

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. 7323982 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7323982 (the "7323982 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

Analysis of U.S. Patent 7,323,982

Title: Method and system to control movable entities

Assignee: The current assignee of record is WirelessWerx IP LLC. The original assignee was Wirelesswerx International Inc.

Inventors: Houston Staton, James Ashley, Sr., James Ashley, Jr., Frank Mooney, Patrick Mooney, Edward Lang, Charles Maggs, and German Santos.

Filing Date: April 13, 2005.

Issue Date: January 29, 2008.

Abstract: The patent describes a method and system for remotely controlling and monitoring movable entities. This is achieved by using pre-configured geographical zones, which can be defined by a series of coordinates or waypoints. A transponder attached to the entity determines...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 7323982 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- WirelessWerx IP LLC v. Audi Of America LLC — 26-1736 · Court of Appeals for the Federal

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.