

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]

June 1, 2026

[Opposing Counsel Name]

[Firm Name]

[Address]

Re: U.S. Patent No. 7738595 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7738595 (the "7738595 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 7738595:

US Patent 7738595: Multiple input, multiple output communications systems

- Title: Multiple input, multiple output communications systems
- Assignee: Integral Wireless Technologies LLC
- Inventor: James Stuart Wight
- Filing Date: July 2, 2004
- Issue Date: June 15, 2010
- Abstract: Embodiments of the present invention include systems and methods for optimizing the transmitter and receiver weights of a MIMO system. In one embodiment, the weights are optimized to create and steer beam nulls, such that each transmitted signal is substantially decoupled from all other signals between a MIMO transmitter and a MIMO receiver. In another...

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 7738595 Patent:

To identify the most relevant prior art for US patent 7738595, I will examine the "Cited By" and "Citations" sections of the patent itself, as listed in the provided full patent text. The USPTO's

Patent Public Search tool can be used for direct searches of patent numbers. I will then analyze each cited patent against the independent claims of US7738595 to determine potential anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Based on the provided patent text, here are some of the cited prior art patents:

Cited Patents (Examiner Citations):

- US6091361A

Full Citation: US6091361A, "Method and apparatus for joint space-time array signal processing", Davis; Dennis W., Issued: 2000-07-18, Filed: 1998-05-12.

Brief Description: This patent describes a method and apparatus for joint space-time array signal processing. It focuses on combining spatial and temporal processing to improve signal reception in wireless communication systems.

Potential Anticipation: This patent generally relates to multi-antenna systems and signal processing. While it addresses space-time processing for improved signal...

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:

toolcode

```
print(googlesearch.search(queries=["US7738595 prior art references", "US7738595 prosecution history", "35 U.S.C. § 103 obviousness analysis"]))
```

thought

The user is asking for an obviousness analysis of US patent 7738595 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, based on the provided "Prior Art" section of the patent. I need to:

1. Review the independent claims (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11) of US7738595.
2. Identify the prior art references listed in the patent.
3. Analyze combinations of these prior art references that would render the claims obvious.
4. Explain the motivation for a Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA) to combine these references.

I have already been provided with a patent summary and the claims. I need to extract the prior art from the full patent text and then perform the analysis. The prompt specifically instructs me to "Use the results from the Prior Art section of this page." Looking at the provided "Full patent text", there isn't a dedicated "Prior Art section" in the same way there are "Previously generated sections". However, there is a "Cited By (2)" and...

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 June 1, 2026 by ihatepatenttrols.com — sample only.