

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

Dear Counsel,

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

As a senior US patent analyst, I must first address that the identifier "UNKNOWN" is not a valid US patent number. The US patent system uses specific numerical and alphanumeric formats for issued patents and published applications. Without a valid, correctly formatted patent number (e.g., US 11,234,567 B2 or US 2024/0123456 A1), a search of authoritative databases like the USPTO Patent Full-Text and Image Database (PatFT) or the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system is not possible.

Consequently, I cannot provide the requested summary of the title, assignee, inventors, filing date, issue date, abstract, or a plain-language overview of the independent claims for "US...

## **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 UNKNOWN Patent:

As a senior US patent analyst, I must reiterate the conclusion from the previously generated sections: the identifier US patent UNKNOWN is not a valid US patent number. A literal search for this identifier in the USPTO's patent databases (PatFT for issued patents and AppFT for published applications) yields no results.

A valid US patent number typically follows a format like US 11,234,567 B2 for a utility patent or

US 2024/0123456 A1 for a pre-grant publication. Because "UNKNOWN" does not conform to any recognized USPTO numbering scheme, no specific patent asset can be located. Consequently, it is impossible to perform the requested prior art analysis. The core steps of this task—identifying the patent's claims and analyzing its cited references—cannot be executed because the subject patent itself cannot be found. Without the patent's claims and its list of cited prior art (often found on the face of the patent or in its file history), there is no basis for an anticipation analysis under 35 U.S.C. § 102. To proceed, a valid and complete US patent number is required.

### **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:

As a technical patent analyst, I must report that an obviousness analysis of US patent UNKNOWN under 35 U.S.C. § 103 cannot be performed.

As established in the "Patent Summary" and "Prior Art" sections of this analysis, "US patent UNKNOWN" is not a valid US patent identifier. Consequently, the patent's claims, specification, and filing date cannot be retrieved.

An obviousness analysis under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires, at a minimum:

1. The Claims of the Subject Patent: The scope of the invention is defined by the claims. Without the specific claim language, there is nothing to compare against the prior art.
2. Relevant Prior Art: Identifying prior art references that disclose elements of the claimed invention. As established previously, without a subject patent, no relevant prior art can be meaningfully identified.
3. Motivation to Combine: A reasoned explanation for why a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA), at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to combine the teachings of two or more prior art references to arrive at the claimed invention....

### **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](http://ihatepatentrolls.com) — sample only.*