

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. 11336597 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 11336597 (the "11336597 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

As of April 28, 2026, the following is a summary of US Patent 11,336,597.

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

Assignee: Disintermediation Services Inc

Inventors:

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

Filing Date: January 11, 2022

Issue Date: May 17, 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 of a web browser. A conversation identifier is determined based on the first...

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 11336597 Patent:

Analysis of Prior Art Cited in US Patent 11,336,597

As a senior US patent analyst, I have reviewed the prior art cited on the face of US Patent 11,336,597. The following analysis details each cited reference and its potential relevance to the claims of the '597 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (Anticipation).

A reference anticipates a claim if it discloses, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of that claim. The independent claims of the '597 patent (Claims 1 and 18) are the primary focus, as the invalidity of an independent claim typically renders its dependent claims invalid as well.

The core novelty of US Patent 11,336,597 appears to be the combination of:

- An unauthenticated web user initiating a communication.
- A first responder (e.g., a virtual assistant) engaging the user.
- The system then identifying a second, different responder based on the user's input.
- Routing the communication to this second responder via their specific, potentially different, communication protocol (e.g., SMS, email).
- Managing the entire conversation through a conversation...

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:

Obviousness Analysis of US Patent 11,336,597 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

This analysis evaluates whether the invention claimed in US Patent 11,336,597 would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA) at the time of the invention. 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 claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art."

The analysis focuses on independent claims 1 and 18, which define the core invention. The key elements of these claims are:

- An unauthenticated web user initiates a conversation.
- A "first responder" sends an initial message or request for information.
- The system receives the user's first communication.
- Based on that communication, the system identifies a "second responder," who is different from the first.
- The system forwards the communication to the second responder using their specific communication protocol (which may differ from...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 11336597 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- Disintermediation Services, Inc. v. LiveAdmins, LLC — 1:2022cv06539 · U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois · Ongoing
- Disintermediation Services, Inc. v. The Kroger Co. et al. — U.S. District Court for the Eastern

District of Texas · Unknown

- Disintermediation Services, Inc. v. Living Spaces Furniture, LLC — U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · Unknown
- Disintermediation Services, Inc. v. Hello UMI S.L. — U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas · Unknown
- Intercom, Inc. v. Disintermediation Services, Inc. — U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware · Unknown

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.