

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. 6460050 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6460050 (the "6460050 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 Analysis: US 6460050 B1

Date of Analysis: May 11, 2026

Summary

Title: Distributed content identification system

Assignee: As of the latest assignment records, the patent is assigned to Intellectual Ventures I LLC. The original assignee was listed as "Individual".

Inventors: Mark Raymond Pace, Brooks Cash Talley

Filing Date: December 22, 1999

Issue Date: October 1, 2002

Abstract:

A file content classification system includes a digital ID generator and an ID appearance database coupled to receive IDs from the ID generator. The system further includes a characteristic comparison routine identifying the file as having a characteristic based on ID appearance in the appearance...

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 6460050 Patent:

Prior Art Analysis for US Patent 6460050

The following analysis details prior art references cited during the examination of US Patent 6460050. These references were considered by the USPTO examiner and are relevant to understanding the patent's claims and novelty. The critical date for prior art is the patent's filing date of December 22, 1999.

U.S. Patent Documents Cited

1. US Patent 5,619,648 - "Method for screening electronic messages for a computer user" (Canale et al.)

- Full Citation: US Patent 5,619,648, Canale, et al., issued April 8, 1997.
- Filing Date: June 7, 1995.
- Brief Description: This patent describes a system for filtering electronic mail (e-mail) based on user-defined criteria. A user can create "screening criteria" which are applied to incoming e-mails. If a message matches the criteria, a user-specified action is performed, such as deleting the message, moving it to a specific folder, or forwarding it. This system acts as an agent for the user to manage unwanted messages automatically.
- Potential Anticipation: This reference is highly relevant to the...

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 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

This analysis evaluates the obviousness of the claims of US patent 6460050 in light of prior art existing before the priority date of December 22, 1999. The core concept of the patent—using a digital identifier (hash) generated on a client machine, sending it to a central server, and using a collective database of these identifiers to classify content like spam or viruses—can be rendered obvious by combining existing technologies and known techniques from that era.

A person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time would have been a computer scientist or software engineer with experience in network protocols, email systems, and cybersecurity, including antivirus and anti-spam techniques.

Primary Obviousness Combination

A strong argument for obviousness can be constructed by combining the teachings of distributed antivirus signature systems with known hashing algorithms for file identification.

1. Distributed Antivirus Technology (The "How"): By the late 1990s, antivirus software was a mature industry. Companies like...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 6460050 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 Corp. et al. — 1:12-cv-01581-LPS · U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware · filed 2010-12-06 · Judgment
- Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Trend Micro Inc. et al. — 19-1122 · U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit · Vacated and Remanded

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 ihatepatentrolls.com — sample only.