

Petitioners request relief from having to make their devices accessible to the disabled. What do they not want to offer universal accessibility as a feature on their products? If I were disabled I would clearly value universal accessibility features. I would not knowingly buy a product that discriminates against the disabled. I don't use the universal accessibility options in my computer or tablet because I don't need to use them but value them being available as an option. Congress intended on such devices being required to grant assistance to the disabled – these companies now want to go around Congress and get a waiver from the FCC of these rules. It's just like with the Selectable Output Control situation with the MPAA. They came to Congress asking for a law change for a problem that didn't exist. Congress was willing to hear what they had to say and listened to them but found no conclusive evidence that there was a problem needing fixing – the problem as the MPAA saw it was not worth legislating if it meant the end of fair use for consumers . When the MPAA did not get its way in Congress lobbying for such a law it went to the FCC to grant a waiver – that is an exemption allowing it to implement this anti-feature. The petitioners in this case – I'm sorry if I take it personally (and some personal bias shows) but I support the rights of the disabled and this is just wrong. If they don't like the law they should try to lobby Congress to change it not covertly asks the FCC for an exemption from a law passed by Congress. Even then I would be upset about a law allowing discrimination. Finally, to the petitioners wanting permission to discriminate against the disabled I would not buy your product if it does not offer universal accessibility. This is like an automobile manufacturer asking for permission to not install seat belts in a car just to cut costs. Safety is more important than cutting costs.