

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. 9092352 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9092352 (the "9092352 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 9092352 Summary

Title: Memory controller with write data error detection and remediation

Current Assignee: Signal LLP

Inventors: Yuanlong Wang, Frederick A. Ware

Filing Date: February 7, 2014

Issue Date: July 28, 2015

Abstract:

A controller includes a link interface configured to connect to a first link for bi-directional data communication and a second link for transmitting unidirectional error-detection information. An encoder dynamically adds first error-detection information to a portion of write data. A transmitter sends this write data via the link interface. A delay element is connected to the encoder's output. A receiver, also coupled to the link interface, receives...

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 9092352 Patent:

To identify the most relevant prior art for US Patent 9092352, I need to access its cited

references. I will search the USPTO database for the patent and then look for the "Cited By" or "References Cited" sections.

Since I cannot directly interact with a live USPTO search portal, I will provide the general approach and list the information I would extract for each relevant prior art reference found.

Search Strategy:

1. Navigate to the USPTO Patent Public Search website or a similar patent database (e.g., Justia Patents).
2. Search for patent number "9092352" (ensuring exact match to avoid similar numbers).
3. Once the patent document is retrieved, locate the "References Cited" section. This section typically lists prior art patents and publications that the examiner considered during the prosecution of US9092352.
4. For each patent listed in the "References Cited" section, I would perform the following:
Retrieve the full citation (Patent Number, Inventor(s), Issue Date).
Note the publication/filing date.
Read the abstract and a portion of the description to get a brief...

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:

The provided patent text for US9092352 details its priority to US patent application Ser. No. 11/330,524, filed on January 11, 2006, which subsequently issued as US Pat. No. 7,562,285. This means the effective priority date for US9092352 is January 11, 2006. The "RELATED APPLICATIONS" and "References" sections within the Google Patents record for US9092352 primarily list continuation and divisional patents from the same patent family, all sharing this earliest priority date. These family members are not prior art for an obviousness analysis under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for US9092352 itself.

The "Prior art keywords" section on the Google Patents page (e.g., "error," "data," "detection information") offers general technical concepts but does not identify specific prior art documents external to the patent family. Therefore, the provided patent text does not contain specific external prior art references that predate the January 11, 2006 priority date and would be necessary for a robust obviousness analysis.

Without specific prior art references that predate the critical date, a...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 9092352 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 — 2:26-cv-00093 · Texas Eastern District Court · active

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