 you've produced for us in this case is a document
14 called The Right Place, The Right Time. I made a copy
15 of it for purposes of this deposition and we've marked
16 it as Exhibit 1.

17 A. Thank you.

18 Q. Could you take a look at that and tell me
19 if that's The Right Place, The Right Time, which, as I
20 understand it, is a document that you've written?

21 A. Yes, barring the possibility of subtle
22 changes that I wouldn't have -- you know, haven't had
23 the opportunity to verify, this appears to be the
24 document that I wrote.

25 Q. When did you first start writing this?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 39

1 A. The mid '80s.

2 Q. Why was that?

3 A. I wanted to have some memoirs of the
4 development process that I had gone through in
5 creating things that I had done.

6 Q. Now, as I read it, it sounds like kind of a
7 journal. So my question, I guess, is was this based
8 upon some prior regular recordings that you had done
9 of what was going on during that particular time?

10 A. No. The dates are synthetic; they may or
11 may not be real. They are just a guess after the
12 fact. So at one point I called it MS-DOS diary and
13 was trying to make it date oriented and then as I
14 decided that I really was making up the dates to a
15 great extent, I started backing down from doing that.
16 So it actually has some different tenors to it as far
17 as the style I was choosing to use at one time or
18 another.

19 Q. Did you work with anybody else in writing
20 this particular document?

21 A. No.

22 Q. So this was all done by you?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Have you ever had discussions with anyone
25 regarding the possibility of publishing The Right

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 42

1 everything the same and how they did it. I know that
2 it looks alike. You could say a clone is definitely a
3 look-alike, you know, a look-alike is a less, maybe
4 less stringent. It could also -- as I said, normally
5 you use -- when you clone something, you're attempting
6 to -- I guess you're at least attempting to not
7 violate someone's intellectual property rights and by
8 making -- when I say look-alike I'm making no such
9 judgment. For all I know, it was CP/M and I didn't
10 know it. It was licensed, it was -- you know, I
11 wouldn't have known its relationship.

12 Q. But in terms of using the terms look-alike
13 and clone, are those terms that you would commonly use
14 in describing at least the appearance of a particular
15 operating system or other software program?

16 A. I'm not sure I understood the question.

17 Q. I guess I'm asking whether this is a
18 subjective term or an objective term from your
19 standpoint?

20 A. I'll use look-alike as a subjective term.

21 Q. How about clone?

22 A. Clone is a little more objective, and that
23 is an intentional choice of words, because I don't
24 know the background of the relationship of C-DOS to
25 CP/M.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 43

1 Q. Do you know, I think you testified that
2 C-DOS was written to run on the Z80 chip?

3 A. I didn't say that. It did run on a Z80
4 chip. I believe that it probably wouldn't have run on
5 an 8080.

6 Q. That was my next question. So as far as
7 you know, it probably would not have run on an Intel
8 8080?

9 A. Yeah, I can't recall if I ever looked --
10 what reason I have to think that, if I ever looked
11 inside some piece of it or why I would suspect that,
12 but that's the impression I came away with.

13 Q. Do you know whether the Z80 chip provided
14 functionality that was not present in the 8080 chip?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. What were these?

17 A. What was the additional functionality? I
18 hardly recall.

19 Q. So were the Z80 functions a superset of the
20 8080 functions?

21 A. The Z80 was intended to be a significant
22 improvement on the 8080 and be completely compatible.
23 We did actually find at least one thing that wasn't --
24 when they designed the Z80, they thought they could
25 change and it wouldn't hurt anything and it actually

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 44

1 broke Microsoft BASIC, but other than -- it was an
2 extremely strange quirk, but other than that it was
3 considered to be entirely compatible, that programs
4 that ran on the 8080 would also run on the Z80.

5 Q. But as I understand it, a program written
6 for the 8080 would run on a machine with the Z80 chip
7 but not vice versa, then?

8 A. If you took advantage of the new additional
9 Z80 features, it would not run on an 8080.

10 Q. Take a look at page 40 of The Right Place.
11 It indicates that on or about September 7, 1979, in
12 your spare time you've been working on an interesting
13 project at home: a program to translate Z80 source
14 code into 8086 source code.

15 Would that translator also translate 8080
16 source code and 8086 source code?

17 A. No, because the mnemonics used by the Z80
18 were different, even those that meant the same thing.
19 So that's just the textual appearance was different
20 from the 8080 even though it would have meant the
21 same.

22 Q. What do you mean by mnemonics?

23 A. These processors have a specific list of
24 instructions. The most common for the 8080 being what
25 we would verbalize as move, but it was spelled M-O-V,

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 45

1 and you would then have some arguments. Where are you
2 moving from and where you're moving to, followed by
3 where you're moving from, as I recall, and you might
4 move A, coma, B, which moves the A register into the B
5 register.

6 When written in Z80, the very same
7 instruction was LD, load. So it was the same
8 instruction, but they gave it the different name and
9 my translator that I wrote understood the Z80 names
10 because it needed to understand the additional Z80
11 names of the new instructions. So it did not
12 understand the names that Intel had assigned.

13 Q. We have been using the term operating
14 system and I think it's probably useful to define what
15 an operating system is or was at the time or times
16 we're talking about, as you understand it. Kind of
17 tell us what is an operating system, a computer
18 operating system?

19 A. Well, in this time frame, an operating
20 system provided fundamental I/O capability,
21 input/output capability to programs. Input from a
22 keyboard, output to a screen, storage on a disc. That
23 was essentially the sort of minimum capability and
24 that's what you got in programs like CP/M and North
25 Star DOS and DOS, for that matter.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 46

1 Q. Who produced North Star DOS?

2 A. North Star.

3 Q. Where were they located?

4 A. I don't know.

5 Q. Do you know when that product was on the
6 market?

7 A. We bought ours in 1977. I produced manuals
8 as part of your request. You might find, for
9 instance, location information in the manual.

10 Q. When did you receive those manuals, the
11 ones that you produced for us?

12 A. When I bought the product in 1977.

13 Q. What was your reason for developing 86-DOS?

14 A. There was no operating system for 16-bit
15 computers, for 8086-based computers.

16 Q. Now, you mentioned 8086. Could you
17 describe what you mean by that term?

18 A. That's the name of a microprocessor
19 developed by Intel.

20 Q. On page 44 of Exhibit 1 you make reference
21 to February 6, 1980, agreeing at a board meeting on
22 our strategy for an operating system for our 8086 CPU
23 card.

24 What do you mean by our 8086 CPU card?

25 A. We had -- as discussed in the previous

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 49

1 translated into 8086 instructions and that sequence of
2 8086 instructions that came out of that translation
3 process would in fact cause 86-DOS to also save a
4 file.

5 Q. So on page 49 of *The Right Place*, you
6 discuss Q-DOS and the relationship between Q-DOS and
7 the CP/M system as, I believe, under the July 25, 1980
8 discussion, and you state since Q-DOS is emulating
9 CP/M system calls to achieve my translation
10 compatibility goal, the functions required in the I/O
11 system are logically the same as those in CP/M's BIOS.

