

Comments related to :Exemption to Prohibition on Circumvention of Copyright Protection Systems for Access Control Technologies

Commenter: Tim Oster

This is in regard to a end users ability to use electronics equipment, purchased in whole as they see fit. It is absurd to think that a manufacturer has the right to restrict the use of an electronic device I have purchased in whole. As the owner of said property I should continue to have the right to modify the device to suit my particular needs and wants. Having paid the full asking price for said device, I feel the manufacturer no longer has valid claim to any control of the use of the device.

The DCMA is intended to protect owners of IP from fraud and theft. It is NOT intended to allow them to control the use of the device after it has been sold to the end user. Replacing the code/OS/firmware in an electronic device in no way steals IP from the manufacturer, in fact you are replacing their owned code with alternate code to which they have no rights or control. I equate this to pouring a Pepsi into a glass purchased which says Coke on the side of it. It is my glass and I should have the right to drink a Pepsi product from said glass without being sued by Coke for using a glass with their logo on it. In this case of course I am free to drink the beverage of my choice.

With an electronic device I should have the same freedom to replace the internal code/os/firmware with code I have written myself, or with code provided by the author to me.

Please continue to allow legal owners of electronic devices to modify them as they see fit.

Tim Oster