

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]

June 1, 2026

[Opposing Counsel Name]

[Firm Name]

[Address]

Re: U.S. Patent No. 6317838 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6317838 (the "6317838 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

Here's a concise summary of US patent 6317838, "Method and architecture to provide a secured remote access to private resources":

- Title: Method and architecture to provide a secured remote access to private resources
- Assignee: EVIDAN (Current Assignee), Bull SAS (Original Assignee)
- Inventor: Eric Baize
- Filing Date: 1998-04-29
- Issue Date: 2001-11-13
- Abstract: The patent describes a method and architecture enabling a remote user, particularly an Internet user, to securely access private resources protected by a firewall. The architecture includes a computer facility with a security server managing a security database. The firewall features a centralized security means, controlled...

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 6317838 Patent:

toolcode

print(googlesearch.search(queries=["US6317838 cited prior art", "US6317838 references"],

"US6317838 claims vs prior art"])

thought

The user wants me to identify the most relevant prior art for US patent 6317838 from its cited references. For each reference, I need to provide:

1. Full citation
2. Publication/filing date
3. Brief description
4. Which claim(s) it potentially anticipates under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

I need to access the "Citations (10)" section of the provided patent text. These are the prior art cited by the examiner. I will then analyze each cited patent and assess its relevance to the claims of US6317838.

Let's break down the information needed for each citation:

- Full Citation: This will come directly from the provided patent text under the "Citations (10)" section.
- Publication/Filing Date: This will also come from the provided patent text. I will use the "Publication Date" for each.
- Brief Description: I will need to infer this from the title of the cited patent and potentially from the abstract of the cited patent (if available in the provided text or if...

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 US Patent 6317838 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) in 1998, working in network security and remote access systems, would have been motivated to combine various known techniques to achieve the functionalities described in US patent 6317838. The patent's claims, particularly independent claims 1 and 8, which describe a method and architecture for secured remote access to private resources through a firewall with centralized security means, Single Sign-On (SSO), and optionally One-Time Passwords (OTPs), appear to be an obvious combination of existing prior art.

Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA)

A PHOSITA in 1998 would possess knowledge of:

- Network architectures, including Local Area Networks (LANs) and Wide Area Networks (WANs) like the Internet.
- Security devices such as firewalls and proxy servers for network perimeter defense.
- User authentication methods, including traditional password/login systems and more advanced token-based authentication like OTPs.
- The concepts of access control,...

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 June 1, 2026 by ihatepatentrolls.com — sample only.