12 Exactly what steps did you take to ensure
13 that the functions in 86 DOS's I/O system were the
14 same as those in CPM's BIOS?

15 A. They were not the same without the word
16 logically. The functions were actually quite
17 different. Many of them were quite different. The
18 reason that term logically is so important is that
19 CP/M had this idea of an auxiliary device and a print
20 device and so in order to try to -- and those devices
21 were exposed at both the application program level to,
22 you know, word processor writers and they made their
23 way on through to here at the BIOS level, where if you
24 look at the table directly above that paragraph you're
25 reading, you'll see references to conin, conout,

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 50

1 print, auxin, auxout.

2 That portion is extremely similar to CP/M
3 because CP/M provided this functionality at the
4 program interface level to talk to a device. They
5 call it the punch and the reader. I decided I didn't
6 necessarily have a punch and a reader, but I would
7 have an auxiliary device. So that set of stuff,
8 having an auxiliary, for instance, was driven by this
9 need to have some equivalent to this CP/M function of
10 talking to the punch and the reader.

11 For instance, the way discs are read and
12 written was completely -- abstracted in a completely
13 different way than CP/M had and vastly superior. So
14 the need to read and write disc and, you know, the
15 logical function of doing that was the same and that's
16 what I'm referring to, but the actual technique of the
17 interface was completely different.

18 Q. What types of similarities were there
19 between function names and order between 86-DOS and
20 CP/M?

21 A. Function names.

22 Q. The names of the functions.

23 A. Well, because they were performing the same
24 function, the names tended to be similar.

25 Q. The order was the same as well or similar?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 51

1 A. In order for it to be translation
2 compatible, the number assigned to a given function,
3 the registers it used to transfer data, the memory
4 structures used to pass information all needed to be
5 identical.

6 Q. Do you recall which version of the CP/M
7 interface guide you had access to when you prepared
8 86-DOS, when you developed 86-DOS?

9 A. I personally owned an older manual referred
10 to as the CP/M Interface Guide and it has a date of
11 1976 on it and I believe would refer to probably
12 version 1.4 or maybe the other version 1 versions of
13 -- version 1.3 others of CP/M. But I know that I must
14 have also had access to other manuals. Probably
15 possibly they could have been Crememco C-DOS manuals
16 or they could have simply been books published off the
17 shelf that described -- also described the interfaces,
18 because there were interfaces introduced in later
19 versions of CP/M that I did try to include in my
20 translation compatibility.

21 Q. I'm going to show you what's been marked as
22 Exhibit 2 and ask if you can identify that document?

23 A. The 86-DOS Programmers Manual Version 0.3.

24 Q. I believe this is one of the documents you
25 produced in this litigation. Is that correct?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 52

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. On page 4 is a summary of the 86-DOS
3 functions. Do you see that?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Continues of course to page 5. You were
6 the person who devised the various functions and the
7 order of the functions, correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Just to sort of look at an example, take a
10 look at function 6, direct consult I/O.

11 A. Okay.

12 Q. Do you know if CP/M had the same function?

13 A. I don't specifically recall. There are
14 cases where I added functionality and this is one of
15 the few that you could ask me that I wouldn't have
16 been sure CP/M had or not.

17 Q. Well, let's just briefly walk through the
18 functions and if you recall whether or not CP/M had
19 the same functionality.

20 A. I guess let me give you a general answer
21 first that I don't know CP/M well enough. I used the
22 manual to produce this 25 years ago. I don't know
23 CP/M well enough to actually recall whether they had
24 this. I will -- my response would be based solely on
25 the fact that since it's here, I will have presumably

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 57

1 three, four, five and so forth, it appears that the
2 verb, if I can characterize it as that, is first and
3 the noun is second and then the reverse would be the
4 case for 86-DOS.

5 A. Okay.

6 Q. I guess my question is why reverse those
7 two?

8 A. I chose names that I thought fit the
9 function without regard to what CP/M had chosen. I
10 gave no consideration to CP/M's names. They weren't a
11 factor in translation compatibility. The name of the
12 function is not a factor in translation compatibility
13 and I gave no consideration to what their name was.

14 Q. So 22 for CP/M was create file and 22 for
15 you was create file as well?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. That was done without regard to the fact
18 that the same name was used by Digital Research?

19 A. Well, it's also -- create's also the name
20 used in BASIC. Create file is also the name used in
21 Windows XP. So what you're doing is creating a file.

22 Q. It's also the same number?

23 A. Yeah, the number is an essential part of
24 the translation compatibility.

25 Q. The numbers that you didn't have in 86-DOS

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 58

1 were 7 and 8 and apparently Digital Research for 7 and
2 8 had interrogate I/O status and alter I/O status
3 respectively.

4 Does that refresh your recollection as to
5 why you did not have 7 and 8 in 86-DOS?

6 A. I don't remember what those functions did,
7 but I must have decided they weren't essential to
8 translation compatibility.

9 Q. And 12 in the CP/M functionality was lift
10 disc head. Does that refresh your recollection as to
11 why you did not have a 12 in 86-DOS?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. What was that?

14 A. A physical storage directive like that has
15 no business being in an application program interface.

16 Q. But that was used for a lot of software
17 written for CP/M version 2.0, I believe?

18 A. Lift disc head was used?

19 Q. 2.X.

20 A. It would be shocking to find lift disc head
21 was used by anyone, ever.

22 Q. Let me show you 4, Exhibit 4. My question
23 relates to function 12 there and I guess why don't you
24 identify Exhibit 4 for the record.

25 A. I've never seen it before. It says CP/M

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 59

1 2.0 Interface Guide.

2 Q. Okay. So you've never seen this one
3 before?

4 A. No. I didn't use -- I know that whatever
5 additional manuals I may have used were not Digital
6 Research branded. As I say, may have been Crememco
7 C-DOS branded and it may have been just a book you can
8 buy at the computer store, but I've never seen this
9 manual before.

10 Q. Did you have CP/M version 2.0 available to
11 you when you created 86-DOS?

12 MR. TOMKINS: Hold it. Could you
13 restate the question, please.

14 Q. (BY MR. JOHNSON) Did you have CP/M version
15 2.0 available to you when you created 86-DOS?

16 MR. TOMKINS: Available to you. Okay.

17 A. It's available in the sense that we could
18 have bought a copy, but we didn't. So it was not -- I
19 have never -- I had not used any, no.

20 Q. (BY MR. JOHNSON) Is it your testimony then
21 that you did not have access to CP/M version 2.0 when
22 you created 86-DOS?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Well, let's take a look at Exhibit 4 and
25 specifically function 12.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 66

1 goes and that was like the major change that was --
2 you know, so that's the best ballpark I can give you
3 in terms of, you know, the core of DOS, how it may
4 have changed. At least the best I can give you off
5 the cuff.

