

microsoft.public.windowsupdate: Re: .Net upgrade fails. (Firefox required for newsgroup access?!!!)

Re: .Net upgrade fails. (Firefox required for newsgroup access?!!!)

Source: <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windowsupdate/2004-12/0517.html>

From: Noel Paton (NoelDPspamless_at_btopenworld.com)

Date: 12/04/04

Date: Sat, 4 Dec 2004 21:23:52 -0000

What can I say? sh1t happens!!

The problem is that when MS write an OS, it gets distributed to perhaps 500million endplaces – no two of which are the same. Some (hopefully very few) of those places are bound to have something somewhere on their system which either shouldn't be there, or has got screwed by some act of idiocy by either the user, or the writer of another piece of software.

Trying to trace and prevent all instances of this type of error is not only costly, it's impossible, unless it's caught very early in the Beta process (and even then, if not reproducible, it may not get fixed). Don't forget, that it's only the hospital cases that generally come to newsgroups, we never get to hear from the vast majority of users who never have a problem, and unfortunately, most savvy users fall into that category – maybe we should be forced to use a noobie's machine for a couple of weeks as penance?<g> (OTOH, I think I'm doing penance on my box at work at the oment – the SysAdmins would act as a good firewall between the brewery and alehouse! – they certainly can't get Win2K to work properly on the network.)

No, it's not a great way to fix a problem, but it can often be an effective way when the problem is badly-defined by its circumstances. I would hazard a guess that either there's a very slight corruption of one of the files concerned, or that a file has been updated without proper permission/knowledge by the framework – and it's now behaving somewhat differently to the original. This can have major consequences, and be an absolute SOB to find, what with the large number of potential files involved, and the easies way around is to uninstall the whole shebang and reinstall it – hopefully curing any corruption/misguided files. This should allow the update to proceed (and then you can start waiting for something else to fall over<eg>).

--

Noel Paton (MS-MVP 2002-2005, Windows)

Nil Carborundum Illegitemi

<http://www.btinternet.com/~winnoel/millsrpch.htm>

<http://tinyurl.com/6oztj>

Please read <http://dts-l.org/goodpost.htm> on how to post messages to NG's

"ZenWarrior" <ZenWarrior@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message

news:9C401A9F-0359-41EC-9F47-90D020FCB536@microsoft.com...

> Noel, I ran Stinger and just as I expected, it returned a completely clean

Re: .Net upgrade fails. (Firefox required for newsgroup access?!!!)

microsoft.public.windowsupdate: Re: .Net upgrade fails. (Firefox required for newsgroup access?!!!)

> bill of health. No viruses found on my system. (And his record of no PC
> viruses in 20+ years still stands! <audience applause!>) Also, trying to
> install the .Net update as a standalone file generated approximately the
> same
> error message:
>
> SL34.tmp - Common Language Runtime Debugging Services
> Application has generated an exception that cannot be handled
> Process id = 0xf0(1264) Thead id = 0x5d8(1496)
> Click OK....
> Click CANCEL....
>
> Other suggestions?
>
> -----
>
> BUT, a search of the net returns over 600 pages about this problem. It is
> a
> bug Microsoft has decided isn't worth fixing--although it has now cost me
> approximately 8 hours of my weekend time. You might wish to read this:
>
> [QUOTE]Take a look at KB article 824643. It essentially has you manually
> deinstall Framework 1.1, then reinstall Framework 1.1 followed by install
> of
> Framework 1.1 Spl, all while running in a "clean boot+ Windows Installer
> service
> only" mode. Some of the "uninstall" parts didn't work for me, but manually
> deleting the various .Net Framework related .msi files from
> C:\\Installer\\ as directed by KB 824643 worked just as well. Kind of
> stupid
> of Microsoft to make us do it this way (deinstall everything, reinstall
> everything), but it worked for me after weeks of frustration. [/QUOTE]
>
> -----
>
> BUT Noel, if you know of a better and easier solution, please do share.
> Otherwise, there is now a probability of 1001% that I will *NEVER* touch
> another Microsoft OS. This is ridiculous. Here is a critical update that I
> cannot install because of Microsoft itself, and this has clearly presented
> problems for countless people who *paid* good money for a bad product.
>
> Not enough of a problem for them to fix? FU, Microsoft! I swear you'll not
> ever get another dime from me, effective this day! So much for a pleasant
> Saturday.