

**SAMPLE — NOT LEGAL ADVICE.** This response letter was generated automatically from publicly available analysis. It has NOT been reviewed by a licensed attorney and SHOULD NOT BE SENT to any party without substantial review and customization by qualified patent counsel. Use as a starting point only.

[Your Name]

[Your Title]

[Your Company]

[Street Address, City, State ZIP]

May 14, 2026

[Opposing Counsel Name]

[Firm Name]

[Address]

**Re: U.S. Patent No. 12125070 — Response to Assertion of Infringement**

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 12125070 (the "12125070 Patent"). After preliminary review, we have substantial concerns about the validity, enforceability, and scope of the asserted claims, summarized below. We reserve all rights and defenses.

## **1. Subject Patent — Summary**

An analysis of U.S. Patent 12,125,070 reveals the following information.

Title: Content delivery systems and methods

Assignee: As of the latest assignment on May 27, 2025, the assignee for this patent is Innovation Technologies Partners LP.

Inventors: David P. Maher, Prasad Khambete, Prasad Sanagavarapu, Sanjeev Tenneti, and Laurent Grandhomme are the listed inventors.

Filing Date: The application for this patent was filed on March 6, 2023.

Issue Date: The patent was granted on October 22, 2024.

Abstract: The provided text does not contain a formal abstract for US Patent 12,125,070. However, the technology described is a platform for monetizing content by dynamically matching...

## **2. Validity Concerns under 35 U.S.C. § 102 — Prior Art**

We have identified prior-art references that, in our preliminary view, anticipate one or more asserted claims of the 12125070 Patent:

Prior Art Analysis for US Patent 12,125,070

Disclaimer: This analysis is based on the provided detailed description and summary of US

Patent 12,125,070. As the specific claims of the patent were not available, a definitive anticipation analysis under 35 U.S.C. § 102 cannot be performed. The following assessment identifies prior art references cited during the prosecution of the '070 patent and discusses their potential relevance to the patent's core inventive concepts, such as client-side ad auctions, dynamic ad insertion based on local data, and the use of rules-based engines (like a DRM engine) for ad selection.

---

1. U.S. Patent No. 7,822,633 B2

- Citation: "Method and apparatus for targeted, synchronized advertising in a digital media system"
- Assignee: Yahoo! Inc.
- Dates: Filed: Mar. 15, 2005; Issued: Oct. 26, 2010.
- Description: This patent describes a system for providing targeted advertisements synchronized with a primary media stream. It discloses creating a user profile based on demographic data and media consumption habits. An ad server selects ads from an...

### **3. Obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Independent of § 102, we believe the asserted claims are obvious in view of combinations of prior art that a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine:

Obviousness Analysis of US Patent 12,125,070 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Disclaimer: This analysis is based on the provided summary and detailed description of US Patent 12,125,070. Since the specific claims are not available, this analysis addresses the obviousness of the core inventive concepts described, such as a client-side ad auction using local data and rules from multiple parties. A definitive legal conclusion would require an analysis of the specific language of the issued claims.

Standard for Obviousness: Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, an invention is unpatentable if the differences between the invention and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art (a "PHOSITA"). An obviousness analysis requires finding a suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of prior art references to arrive at the claimed invention.

Definition of a PHOSITA: A person having ordinary skill in the art for this invention would likely be a software engineer or computer scientist with...

### **4. Request**

In light of the foregoing, we request that your client (i) provide a detailed claim chart identifying each accused product or service and mapping every limitation of each asserted claim, (ii) identify any prior art known to your client, including any references cited during prosecution or reexamination, and (iii) substantiate the basis for any damages or licensing demand. We are prepared to discuss the matter further once we have received and reviewed the foregoing.

Sincerely,

**[Your Name]**

**DISCLAIMER.** This document is a machine-generated sample. The factual assertions, prior-art citations, and legal arguments above are AI-produced and may contain errors, omissions, or outdated information. Do not transmit this letter, in whole or in part, to any party. This is not legal advice; no attorney-client relationship is created by its existence. Consult a licensed patent attorney before responding to any patent-infringement assertion.

*Generated May 14, 2026 by [ihatepatentrolls.com](http://ihatepatentrolls.com) — sample only.*