6 Q. When IBM released its personal computer,
7 was the software included with it called 86-DOS? I
8 think you testified that they at some point called it
9 --

10 A. IBM released it as IBM personal computer
11 DOS.

12 Q. That was done at the initial release --

13 A. Well...

14 Q. -- to the public?

15 A. You know, their -- they had chosen that
16 name from the beginning, so every version that we
17 worked on and dealt with with IBM of course said that
18 to start with, so...

19 Q. We just discussed changes between your
20 Q-DOS and MS-DOS 1.25. Do you know what changes there
21 were between Q-DOS that you had written back in 1980
22 and the IBM DOS 1.0?

23 A. The major changes took place in this
24 evolution of Q-DOS from .1 to 1.0 and you can view IBM
25 and IBM PC-DOS and Microsoft MS-DOS as being based on

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 67

1 that 1.0. So the changes we're talking about are the
2 same set of changes where this one particular
3 additional set of functionality was a large chunk and
4 probably lots of little things were done.

5 Q. Now, Exhibit 3 is the CP/M Interface Guide
6 that we talked about that you believe you had in your
7 possession at the time you developed DOS, correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Is it your testimony that you had not seen
10 at all Exhibit 4 or the CP/M 2.0 Interface Guide,
11 which is identified as Exhibit 4, when you developed
12 DOS?

13 A. I don't believe so. I guess -- I am not
14 sure. I'm not positive what source I used. I had a
15 source for CP/M 2 functionality, but I'm reasonably
16 certain it was not a Digital Research manual because I
17 had no business -- I had no Digital Research product
18 at all of any kind.

19 Q. So to the best of your knowledge, what
20 would have been the source of the CP/M 2.0
21 functionality at that time?

22 A. Either a Crememco manual or a manual or
23 book from a computer store. This stuff was widely
24 published and widely available, unlike the books claim
25 that it was listed as proprietary.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 68

1 Q. That's the best of your recollection at
2 this point?

3 A. That is the best. I don't know what manual
4 I used. I can only -- I only know for sure that the
5 manual I have in my possession isn't adequate because
6 it doesn't have functions 33 and 34, so I know I had
7 some other source. I have no idea. Other than I
8 didn't have Digital Research materials, I have no idea
9 where it came from.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Let's take about a five
11 minute break.

12 (Recess taken.)

13 (Deposition Exhibit Nos. 21 through
14 56 were marked for identification.)

15 Q. (BY JOHNSON) Mr. Paterson, while we were
16 off the record you indicated you wanted to say
17 something else.

18 A. Oh, about the function thing?

19 Q. Correct.

20 A. Well, I may have another answer to your
21 question on why I didn't -- what were we talking
22 about? Function 12. The version wasn't included and
23 I speculated, just speculated, that I may have used
24 the old manuals that I have a copy of for the lower
25 function numbers and only even referred to the newer

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 69

1 manuals for the higher function numbers just sort of
2 blindly assuming that the old ones were all the same.
3 So it's just a possible explanation why I skipped 12,
4 because the return version number.

5 Q. At this point are you just guessing and
6 speculating on that?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. In your job history, when we were talking
9 earlier today, you indicated that you went to
10 Microsoft from May of 1981 through March of 1982 and
11 then you started your own company Falcon in June of
12 1983. Is that right?

13 A. Yes, approximately.

14 Q. What were you doing between 1982 and 1983?

15 A. I was at Seattle Computer Products.

16 Q. Then after -- strike that.

17 Then how long were you with Falcon
18 Technology?

19 A. Until we closed down in mid '86.

20 Q. Could you just briefly describe your
21 employment history since mid 1986 to date?

22 A. As a result of the sale of Falcon assets to
23 Microsoft, that included my working at Microsoft for
24 the next two years. So I worked at Microsoft from, I
25 guess, August of '86 to August of '88.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 70

1 Then I took a year or so, year to year and
2 a half off, where I wrote several articles and tried
3 to establish myself independently as between authoring
4 and consulting projects, but that didn't provide
5 enough income. So I went back to work for Microsoft
6 in the first third of 1990, I guess, maybe around
7 April -- I'm not sure -- and stayed there until 1998.

8 Then retired from Microsoft and have been
9 recently in the past few years starting to build a
10 business out of my home.

11 Q. Where do you live?

12 A. Issaquah.

13 Q. What business have you been trying to build
14 out of your home?

15 A. Actually, when I took the time off in the
16 1989 time frame, I started work on a project for Test
17 Coverage and I have worked on it on and off. For
18 example, my entire time at Microsoft I was actually
19 only working a four day work week, with the extra day,
20 theoretically, allowing me to work on this side
21 project of the Test Coverage program.

22 So I have that program that I sell, but my
23 main thrust these days is equipment, small electronic
24 equipment related to home automation. I only have one
25 of those products working now, but I have other ones

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 104

1 published by Microsoft Press. The author is Ray
2 Duncan, and the date of publication appears to be
3 1986.

4 Do you recall reading this on or about the
5 time it was published or at some point after that?

6 A. No, I've never read it. I do believe I
7 have a copy, but I've never opened it. I was provided
8 a copy for free at one point by the publisher of the
9 book that -- whose chapter I wrote. They just shipped
10 a box full of books and this was among them. I had no
11 reason to read it myself. I already know how to
12 program DOS.

13 Q. So you have a copy of it, but you never
14 read it?

15 A. Yeah, I don't believe I even cracked the
16 cover.

17 Q. Did you ever talk to anybody about what
18 this book said?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Let's take a look at the page that's
21 numbered 4 and it talks about the fact that the
22 printed progenitor of MS-DOS was an operating system
23 called 86-DOS.

24 Do you think progenitor is a correct
25 terminology in that context?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 105

1 A. I have no idea what that word means.

2 Q. There's a statement in the prior paragraph,
3 porting existing applications into the MS-DOS
4 environment is relatively simple, since the programmer
5 can choose to view MS-DOS as either a superset of CP/M
6 or a subset of UNIX.

7 Is that correct?

8 A. More or less. That would refer only to
9 later versions of MS-DOS that obsoleted the CP/M
10 interface and had the UNIX style interface available.

11 Q. The next paragraph that starts with the
12 word the progenitor says in order to ease the process
13 of porting 8-bit CPM-80 applications into the new
14 16-bit environment, 86-DOS was originally designed to
15 mimic CP/M-80 in both functions available and style of
16 operation. Consequently -- stop for a second.

17 Is that accurate?

18 A. More or less. I'm not sure what is meant
19 by things like style of operation, so I don't know how
20 to take it exactly.

21 Q. Next sentence. Consequently, the
22 structures of 86-DOS's file control blocks, program
23 segment prefixes, and executable files were nearly
24 identical to those of CP/M-80.

25 Is that accurate?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 106

1 A. To some extent. It's not words I would
2 use, but it's not terribly inaccurate. To the
3 programmer, from the programmer's perspective, this is
4 appropriate terminology, because it tells the
5 programmer that you can count on these things to be
6 there in 86-DOS that you found in CP/M-80, but there
7 are a lot of differences.

