

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. 7383209 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7383209 (the "7383209 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

Summary of U.S. Patent 7,383,209

A concise summary of the key details of U.S. Patent 7,383,209 is provided below, based on a search of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) database. A search of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) dockets for 2026 did not yield any specific litigation records for this patent.

Title: System and method for automatic access of a remote computer over a network

Assignee: NM LLC

Inventors: Frank C. Hudetz, Peter R. Hudetz

Filing Date: January 29, 2004

Issue Date: June 3, 2008

Abstract: A system and method for using identification codes found on ordinary articles of commerce to access remote computers on a network. In...

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 7383209 Patent:

Analysis of Prior Art for U.S. Patent 7,383,209

This analysis identifies and examines the most relevant prior art references for U.S. Patent 7,383,209, based on a review of the patent's prosecution history and the state of the art preceding its priority date of June 20, 1995. The focus is on references that potentially anticipate the independent claims of the '209 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by disclosing all elements of the claimed invention.

The core inventive concept of US 7,383,209 is a method of indirection: a user's computer reads an index (e.g., a UPC barcode) from an object, transmits this index to a remote routing computer, which uses a table (database) to look up a corresponding pointer (e.g., a URL). This pointer is returned to the user's computer, which then uses it to access content from a separate information computer. This contrasts with the simpler method of directly encoding the final network address into a barcode.

Below are key prior art references and their impact on the claims of the '209 patent.

1. U.S. Patent 5,978,773 A (Hudetz et al.)

• Full...

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 7,383,209 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

This analysis evaluates whether the invention claimed in U.S. Patent 7,383,209 would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) at the time the invention was made. The legal standard for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 prevents the patenting of an invention if the differences between the invention and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to a PHOSITA. The analysis relies on the prior art references identified in the preceding section.

Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA)

As of the patent's priority date of June 20, 1995, a PHOSITA would be an individual with a Bachelor's degree in Computer Science or a related field, and several years of experience in client-server networking, database management, and emerging Internet technologies. This person would be familiar with the architecture of the World Wide Web, including HTTP, URLs, and web browsers, as well as data capture technologies like barcode scanning and their...

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 ihatepatenttrols.com — sample only.