

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. 5602377 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5602377 (the "5602377 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

Analysis of U.S. Patent 5,602,377

As of April 28, 2026, this report provides a concise summary of United States Patent 5,602,377. A search of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) database confirms the following details. Additionally, a search of the 2026 dockets for the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) for litigation involving this patent yielded no results.

Title: Bar code dataform scanning and labeling apparatus and method

Assignee: The original assignee is listed as Metanetics Corp. The patent has since been assigned to Symbol Technologies, LLC, and subsequently to Meta Holding Corp.

Inventors:

- William E. Beller
- Ynjiun P. Wang

Filing Date: March...

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 5602377 Patent:

Analysis of Prior Art for U.S. Patent 5,602,377

As a senior US patent analyst, I have identified and reviewed the most relevant prior art cited during the examination of U.S. Patent 5,602,377. Below is a detailed analysis of each key reference, its relevance, and the specific claims of patent 5,602,377 that it could potentially anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The following documents were cited by the examiner during the prosecution of the application for U.S. Patent 5,602,377 and are listed on the face of the issued patent.

U.S. Patent 4,874,936

- Full Citation: Allais, D., et al., "Two-Dimensional Bar Code and Method of Encoding and Decoding," U.S. Patent 4,874,936, filed May 13, 1988, and issued October 17, 1989.
- Brief Description: This patent discloses a method and apparatus for encoding data into a two-dimensional bar code symbol, which consists of a stacked series of linear bar codes. It describes the structure of the symbol, including start and stop characters and row identifiers, to allow for high-density data storage. The '936 patent is foundational in the area of...

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 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for U.S. Patent 5,602,377

This analysis evaluates the obviousness of the independent claims of U.S. Patent 5,602,377 in light of the prior art cited during its examination. An invention is considered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented 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 (PHOSITA). As of the priority date of March 1, 1995, a PHOSITA in this field would likely have been an engineer or computer scientist with experience in bar code scanning systems, data processing, and enterprise inventory or point-of-sale systems.

The key innovation identified in the prior art analysis was the integration of a specific workflow: (1) scanning an existing bar code, (2) retrieving additional data from a remote database, (3) combining the two data sets, and (4) printing a new, updated 2D bar code. While no single prior art reference disclosed this entire sequence, the...

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.