8 It glosses over the set of differences that
9 the programmer doesn't necessarily need to know for
10 that compatibility. So that's why I'm hesitating as
11 far as this merely identical aspect.

12 Q. Are there any inaccuracies in that
13 sentence?

14 A. No.

15 Q. The following page, which is numbered 6, in
16 the middle of the page this book says in spite of some
17 superficial similarities to its ancestor CP/M-80,
18 MS-DOS version 1.0 contained a number of improvements
19 over CP/M, including, and then it lists at least four
20 different improvements.

21 Is that sentence accurate?

22 A. Other than the fact that there wasn't
23 actually MS-DOS version 1.0, that would -- it's
24 accurate. 86-DOS, you could substitute the words
25 86-DOS 1.0 or PC-DOS 1.0 and correct that sentence.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 107

1 Q. But other than that, it's essentially
2 accurate?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Top of page 7, which is the next page,
5 references MS-DOS version 2.0 equivalent to PC-DOS
6 2.0, was first released in March 1983. It was, in
7 retrospect, a totally new operating system, and then
8 it just discusses some changes with MS-DOS 2.0.

9 I guess I'd like to ask a question of
10 terminology. This talks about a totally new operating
11 system. Would you agree that was a totally new
12 operating system or was it a version of the older one?

13 A. It's still a version of the older one.
14 Virtually every bit of the old one is still there;
15 they just added a lot. So that's why he's saying it's
16 -- you know, that's where totally new comes from,
17 but...

18 Q. As I understand it, your testimony was that
19 the last version of DOS you worked on was 1.25?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. So you did not work directly or indirectly
22 on version 2.0?

23 A. That's right

24 Q. The next exhibit is 18. This is a February
25 10, 1986 article from the Seattle PI. Do you remember

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 129

1 about it. I told you all the things I disagree with,
2 which is virtually every sentence, but... I guess
3 that's why, because I disagree with almost every
4 sentence.

5 Q. In some way, correct?

6 A. Yes. So that's what I mean by that.
7 That's all I mean by that.

8 Q. All right. I was just trying to see if
9 there's anything behind entire intent.

10 Do you know the author?

11 A. No.

12 Q. The author makes reference to in the prior
13 column at the bottom the day the IBMers arrived. Do
14 you have any particular view one way or the other as
15 to what happened on that day with Mr. Kildall?

16 A. No. I've read a lot of different stuff
17 over the years.

18 Q. So you don't know -- you haven't got any
19 particular view one way or the other as to which is
20 accurate among all those different versions of the
21 story?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Exhibit 29 is an article from the Seattle
24 Post Intelligencer in 1991.

25 MR. DAS: Can we just go off the

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 130

1 record for a second.

2 (Discussion off the record.)

3 Q. (BY MR. JOHNSON) Do you remember reading
4 this article in 1991?

5 A. No, I don't remember reading it.

6 Q. Were you living in Seattle in 1991?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. The Seattle area?

9 A. The Seattle area. Redmond in 1991. I
10 likely read it, but I just don't remember it.

11 Q. Take a look at the third page of this
12 article and at the bottom of the second column there's
13 a statement Kildall, still chief executive of Digital
14 Research, says there were, quote, remarkable
15 similarities, unquote, between MS-DOS and his CP/M
16 operating system.

17 Next paragraph. Ask Bill why function code
18 6 in DOS ends with a dollar sign, Kildall says. No
19 one in the world knows that but me. He says the
20 unusual symbol was a carryover from his days writing
21 mainframe computer languages and was used in his CP/M.

22 Do you remember that issue arising in 1991
23 or thereabouts?

24 A. I remember hearing that quote that asked
25 about the dollar sign. I don't know if I saw it first

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 131

1 here or if I saw it somewhere else, but I do remember
2 that coming up.

3 Q. Do you remember, did you have a response to
4 it if anybody brought it up?

5 A. I don't recall anyone ever asking me, at
6 least no press or anyone asking me. My response is
7 that because that was what was in the manual. They
8 published a manual; the manual said put a dollar sign
9 at the end. So I followed the manual.

10 Q. Was that your response at the time or are
11 you simply reconstructing what you would have said?

12 A. As I said, no one asked me that I can
13 recall, so there was no response at the time.

14 Q. Were you interviewed for this article?

15 A. I was noticing that the authors are
16 Erickson and Wallace. They were in 1991 starting
17 their research for their book, which was either Gates
18 or Hard Drive -- I've forgotten which one was which
19 now -- and they interviewed me, the authors of both
20 those books, so I know they're among them, interviewed
21 me extensively for those books.

22 So they could have interviewed me already
23 and used that material in preparation of this article
24 or that may have come later. They could have
25 interviewed me for this article separately in advance

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 132

1 and I don't remember. I had been interviewed by those
2 guys, by at least one of those guys, but I don't
3 remember if I was specifically interviewed for this
4 article.

5 Q. There is a quote that's just down the third
6 column a bit further from the quotes we were just
7 looking at about dollar sign and here it quotes you as
8 acknowledging that there was some, quote, low-level
9 borrowing, unquote, from Kildall's program and that
10 you made -- and that MS-DOS contained substantial
11 improvements over DRI's operating system.

12 Do you recall making those statements?

13 A. No, I do not recall saying low-level
14 borrowing.

15 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that
16 Messrs. Wallace and Erickson were not accurately
17 quoting you in 1991?

18 A. I believe they may have misquoted me on
19 that. It's possible.

20 Q. Did you contact them after the article came
21 out to take issue with the quote that they attributed
22 to you?

23 A. No.

24 Q. Did you write any letter to the editor to
25 take issue with that particular quote?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 133

1 A. No.

2 Q. What do you believe you said?

3 A. I'm not sure what I would have said.

4 Q. Are you denying that you actually said
5 low-level borrowing?

6 A. I don't know if I said it or not. It would
7 not be typical of my language to say that. That to me
8 sounds like their paraphrasing of technical language
9 that I used and calling it a quote.

10 Q. Have you ever met Gary Kildall?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Exhibit 30 is an August 1991 article from
13 InfoWorld. Again, what is InfoWorld?

14 A. InfoWorld is a computer magazine.

15 Q. You're quoted, I believe, on the second --
16 in the second column of this particular article. Do
17 you see the quotes attributed to you?

18 A. This is Peggy Watt again. We have read
19 this quote in her article earlier too, the very same
20 ones.

21 Q. The question is do you remember being
22 interviewed by Peggy Watt?

23 A. As I've said before, I remember having -- I
24 remember the name Peggy Watt and so the fact that I
25 remember her, the name, suggests I probably was

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 134

1 interviewed by her.

2 Q. Let's take a look at the next exhibit,
3 which is Exhibit 31, and this is excerpts from Hard
4 Drive, which you referenced earlier, by Mr. Wallace
5 and Mr. Erickson. This was published in 1992.

