

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. US20170193836A1 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. US20170193836A1 (the "US20170193836A1 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 concise summary of US patent application publication US20170193836A1 is provided below, along with a plain-language overview of its independent claims.

Summary of US20170193836A1

- Title: Freeform mathematical parsing and grading method and system
- Assignee: Cengage Learning Inc. (Current Assignee as of March 22, 2024). The original assignee was Advanced Instructional Systems Inc.
- Inventors: Hildon Smith, Terrance T. Ford
- Filing Date: January 6, 2017
- Issue Date: US20170193836A1 is a patent application publication, published on July 6, 2017. The corresponding granted patent, US10019909B2, was granted and published on July 10, 2018.
- Abstract: The patent describes systems,...

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 US20170193836A1 Patent:

To identify the most relevant prior art for US patent application publication US20170193836A1, I

will consult the USPTO Patent Public Search tool. The Patent Public Search tool is a web-based search application that provides enhanced access to prior art and allows searching of patents and patent application publications. I will use the "Basic search" option to search by publication number.

Since I cannot directly execute a live search on the USPTO database, I will rely on the information available through Google Patents, which typically includes examiner-cited prior art. Google Patents is a reliable source for patent information, including citations.

Based on the provided Google Patents data for US20170193836A1, I will look for documents listed under "Prior art citations" or "Cited by examiner" to determine the most relevant prior art. I am unable to perform a live search of the USPTO database directly. However, based on typical patent examination procedures, prior art citations are usually included in the published patent application (US20170193836A1) and its corresponding...

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:

I cannot perform an obviousness analysis under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for US patent application publication US20170193836A1.

The previous "Prior art" section explicitly stated: "I do not have the specific list of prior art citations generated by the USPTO examiner for US20170193836A1. Therefore, I cannot identify the most relevant prior art and determine which claims they potentially anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102."

Without a list of relevant prior art references, I am unable to identify combinations of such references or determine the motivation a person having ordinary skill in the art would have to combine them, which are necessary steps for an obviousness analysis.

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.