

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 25, 2026

[Opposing Counsel Name]

[Firm Name]

[Address]

Re: U.S. Patent No. 6537227 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6537227 (the "6537227 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 is a concise summary of US patent 6537227:

US Patent 6537227: Method and equipment for human-related measuring

- Title: Method and equipment for human-related measuring
- Assignee: Polar Electro Oy
- Inventors: Hannu Kinnunen, Seppo Nissilä
- Filing Date: 2001-03-02
- Issue Date: 2003-03-25
- Abstract: A heart rate measuring arrangement including measuring means for measuring a person's heart rate during exercise and a calculating unit for calculating an assessment of the person's energy consumption during exercise. This calculation uses at least two parameters: a heart rate parameter from measured heart rate information and an energy consumption reference value. The reference value...

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 6537227 Patent:

To identify the most relevant prior art for US patent 6537227, I will examine the "Citations"

section of the patent document itself. The patent document lists "Cited By" (patents that cite 6537227) and "Citations" (prior art cited against 6537227). For this task, "Citations" are the relevant prior art.

I will use the provided patent text to extract the citations, as direct access to the USPTO database for live search of citation details for a specific patent is not within my capabilities in this interactive format beyond what is already included in the provided patent text.

Based on the provided patent text, the following prior art documents are cited:

Most Relevant Prior Art for US Patent 6537227

Here are the prior art references cited in US Patent 6537227, along with available details:

1. US4566461A

Full Citation: US4566461A

Publication Date: 1986-01-28

Filing Date: 1983-02-15

Assignee: Michael Lubell

Description: "Health fitness monitor." This patent describes a monitor for health and fitness, which could be relevant to the general concept of monitoring physiological...

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 obviousness analysis under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires identifying combinations of prior art that would render the claims of US patent 6537227 obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time of the invention (priority date March 7, 2000). A PHOSITA in this field would possess knowledge in exercise physiology, biomedical engineering, or sports science, and be familiar with heart rate monitoring, energy expenditure calculation, and physiological modeling.

Critical Limitation: The original independent claims (Claim 1 and Claim 16) of US6537227 were cancelled during reexamination. While the patent now relies on amended dependent claims (2-15, 17-46) and newly added claims (32-42, 43-46, 47-52), the specific text of these currently valid independent claims is not available in the provided patent document. Therefore, this obviousness analysis must be conducted at a high level, focusing on the core inventive concepts described in the patent's abstract and detailed description, and acknowledging that specific claim language might introduce nuances not captured...

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 25, 2026 by ihatepatenttrols.com — sample only.