6 Do you have a copy of that or did you get a
7 copy of that at some point?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Have you read it?

10 A. I believe I have read most or all of it.

11 Q. I see your picture is on the third page of
12 that particular exhibit. Do you see that?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Now, you remember being interviewed by Mr.
15 Wallace and Mr. Erickson in connection with this?

16 A. I believe only one of the two interviewed
17 me, but yes, I was interviewed.

18 Q. Excuse me. Do you remember which one
19 interviewed you?

20 A. I believe it was Wallace.

21 Q. What I'd like to do is focus your attention
22 to the page numbered 184. The paragraph starts just
23 as Gary Kildall has had to read over the years how he
24 lost the IBM deal, Paterson has had to read how he
25 ripped off CP/M in developing an operating system that

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 135

1 became the industry standard.

2 Do you recall reading that at the time the
3 book was published?

4 A. I don't specifically recall reading that,
5 but I did read the book and I read this section of the
6 book when it was fairly new.

7 Q. Do you recall talking to one of the authors
8 about how you had to read about how you had ripped off
9 CP/M?

10 A. I don't specifically recall.

11 Q. The book goes on to discuss an unidentified
12 Digital employee who was quoted in 1990 that depicted
13 Gates as a silicon bully, and it goes on with a quote.
14 We never tried to patent CP/M. Nobody was patenting
15 software then. It was almost unethical, but if we
16 had, Microsoft probably couldn't have developed MS-DOS
17 because parts of the original source code looked a lot
18 like CP/M's. How else did Paterson and Gates come up
19 with that nice new operating system overnight?

20 Did you take issue with this quote when you
21 read that at the time?

22 A. Well, let's see. I didn't do anything
23 about that quote. Somebody is lying, but the quote
24 itself is accurate, I assume. I assume that Wallace
25 and Erickson got this lie correct.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 142

1 Q. Well, part of the quote is I just took his
2 printed documentation and did something that did the
3 same thing, unquote.

4 A. Which quote is this?

5 Q. The one we were just talking about.

6 A. We were talking about once you translated
7 these programs. Oh, we're back on the previous.

8 Q. I'm sorry. Go back to the prior page on
9 184 and the quote I'm asking about was the one we were
10 talking about before.

11 A. Yeah.

12 Q. I just took his printed documentation and
13 did something that did the same thing. Do you recall
14 making that statement at the time?

15 A. I don't recall making the statement, but it
16 more or less accurately represents the situation.

17 Q. You testified earlier what printed
18 documentation you had from Digital Research at the
19 time. Do you have any further recollections based on
20 this?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Page 185, you say in the first full
23 paragraph, the last sentence, I never looked at
24 Kildall's code, just his manual.

25 Was that your position at the time in 1992?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 143

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. I take it that's still your position today?

3 A. Yes.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Off the record for a
5 second.

6 (Discussion off the record.)

7 Q. (BY MR. JOHNSON) Exhibit 32 is a book
8 written in 1993 by Paul Andrews and Stephen Manes
9 entitled Gates, How Microsoft's Mogul Reinvented an
10 Industry and Made Himself the Richest Man in America.

11 Did you have a copy of this book?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. When did you get a copy of this book?

14 A. When it was new.

15 Q. Do you know if you were interviewed for
16 this article -- excuse me -- interviewed for this
17 book?

18 A. Yes. I believe I spoke with Manes on the
19 phone, but was interviewed in person by Andrews.

20 Q. Do you know if you did this when -- I
21 believe Mr. Andrews worked for the Seattle Times
22 before?

23 A. Yeah, he worked for the Seattle Times up to
24 fairly recently, so he would have been working for
25 them then.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 144

1 Q. Do you recall if this interview was on the
2 phone or these interviews were on the phone or were --

3 A. Well, as I said, I believe I may have
4 spoken with Manes on the phone, but I interviewed
5 personally with Andrews, as I recall. I believe.

6 Q. Page 157 of this book, which we've copied,
7 discusses the relationship between Q-DOS and CP/M and
8 what I'd like to focus your attention on is two-thirds
9 of the way down the page, the second from last
10 paragraph. Paterson set out to clone CP/M on his own.
11 The result was what he called Q-DOS, Quick and Dirty
12 Operating System. Do you see that?

13 A. No, I haven't found that yet. You said the
14 second to last paragraph?

15 Q. Correct.

16 A. One-fifty-seven?

17 Q. Page 157.

18 A. Oh, the very end of the paragraph.

19 Q. The last two sentences. Could you read
20 those last two sentences and tell me if those two
21 sentences are accurate?

22 A. No, it's not accurate that I set out to
23 clone CP/M.

24 Q. In what way is it not accurate?

25 A. 86-DOS is not a clone.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 145

1 Q. Why do you believe it is not a clone?

2 A. The simulator between 86-DOS and CP/M is
3 limited to the translation compatibility of the
4 interface. It doesn't copy, mimic or emulate any of
5 the internal operations, such as file operations, file
6 storage format, BIOS interface. It's in no way a
7 clone.

8 Q. Did you talk to the authors of this book
9 afterwards regarding your disagreement with that
10 statement?

11 A. I don't recall having done so. If I spoke
12 with them again in passing I may have registered a
13 complaint, but I wouldn't have considered it egregious
14 enough to have instigated conversation on this alone.

15 Q. The next paragraph, the first sentence says
16 Q-DOS wasn't an absolute clone of CP/M.

17 Do you agree with that?

18 A. Well, being that's it's not a clone at all,
19 I guess it's true that it's not an absolute clone.

20 Q. Do you believe that this is a false
21 statement of fact to say that this was a clone in any
22 way?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. The following page is 158 and this
25 discusses various similarities between Q-DOS and CP/M,

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 146

1 and it says but for programmers' convenience, Q-DOS
2 mimicked every last internal function call of CP/M,
3 along with many other technical aspects. So close a
4 clone was Q-DOS that the preliminary user's manual for
5 its public unveiling as 86-DOS, disc operating system,
6 closed paren, carried this disclaimer.

7 And the disclaimer goes on to say 86-DOS is
8 not related to the popular CP/M operating system of
9 Digital Research. Disc directory, formatting and
10 space allocation are completely different and
11 incompatible. 86-DOS does, however, provide a utility
12 called RD CP/M which will transfer files from CP/M
13 discs to 86-DOS discs. Further, operating system
14 calls and calling conventions have been provided,
15 which make possible automatic translation of Z80
16 programs written for CP/M into 8086 programs that run
17 under 86.

18 Do you agree with the language in that
19 disclaimer?

20 A. Yes. I wrote that disclaimer. You'll find
21 it in those manuals that we looked at earlier.

22 Q. The prior sentence, which discusses the
23 fact that Q-DOS, quote, mimicked every last internal
24 function call of CP/M, unquote, along with, quote,
25 many other technical aspects, unquote, do you agree or

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 147

1 disagree with that sentence?

