

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. 12375890 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 12375890 (the "12375890 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

Unable to Locate Patent Information for US 12375890

As of April 26, 2026, a search of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) database and the 2026 dockets of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) for patent number 12375890 yielded no specific results.

Consequently, it is not possible to provide a summary of the patent's title, assignee, inventors, filing date, issue date, or abstract. A plain-language overview of its independent claims cannot be formulated as the claims themselves are unavailable.

This lack of information may be due to several reasons, including but not limited to: the patent number being inaccurate, the application being under 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 12375890 Patent:

Prior Art Analysis for US Patent 12375890

This analysis identifies and examines the prior art cited in US Patent 12,375,890, titled "System and method for managing access to a push-to-talk-over-cellular communication network." The information is based on the authoritative patent text retrieved on May 6, 2026. The analysis

focuses on determining which claims of the patent are potentially anticipated by each prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The core invention of US Patent 12,375,890 revolves around a system for temporarily granting non-subscriber devices access to a Push-to-Talk-over-Cellular (POC) talkgroup. This is initiated by a subscriber device sending non-subscriber contact information to a control device, which then transmits a communication to the non-subscriber device, often including a link to download the necessary software and configuration information. Access for the non-subscriber is typically granted for a predetermined period and can be automatically revoked.

Cited Prior Art References and Potential Anticipation

The following table details the prior art...

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 12375890

This analysis examines the obviousness of the claims of US Patent 12,375,890 ("the '890 patent") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The analysis is based on the previously generated Prior Art section and concludes that the claims would likely be considered obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA) at the time of the invention.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, a patent claim is unpatentable if the differences between the claimed 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. An obviousness rejection often involves combining the teachings of multiple prior art references. A key requirement for such a rejection is demonstrating that a PHOSITA would have been motivated to combine the references to achieve the claimed invention.

Analysis of Independent Claims

The '890 patent's novelty, as established in the prior art analysis, centers on a specific workflow for granting temporary access to a...

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 — sample only.