

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. 7177838 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7177838 (the "7177838 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

An analysis of United States Patent 7,177,838 reveals a method for conducting e-commerce transactions using electronic tokens issued directly by a vendor. The patent, now expired, has been the subject of significant litigation.

Title: Method and apparatus for conducting electronic commerce transactions using electronic tokens

Assignee: The current assignee is listed as Aml Ip LLC. The original assignee was PayByClick Corp.

Inventors: Marvin T. Ling

Filing Date: April 21, 2000

Issue Date: February 13, 2007

Abstract: The patent describes a system where a vendor issues and maintains electronic tokens that customers can purchase online (e.g., with a credit card) or offline (e.g., with a...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 7177838 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- AML IP LLC v. Dave & Busters Inc — 3:26-cv-01250 · Texas Northern District Court · filed

2026-04-17 · Open

- AML IP LLC v. Brinker International Payroll Company, L.P. — 3:26-cv-01242 · Texas Northern District Court · filed 2026-04-17 · Open
- AML IP LLC v. Cinemark USA Inc — 2:26-cv-00306 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2026-04-17 · Open
- AML IP LLC v. CEC Entertainment Concepts, LP — 3:26-cv-01249 · Texas Northern District Court · filed 2026-04-17 · Open
- AML IP LLC v. Cinemark USA Inc — 3:26-cv-01252 · Texas Northern District Court · filed 2026-04-17 · Open
- AML IP LLC v. Callaway Corp — 2:26-cv-00310 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2026-04-17 · Open
- AML IP LLC v. Marriott International Inc — 2:26-cv-00307 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2026-04-17 · Open
- AML IP LLC v. RaceTrac Inc — 2:26-cv-00309 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2026-04-17 · Open
- ...and 12 additional case(s)

3. 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 ihatepatenttrolls.com — sample only.