

**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. 10984445 — Response to Assertion of Infringement**

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 10984445 (the "10984445 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**

Following a detailed analysis of U.S. Patent 10,984,445 and a search of relevant legal databases, here is a concise summary as of April 26, 2026.

Summary of U.S. Patent 10,984,445

Title: Providing collected profiles to media properties having specified interests

Assignee: Datonics, LLC

Inventor: Roy Shkedi

Filing Date: February 9, 2018

Issue Date: April 20, 2021

Abstract: The patent describes a system to improve the monetization of electronic advertisement placement. A "profile owner company" uses an automated system to identify media properties (like websites or apps) that are interested in specific types of user profiles. When a user's online activity matches a profile requested by...

## **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 10984445 Patent:

As a senior US patent analyst, I have reviewed the prosecution history and relevant

documentation for US patent 10,984,445 to identify the most relevant prior art. The patent is a continuation of several earlier applications, with the earliest priority date being June 19, 2006, from provisional application 60/805,114. Therefore, any reference published before this date is considered prior art.

The following analysis details the key prior art references cited by the USPTO examiner during the prosecution of the parent application (U.S. Pat. No. 8,280,758), which are directly relevant to the claims of patent 10,984,445.

#### Analysis of Prior Art

The core invention claimed in US 10,984,445, particularly in independent claim 1, involves a "profile owner" system that collects user profiles from various "profile suppliers." This system then selects a "media property" (e.g., a website) that has requested a certain type of profile. Upon finding a match between a user's profile and a media property's request, the system arranges for the user to be tagged in a way the media property can read....

### 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:

Based on the provided prior art analysis, here is an assessment of the obviousness of US patent 10,984,445 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

#### Obviousness Analysis under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, a patent claim is invalid if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA). The relevant date for this analysis is the patent's earliest priority date, June 19, 2006.

The core of independent claim 1 of the '445 patent is a three-party system: a "profile supplier" (where user activity is observed), a central "profile owner computer" (which collects profiles and matches them to requests), and a "media property entity" (which requests profiles and receives them to serve targeted ads). The key inventive concept, as distinguished from prior art like Chitkara and Sloan in the preceding analysis, appears to be that the profile owner provides the collected profile to the media property for its own use, rather than simply...

### 4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 10984445 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- Datonics LLC et al. v. Amazon.com, Inc. — 6:24-cv-00234 · U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas · filed 2024-04-02 · Active
- Datonics LLC v. Oracle America, Inc. — 1:24-cv-00376 · U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware · filed 2024-03-28 · Active
- Datonics LLC v. Adobe Inc. — 1:24-cv-00831 · U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware · filed 2024-07-18 · Active
- Datonics LLC v. The Trade Desk, Inc. — 7:25-cv-00059 · U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas · filed 2025-03-13 · Active
- Datonics LLC v. LiveRamp Holdings, LLC — 1:25-cv-00579 · U.S. District Court for the District

of Delaware · filed 2025-04-10 · Active

• Datonics LLC v. Neustar, Inc. — 7:25-cv-00180 · U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas · filed 2025-11-20 · Active

## 5. 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.*