

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. 6044382 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6044382 (the "6044382 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 6,044,382: Data Transaction Assembly Server

Date of Analysis: May 11, 2026

This report provides a concise summary of United States Patent 6,044,382, titled "Data transaction assembly server." The information is based on the full text of the patent. A search of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) database confirms the details presented below. A search of the 2026 dockets for the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) did not yield any specific results for this patent number.

Patent Overview

|||

---|---

| Title | Data transaction assembly server |

| Assignee | Cyber Fone Tech Inc |

| Inventor | Rocco L. Martino |

| Filing Date | ...

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 6044382 Patent:

Based on a thorough review of the prosecution history and cited references for U.S. Patent 6,044,382, the following analysis identifies the most relevant prior art.

Analysis of Prior Art Cited in U.S. Patent 6,044,382

The core invention of US 6,044,382 lies in a client-server architecture where a "host computer" with minimal local processing logic is dynamically configured to handle various data transactions. This is achieved by a remote "database server" downloading data streams that represent forms and menus. The host processor uses these forms to create a user interface, collect data, assemble a "data transaction," and send it back to the server. The patent repeatedly emphasizes that this method is "operating system independent," as the host device does not require pre-installed application-specific software but is instead reconfigured by the downloaded forms themselves (see patent Abstract and Claim 1).

The analysis below focuses on the prior art cited by the patent examiner during prosecution, as these references were considered most relevant to the patentability of the...

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 obviousness of U.S. Patent 6,044,382 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires identifying prior art references that, when combined, would have made the invention obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (POSITA) at the time the invention was made. The priority date of the patent is May 19, 1995.

A POSITA at that time would have possessed a bachelor's degree in computer science or a related field, along with several years of experience in client-server architecture, network programming, and transaction-based systems. They would have been familiar with the industry's move toward network-centric computing and the desire for "thin-client" architectures to simplify software deployment and reduce costs on the user's end.

The analysis below is based on the prior art references cited by the USPTO examiner during the prosecution of the '382 patent.

Ground 1: Claims 1 and 13 are obvious over Reisman (US 5,694,546) in view of Judson (US 5,572,643) and Pitroda (US 5,590,038).

This combination of references teaches a dynamically configurable, OS-independent client...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 6044382 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- Cyberfone Systems, LLC v. AT&T Inc. et al. — 1:11-cv-00827 · D. Del. · filed 2011-09-14 · Terminated
- Cyberfone Systems, LLC v. American Airlines, Inc. — 1:11-cv-00828 · D. Del. · filed 2011-09-14 · Terminated
- Cyberfone Systems, LLC v. Bank of America Corp. — 1:11-cv-00830 · D. Del. · filed 2011-09-14 · Terminated

- Cyberfone Systems, LLC v. Wells Fargo & Company — 1:11-cv-00831 · D. Del. · filed 2011-09-14 · Terminated
- Cyberfone Systems, LLC v. United Air Lines, Inc. — 1:11-cv-00833 · D. Del. · filed 2011-09-14 · Terminated
- Cyberfone Systems, LLC v. Southwest Airlines Co. — 1:11-cv-00834 · D. Del. · filed 2011-09-14 · Terminated
- Cyberfone Systems, LLC v. E*TRADE Financial Corporation — 1:11-cv-00835 · D. Del. · filed 2011-09-14 · Terminated
- Cyberfone Systems, LLC v. Capital One Financial Corporation — 2:14-cv-00109 · E.D. Tex. · filed 2014-02-18 · Terminated
- ...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.