

Robert L. Nuckolls, III

AeroElectric Connection
6936 Bainbridge Road
Wichita, Kansas 67226-1008
Phone/Fax (316) 685-8617 E-Mail: nuckolls@aeroelectric.com

February 28, 1999

J.P. Instruments
Consumer Affairs Office
P.O. Box 7033
Huntington Beach CA 92615

Greetings,

I've been following the dispute launched by JPI against Matronics and I've read the statement posted on JPI's website. Can you help me understand some of what I read there?

"However, Matronics, upon its own initiative, decided to present the dispute to a public forum, without first contacting J.P. Instruments, and without disclosing all of the relevant facts."

Please explain what "relevant facts" were not disclosed? Your website statement is not specific. You also wrote . . .

"The irreversible damage of this intentional campaign by Metronics (sic) to discredit and damage the reputation of J.P. Instruments in the aviation market place was extensive. For several days, J.P. Instruments' phone lines were bombarded with complaints and prank phone calls, while the fax machines rang continuously to keep them occupied. Distasteful and obscene letters were sent to several J.P. Instruments' employees via e-mail and via fax. In total, J.P. Instruments' sales and operations were disrupted for a matter of days. However, more importantly, J.P. Instruments believes that a one-sided presentation of the facts to the public, severely damaged the long established and highly regarded reputation of a company, which is considered the leader in its field."

I'm very sorry that some of the individuals who responded to Mr. Dralle's plea found it necessary to display their lack of good citizenship. JPI's position as supplier to the aviation community has never been in doubt. I have often recommend JPI to my clients when their needs were addressed by one or more JPI products. However, I will take issue with the fact that Matronic's presentation was anything other than it could be . . . the documents mailed to Mr. Dralle were

accurately reproduced on the net. Both JPI's and Matronics positions were quite clear. For JPI to now label Matt's presentation of fact as "one sided" is clearly contrary to fact.

Please consider the manner in which JPI initiated this situation: In an era of predatory litigation, judicial steamrolling of smaller companies by larger ones, and demonstrated lack of equity in the justice system, the response to your actions was predictable. If the president of JPI had called Mr. Dralle and opened a civil conversation about the matter, all of this might have been avoided. Instead, Mr. Dralle receives a packet of legal documentation from a lawyer. Matt doesn't spend his day dealing with such matters. The first time one receives such a mailing, the first impression is that the steamroller is stoked and just around the corner. I'll respectfully suggest that Matt's reaction was understandable.

I'll further suggest that JPI has avoided the publication of other relevant facts. I'm told that several companies have been issued trademarks on the word "scanner". I'm also mystified as to how you make the connection between "scanner" a proper English noun and "FuelScan" an obviously stylized use of words to refer to a specific product that is NOT manufactured by JPI. I suspect a diligent search of the business archives will reveal literally hundreds of variations on the use of the word "scan" and many of those may be trademarked also.

I have difficulties with my own business name . . . there are at least three other companies who use a derivation of "AeroElectric" and we trade misdirected faxes, packages and letters. As long as the other users are conducting themselves in an honorable way, I see no reason to throw stones . . . socially or legally. We redirect errant items to the proper address and speak well of each other. But should one of them stir up the guard-dogs and send me a letter like Mr. Dralle received, I'm not sure that I would react any differently.

The tone of your website posting was not conciliatory in any fashion so may I presume that there are no plans to put this matter to peaceful rest? JPI's claim to confusion and loss of identity much less clear than my own. May I suggest that a conciliatory meeting between Joe and Matt is in order? I'll predict the finest possible outcome for all concerned if this matter is simply cooled off and put to rest . . . I cannot see how any other course of action can be useful to anyone. If the matter continues on the usual course under the guidance of lawyers, I fear that the damage to both companies will be incalculable.

Kindest regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert L. Nuckolls, III". The signature is written in a cursive style with a stylized "R" and "N".

Robert L. Nuckolls, III