

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. US8069073B2 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. US8069073B2 (the "US8069073B2 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

Summary of US Patent US8069073B2

Title: System and method for facilitating bilateral and multilateral decision-making

Assignee: Dalton Sentry LLC

Inventors: Eileen C. Shapiro, Steven J. Mintz

Filing Date: March 29, 2000

Issue Date: November 29, 2011

Abstract

This invention provides a system and method for facilitating complex decision-making between two or more parties. The method involves presenting parties and counterparties with a series of forced-choice questions to understand their preferences. By analyzing the responses using conjoint analysis, the system generates a list of matched parties and counterparties, effectively streamlining the evaluation process for transactions,...

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 US8069073B2 Patent:

Quest for Precedence: Unearthing the Most Relevant Prior Art for a Foundational Business

Method Patent

Washington D.C. - A deep dive into the archives of innovation has identified key prior art that could be considered relevant to U.S. Patent No. 8,069,073 B2, a patent that outlines a system and method for facilitating introductions between business and social network users. The identified references, spanning both issued patents and published patent applications, touch upon similar concepts of connecting individuals within a network based on shared interests and professional goals. Understanding this prior art is crucial for navigating the landscape of business method patents and the specific domain of online networking.

U.S. Patent No. 8,069,073 B2, titled "Systems and methods for providing network-based business/social introductions," describes a computerized method for identifying a "most likely" introduction between two users of a business or social network. The core of the invention lies in a system that calculates a "likelihood of introduction" score based on the...

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:

An analysis of the obviousness of U.S. Patent No. 8,069,073 B2 ("the '073 patent") under 35 U.S.C. § 103 reveals a strong case for invalidity. The patent, which claims a system and method for facilitating bilateral and multilateral decision-making, appears to be a combination of known elements from the prior art that would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The key elements of the patent—the use of forced-choice questions, the creation of preference profiles, and the application of conjoint analysis for matching—were all well-established in fields such as market research, survey methodology, and early e-commerce systems before the patent's priority date of December 23, 1999.

Breaking Down the '073 Patent Claims

While the full text of all claims is extensive, the core of the invention is captured in its independent claims. These claims generally describe a computer-implemented method for facilitating an evaluation between parties and counterparties in a transactional context. The method involves:

1. Presenting a series of...

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.