

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. 9665705 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9665705 (the "9665705 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 comprehensive analysis of United States Patent 9,665,705 reveals a system for biometric security access that has been the subject of administrative challenges at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).

Patent Overview

- Title: Remote entry system
- Assignee: Cpc Patent Technologies Pty Ltd
- Inventor: Christopher John Burke
- Filing Date: January 19, 2016
- Issue Date: May 30, 2017
- Abstract: The patent describes a system for providing secure access to a controlled item. It comprises a database of biometric signatures and a transmitter subsystem with a biometric sensor. This subsystem matches a received biometric signal against the database to generate an "accessibility..."

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 9665705 Patent:

Based on a technical analysis of the prior art cited in US Patent 9,665,705, the following references are identified as most relevant to the claims of the patent. The analysis focuses on potential anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, which requires a single prior art reference to disclose every element of a claimed invention.

A key inventive concept in claim 1 of US Patent 9,665,705 appears to be the method of enrolling new users. Specifically, the claim requires that the transmitter sub-system can "populate the data base" by receiving "a series of entries of the biometric signal, said series being characterised according to at least one of the number of said entries and a duration of each said entry" which is then mapped "into an instruction." This describes using the biometric sensor itself as an input device for administrative commands (e.g., a specific sequence of long and short presses) to enter an enrollment mode.

While several prior art references describe a similar overall system architecture, they typically rely on a separate physical button or a software interface on a...

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:

Based on a technical analysis of the prior art, the claims of US Patent 9,665,705 appear to be vulnerable to an obviousness challenge under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The primary inventive concept resides in using the biometric sensor not just for authentication but also as a command input device for administrative tasks, such as user enrollment, based on the number or duration of sensor presses.

While the cited prior art references (Fingar, Sato, Sako) do not explicitly teach this enrollment method, they establish a strong baseline for the overall system architecture. An obviousness argument can be constructed by combining one of these primary references with the general knowledge of a person having ordinary skill in the art (POSITA) regarding user interface design for compact electronic devices at the time of the invention.

Obviousness Argument: Combination of Fingar and Known UI Design Principles

A primary argument for obviousness can be made by combining U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0230810 A1 (Fingar) with well-established principles of user interface (UI) design for...

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 14, 2026 by ihatepatentrolls.com — sample only.