**U.S. - Microsoft Consent Decree Timeline**

**May 1998** – The U.S. Department of Justice and 19 states plus the District of Columbia file antitrust lawsuits against Microsoft relating to the Windows operating system and competition with Netscape in Web browsing.

**October 1998** – A consolidated antitrust case against Microsoft goes to trial before Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

**April 2000** – Judge Jackson rules that Microsoft unlawfully maintained a monopoly in Windows and unlawfully tied its Web browser to Windows.

**June 2000** – Judge Jackson orders the breakup of Microsoft into two companies.

**June 2001** – A federal appeals court unanimously affirms the monopolization ruling but overturns the tying ruling. The appeals court also reverses the breakup order and disqualifies Judge Jackson from further participation in the case due to an appearance of bias.

**September 2001** – The Department of Justice announces it will no longer seek a breakup of Microsoft.

**October 2001** – U.S. District Court Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly appoints a mediator and “urges the parties to remain steadfast in their efforts to reach a mutually agreeable resolution” on remedies.

**November 2001** – The Department of Justice and Microsoft reach a tentative agreement to settle the antitrust case and submit a proposed settlement to the district court for approval. Four days later, nine plaintiff states join the settlement.

**March 2002** – Judge Kollar-Kotelly commences a trial on a request by nine other states and the District of Columbia, led by California, for far stiffer remedies to be imposed on Microsoft.

**Early 2002** – Microsoft unveils new business practices and product changes it will implement as part of the settlement with the Department of Justice, including giving users the ability to remove access to Windows features, such as the Internet Explorer browser, and see only competing products.

**November 2002** –Judge Kollar-Kotelly approves the settlement between Microsoft, the Department of Justice and nine plaintiff states. Microsoft is ordered to comply with the consent decree for five years. The judge also rules against the stiffer remedies requested by nine states and the District of Columbia.

**June 2004** – A federal appeals court unanimously approves the settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice, rejecting objections from Massachusetts that the sanctions are inadequate.

**May 2006** – The Department of Justice announces that Microsoft has voluntarily agreed to extend until November 2009 selected provisions of the consent decree governing the licensing of client-server communications protocols.

**July 2006** – Microsoft adopts a set of principles that will guide the company’s future development of the Windows desktop platform after major parts of the consent decree expire.

**August 30, 2007** – The Department of Justice and six states, including New York, tell the court the consent decree has achieved its goals.

**October 16, 2007** – Less than a month before the consent decree is due to expire, a group of seven states led by California asks the court to extend the decree until 2012 on the grounds that it has not been successful. Two days later four other states, including New York, join the California group in seeking a five-year extension of the consent decree, but this group argues the decree has been successful and its benefits should continue.

**October 19, 2007** – The Department of Justice tells the court “it does not believe the standard for such an extension has been met” and the consent decree should expire in November.

**October 30, 2007** –All parties agree to temporarily extend the consent decree until Jan. 31, 2008, to give Judge Kollar-Kotelly time to consider whether to grant the California group’s request for a five-year extension.

**November 9, 2007 –** The Department of Justice files an amicus curiae brief explaining in detail why it believes the consent decree has accomplished its goal and does not need to be extended.

**January 29, 2008** – Judge Kollar-Kotelly grants a shorter extension than requested, to November 12, 2009.

**February 21, 2008 –** Microsoft announces a new set of interoperability principles, making free and available online technical documentation to aid developers in creating Windows-compatible applications.

**April 16, 2009** **–** The parties agree to an 18 month extension to May 12, 2011 to allow sufficient time to complete review of the technical documentation and for Microsoft to address any feedback from the review.

**December 8, 2009** **–** Plaintiffs declare that the protocol documentation is “substantially complete.”

**June 16, 2010** **–** The parties announce a set of milestones to wind down Microsoft’s compliance with the Final Judgments in advance of the May 12, 2011 expiration.

**January 1, 2011 –** Document review completed.

**April 22, 2011 –** Plaintiffs declare that Microsoft has met the wind down milestones and that the Final Judgments can expire on May 12, 2011.

**April 27, 2011 –** Microsoft and plaintiffs meet with Judge Kollar-Kotelly for a final hearing. Judge Kollar-Kotelly states that Microsoft is in compliance and that it is appropriate for the Final Judgments to expire on May 12, 2011. This hearing concludes the formal review and management of the company’s compliance with the consent decree.