

**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. 12409014 — Response to Assertion of Infringement**

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 12409014 (the "12409014 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**

Technical Analysis of U.S. Patent 12,409,014

Date of Analysis: April 26, 2026

Patent Number: 12,409,014

Title: Systems and methods for orthodontic bracket design

Assignee: The patent was initially assigned to Lightforce Orthodontics Inc. The assignment was later made to TRINITY CAPITAL INC. on August 14, 2024.

Inventors:

- Alfred Charles Griffin, III

- Kelsey A. Fafara

Filing Date: March 13, 2024

Issue Date: Based on the provided documentation, the application was granted on September 9, 2025, and published as US 12,409,014 B2 on the same day.

Abstract:

The patent describes a method for manufacturing customized ceramic labial/lingual orthodontic brackets using additive...

## **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 12409014 Patent:

Anticipation Analysis of Prior Art for U.S. Patent 12,409,014

Analysis Date: May 8, 2026

This report provides an analysis of the most relevant prior art cited in U.S. Patent 12,409,014 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (Anticipation). Anticipation requires that a single prior art reference discloses every element of a claimed invention. This analysis focuses on the independent claims of the '014 patent, which broadly cover a method of manufacturing customized orthodontic brackets using a digital workflow and additive manufacturing with specific inorganic materials.

---

1. U.S. Patent No. 8,694,142 B2 ("142 Patent")

- Full Citation: U.S. Patent 8,694,142 B2, "Method for producing a patient-specific orthodontic appliance," filed Nov 12, 2009; issued Apr 8, 2014. Assignee: OraMetrix, Inc.
- Brief Description: The '142 patent describes a method for creating patient-specific orthodontic appliances, including brackets. The process involves obtaining a 3D digital model of the patient's dentition, virtually designing the appliance on this model, and then fabricating the appliance using a...

### 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 12,409,014 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Analysis Date: May 8, 2026

This analysis evaluates whether the invention claimed in U.S. Patent 12,409,014 would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA) at the time of the invention. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, a claimed invention is unpatentable if the differences between the invention and the prior art are such that the invention as a whole would have been obvious to a PHOSITA. This analysis relies on the prior art references detailed in the previously generated "Prior Art" section of this report.

A PHOSITA in this field would likely be a materials scientist, biomedical engineer, or a dental professional (such as an orthodontist) with knowledge of digital dentistry workflows (CAD/CAM) and additive manufacturing technologies.

---

Primary Obviousness Combination: U.S. Patent 8,694,142 ('142) in view of U.S. Patent 8,623,264 ('264)

A strong argument for obviousness can be made by combining the teachings of the '142 and '264 patents.

- What the '142 Patent Teaches: As established in...

### 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](http://ihatepatenttrols.com) — sample only.*