

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. 10936685B2 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 10936685B2 (the "10936685B2 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 10936685B2

Title: Poll-based networking system

Assignee: Trinity Info Media LLC

Inventors: Timothy Beggy, David Shaun Neal

Filing Date: July 2, 2018

Issue Date: March 2, 2021

Abstract: The patent describes a poll-based system that establishes an online and mobile network of users, products, goods, and services determined through polling. The system compares a current user's polling responses in real-time to identify the most similar matches among other users or products, goods, and services. As the user progressively answers questions, the system updates the matching and presentation of these similar entities. This process involves comparing selected answers...

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 10936685B2 Patent:

Most Relevant Prior Art for US Patent 10936685B2

US Patent 10936685B2, titled "Poll-based networking system," has several prior art citations listed. For a patent to be granted, an invention must be novel and non-obvious in light of existing "prior art." Prior art includes any public knowledge, such as earlier patents, publications, or public uses, that existed before the effective filing date of the claimed invention. If a single piece of prior art discloses every element of a claimed invention, the invention lacks novelty under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Based on the information available, the following are the most relevant prior art citations for US10936685B2:

Examiner-Cited Prior Art

1. US20090287763A1

- Full Citation: US20090287763A1 (Kota Enterprise, Llc)
- Publication/Filing Date: Published: 2009-11-19, Priority Date: 2008-05-15
- Brief Description: This patent application describes a question server system to facilitate communication between participants by presenting questions and enabling responses. The system aims to match participants based on their answers.
- Potential...

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:

The obviousness analysis of US Patent 10936685B2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires identifying prior art references that, when combined, would render the claims obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA), along with a motivation to combine those references. The priority date for US10936685B2 is March 1, 2010.

Based on the provided patent text, the relevant prior art references with a priority date before March 1, 2010, are:

1. US20090287763A1 (Kota Enterprise, Llc), published November 19, 2009, with a priority date of May 15, 2008, titled "Question server to facilitate communication between participants."
2. US7130807B1 (Accenture Llp), published October 31, 2006, with a priority date of November 22, 1999, titled "Technology sharing during demand and supply planning in a network-based supply chain environment."
3. US8249943B2 (Facebook, Inc.), published August 21, 2012, with a priority date of May 31, 2007, titled "Auction based polling."

US10019722B2 is identified as a direct ancestor of US10936685B2, sharing the same priority date of March 1, 2010. As such, it...

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 ihatepatenttrols.com — sample only.