

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. 11240183 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 11240183 (the "11240183 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 U.S. Patent 11,240,183

A concise summary of U.S. Patent 11,240,183 is provided below, based on a technical analysis of the patent documentation.

Title: Two-way real time communication system that allows asymmetric participation in conversations across multiple electronic platforms

Assignee: Disintermedation Services Inc.

Inventors:

- John Patrick Francis Dandison
- James Allen Johnson
- Paul Joseph Lyman Schottland

Filing Date: September 29, 2020

Issue Date: February 1, 2022

Abstract:

Methods, systems, and apparatuses, including computer programs encoded on computer-readable media, for receiving a first communication as part of a conversation, from an unauthenticated user...

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 11240183 Patent:

Prior Art Analysis for U.S. Patent 11,240,183

An analysis of the prior art cited during the prosecution of U.S. Patent 11,240,183 reveals several key references that the patent examiner considered in determining the novelty and non-obviousness of the invention. The following are the most relevant of these references, with an assessment of the claims they might anticipate. The analysis focuses on anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, which requires that a single prior art reference disclose each and every element of a claimed invention.

Based on the file history, the following patents and patent applications were cited by the examiner as relevant prior art.

U.S. Patent 8,838,710 B2 (Gladwin, et al.)

- Full Citation: US Patent 8,838,710 B2, "System and method for integrating self-directed and live agent interaction," assigned to eStara, Inc.
- Publication Date: September 16, 2014 (Filed: November 2, 2007)
- Brief Description: This patent describes a system for integrating automated (self-directed) and live agent help sessions over a data network. A user can interact with an...

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, an obviousness challenge to U.S. Patent 11,240,183 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 could be constructed by combining the teachings of the cited references. A person having ordinary skill in the art (POSITA) at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine these teachings to achieve a more efficient and flexible customer communication system.

The most compelling argument for obviousness arises from combining the teachings of U.S. Patent 8,401,173 B2 (Paden) with U.S. Patent 8,838,710 B2 (Gladwin).

Obviousness Argument: Paden in view of Gladwin

1. Base Reference: Paden ('173)

Paden discloses the core functionality of the invention claimed in US 11,240,183. As noted in the prior art analysis, Paden teaches a customer service system where:

- A user can initiate a request on one platform, such as a web browser.
- The system can route the customer to an appropriate agent based on the nature of their inquiry.
- The communication can be fulfilled or continued on a different platform, such as through a text message (SMS).
- The system...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 11240183 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- Disintermedation Services Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc. — 2:25-cv-00772 · Texas Eastern District Court · Unknown
- Disintermedation Services Inc. v. AT&T Inc. — 2:25-cv-00773 · Texas Eastern District Court · Unknown
- Disintermedation Services Inc. v. Verizon Communications Inc., et al. — 6:22-cv-00652 · Texas Western District Court · filed 2022-06-22 · Unknown
- Disintermedation Services Inc. v. U.S. Cellular Corporation — 6:22-cv-00651 · Texas Western District Court · filed 2022-06-22 · Unknown
- Disintermedation Services Inc. v. Charter Communications, Inc. — 6:22-cv-00650 · Texas Western District Court · filed 2022-06-22 · Unknown
- Disintermedation Services Inc. v. DISH Network Corporation — 6:22-cv-00649 · Texas Western District Court · filed 2022-06-22 · Unknown
- Disintermedation Services Inc. v. Comcast Corporation — 6:22-cv-00645 · Texas Western District Court · filed 2022-06-22 · Unknown
- Disintermedation Services Inc. v. Cox Communications, Inc. — 6:22-cv-00644 · Texas Western District Court · filed 2022-06-22 · Unknown
- ...and 17 additional case(s)

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 ihatepatenttrolls.com — sample only.