

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. 6108329 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6108329 (the "6108329 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 U.S. Patent 6,108,329

A review of U.S. Patent 6,108,329 reveals the following details regarding the invention and its legal status.

Title: Telephone apparatus used for computer network telephone system

Assignee: The patent was originally assigned to Sony Corp. As of the latest assignment recorded on March 27, 2017, the current assignee is Ironworks Patents LLC.

Inventors:

- Akimasa Oyama
- Hidekazu Watanabe
- Masahiro Asai
- Kazunori Ozawa
- Nobuhiro Tone

Filing Date: December 6, 1996

Issue Date: August 22, 2000

Abstract:

The patent describes a telephone system where terminals within computer networks are connected via servers to transmit data, including audio, over the...

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 6108329 Patent:

As a senior technical patent analyst, I have examined the prior art references cited during the prosecution of U.S. Patent 6,108,329. Below is an analysis of each reference and its potential to anticipate the claims of the '329 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The analysis focuses on the independent claim, Claim 1, as the validity of dependent claim 2 relies upon it. For a reference to anticipate a claim, it must disclose, either expressly or inherently, every limitation of that claim.

Analysis of Cited Prior Art

Based on the file wrapper, the following references were cited by the USPTO examiner.

1. U.S. Patent 5,062,133A: Multi-function telephone call management system

- Publication Date: October 29, 1991
- Filing Date: July 7, 1989
- Brief Description: This patent describes a telephone call management system that can screen incoming calls based on a stored list of telephone numbers. It can automatically answer calls, play customized greetings based on the caller's identity (determined via Caller ID), and record messages. The system can connect to a telephone line and includes...

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 6,108,329 ("the '329 patent") under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is provided below, based on the prior art cited by the patent examiner during prosecution. The analysis concludes that the claims of the '329 patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) as of the priority date of December 18, 1995.

Deconstruction of Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 of the '329 patent can be broken down into the following key limitations for analysis:

- a) System Architecture: A telephone apparatus connected via a telephone network to an internet network, which uses a server for transmitting audio data.
- b) Server Database: The server maintains a database with user information, including a public phone number for Point-to-Point Protocol (PPP) and an IP address.
- c) Caller Information Forwarding: The server sends information identifying the calling party to the destination apparatus.
- d) Local Caller List: The destination apparatus stores a list of approved callers in a local memory.
- e) Call-Type Determination: The apparatus can...

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.