

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. 6032137 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6032137 (the "6032137 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

A concise summary of US Patent 6,032,137 is provided below.

Title: Remote image capture with centralized processing and storage

Assignee: The original assignee was CSP Holdings LLC. The patent has since been reassigned, with the current listed assignee being SHORE DEARY LLP.

Inventors: Claudio R. Ballard

Filing Date: May 19, 1998

Issue Date: February 29, 2000

Abstract:

A system for remote data acquisition and centralized processing and storage is disclosed called the DataTreasury™ System. The DataTreasury™ System provides comprehensive support for the processing of documents and electronic data associated with different applications including sale, business, banking and general...

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 6032137 Patent:

Based on a review of the references cited during the prosecution of US Patent 6,032,137, the

following prior art is identified as most relevant to the patent's claims, particularly independent claim 1. The analysis focuses on potential anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, which requires a single prior art reference to disclose every element of a claimed invention.

Most Relevant Prior Art

The most relevant cited reference appears to be US 5,870,723. It describes a system for converting paper-based transactions, such as checks, into electronic transactions at a remote point of sale, which closely aligns with the system claimed in the '137 patent. Other references, such as US 5,283,829 and US 5,602,933, are also highly relevant as they disclose systems for remote data capture and central verification.

Detailed Analysis of Key Prior Art References

1. U.S. Patent 5,870,723 A

- Full Citation: Pare, Jr. et al., "System for managing and conducting a paper-based transaction as an electronic transaction"
- Publication Date: February 9, 1999
- Filing Date: August 8, 1996
- Brief...

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 No. 6,032,137 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

This analysis evaluates whether the invention claimed in U.S. Patent No. 6,032,137 would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA) at the time of the invention, with a priority date of August 27, 1997. A PHOSITA in this context would be an individual with a degree in computer science or electrical engineering and several years of experience in designing and implementing distributed data processing systems, particularly for financial transactions.

The analysis focuses on independent claim 1, as all other claims are dependent upon it.

Deconstruction of Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 describes a system with four key functional blocks:

1. Remote Data Access Subsystem: A terminal at a remote location (e.g., a merchant) that captures both paper and electronic transaction data and sends it.
2. Data Collecting Subsystem: An intermediate server that collects data from multiple remote subsystems and forwards it.
3. Central Data Processing Subsystem: A central server that receives data...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 6032137 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- DataTreasury Corporation v. JPMorgan Chase & Co. et al. — U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · Settled

- DataTreasury Corporation v. U.S. Bank et al. — U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · Settled
- DataTreasury Corporation v. Bank of America — U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · Settled
- DataTreasury Corporation v. Wells Fargo & Company — 2:2006cv00072 · U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · filed 2006-02-24 · Settled
- DataTreasury Corporation v. NCR Corp. — U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · Settled
- DataTreasury Corporation v. Jack Henry & Associates, Inc. — 2:13-cv-00433 · U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · filed 2013-05-28 · On appeal
- DataTreasury Corporation v. Fidelity National Information Services, Inc. — U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · filed 2013-05-28 · Active
- DataTreasury Corporation v. Fiserv, Inc. — U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · filed 2013-05-28 · Active
- ...and 2 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 ihatepatent trolls.com — sample only.