

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. 5768384 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5768384 (the "5768384 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

Summary of US Patent 5,768,384

Based on the provided patent text and public records, here is a concise summary of US patent 5,768,384.

- Title: System for identifying authenticating and tracking manufactured articles
- Assignee: Pitney Bowes Inc.
- Inventor: William Berson
- Filing Date: March 28, 1996
- Issue Date: June 16, 1998
- Abstract: This invention relates to a system for identifying, authenticating and tracking articles of manufacture throughout their manufacturing and distribution channels. The foregoing system utilizes: manufacturing meters that are located at authorized manufacturing locations and produce encrypted data that is uniquely associated with each manufactured...

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 5768384 Patent:

An analysis of the prior art cited during the examination of US patent 5,768,384 reveals several

key references that inform the scope and patentability of the claimed invention. The following patents, cited by the USPTO examiner, are the most relevant in assessing the novelty of the claims.

Prior Art Analysis

The core of US patent 5,768,384, as detailed in its independent claims (1 and 19), lies in a system and method for generating unique, encrypted information at the point of manufacture, affixing it to an article, and later comparing that information with data from associated documents (like invoices or manifests) to authenticate the article and track it through the supply chain. A key element is the "manufacturing meter," a secure device that creates this encrypted data, often including details about the manufacturing process, location, and even the equipment operator.

The following patents were considered by the examiner and are relevant to these concepts.

1. US5592561A: Anti-counterfeiting system

- Full Citation: Moore; Lewis J., US Patent 5,592,561, filed April 14,...

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:

An analysis of the claims of US patent 5,768,384 in light of the cited prior art indicates that the patent's claims would likely be rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The core invention—applying a secure, network-connected metering device to general manufacturing for anti-counterfeiting and tracking—represents a combination of existing technologies that a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) would have been motivated to assemble. The primary argument for obviousness rests on combining the teachings of secure metering systems, such as those for postage (US 5,666,421A) or identification cards (US 5,384,846A), with the known problem of product counterfeiting (addressed in US 5,592,561A) and methods for document verification (US 5,426,700A).

Combination of References Rendering Claims Obvious

A combination of US 5,666,421A (hereafter '421) or US 5,384,846A (hereafter '846) as the primary reference, modified by the teachings of US 5,592,561A (hereafter '561) and US 5,426,700A (hereafter '700), would render the independent claims (1 and 19) and their dependent claims...

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.