

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. 6199048 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6199048 (the "6199048 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 comprehensive analysis of U.S. Patent 6,199,048 reveals a foundational system for linking physical products to the digital world, a concept that has become ubiquitous in today's interconnected economy. As of April 28, 2026, a search for ongoing litigation in the dockets of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) for the year 2026 reveals no pending cases specifically citing this patent.

Summary of U.S. Patent 6,199,048

- Title: System and method for automatic access of a remote computer over a network
- Assignee: The patent's ownership has a detailed history, originally assigned to Neomedia Technologies Inc. According to available records, the current assignee is listed...

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 6199048 Patent:

Prior Art Analysis for U.S. Patent 6,199,048

As a senior patent analyst, this report details the most relevant prior art cited against U.S. Patent 6,199,048, "System and method for automatic access of a remote computer over a network."

The analysis is based on the patent's own citations and examines the potential for anticipation of

its claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The core invention of patent 6,199,048 is a system and method that uses a product's identification code (like a UPC barcode) as an "index" to look up a network address (a "pointer," such as a URL) in a database, and then uses that address to connect a user's computer to a remote computer on a network. The independent claims (1, 36, and 71) broadly cover this method, the system for implementing it, and the user's computing device, respectively.

Below is an examination of the key prior art references cited by the patent examiner during the prosecution of the 6,199,048 patent.

U.S. Patent 5,727,155: "Remote retrieval and loading of network addresses"

- Full Citation: U.S. Patent 5,727,155, Dawson, et al.

- ...

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:

Based on the provided prior art references, a strong argument can be made that the independent claims of U.S. Patent 6,199,048 would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of the invention, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103. The priority date of the patent is June 20, 1995, a time when the World Wide Web was rapidly expanding and the use of barcodes in commerce was ubiquitous.

An analysis of obviousness requires showing that a PHOSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of existing prior art references and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so. The most compelling combination of the provided prior art involves U.S. Patent 5,761,606 (Wolzien) and U.S. Patent 5,727,155 (Dawson).

Obviousness Based on the Combination of Wolzien ('606) and Dawson ('155)

A PHOSITA in mid-1995 would have been familiar with database management, computer networking (specifically the client-server model of the World Wide Web), and the function of common input devices like barcode scanners.

1. Elements Taught by the Prior Art:...

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 ihatepatentrolls.com — sample only.