

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. 10523350 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 10523350 (the "10523350 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

I have successfully searched the USPTO database for US Patent 10,523,350 and have gathered the necessary information regarding its title, assignee, inventors, filing and issue dates, and the abstract. I also have the full text of the patent, which will allow me to analyze the independent claims. I will now proceed to search the CAFC dockets for any relevant litigation. After that, I will compile all the information into the requested summary.

Here is a summary of US Patent 10,523,350:

Title: Signal processing apparatus and methods

Assignee: CONTENTNEXUS LLC

Inventors: John Christopher Harvey, James William Cuddihy

Filing Date: June 2, 1995

Issue Date: December 31, 2019

Abstract:

The...

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 10523350 Patent:

Prior Art Analysis for U.S. Patent No. 10,523,350

As a senior U.S. patent analyst, I have reviewed the prior art cited during the prosecution of U.S. Patent No. 10,523,350. Below is an analysis of each reference, detailing its content and its potential relevance to the claims of the '350 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (Anticipation).

This analysis is based on the "References Cited" section of the issued patent and my interpretation of the claims. The '350 patent has a very early priority date of November 3, 1981, based on its parent application, US06/317,510. This early date is critical, as any prior art must have been published before this date to be considered anticipatory.

Cited U.S. Patent Documents

1. U.S. Patent No. 3,845,391: "Broadcast signal identification system" (Crosby)

Publication Date: October 29, 1974

Filing Date: June 18, 1973

Brief Description: The Crosby patent discloses a system for identifying broadcast programs by embedding an inaudible identification code within the audio signal of the program. A monitoring device at a remote location can detect this code...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 10523350 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- ContentNexus LLC v. Red Bull GMBH — 2:26-cv-00323 · Texas Eastern District Court · filed 2026-04-22 · Open

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.