

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 24, 2026

[Opposing Counsel Name]

[Firm Name]

[Address]

Re: U.S. Patent No. 8271315 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8271315 (the "8271315 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

US Patent 8271315: Personal Information Utilization System for Commodity-Based Identification

Title: Personal information utilization system and personal information utilization program for commodity based identification

Assignee: Keysoft Inc.

Inventors: Yoshimitsu Kagiwada

Filing Date: November 5, 2002

Issue Date: September 18, 2012

Abstract: The patent aims to enhance customer service quality by enabling the sharing and utilization of customer personal information across various industries. It describes a system comprising a personal information storage means, a communication means, and an information processing means. The personal information storage means stores not only personal...

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 8271315 Patent:

The search results provided information about "priority dates" in the context of immigration, which is not relevant to patent analysis. I need to rely on the priority date information directly

from the patent document itself, which I have already done.

As previously determined, the effective priority date for US8271315 is May 7, 2001.

I will now list the most relevant prior art from the patent's own citations, ensuring they pre-date this priority date, and provide the requested details and a conceptual overlap analysis, with the explicit disclaimer about the legal determination of anticipation.

Most Relevant Prior Art for US Patent 8271315

The analysis of prior art for US Patent 8271315 (priority date: May 7, 2001) focuses on the citations that predate this effective priority date, making them potential prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102. It is important to note that a definitive determination of anticipation under § 102 requires a detailed, element-by-element legal comparison of the prior art disclosure to each claim of US8271315, which is beyond the scope of this technical...

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 8271315 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

This analysis identifies combinations of prior art references that would render the claims of US Patent 8271315 obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (POSITA) at the time of the invention (i.e., before the effective priority date of May 7, 2001). The core objective of US8271315, as stated in its abstract, is to "improve quality of service for customers by sharing and utilizing personal information on customers among variety of industries." This objective itself provides a strong motivation for a POSITA to combine existing technologies to achieve cross-industry data sharing for targeted marketing.

Legal Standard for Obviousness

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, a patent may not be obtained if "the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the claimed invention pertains." To establish obviousness, there must be some...

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 24, 2026 by ihatepatentrolls.com — sample only.