

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. 7279708 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7279708 (the "7279708 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

To provide a comprehensive analysis of U.S. Patent 7,279,708, I will conduct a thorough search of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) database. This search will be performed today, April 26, 2026, to ensure the most current information is obtained.

The search will focus on retrieving the following key details associated with this specific patent number:

- Title: The official title of the invention as recorded by the USPTO.
- Assignee: The legal entity or individual to whom the patent rights have been assigned.
- Inventors: The names of the individuals credited with the invention.
- Filing Date: The date on which the patent application was originally filed.
- Issue Date:...

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 7279708 Patent:

As a senior US patent analyst, I have reviewed the prior art cited during the prosecution of U.S. Patent 7,279,708. The following analysis details the most relevant references cited by the USPTO patent examiner and discusses their potential impact on the patentability of the '708

patent's claims. This analysis is based on the information available as of today, May 13, 2026.
Understanding Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102

For a prior art reference to "anticipate" a patent claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, it must explicitly or inherently disclose every single element and limitation of that claim, arranged as in the claim. If even one element is missing, the claim is not anticipated, though it might be rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The following analysis focuses strictly on potential anticipation.

Analysis of Prior Art Cited in U.S. Patent 7,279,708

The examiner of the '708 patent cited five prior art references. The most pertinent of these are detailed below.

1. US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0200270 A1 (Kwak)

• Full Citation: US 2005/0200270 A1,...

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 U.S. Patent 7,279,708 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

This analysis evaluates whether an invention claimed in U.S. Patent 7,279,708 would have been obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art (POSA) at the time the invention was made (circa 2004-2005). An invention is obvious if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the invention as a whole would have been obvious to a POSA.

The key inventive concept in the '708 patent is the creation of vents in a sub-conductive layer to allow for the outgassing of an underlying organic insulating layer during the manufacturing of an electroluminescent (EL) display. This sub-conductive layer's primary purpose is to electrically connect a power supply line to the device's second electrode (cathode). The vents are realized either as "penetration portions" (holes) in a continuous layer (Claim 1) or as gaps between "unit sub-conductive layers" (Claim 9).

Primary Obviousness Combination: US 2005/0200270 A1 (Kwak) in view of General Knowledge of Outgassing

A strong argument for obviousness...

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.