

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. 8145721 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8145721 (the "8145721 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 8,145,721: Bit Streams Combination of Downloaded Multimedia Files
As of April 26, 2026, this report provides a concise summary of U.S. Patent 8,145,721, including its key details and an overview of its independent claims. A search of the 2026 dockets for the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) did not yield any specific litigation related to this patent.

Title: Bit streams combination of downloaded multimedia files

Assignee: The patent was originally assigned to Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson (PUBL).

However, records indicate a subsequent assignment to Novacloud Licensing LLC.

Inventors: Andreas Olsson and Mårten Sundberg.

Filing Date: March 1,...

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 8145721 Patent:

Prior Art Analysis (35 U.S.C. § 102)

As of May 11, 2026, this analysis reviews the prior art cited during the prosecution of U.S.

Patent 8,145,721 to assess potential anticipation of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Anticipation requires that every element and limitation of a claim be found in a single prior art reference. The following three references were cited by the applicant or the examiner during prosecution.

1. WO2003042783A2 ("WO '783")

- Full Citation: WO2003042783A2, "File splitting scalade coding and asynchronous transmission in streamed data transfer."
- Assignee: Musicmatch, Inc.
- Dates: Published May 22, 2003; priority date November 9, 2001. This reference qualifies as prior art.
- Brief Description: WO '783 discloses a system for delivering media files using scalable coding. A media file is split into a "base layer" (a playable, lower-quality version) and one or more "enhancement layers" (which contain data to improve the quality). The system allows for "asynchronous transmission," where the base layer can be streamed to a user for immediate playback, while...

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:

As of May 11, 2026, this report provides an obviousness analysis of U.S. Patent 8,145,721 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, based on the prior art cited during its prosecution. This analysis concludes that the patent's independent claims are likely obvious over a single reference, and that key dependent claims are obvious over a combination of references.

Obviousness of Independent Claims (1, 7, 10, 14)

The central inventive concept recited across all independent claims of US 8,145,721 is a method and system where a multimedia file is divided into a low-quality, streamable "first part" and a high-quality "second part" which are sent separately and later combined on the user's device. This concept appears to be rendered obvious by the teachings of a single prior art reference.

Primary Reference: WO2003042783A2 ("WO '783")

A person of ordinary skill in the art (POSITA) at the time of the invention (before March 1, 2007) would have been familiar with scalable coding techniques for media streaming. The teachings in WO '783 are not just relevant; they appear to describe the exact same system...

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.