Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington , DC 200554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	**WT Docket No.03-66**
Amendment of Par t s 1, 21, 73 , and 101	)	**RM-10586**
Of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate	)	
The Provision of Fixed and Mobile	)	
Broadband Access , Educational and	)	
Other Advanced Services in the 2150-	)	
2162 and 2500-2690MHz Bands	)	
	)	
	)	
Part 1 of the Commission's Rules	)	**WT Docket No. 03-67**
Further Competitive Bidding	)	
Procedures	)	
	)	
	)	
Amendment of parts 21 and 74 of the	)	
Commissions's Rules With Regard to	)	**WT Docket No. 02-68**
Licensing in the Multipoint Distribution	)	**RM-9718**
Service and in the Instructional Television	)	
Fixed Service for the Gulf of Mexico	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
Amendment of Part 2 of the Commission's	)	**ET Docket No. 00-258**
Rules to Allocate Spectrum below 3 GHz	)	
For Mobile and Fixed Services to Support	)	
The Introduction of New Advances	)	
Wireless Services , Including Third	)	
Generation Wireless Systems	)	

THESE COMMENTS ARE FILED EX-PARTE IN THE ABOVE REFERENCED DOCKETS AND RULE MAKING PROCEDURES BEFORE THE FCC .

Dorothy M. Hartman , inventor , in the above referenced matter(s) hereby opposes the referenced petitions only as they apply to bidding , leasing , or free access to Broadband which accesses to the INTERNET or WORLDWIDE WEB either by phone , cable , or wireless . **Hartman** who claims that she is the inventor of the

INTERNET and the WORLDWIDE WEB in an email to the FCC ,PLEASE STOP THE FREE GIVEAWAY OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY , June 26 , 2008 and by exparte comments to relevant proceedings before the FCC having to do with the disbursement of these services claims that this is her intellectual property. She further claims that the FCC is in error when it invokes the Communications Act of 1934 as its premise in taking such actions including the distribution of licensing and other matters relating to communications , Title 47 CFR , 27.1(a) " The Rules for miscellaneous wireless communications services (WCS) in this part are promulgated under the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 …… The inventor Hartman contends that the FCC may be engaging in retroactive rulemaking citing the use of the 1934 Communications Act – law(s) written over 50 years before the introduction of the INTERNET , WORLDWIDE WEB , or 'BROADBAND'. Rules are retroactive if they " alter the past legal consequences of past actions " or " change what the law was in the past ."

The inventor , **Hartman** is addressing her comments before the **FCC** on these relevant matters in the hope that the FCC will cease and desist immediately in the matter of the distribution of INTERNET property which she claims is intellectual property and therefore the FCC may not be lawful in its actions .The **Commission** has within its own power and within its own rules the power to change this situation immediately , pursuant to 47 CFR 1.1, 1.2 , 1.3 . Subject to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act section 5(d) , '… On its own motion the [Commission] may issue a declaratory ruling terminating a controversy or removing uncertainty .' Under 47 CFR 1.3 and subject to the APA , the Commission may waiver its own rules if good cause is shown .Therefore Ms. Hartman hopes that the Commission will consider all of the ramifications of its actions regarding the distribution of INTERNET and INTERNET PROPERTIES as such actions could have grave consequences as to the rights of Inventor regarding proprietary information and

intellectual property as well . There may also be grave consequences to the economy . In the interest of justice and and sound economic sense , Ms. Hartman is hopeful that the FCC will consider all of hercomments in the relevant proceeding(s) and will alter its Rulemaking accordingly in these matter(s) .

Ms Hartman contends that she is the owner of proprietary information which was accepted by government research agencies as early as 1990 . She contends that her information was accepted in a confidential manner as part of requests for funding to start her own business , a telecommunications prototype.

Ms Hartman contends that confidential proprietary information contained in those proposals presented to the SBA (Small Business Administration) through its SBIR (Small Business Innovation Research) , BFTC (Benjamin Franklin Technology Center) , PA. Department of Commerce and indirectly to the NSF (National Science Foundation) and other programs resulted in use of her idea(s) , the *FEASIBILITY OF ACCESSING ACCESSIBILITY* as a template by the federal government through its funding to to educational institutions and private companies to build the INTERNET and the WORLDWIDE WEB .

