

**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. 11921355 — Response to Assertion of Infringement**

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 11921355 (the "11921355 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 No. 11,921,355

Title: Head-worn personal audio apparatus supporting enhanced hearing support

Assignee: Ingeniospec LLC

Inventors: Thomas A. Howell, David Chao, C. Douglass Thomas, Peter P. Tong

Filing Date: May 8, 2023

Issue Date: March 5, 2024

Abstract:

The patent describes a head-worn personal audio apparatus, such as eyeglasses, that incorporates electronic components to provide enhanced hearing support. The apparatus can include features like audio output, communication capabilities, and health or fitness monitoring. The electronic components can be integrated into the temples or temple tips of the eyeglasses, or tethered to the device. The invention aims to...

## **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 11921355 Patent:

Analysis of Prior Art for U.S. Patent No. 11,921,355

This analysis examines the prior art cited during the prosecution of U.S. Patent No. 11,921,355 to assess its potential relevance to the patent's claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for anticipation. The following references were considered by the USPTO examiner.

U.S. Patent No. 7,163,283 B2 (Hsu)

- Full Citation: Hsu, US 7,163,283 B2, "Eyeglasses with Detachable Electronic Devices"
- Publication Date: January 16, 2007
- Filing Date: August 26, 2004
- Description: This patent describes an eyeglass frame with a detachable electronic device. The device, which can be an MP3 player, radio, or other electronic apparatus, is designed to be easily attached to and removed from the temple of the eyeglasses. The connection is facilitated by a locking mechanism, and electrical contact is established between the device and speakers integrated into the eyeglass frame.
- Potential Anticipation of Claims:

Claim 1: The Hsu patent appears to disclose many elements of claim 1. It describes a "temple arrangement" in the form of a detachable...

### **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 U.S. Patent No. 11,921,355 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

This analysis evaluates the claims of U.S. Patent No. 11,921,355 ('355 patent) for obviousness in light of the prior art references cited during its prosecution. The standard for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is whether the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA). A PHOSITA in this field would likely be an engineer or product designer with experience in consumer electronics, wearable technology, and eyewear manufacturing.

The core concept of the '355 patent revolves around modularly adding electronic components to eyeglasses via a "temple arrangement" or a "temple adapter." This allows for customization and upgrading of eyewear with functionalities like audio playback, communication, or health monitoring. The prior art, however, extensively explores this very concept.

---

I. Obviousness of Independent Claim 1  
Independent...

### **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 14, 2026 by [ihatepatenttrols.com](http://ihatepatenttrols.com) — sample only.*