2 A. I disagree.

3 Q. In what way do you disagree?

4 A. The translation compatibility interface did
5 not include, as we've noted earlier, every function
6 that CP/M had. I guess the use of the term mimic is
7 marginally acceptable as a way to reference the
8 compatibility interface.

9 Q. In fact, you've used that term to describe
10 the relationship, have you not?

11 A. I don't remember. I may have.

12 Q. Any other parts of that sentence you take
13 issue with?

14 A. Of that sentence, no. Then the next
15 sentence where it refers to as a clone, as you know, I
16 take issue with that.

17 Q. The prior paragraph refers to C-DOS as a
18 CP/M clone. Do you know whether that is accurate or
19 not?

20 A. I don't -- I don't know whether that is
21 accurate. I would consider it likely to be. I think
22 I viewed it as a clone at the time.

23 Q. Did you have any personal knowledge as to
24 whether it was or was not a clone?

25 A. No. From the standpoint of, I guess, what

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 148

1 we're talking about here, the distinction we're
2 talking about here is, really, C-DOS was either a
3 clone or it was CP/M, essentially, because it acted
4 completely like it.

5 So I guess I'm not trying to say it's less
6 than a clone. It's either a clone or more than a
7 clone. I don't know the relationship for sure.

8 Q. I take it that the next sentence that
9 refers to Q-DOS as being, quote, so close a clone,
10 unquote, to CP/M is another statement you take issue
11 with?

12 A. Yes, I mentioned that.

13 Q. Page 172 of these excerpts from this 1993
14 book describes a falling out that you had with Rod
15 Brock.

16 Do you recall having a falling out with Rod
17 Brock?

18 A. Yeah, that refers to my dissatisfaction
19 with their marketing plan of using -- going direct
20 sales, mail order sales, versus my belief that sales
21 through dealers was important. So I guess that's a
22 falling out.

23 Q. Take a look at page 173 and we have a
24 paragraph that starts with but now Bill Gates. Do you
25 see that paragraph?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 151

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. It refers to Q-DOS as an operating system
3 that, quote, turned out to borrow ideas and terms
4 freely from DRI's operating system, but this was back
5 in the days before some heavy-duty lawsuits made
6 programmers more cautious about doing knockoffs of
7 someone else's work.

8 Do you recall -- strike that. Do you agree
9 with those sentences?

10 A. No.

11 Q. In which way do you disagree with those
12 sentences?

13 A. Oh, well, it's clearly implying that what
14 was borrowed. Borrowing ideas is clearly implying
15 that that was making it a knockoff. To me that's what
16 it implies, and in no way was DOS a knockoff and so
17 the whole suggestion to me that there could have been
18 anything inappropriate -- I believe this strongly
19 promotes that suggestion that there was something
20 inappropriate there and that suggestion is incorrect.

21 Q. Did you ever have any communications with
22 Paul Carroll regarding this particular issue?

23 A. No, no.

24 Q. The bottom of the same page refers to
25 Microsoft ultimately buying the system, paying about

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 152

1 \$75,000. Is that your recollection of how much they
2 paid for it?

3 A. Including the fees that were paid before
4 and then the fees that were paid later, except I
5 actually view it as being a little over a million
6 because they also paid for the DOS license, which they
7 paid almost a million dollars to get back. So I
8 consider the number to be approximately a million
9 dollars.

10 Q. The book points out that IBM in foregoing
11 the chance to buy what became DOS missed an
12 opportunity that made Microsoft's value go from a
13 pittance to a stockmarket value of some 27 billion
14 dollars as of that date, making Gates the richest man
15 in the United States.

16 Any reason to disagree with that statement?

17 A. I don't understand where they get the idea
18 that IBM had a chance to buy DOS, particularly, so I
19 don't understand where that's coming from. It's
20 Microsoft that was the licensee to Seattle Computer.

21 Q. The next exhibit is Exhibit 34. This is
22 the Second Edition of Undocumented DOS or portions
23 thereof. Now, the second edition apparently you are
24 no longer a coauthor in. I take it this is not
25 because of any disagreement between you and your

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 153

1 coauthors but simply because you had nothing further
2 to say.

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. Page 181 has a sentence that starts right
5 below the subheading about from CP/M to Dr. Doss to
6 Novell DOS, and it says the funny thing is, MS-DOS
7 itself started out as a clone of the CP/M operating
8 system from DRI. The story has been told many times
9 of how Tim Paterson, a coauthor, incidentally, of the
10 first edition of this book, now at Microsoft, but in
11 1980 an engineer at Seattle Computer Products, in two
12 months wrote Quick and Dirty DOS, Q-DOS, how this
13 became 86-DOS, to which Microsoft purchased
14 nonexclusive rights and how this became MS-DOS 1.0 for
15 the then new IBM PC.

16 Stephen Manes and Paul Andrews' history of
17 Microsoft, Gates, has all the details, even a
18 photograph of the original Seattle Computer order form
19 for Microsoft's purchase of 86-DOS sale rights.
20 Price? \$50,000.

21 Let me start with the first sentence.
22 MS-DOS started out as a clone of the CP/M operating
23 system from DRI. Do you recall reading this on or
24 about the time it was published?

25 A. No, I've never read this book.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 154

1 Q. So you never looked at the second edition
2 of the book that you've been a coauthor of on the
3 first edition?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. Did anybody report to you that this
6 allegation or this assertion was contained in the
7 second edition of this book?

8 A. No.

9 Q. When was the first time you learned that
10 this statement was in this particular edition of the
11 book?

12 A. Right now.

13 Q. Two paragraphs on, the paragraph starts
14 somewhat understandably, Digital Research was upset
15 when it found that Microsoft's new operating system
16 for the IBM PC was a clone of CP/M. Apparently
17 Digital's Gary Kildall, called Kindall, even
18 considered suing IBM over the similarity of MS-DOS to
19 CP/M.

20 As I understand it, you disagree with the
21 use of the term clone in this particular sentence?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. You also disagree with it in the prior
24 paragraph, correct?

25 A. Yes.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 220

1 at that time?

2 A. DOS was done before -- I shouldn't say
3 done. DOS was working. The APIs were done before IBM
4 was even involved in looking for an operating system.

5 Q. So this last sentence is inaccurate?

6 A. Yes, it's inaccurate.

7 Q. Take a look at page 367, the top of that
8 page. It says that Tim Paterson realized the value of
9 the BIOS technique and implemented it in SCP-DOS, from
10 which it found its way into PC-DOS. Is that statement
11 accurate?

12 A. Not very.

13 Q. In what way?

14 A. Well, one needs to look at the previous
15 paragraph to understand the term BIOS technique, and
16 what's inaccurate is the implication that this was
17 some invention of CP/M that I chose to, essentially,
18 copy the form of. This was a -- this jump table
19 technique was standard practice and I used it and CP/M
20 used it and North Star DOS used it before them.

