



*Corporate offices & Manufacturing Facilities*  
730 Hemlock Road, Morgantown, PA 19543  
(610) 286-2007 Phone - (610) 286-3071 Fax

---

## **CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT**

July 26, 2012

Brent and Shannon Potvin  
Dogwatch Atlanta  
1025 Nine North Dr., Suite A  
Alpharetta, Ga. 30004

### Regarding Unfair Competition Practices

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Potvin:

I am writing on behalf of Perimeter Technologies, Inc., owners of the Pet Stop brand of pet containment. This letter is intended to call your attention to various information listed on your website <http://www.atlantahiddendogfence.com> and a statement that is being made to sales prospects that are either false or intentionally misleading, which may rise to unlawful acts.

In the spirit of competition it is common to emphasize ones advantages over the competition. It is only when those "advantages" are inaccurate or blandly misleading that we object. Such is the situation in this matter where claims you make on your website are categorically false and therefore misleading. Consequently we presume that this is leading to false statements being made to sales prospects in sales presentations. Because these claims are untrue they are damaging to us and our Dealers in the Atlanta market.

Specifically I am referring to the following:

1. Your statement that Dogwatch product is the safest available.
2. Statements made on your website relating to the superiority of FM over AM as it relates to pet containment products.
3. Statements that are being made to sales prospects that Pet Stop product is subject to "misfiring".

4. Information listed on your website on the page titled: "How DogWatch® Protects Your Home".

First, let me applaud Dogwatch for taking a negative and turning it into a positive. When faced with an infringement complaint from Invisible Fence Company many years ago, Dogwatch switched its method of receiving a signal to FM. To their credit they gave it the catchy name Safelink®, which, giving the public's general acceptance that a FM radio signal is clearer than an AM radio, allowed Dogwatch to create the impression that their FM system was superior.

While the public is allowed to draw their own conclusions from such a marketing twist, your website goes way beyond association and attempts to give reasons why FM is superior. That explanation contains false and misleading information, mostly because in reality there is little or no difference between the two modulations used in a Pet Containment system.

Specifically you state:

*"Whenever the AM Hidden Fence signal is "off" it's open to interference from other radio signals coming from common household electronics such as garage door openers, television remotes, baby monitors, etc. The result of this interference is a digital AM Hidden Fence system that's prone to "misfire", randomly shocking your pet. This can lead to a confused and frightened animal."*

This is false! In practice it is how the signal is processed that creates the security of the signal. All Pet Stop receivers incorporate processing that discriminates signals to prevent false activation. Furthermore, none of the devices you list use a signal near the frequency used in pet containment devices and therefore none of those products could possibly falsely activate a pet fence receiver.

You also state:

*".....This is why FM music plays over the radio with no static (at all...) and fire/police departments, air traffic controllers, etc. all communicate exclusively over FM channels. Bottom line; digital FM is superior to digital AM."*

This statement is also false. Aircraft radios use amplitude modulation (AM) rather than frequency modulation (FM). The advantage of AM is that a listener can hear two simultaneous transmissions on the same frequency. With FM, only the stronger one can be heard. There's less risk of misunderstood communication with AM, which is a safety consideration in crowded air space.

Your claim that Dogwatch is the safest product available is false and misleading. Pet Stop incorporates safety measure in all its designs. Any “misfires” are only due to the pet containment signal being rebroadcast onto some other device or ground loop. Dogwatch is also susceptible to the same occurrences. Therefore the claims you make are false and therefore misleading to the public.

Finally, the page titled “How DogWatch® Protects Your Pet” presents the false position that grounding outside the house is superior to the grounding methods employed by Pet Stop and other pet containment companies. In fact, you specifically assert that “*Any other approach to this protection is an unsafe shortcut.*” This entire presentation is false and misleading due to the fact that it’s premise is flawed. The lightning design for all Pet Stop transmitters has been recognized by UL and approved for use in pet containment and therefore is as safe, if not safer, than methods employed by Dogwatch. Our company and the engineering talent it employs stand on a rich history of experience in this field. As a result we find this section particularly offensive in its premise that Dogwatch alone provides a safer design than does Pet Stop.

We request that you amend your website accordingly and cease making the statement that Pet Stop receivers are prone to “misfires”. Additionally, should you not be the creator of these materials, we ask that you forward this letter to the creator so that this information may be amended.

Finally, I am obligated to inform you that unfair competitive practices are unlawful and covered under provision of the Lanham Act. While we hope you respond to this letter and make the requested changes, if such requests are not made within the next 30 days, I will be forced to turn this matter over to our General Counsel, Jason Theobald, who I have copied on this communication.

We appreciate your cooperation and should you have any questions or wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

John J. Purtell  
President

cc: Jason Theobald, Corporate Counsel