

**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. 8664239 — Response to Assertion of Infringement**

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8664239 (the "8664239 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**

Patent Summary: US 8,664,239 B2

Title: Tacrolimus for improved treatment of transplant patients

Assignee: Veloxis Pharmaceuticals Inc.

Inventors: Robert D. Gordon, Per Holm, Anne-Marie Lademann, Tomas Norling

Filing Date: June 23, 2011

Issue Date: March 4, 2014

Abstract:

The patent describes an extended-release oral dosage form of tacrolimus, an immunosuppressant drug used in transplant patients. This formulation is designed for once-daily administration and aims to provide improved pharmacokinetic properties compared to conventional, immediate-release tacrolimus formulations. Key features of the invention include a release of the active substance over a prolonged period, leading to a...

## **4. Litigation History of the Patent**

Public records reflect that the 8664239 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- Veloxis Pharmaceuticals AS v. Zydus Cadila et al. — 1:26-cv-00467 · Delaware District Court ·

### 3. 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.**