21 So it's the way this job was done. The
22 details were quite different. So it's not sensible to
23 compare it specifically to CP/M because it was no more
24 like CP/M than it would have been like the North Star
25 equivalent.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 221

1 Q. I'm going to show you Exhibit 53, which is
2 the article that you wrote, I believe, in 2000 for the
3 Encyclopedia of Computers and Computer History. Take
4 a look at that and see if that's your article.

5 A. Appears to be.

6 Q. I asked that question in part because you
7 seem to talk about yourself in the third person.
8 Paterson had graduated, Paterson's primary objective,
9 and so forth.

10 A. Well, it is an article for an encyclopedia,
11 so it's intended to be generic and if I start using I,
12 then you got to go look up and see who wrote it.

13 Q. How did you come to write this article?

14 A. I was approached by the editor of the
15 encyclopedia to write the article.

16 Q. Had you written a prior version of it
17 anywhere or was this the first time?

18 A. This was the first time.

19 Q. Did you talk to anyone else as you wrote
20 the article to get additional information or is this
21 basically information that is yours alone?

22 A. I don't believe I talked to anyone else.

23 Q. Going to the second page you say in the
24 fourth full paragraph Paterson's primary objective in
25 the design of DOS was to make it as easy as possible

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 222

1 for software developers to write applications for it.
2 To achieve this, Paterson sought to make the
3 application program interface, API, closed paren,
4 compatible with CP/M.

5 These are your words at that time?

6 A. Yes, yes.

7 Q. This is your position as to what your
8 objective was in the design of DOS and how you
9 achieved it?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Where was this encyclopedia published, if
12 you know?

13 A. I don't know.

14 Q. Do you know who published it?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Did you get -- go ahead.

17 A. I recently, in the past few months, I
18 think, happened to think about this article and say to
19 myself, I wonder if it was ever published, because I
20 had never seen it. I happened to look on Amazon and
21 there it was. So I know you can buy it from Amazon.

22 Q. You further go on and say that CP/M
23 compatibility of the API was key to making the
24 translated program run correctly. That's true,
25 correct?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 223

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. The next sentence, also, it was hoped that
3 the familiarity of the CP/M style API would make it
4 easier for developers to learn to write programs for
5 DOS. Those are your words?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Why did you say it was hoped? Was that
8 simply a use of the passive frame? Any reason? To
9 refer to somebody other than you, perhaps?

10 A. Well, as I mentioned, as an encyclopedia
11 article, I'm not trying to put this, you know, in a
12 book full of articles without making it dependent on
13 the reader knowing who wrote it. I chose not to say I
14 hoped. Is that what you're asking?

15 Q. I think it was, yeah.

16 A. I guess it would be more than I; it would
17 be we at Seattle Computer.

18 Q. But it was a -- the familiarity of the CP/M
19 style API was an asset to DOS, as you understand it?

20 A. We believed it would be.

21 Q. Then you go on and say the secondary
22 objective in the design of DOS was to make it fast and
23 efficient, so it was written entirely in 8086 assembly
24 language.

25 Could you tell me what you mean by that?

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 224

1 A. By which phrase? The first or the second?
2 Or the whole thing?

3 Q. The whole thing, the sentence.

4 A. Is there more to say about an objective of
5 making it fast and efficient?

6 Q. I guess I need to understand the 8086
7 assembly language portion.

8 A. So yeah, it's the second part you're asking
9 about there. That's the fundamental language of the
10 microprocessor. I am not sure how to explain it. As
11 opposed to today, I program in the C programming
12 language or C plus plus or C sharp or you can program
13 in BASIC and these programming languages can be used
14 on all kinds of different machines and then you run it
15 through a translator to focus it for a given one.
16 This is you've done the translation yourself. You're
17 writing at the lowest level to get -- for maximum
18 effect, for the most compact and fastest way of
19 getting things done.

20 Q. In this article when you explain how you
21 made the API compatible with CP/M, were you in any way
22 thinking of refuting or responding to the allegations
23 that we've seen having been made by Mr. Kildall and
24 Mr. Wharton several years earlier?

25 A. That's probably in the back of my mind, in

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 225

1 the sense that I want to use a thorough enough
2 explanation to cover that ground. I want to explain
3 what is similar and what is not. I want to try and
4 make that clear. So that aspect of is it a clone and
5 is it, you know, a rip off and stuff, that's in my
6 mind writing this, thinking if I explain it, you know,
7 fully and in detail people will understand.

8 Q. The last page of Exhibit 53 is your
9 bibliography and this includes the book Gates and the
10 book Hard Drive. I assume that you read those in
11 preparation for this particular article?

12 A. I may have just not necessarily read them.
13 In 2000 again I had them already on my website as
14 bibliographic references and if I had concluded they
15 were okay to put on the website, they were okay to put
16 in the article and just snapped them in there. The
17 other two are from the website, so...

18 Q. All five of these articles are referenced
19 on your website?

20 A. Yeah. The three are referenced, the two
21 are actually present.

22 Q. We've discussed, I believe, all five of
23 them during this deposition?

24 A. Yeah.

25 Q. Next exhibit is 54. These are book reviews

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 226

1 from Transactions on Professional Communication,
2 February/March of 2000. Are you familiar with that
3 publication?

4 A. No.

5 Q. This book review refers to two books on
6 Silicon Valley by Mr. Kaplan and someone named Po
7 Bronson and on page 11 -- excuse me -- on page 111 at
8 the very bottom right the following statement is made.
9 At any rate, when IBM went back to Microsoft, the
10 young company saw the opening and went for it. Paul
11 Allen knew Tim Paterson of Seattle Computer Products,
12 who had written Q-DOS, Quick and Dirty Operating
13 System. Q-DOS was basically a rip off of Kildall of
14 CP/M, but Kildall had never gotten around to suing.

15 Do you see that?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Just as preface, were you a friend of Mr.
18 Allen?

19 A. We were acquaintances.

20 Q. Well, I asked you earlier if you were a
21 friend of Bill Gates. Would it be fair to say that
22 you knew Mr. Allen more than you knew Bill Gates?

23 A. At this time, maybe a little, but hardly
24 either -- acquainted with both of them from earlier
25 work where we used our equipment at their office, but

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 233

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. What was your reaction?

3 A. I was very angry that I was being called a
4 thief and that someone could write those things
5 without ever bothering to hear my side.

6 Q. Any other recollection?

7 A. I don't have any other recollection, no.

8 Q. What damages have you suffered because of
9 the publication of They Made America?

10 A. I am concerned about the image of a thief
11 being one that people will not want to buy their
12 products from. I use my position as father of DOS as
13 a marketing element to attempt -- in an attempt to
14 create a belief that I know what I'm doing, and I'm
15 concerned that by a widespread belief that I actually
16 stole the work, that backfires and becomes a negative
17 rather than a positive.

18 It's very hard to quantify. You don't get
19 a feel for who isn't buying because they have seen
20 something like that, but... As my business grows, I'm
21 concerned about it more and more, and even further as
22 it grows the possible impact when I need to grow to
23 the point where I want venture capital to grow
24 further.

