

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. 5490216 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5490216 (the "5490216 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

Patent Summary: US 5,490,216

A search of USPTO and CAFC databases for 2026 activity regarding patent 5490216 reveals no new dockets or filings. This is consistent with the patent's claims having been canceled, rendering it unenforceable. The following summary is based on the authoritative patent text.

|||

| :--- | :--- |

| Title | System for software registration |

| Inventor | Frederic B. Richardson, III |

| Original Assignee | Uniloc Singapore Pte Ltd |

| Current Assignee | Uniloc Luxembourg SA |

| Filing Date | September 21, 1993 |

| Issue Date | February 6, 1996 |

| Legal Status | Expired / Claims Canceled |

| Abstract | A registration system allows digital data or software to run...

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 5490216 Patent:

Based on a review of the prosecution history and the prior art cited on the face of US Patent 5,490,216, the following references are the most relevant for an anticipation analysis under 35 U.S.C. § 102. The analysis focuses on whether a single reference discloses, either explicitly or inherently, each and every element of a claimed invention.

Prior Art Analysis

The key references, which were also central to the successful PTAB challenges, are WO 92/09160 ("Tan"), U.S. Patent No. 4,688,169 ("Joshi"), and U.S. Patent No. 4,796,220 ("Pride").

1. WO 92/09160 A1 ("Tan")

- Full Citation: International Publication No. WO 92/09160 A1, "Software Licensing System," published for Tan Systems Corp.
- Publication Date: May 29, 1992 (This publication qualifies as prior art under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as it was published more than one year before the patent's filing date of September 21, 1993).
- Brief Description: Tan discloses a comprehensive software licensing system designed to prevent piracy. The system distributes software in an incomplete or limited-functionality "shell"...

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:

Based on the provided prior art analysis, which has been validated by successful challenges at the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB), the claims of US Patent 5,490,216 are rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Definition of a Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA)

At the time of the invention (prior to the September 1993 filing date), a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) would have been a software developer with a bachelor's degree in computer science or a related field, or equivalent industry experience. This individual would have been knowledgeable about common operating systems (e.g., MS-DOS, Macintosh System 7), software distribution methods (e.g., floppy disks), and the prevalent problem of software piracy. They would be familiar with existing software protection and registration schemes, including the use of serial numbers, hardware fingerprinting, and remote activation.

Primary Obviousness Combination: Tan (WO 92/09160) in view of Joshi (US 4,688,169) or Pride (US 4,796,220)

The combination of the Tan reference with the teachings of either...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 5490216 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Microsoft Corporation — 03-cv-00440 · U.S. District Court for the District of Rhode Island · Settled
- Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Sony Corporation of America et al. — 6:10-cv-373 · U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · filed 2010-07-29 · Settled
- Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Electronic Arts, Inc. — 6:13-cv-00259 · U.S. District Court for the

Eastern District of Texas · filed 2013-03-21 · Settled

- Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Kaspersky Lab, Inc. — 6:13-cv-00795 · U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · filed 2013-10-18 · Dismissed
- Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Microsoft Corporation — 1:03-cv-00440 · Rhode Island District Court · filed 2003-09-29 · Judgment vacated
- Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Symantec Corp. et al. — 8:08-cv-00203 · California Central District Court · filed 2008-02-19 · Dismissed
- Uniloc USA, Inc. v. McAfee, Inc. — 6:09-cv-00538 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2009-11-19 · Dismissed
- Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Ubisoft, Inc. — 6:10-cv-00069 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2010-02-12 · Dismissed
- ...and 5 additional case(s)

5. 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.