

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. 6076733 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6076733 (the "6076733 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

Patent Summary: U.S. Patent No. 6,076,733

Date of Analysis: April 26, 2026

A review of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) database and the 2026 dockets of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) has been conducted for U.S. Patent No. 6,076,733.

Title: Web-based system and method for enabling a viewer to access and display HTML-encoded documents located on the world wide web (WWW) by reading URL-encoded bar code symbols printed on a web-based information resource guide

Assignee: Metrologic Instruments, Inc.

Inventors: David M. Wilz, Sr., Carl Harry Knowles

Filing Date: April 25, 1997

Issue Date: June 20, 2000

Abstract:

The patent describes a system and...

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 6076733 Patent:

Analysis of Prior Art for U.S. Patent 6,076,733

The following is an analysis of the prior art cited in U.S. Patent 6,076,733, which describes a "Web-based system and method for enabling a viewer to access and display HTML-encoded documents located on the world wide web (WWW) by reading URL-encoded bar code symbols printed on a web-based information resource guide." This analysis assesses the relevance of each cited patent and its potential to anticipate the claims of the '733 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Key Independent Claims of U.S. Patent 6,076,733:

- Claim 1: A system combining an internet-connected terminal with a GUI-based web browser and a bar code reader. The reader is programmed to read a URL-encoded bar code, and upon reading, the system automatically accesses and displays the corresponding web page.
- Claim 11: A method for accessing web documents by providing a printed guide with URL-encoded bar codes, using a bar code reader to scan a symbol from the guide, transmitting the URL data to a web browser, and automatically accessing and displaying the corresponding web...

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. 6,076,733

Prepared for: Internal Review

Date: April 29, 2026

Analyst: Senior U.S. Patent Analyst

An analysis of U.S. Patent No. 6,076,733 ("the '733 patent") has been conducted to assess the patentability of its claims in light of the prior art of record, specifically concerning the non-obviousness requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The '733 patent, filed on April 25, 1997, claims a system and method for accessing World Wide Web (WWW) documents by scanning a barcode encoded with a Uniform Resource Locator (URL).

The standard for obviousness, as defined in 35 U.S.C. § 103, is whether the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the invention as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA). This analysis requires a factual inquiry into the scope of the prior art, the differences between the prior art and the claims, and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. A key component is determining whether a PHOSITA would have been...

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.