

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. 7765126 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7765126 (the "7765126 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

An analysis of United States Patent 7,765,126 reveals the following details:

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

Assignee: The listed current assignee is Nm LLC. The original assignee was Neomedica Technologies Inc.

Inventors: Frank C. Hudetz and Peter R. Hudetz

Filing Date: June 20, 2007

Issue Date: July 27, 2010

Abstract:

The patent describes a system and method that uses identification codes, such as Uniform Product Codes (UPCs) found on commercial articles, to access remote computers on a network. A user can input a product's UPC, for instance by scanning the barcode, into a computer. A database then uses this UPC to find a...

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 7765126 Patent:

Based on a technical analysis of US patent 7,765,126 and the prior art cited during its

examination by the USPTO, the following references are identified as most relevant. These references describe technologies that existed before the patent's priority date of June 20, 1995, and disclose systems and methods similar to those claimed in the '126 patent.

An anticipatory prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102 must disclose every element of a patent claim, either explicitly or inherently. The analysis below outlines how each cited reference potentially anticipates the independent claims (1, 7, and 11) of the '126 patent.

Most Relevant Prior Art

1. EP 0 744 856 A3 (AT&T Corp)

- Full Citation: European Patent Application EP0744856A3, "Apparatus for and method of utilizing product identifier codes to establish communication connections." Filed on May 26, 1995.
- Brief Description: This patent application discloses a system where a user can scan a product identifier, such as a UPC barcode on a product, using a scanning device. This identifier is then sent to a remote service that...

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:

Based on the provided prior art and the state of technology as of the patent's priority date of June 20, 1995, an analysis of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 indicates that the independent claims of US patent 7,765,126 would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA).

A PHOSITA at that time would have possessed a working knowledge of computer networking, including the protocols and architecture of the burgeoning World Wide Web (WWW), familiarity with database systems, and an understanding of common data input methods, such as barcode scanning for product identification.

The core concept of the '126 patent is the use of a pre-existing product identifier (like a UPC) to look up a corresponding network address (URL) in a remote database, thereby linking a physical object to an online resource. The prior art, when combined, suggests this solution was an obvious advancement.

Obviousness Combinations

1. Combination of Rathus ('534) with the known architecture of the World Wide Web
- Rathus (US 6,164,534 A): Teaches a system for linking printed media to...

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.