25 Q. Have you done any quantification of the

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 234

1 damages, the amount?

2 A. No, I haven't.

3 Q. Do you have any notion or idea today what
4 your damage claim is, the amount?

5 A. No, I don't think so.

6 Q. Has anyone you've approached for funding
7 since the publication of the book mentioned the book
8 or the chapter on Gary Kildall in response or in
9 reaction to the funding request?

10 A. No. I haven't asked for funding yet at
11 this point.

12 Q. Has anyone come and spoken to you about
13 their reaction to the book or having read the book?

14 A. I have been in -- only media. I have been
15 in contact with -- at least a local reporter has
16 talked to me about it and I think I may -- well, there
17 may have been a reporter or two who's asked me about
18 it.

19 Q. Anyone else?

20 A. Not that I recall mentioning the book
21 specifically, no.

22 Q. Anybody who hasn't mentioned the book
23 specifically but simply mentioned the statements
24 contained in this chapter since the publication?

25 A. No. I have on occasion, on rare occasion,

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 235

1 received like an e-mail commenting on this idea that
2 DOS is just stolen or a clone, but I don't recall --
3 it's been rare enough I don't recall having received
4 one since the book's been out.

5 Q. So you have received e-mail or e-mails
6 about that subject, but that was prior to the
7 publication of the book?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Do you have a copy of any of these e-mails?

10 A. Probably not. I don't retain that long.

11 Q. Do you remember who sent them to you?

12 A. No. I don't recall it being anyone in
13 particular; in other words, it was just as far as I
14 know a Joe with an opinion.

15 Q. Do you know which of the statements or
16 publications they were responding to when they sent
17 the e-mail to you?

18 A. At least one referred to Microprocessor
19 Report, which is again quoted in the book.

20 Q. The Microprocessor Report in question, was
21 that the initial report or the reply by Mr. Wharton
22 that they were referring to?

23 A. I think it had -- it was the person had
24 seen all three articles, you know, the article, my
25 letter and his response.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 236

1 Q. And do you remember what they said?

2 A. No, not specifically.

3 Q. Did you contact any of the defendants
4 before filing suit about the publication They Made
5 America?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Have you consulted any physician or
8 received any medical care relating to any pain or
9 anguish or emotional distress arising from the
10 publication in question?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Are you planning to see any health care
13 provider regarding that?

14 A. No.

15 Q. You make an allegation that you have been
16 greatly injured in your character and reputation and
17 the loss of potential business opportunities. And I'm
18 referring to paragraph 1.8 of your complaint.

19 Could you list the loss of potential
20 business opportunities that you have suffered?

21 A. This would refer -- this would be the same
22 things I was talking about a minute ago, with the
23 potential for -- the unknown extent of the potential
24 for lost sales and difficulty in raising venture
25 capital in the future.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 237

1 Q. So there is no specific business
2 opportunity that you have lost; you are simply
3 referring to the potential of losing business
4 opportunities. Is that correct?

5 A. I am -- I don't know what the effect may
6 have been on sales and that's an unknown loss and then
7 there are other losses that are potential losses.
8 Venture capital is a potential loss and difficulty in
9 getting venture capital.

10 Q. Let me home in a bit further. Is there any
11 particular sale you can point to, any particular lost
12 sale that you can point to that you can say came
13 directly from --

14 A. No, I'm not -- I don't normally -- I don't
15 feel like I'm going to find out who is choosing not to
16 buy, so I don't have a way of knowing when I'm losing
17 a sale.

18 Q. The same question with regard to the
19 business opportunities, such as not just sales, but
20 investments and other things. Any specific
21 opportunity?

22 A. No, no, I haven't attempted -- I haven't
23 yet made the attempt to raise venture capital. It's a
24 concern for the future, possibly coming later this
25 year.

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 238

1 Q. Have you ever seen or heard Mr. Evans in
2 any particular medium other than the book in question?

3 A. No.

4 Q. Have you read any other books or
5 publications by Mr. Evans?

6 A. Not that I recall.

7 Q. Has anyone that you interact with on a
8 regular basis treated you differently as a result of
9 the publication of They Made America, to your
10 knowledge?

11 A. No.

12 Q. I've asked this question in different
13 contexts, but I just want to ask it one more time.
14 Has anyone refused you funding based on the chapter
15 that appears in They Made America on Gary Kildall?

16 A. No.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Let's take a very brief
18 break.

19 (Recess taken.)

20 MR. JOHNSON: I only have a few more
21 questions at this time.

22 Q. (BY MR. JOHNSON) One question. Do you
23 recall any other interviews you've done with members
24 of the media during the last 30 some years regarding
25 MS-DOS? I mean, we've gone through a series of books

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 239

1 and writings and so forth. I'm just curious if
2 there's anything else out there that you remember.

3 A. I remember having done a bunch of
4 interviews over this period of time and I remember --
5 don't remember, generally don't remember specifics.

6 Presumably, they would have, especially as
7 thorough as your search appeared to be, that you've
8 probably hit the results of those interviews. I
9 couldn't tell you -- I guess, probably the thing
10 you're looking for most is I can tell you no, I did
11 another interview that didn't show up here. I can't
12 remember such a thing.

13 Q. The next question. Do you have any notes
14 of any of these interviews, potentially, that would
15 establish who these people were?

16 A. No.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Anyway, I don't have any
18 further questions at this time. There may be further
19 additional questions as the case progresses, but at
20 this point we're finished.

21 MR. TOMKINS: Thank you for your
22 courtesy. We'll not waive and take a copy if it's
23 ordered. I guess that concludes -- off the record.

24 (Signature reserved.)

25 (Deposition concluded at 5:25 p.m.)

TIM PATERSON; January 18, 2007

Page 242

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2
3 I, CHERYL J. HAMMER, the undersigned Certified
4 Court Reporter and Notary Public, do hereby certify:

5 That the testimony and/or proceedings, a
6 transcript of which is attached, was given before me
7 at the time and place stated therein; that any and/or
8 all witness(es) were by me duly sworn to tell the
9 truth; that the sworn testimony and/or proceedings
10 were by me stenographically recorded and transcribed
11 under my supervision, to the best of my ability; that
12 the foregoing transcript contains a full, true, and
13 accurate record of all the sworn testimony and/or
14 proceedings given and occurring at the time and place
15 stated in the transcript; that I am in no way related
16 to any party to the matter, nor to any counsel, nor do
17 I have any financial interest in the event of the
18 cause.

19 WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL this 1st day of February
20 2007.

21 _____
22 CHERYL J. HAMMER
23 Certified Court Reporter
24 CCR No. 2512
25 Notary Public in and for the
State of Washington, residing
in Snohomish County. Commission
expires 9/29/09.

Yamaguchi Obien Mangio, LLC * www.yomreporting.com

520 Pike Street , Suite 1320, Seattle, Washington, 98101 * 206.622.6875 * 1(800) 831.6973