She also contends that she was denied funding , primarily because she was poor , disadvantaged and a minority . Her ideas which were 'as good as gold' were kept and shared with existing telecom , computer companies and used without her permission to build the INTERNET which has brought trillions of dollars into the government and into private industry . Ms. Hartman who never minded sharing , if she herself had not been overlooked and treated so badly has yet to be recognized for her contributions as inventor of one of the greatest inventions of the 21st century . She has never been thanked or compensated in anyway – but the government now through actions by the FCC and delays in the USPTO is now robbing her of any opportunity whatsoever to recover. Ms. Hartman feels that these actions are unjust and unconscionable as the federal

government is well aware of her claims .

Financial hardship and disability have hampered her ability to overcome this injustice to her. Further upon learning of her plans to claim her rights by patent application – since 2004 , Ms . Hartman alleges that the federal government has made a monumental decisions to remove any rights that she might have to claiming the INTERNET as her intellectual property by the "rush" to declare the spectrum open for licenses , auctions , "giveaways", etc. The United States Patent and Trademark Office under the Department of Commerce has delayed the processing of Ms. Hartman's patent application for almost four (4) years essentially holding the patent application "hostage"while the government through the FCC has made its moves to strip Ms. Hartman of any proprietary or ownership rights by seeking even now to give away ' free access to all Americans ' and is apparently going around the world to give 'free access to everyone .' While on the face of it -it may seem "free access" – upon closer inspection it really is not ,as the tech companies which received government funding to build it in the first place will still be allowed to prosper for they will continue to charge fees for their services and costs for technology gadgets that customers will need to access the so called "free" internet .

The difference is that the INTERNET is bundled in and therefore any ownership or property rights by the inventor are made null and void . As altruistic as the acts appear to be on the face of it "broadband to all Americans " or 'free access to everyone ' – indeed it may simply be a ruse to cover a very unjust act– of racism and oppression . All indication is that the service is not free per se but bundled in with fee packages from various telecom and other tech companies and now even car companies and hotel packages- some of this bundling already begun and on the market using "free internet" as a 'hook' or 'draw.' The only thing supposedly non fee is the internet which is bundled in and Ms. Hartman contends that this arrangement is designed to strip her of any residual rights that she might

have even if awarded a patent and of any proprietary rights , such as ownership and management of the property .

Therefore , -not only for her protection as an inventor , but for the protection of other inventors and for the prevention of ad hoc laws and rules made on the basis of prejudice , suspicion , and fear and not jurisprudence and sound judgment- she hopes that the FCC will be very thorough in the evaluation of its acts and the facts .Being thus , perhaps it will not seek to hurt rules governing proprietary information , patent laws and intellectual property laws . This would be acting arbitrarily , capriciously , and not in accordance with law.

Ms. Hartman claims that not only would she be irreparably harmed by these actions by the FCC in reference to her intellectual property , but that this would open the door to any inventor or future inventors being hurt by the government making up **ad hoc** rules because they did not like the color , race , opinions , health or any other orientation of the inventor and decide to change the rules of the game just because it finds it convenient to deny or oppress the rights of inventor . The inventor , **Hartman** further contends that in the effort to deny one individual what is rightfully hers , the actions of the FCC might unwittingly hurt an already fragile economy and the millions of people who depend on it . An oppressive act does not foster competition , it stifles it and more importantly it makes nil a very powerful tool to hedge against recession and inflation .This is a very , very serious matter and the filer hopes that the FCC will seriously consider its actions and waive these procedures until such time – the legalities surrounding these matters are clarified .

Ms. Hartman contends that although she filed a patent for the ACCESSING ACCESSIBILITY PROCESS which is now in the final stages of the patent application and it status should be Patent Pending – that her ownership of this intellectual property extends to back to 1989 when she first conceived it and submitted it first to the SBA in 1990 . Priority Data as claimed by Inventor/ Applicant is as follows : Ms. Hartman claims that