

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. 8234705 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8234705 (the "8234705 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

A concise summary of US patent 8,234,705 is provided below.

Title: Contagion isolation and inoculation

Assignee: K Mizra LLC. Notably, the patent record indicates that the listed assignees may be inaccurate.

Inventors:

- James A. Roskind
- Aaron T. Emigh

Filing Date: September 27, 2005

Issue Date: July 31, 2012

Abstract:

The patent describes a method for "contagion isolation and inoculation." When a host computer requests to connect to a protected network, a determination is made as to whether the host needs to be quarantined. If quarantined, the host is granted only limited access to the network. This limited access is typically sufficient to remedy the condition that led to 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 8234705 Patent:

An analysis of select prior art cited against U.S. Patent 8,234,705, titled "Contagion isolation and inoculation," reveals several earlier patents that touch upon key concepts of network security, including the quarantining of potentially infected computers. This analysis focuses on the most relevant of the 60 patent citations, examining their contributions to the field and their potential to anticipate the claims of the '705 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The '705 patent, filed on September 27, 2005, describes a system where a host attempting to connect to a protected network is assessed to determine if it needs to be quarantined. If quarantined, the host is given limited network access, primarily for remediation purposes, such as downloading security patches or updates. Attempts to access other network resources are redirected to a quarantine server that provides information and instructions to the user.

Below is an examination of key prior art and the specific claims of U.S. Patent 8,234,705 they may anticipate.

Key Prior Art Analysis:

1. U.S. Patent 6,804,780 B1: System and...

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 US Patent 8,234,705

This analysis evaluates the patentability of the independent claims of U.S. Patent 8,234,705 ("the '705 patent") in light of prior art, focusing on the standard of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The '705 patent, with a priority date of September 27, 2004, describes a method and system for quarantining a host computer that requests access to a protected network.

I. Standard for Obviousness

An invention is considered obvious if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA). An obviousness rejection requires a clear articulation of the reasons why the claimed invention would have been obvious. This involves demonstrating not just that individual elements of the claim existed in the prior art, but that a PHOSITA would have been motivated to combine these elements with a reasonable expectation of success.

II. Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA)

For...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 8234705 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- Untitled case — 1:26-cv-00316 · U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas · Pending

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 ihatepatenttrols.com — sample only.