

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. 7742388 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7742388 (the "7742388 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 7,742,388

Title: Packet generation systems and methods

Assignee: Fleet Connect Solutions LLC

Inventors: Daniel Shearer, Mark A. Webster

Filing Date: July 20, 2005

Issue Date: June 22, 2010

Abstract: Disclosed herein are various embodiments of methods, systems, and apparatus for increasing packet generation in a digital communication system. In one exemplary method embodiment, subcarriers are added to a packet in a wireless local area network transmission to increase the data rate.

Plain-Language Overview of Independent Claims:

This patent has two independent claims: claim 1 and claim 12.

Claim 1: This claim describes a method for increasing the...

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 7742388 Patent:

Prior Art Analysis for U.S. Patent 7,742,388

The following analysis details the prior art references cited during the prosecution of U.S. Patent 7,742,388. The analysis focuses on the potential for these references to anticipate the independent claims (1 and 12) under 35 U.S.C. § 102. The priority date for US 7,742,388 is July 20, 2004.

A crucial point of context is that the IEEE 802.11a standard, which predates the '388 patent, defines a preamble structure for OFDM packets that includes a Short Training Symbol (STS) followed by a Long Training Symbol (LTS). In this standard structure, the STS is formed using 12 modulated subcarriers, and the LTS is formed using 52 modulated subcarriers. This existing standard inherently describes a packet where the second training symbol (LTS) has a greater quantity of modulated subcarriers than the first training symbol (STS).

Key Cited Prior Art References:

1. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0063675 A1 (Ho)

• Full Citation: US 2003/0063675 A1, "Preamble for high-throughput OFDM," Inventor: Manyoo Ho, Assignee: Texas...

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 7,742,388 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

This analysis evaluates whether the inventions claimed in U.S. Patent 7,742,388 would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA) at the time of the invention, given the prior art. The legal standard for obviousness is based on the framework established in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966), which requires considering the scope and content of the prior art, the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue, and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. The priority date of the '388 patent is July 20, 2004.

A PHOSITA in this context would be an electrical engineer or computer scientist with knowledge of digital communication systems and practical experience with wireless networking protocols, specifically Orthogonal Frequency-Division Multiplexing (OFDM) and the IEEE 802.11 family of standards.

Analysis of Independent Claim 12

Claim 12: A method comprising generating and transmitting a packet with a preamble containing a first training symbol and a second...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 7742388 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

• Fleet Connect Solutions LLC v. Ford Motor Company — 6:20-cv-01095 · Texas Western District Court · filed 2020-11-24 · Unknown

• Fleet Connect Solutions LLC v. General Motors LLC — 6:21-cv-00987 · Texas Western District Court · filed 2021-09-22 · Unknown

- Fleet Connect Solutions LLC v. Cisco Systems, Inc. — 2:21-cv-00365 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2021-10-01 · Unknown
- Fleet Connect Solutions LLC v. NETGEAR, Inc. — 3:21-cv-09775 · California Northern District Court · filed 2021-12-17 · Case transferred
- Fleet Connect Solutions LLC v. CommScope, Inc. — 2:22-cv-00160 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2022-05-05 · Unknown
- Fleet Connect Solutions LLC v. Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company — 2:22-cv-00312 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2022-08-23 · Unknown
- Fleet Connect Solutions LLC v. Toyota Motor North America, Inc. — 2:23-cv-00210 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2023-05-10 · Unknown
- Fleet Connect Solutions LLC v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. — 2:23-cv-00303 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2023-06-27 · Unknown
- ...and 8 additional case(s)

5. 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.