

CASE ARGUED FEBRUARY 26 & 27, 2001, DECIDED JUNE 28, 2001

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

---

No. 00-5212

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Defendant-Appellant

---

Consolidated with No. 00-5213

---

**APPELLEES' MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE ISSUANCE OF MANDATE**

---

This Court has directed the Clerk to withhold issuance of the mandate until “seven days after disposition of any timely petition for rehearing.” Order of June 28, 2001, citing D.C. Cir. Rule 41. The Court specified, however, that its instruction was “without prejudice to the right of any party at any time to move for expedited issuance of the mandate for good cause shown.” *Id.* In light of the exceptional importance of this case, and the strong public interest in prompt entry of a decree providing an effective remedy for Microsoft’s illegal conduct, the United States and the State Plaintiffs respectfully move that the Court direct the Clerk to issue the mandate immediately.

1. As the Court recognized in deciding at the outset to hear the appeal *en banc*, this case is of “exceptional importance.” Orders of June 13, 2000. The Court has since found that

Microsoft had a monopoly with respect to Intel-compatible PC operating systems, that Microsoft behaved anticompetitively, and that its anticompetitive conduct contributed to maintenance of its monopoly power, in violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act. Microsoft's operating system affects millions of businesses and hundreds of millions of consumers worldwide. Delay in imposing an effective remedy inflicts substantial and widespread consumer injury and needlessly prolongs uncertainty in the computer industry. In a dynamic marketplace, speed is of the essence in remedying the effects of unlawful exclusionary conduct designed to crush nascent competitive technologies. In these circumstances, the public interest is plainly served by allowing the proceedings on remand to go forward as quickly as possible.

2. There is no good reason to delay issuance of the mandate until mid-August or later.

The United States and the State Plaintiffs do not intend to petition for rehearing. Whether or not Microsoft decides to seek rehearing, the Court has already devoted unusually extensive resources to this matter, including two days of oral argument. There is no reason to believe that a petition for rehearing of this per curiam *en banc* decision would be granted and, therefore, no reason to await any such filing before issuing the mandate.

Furthermore, the United States and the State Plaintiffs do not intend to seek Supreme Court review of the case at this stage. While the United States and the State Plaintiffs do not know whether Microsoft will seek such review,<sup>1</sup> the possibility that Microsoft might choose to file a petition for certiorari does not preclude immediate issuance of the mandate. The Court's Order does not direct the Clerk to withhold the mandate pending the filing of any petition for certiorari.

---

<sup>1</sup>The United States and the State Plaintiffs reserve the right, of course, to file a conditional cross-petition for certiorari in the event that Microsoft seeks Supreme Court review at this time.

If Microsoft sought to stay the issuance of the mandate beyond the period specified in the Order, it would be required to file a motion showing that the petition for certiorari “would present a substantial question and that there is good cause for a stay.” Fed. R. App. P. 41(d)(2)(A). *See also* D.C. Cir. Rule 41(a)(2) (motion for stay of mandate must “set[] forth facts showing good cause”); *Johnson v. Bechtel Associates Prof’l. Corp.*, 801 F.2d 412, 415 (D.C. Cir. 1986). We have no reason to believe that Microsoft would be able to meet that standard.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should direct the Clerk to issue the mandate immediately. We have informed counsel for Microsoft of our intention to file this motion.

Respectfully submitted.

ELIOT SPITZER  
Attorney General of New York  
PREETA D. BANSAL  
Solicitor General  
JAY L. HIMES  
Chief, Antitrust Bureau  
MELANIE L. OXHORN  
Assistant Solicitor General  
RICHARD L. SCHWARTZ  
Assistant Attorney General  
120 Broadway  
New York, New York 10271  
(212) 416-6229

JAMES E. DOYLE  
Attorney General of Wisconsin  
KEVIN J. O’CONNOR  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of Attorney General  
State Capitol  
Post Office Box 7857, Suite 114 East  
Madison WI 53707-7857

July 13, 2001

---

CHARLES A. JAMES  
Assistant Attorney General  
DEBORAH P. HERMAN  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
CATHERINE G. O’SULLIVAN  
ROBERT B. NICHOLSON  
ADAM D. HIRSH  
ANDREA LIMMER  
DAVID SEIDMAN  
Attorneys

U.S. Department of Justice  
601 D Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
(202) 514-2413

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 13th day of July, 2001, I caused one copy of the foregoing APPELLEES' MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE ISSUANCE OF MANDATE to be served by facsimile, followed by the first class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, or by hand upon:

Bradley P. Smith (By hand)  
Sullivan & Cromwell  
1701 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 956-7500  
*Counsel for Appellant Microsoft*

Randall J. Boe  
Theodore W. Ulyot  
America Online, Inc.  
22000 AOL Way  
Dulles, Virginia 20166  
Tel: (703) 448-8700  
Fax: (703) 265-1495  
*Counsel for AOL*

Donald M. Falk  
Mayer, Brown & Platt  
1909 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 263-3000  
Fax: (202) 263-3300  
*Counsel for SIIA*

Carl Lundgren  
Valmarpro Antitrust  
5035 South 25th Street  
Arlington, Virginia 22206-1057  
Tel: (703) 235-1910  
Fax: (703) 235-5551

Edward J. Black  
Jason M. Mahler  
Computer & Communications  
Industry Association  
666 Eleventh Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 783-0070  
Fax: (202) 783-0534  
*Counsel for CCIA*

Louis R. Cohen  
C. Boyden Gray  
Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering  
2445 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-1420  
Tel: (202) 663-6000  
Fax: (202) 663-6363  
*Counsel for ACT and CompTIA*

Robert S. Getman  
359 West 29th Street  
Suite G  
New York, New York 10001  
Tel: (212) 594-6721  
Fax: (212) 594-6732  
*Counsel for TAFOL*

Robert H. Bork  
1150 17th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 862-5851  
Fax: (202) 862-5899  
*Counsel for ProComp*

John Warden  
Sullivan & Cromwell  
125 Broad Street  
New York, New York 10004  
Tel: (212) 558-4000  
*Counsel for Appellant Microsoft*

Paul T. Cappuccio  
Time Warner  
75 Rockefeller Plaza  
Floor 28  
New York, New York 10019  
*Counsel for AOL*

David Burton (By First Class Mail)  
333 North Fairfax Street  
Suite 302  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
*Counsel for CMDC*

Dr. Lee Hollaar  
Professor of Computing Science  
School of Computing  
University of Utah  
3190 Merrill Engineering Building  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112  
Tel: (801) 581-3203  
Fax: (810) 581-5843

William Neukom  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, Washington 98052  
Tel: (425) 869-1327  
*Counsel for Appellant Microsoft*

---

Catherine G. O'Sullivan  
(202) 514-2413