

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. 6073142 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6073142 (the "6073142 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 technical analysis of U.S. Patent 6,073,142 reveals the following details:

Title: Automated post office based rule analysis of e-mail messages and other data objects for controlled distribution in network environments

Assignee: The original assignee was Park City Group Inc. The current assignee, as of the latest records, is Tumbleweed Holdings LLC.

Inventors: Fred J. Geiger, William K. Wood, Sonjaya T. Tandon

Filing Date: June 23, 1997

Issue Date: June 6, 2000

Abstract: The patent describes a system and method for automatically deferring and reviewing electronic mail (e-mail) messages and other data objects within a computer network. This is achieved by applying a set of "business...

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 6073142 Patent:

Of the prior art cited during the prosecution of U.S. Patent 6,073,142, the following references are the most relevant to the patent's core claims. The analysis below focuses on how these

references might anticipate the independent claims (1, 16, and 31), which define the invention's broadest scope.

Key Limitations of the Independent Claims

For a prior art reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, it must disclose, either expressly or inherently, every single element of that claim. The key elements of the independent claims of the '142 patent are:

- **Server-Side Processing:** The rules are applied at a central "post office" or server, not on the end-user's client machine.
- **Business Rules:** The system uses a database of rules that implement an organization's communication policies.
- **Rule Engine:** An engine automatically applies these rules to data objects.
- **Action List & Priority:** The engine generates a set of actions when rules are triggered, and a distribution engine executes the action with the highest priority.
- **Gating:** A specific action where a data object is...

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 (35 U.S.C. § 103)

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, an invention is unpatentable if the differences between the claimed invention 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 (POSITA). This analysis considers whether a POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of prior art references to arrive at the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success. The claims of US 6,073,142 are obvious in light of well-established, pre-1997 server-side email processing technologies, particularly the combination of Sendmail with procmail and the known administrative need for policy enforcement and message quarantining.

Deconstruction of Independent Claim 1

Independent Claim 1, the broadest method claim, can be broken down into the following key elements:

- a. Receiving a data object at a post office: A standard function of any Mail Transfer Agent (MTA) like Sendmail.
- b. Storing a plurality of business rules: Storing a set of filtering...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 6073142 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- *Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corporation et al.* — 1:10-cv-01067 · U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware · filed 2010-12-09 · Appealed
- *Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Canon Inc. et al.* — 1:12-cv-01581 · U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware · filed 2012-12-04 · Dismissed
- *Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.* — 2015-1769, 2015-1770, 2015-1771 · U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit · Affirmed

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 ihatepatenttrols.com — sample only.