

# Re: Free FAT16 Filesystem

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.arch.embedded/2005-08/msg00326.html>

---

- *From:* "Murray R. Van Luyn" <[vanluynm@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:vanluynm@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 9 Aug 2005 16:21:55 +0800
- 

Dave,

I can walk from this without losing a thing. I'm not that important. This is now because of the thousands of people that have missed out without there being an honourable reason.

Dave, I made every effort 3 weeks ago to have you understand that if you were to get greedy, that this is where we would end up.

> and this is the first time someone has tried to lock my tools out of the results.

That's just not true. My license terms read "It is released free of charge for any purpose, including both commercial and non-commercial uses." I have already explained to you that there is only the single impediment that restricts you or anyone else from adapting and using the code to promote his or her own software tools, and that is that it's as yet un-releasable. You withdrew permission.

> I did make the error of assuming he was using my tools, as it was not indicated  
> otherwise.

No, that's not true. You have had 30 days in which you chose to plead ignorant. I have sent you countless e-mails describing precisely my activities and intentions. You agreed without reservation, so the work was performed.

What is clear to me is your motivation. You now have in your possession a piece of code that is highly marketable, and you appear to have chosen to preserve a market for it by eliminating its competition. Better than that, you seem to believe that you have manipulated someone into performing the value adding process for you.

> Unfortunately he has chosen to close that door.

No, that's also deceitful. The only thing preventing me from releasing the code free of charge for any purpose is that YOU have withdrawn the FAT12 code contribution's permission. Now you appear to want me to do the rest of

Re: Free FAT16 Filesystem

the hard work to adapt it so that you can sell more compilers, and then shut the door to preserve a greedy market strategy once more.

Dave, you have stated to me that use of the MDCFS code in the development of the FAT16 code would have no economic impact "since MDCFS is not a revenue source for me". It is now up to you to be true to your word. Prove me wrong and let me release the code I worked so hard on for everyone to use. Otherwise, we will all be watching your website to see just how long it takes you to prove what I have suggested absolutely true.

Regards,  
Murray R. Van Luyn.

"Dave Dunfield" <Dave.Dunfield@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:OcQJe.862\\$Dd.2598@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:OcQJe.862$Dd.2598@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

> Hi Jon,  
>  
>>Your desire that the modifications of your code be at least compatible  
>>with your compiler are quite reasonable. But since this has been  
>>aired now in public I've a couple of questions which I believe are  
>>fair to ask. (I'm in an ornery mood, this morning? Perhaps.)  
>  
>>No need to answer them, if you feel that an extended discussion here  
>>is inappropriate --- in that case, these will just lay on the table, as  
>>it were:  
>  
> I agree that this should be put to rest, however in the light of recent  
> activities, I will provide brief responses:  
>  
>>(1) Who was the professional in this situation, Dave? I accept that  
>>Murray did not mention Keil in his correspondence to you. But why  
>>didn't you ask? It seems to me, an outsider of this relationship,  
>>that if something like this slips between the cracks, so to speak,  
>>then the fact that it did lays more to your error than his. His  
>>standard of care is less than yours, I believe. Of course, regardless  
>>of this question, I do think your position is a reasonable one. I'm  
>>just wondering how \_you\_ let this slip through without being asked.  
>  
> For several reasons:  
>  
> The initial contact came from the support channel on my web site, and  
> the individual identified himself as one of my customers – I did make  
> the error of assuming he was using my tools, as it was not indicated  
> otherwise.  
>  
> The original MDCFS.C is very generic, not targeted to a particular  
> processor, and barely targeted at my tools (the disk read/write  
> examples given in the distribution are inline Micro-C/86 assembly,  
> but otherwise the program is fairly standard). It seemed reasonable  
> that he would keep it that way.

Re: Free FAT16 Filesystem

>  
> And frankly, it never occurred to me ... I've granted use of bits of my  
> source code to hundreds of people (most anyone who asks), >  
> But your point is well taken, I will indeed be more diligent in the  
> future.  
>  
>  
>>(2) Let's say that Murray had, instead, developed a single set of  
>>source code from your FAT12 MDCFS code that was able to be compiled on  
>>both your compiler AND under Keil's, as well. In other words, it used  
>>#if type statements to allow it to compile for either product. Would  
>>this then still remain a problem for you? In other words, would you  
>>\_require\_ that the result of Murray's efforts \_also\_ be incompatible  
>>with your competition? Because if that is the case, it seems to me to  
>>place an even greater emphasis on my first question.  
>  
> I would not have a problem with that, in fact in correspondence with him  
> this morning, I suggested that either a) he could release it in a generic  
> form similar to the original code, or b) I would help him if required to make  
> it compatible with both toolsets. Unfortunately he has chosen to close  
> that  
> door.  
>  
>  
>>I think the letter you presented was very clear and given that you had  
>>no idea that it was being ported to Keil as well as being enhanced,  
>>quite understandable. I'm just not sure why you let this one get so  
>>far away from your interest without ever asking a question that  
>>probably should have been asked. You are the professional one, held  
>>to the higher standard, in this partnership -- from my otherwise  
>>ignorant perspective.  
>  
> Up until yesterday, it was all very friendly and I wasn't worried about  
> it.  
> When I realized he had locked out my tools, I asked for it to be removed,  
> figuring that we would probably work something out later ...  
>  
> Regarding your original question "Who was the professional in this  
> situation?",  
> I can only say to please take a look at the comments that he has posted  
> about  
> me on his web site and draw your own conclusion.  
>  
> This is as far as this should go in a public forum – if anyone wishes  
> further  
> clarification of my position, please contact me privately.  
>  
> Regards,  
>  
> Dave

Re: Free FAT16 Filesystem

>  
> ---  
> Dunfield Development Systems <http://www.dunfield.com>  
> Low cost software development tools for embedded systems  
> Software/firmware development services [Fax:613-256-5821](tel:613-256-5821)  
>

---

• **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: Free FAT16 Filesystem**  
◇ From: Paul Burke

• **References:**

- ◆ **Free FAT16 Filesystem**  
◇ From: Murray R. Van Luyn
- ◆ **Re: Free FAT16 Filesystem**  
◇ From: Murray R. Van Luyn
- ◆ **Re: Free FAT16 Filesystem**  
◇ From: Dave Dunfield
- ◆ **Re: Free FAT16 Filesystem**  
◇ From: Jonathan Kirwan
- ◆ **Re: Free FAT16 Filesystem**  
◇ From: Dave Dunfield

- Prev by Date: **Cores on the PLB of the Virtex2Pro**
- Next by Date: **GUI Development Tools**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Free FAT16 Filesystem**
- Next by thread: **Re: Free FAT16 Filesystem**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**