

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. 12254103 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 12254103 (the "12254103 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

As of April 30, 2026, a search of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) and U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) dockets for patent number 12,254,103 reveals the following information.

Summary of U.S. Patent No. 12,254,103

Title: Security mechanism for namespaces used in electronic identification on mobile devices

Assignee: Thales DIS France SAS

Inventors: Mourad Faher, Carole Bayle

Filing Date: September 25, 2020

Issue Date: March 18, 2025

Abstract:

A system, mobile device, and method for managing security policies for data items stored in an electronic identification (eID) wallet on the mobile device. Security policies are associated with each of a...

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 12254103 Patent:

Analysis of Prior Art for U.S. Patent No. 12,254,103

This analysis reviews the prior art cited by the USPTO examiner during the prosecution of U.S. Patent No. 12,254,103. The focus is on determining whether any single reference anticipates the patent's independent claims (Claims 1, 11, and 16) under 35 U.S.C. § 102, which requires that a single prior art document disclose every element of a claim.

The core inventive concept of patent 12,254,103 appears to be the interactive method where a mobile device's eID wallet advertises multiple data sources ("namespaces") along with their specific security rules, allowing an external reader (or "verifier") to evaluate these rules and select the most appropriate namespace for a given transaction. This shifts some of the decision-making logic to the reader, which can then choose a namespace based on its own capabilities and the level of trust required.

Based on the examiner-cited references, the following are the most relevant prior art.

1. US Patent Application Publication No. 2015/0040180 A1

• Full Citation: US 2015/0040180 A1,...

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 U.S. Patent No. 12,254,103 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

This analysis evaluates whether the independent claims of U.S. Patent No. 12,254,103 would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA) at the time of the invention, with a priority date of October 18, 2019. An invention is considered obvious if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to a PHOSITA. This analysis relies on the prior art references cited by the USPTO examiner and summarized in the "Prior art" section.

A PHOSITA in this technical field would be an engineer or computer scientist with several years of experience in mobile application development, data security, secure element technology, and client-server communication protocols, particularly within the context of identity management or electronic payment systems.

Combination of Prior Art

The independent claims of patent 12,254,103 could be rendered obvious by combining the teachings of US 2015/0040180 A1 (the '180 application)...

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 ihatepatenttrols.com — sample only.