

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]

June 1, 2026

[Opposing Counsel Name]

[Firm Name]

[Address]

Re: U.S. Patent No. 8842454B2 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8842454B2 (the "8842454B2 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

Here is a concise summary of US patent 8842454B2:

Title: Inverter array with localized inverter control

Assignee: GRIDSCALE SOLUTIONS, LLC

Inventors: Brian Johnson, Philip Krein, Alexander Gray, Patrick L. Chapman

Filing Date: 2011-02-17

Issue Date: 2014-09-23

Abstract: An apparatus for delivering AC power to an AC load may include a plurality of inverters configured to receive direct current (DC) power from a respective DC power source and respectively provide AC power to an AC load. The apparatus may further include a first controller configured to generate a first control signal based on total AC current and total AC voltage being delivered to the AC load by the plurality of...

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 8842454B2 Patent:

As a technical patent analyst, I have searched the USPTO database for US patent 8842454B2. The USPTO's Patent Public Search tool is a web-based application providing access to patents

and patent application publications.

To determine the most relevant prior art for US patent 8842454B2, I will examine the "Cited By" and "Citations" sections of the patent itself, as found on Google Patents. Prior art is crucial in patent examination to assess novelty and non-obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 102. A prior art document is read as a person skilled in the art would have read it on its relevant date (publication or priority date).

Please note that the Google Patents page for US8842454B2 serves as the primary source for the following prior art citations. The USPTO provides resources for conducting prior art searches and lists prior art in patent examination.

Here is an analysis of the most relevant prior art cited within US patent 8842454B2, focusing on the "Citations" section. I will prioritize patents that appear to have a strong conceptual overlap with the independent claims of...

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 US8842454B2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The independent claims of US patent 8842454B2 describe an apparatus, method, and computer-readable medium for delivering AC power from an array of inverters using a hierarchical control scheme. This scheme involves a primary (master) controller generating a global control signal based on the total AC output (current and voltage) of the array, and multiple secondary (local) controllers, each receiving this primary signal and adjusting it based on local conditions (e.g., respective DC bus voltage) to control its corresponding inverter's AC power output.

A person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) in power electronics and photovoltaic (PV) systems, at the time of the invention's priority date (November 29, 2010), would have been motivated to combine existing technologies to address the known challenges in distributed PV systems, such as maximizing power harvest, maintaining grid synchronization, and managing individual inverter performance under varying environmental conditions like partial shading. Based on the...

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 June 1, 2026 by ihatepatentrolls.com — sample only.