

**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 25, 2026

[Opposing Counsel Name]

[Firm Name]

[Address]

**Re: U.S. Patent No. 11516694 — Response to Assertion of Infringement**

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 11516694 (the "11516694 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**

Here's a concise summary of US patent 11516694:

Title: Low latency wireless messaging

Assignee: SPECTRANET TECHNOLOGIES LLC

Inventors: Jeffrey C. Adams

Filing Date: March 18, 2021 [cite: US11516694B1]

Issue Date: November 29, 2022 [cite: US11516694B1]

Abstract:

The patent describes technology for the wireless transmission of messages to remote receiving devices. This technology involves receiving a message, determining specific transmission parameters for it, and then transmitting the message according to these parameters. A key aspect is encoding the message to minimize message latency. The system is designed for message transmission via the ionosphere or other atmospheric layers,...

## **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 11516694 Patent:

To identify the most relevant prior art for US patent 11516694, I will analyze the patents cited

within its "Patent Citations" section, excluding those that are part of the same patent family and share the same priority date (July 24, 2012). For each relevant citation, I will provide the full citation, the earliest effective date for prior art purposes, a brief description, and an assessment of which claims it potentially anticipates under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The following patents are excluded from the prior art analysis as they are direct ancestors or siblings sharing the same priority date (July 24, 2012) as US11516694B1, meaning they are not prior art in the traditional sense under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

- US9215726B1 (continuation of 13/948,081)
- US9578540B1 (continuation of 14/664,255)
- US10959123B1 (continuation of 15/436,779)

Below is an analysis of the remaining cited prior art from US11516694B1.

---

Identified Prior Art and Anticipation Analysis

1. US6104712A

- Full Citation: US6104712A, Robert; Bruno G., "Wireless communication network including plural migratory access...

### **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:

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, a patent claim is unpatentable 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 analysis requires identifying: (1) the scope and content of the prior art, (2) the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue, (3) the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art, and (4) secondary considerations of obviousness (though none are presented here in the provided context). The motivation to combine prior art references is a crucial aspect of the obviousness analysis.

The priority date for US Patent 11516694 is July 24, 2012. Therefore, only prior art references published or publicly available before this date are relevant for an obviousness analysis.

Prior Art References Considered:

Based on the patent's own citations, the following references are relevant prior art:

1. ITU-R Recommendation P.533-10 (October 2009): "Method for the prediction of the performance of HF...

### **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 May 25, 2026 by [ihatepatenttrols.com](http://ihatepatenttrols.com) — sample only.*