

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. 11929073 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 11929073 (the "11929073 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 11,929,073

Title: Hybrid arbitration system

Assignee: Cerence Operating Co.

Inventor: Min Tang

Filing Date: October 3, 2022

Issue Date: March 12, 2024

Abstract:

A method for selecting a speech recognition result on a computing device includes receiving a first speech recognition result determined by the computing device, receiving first features, at least some of the features being determined using the first speech recognition result, determining whether to select the first speech recognition result or to wait for a second speech recognition result determined by a cloud computing service based at least in part on the first speech recognition result and 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 11929073 Patent:

Analysis of Prior Art for U.S. Patent 11,929,073

Here is an analysis of the most relevant prior art cited during the examination of U.S. Patent 11,929,073. This analysis focuses on references that could potentially anticipate the independent claims of the patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The core of the invention in patent 11,929,073 is a two-stage arbitration process for a hybrid speech recognition system. The first stage, or "short-circuit," decides whether to accept a locally-generated recognition result immediately or to wait for a result from a more powerful cloud-based system. This initial decision is made before the cloud result is even received.

Key Prior Art References

1. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2013/0346078 A1

- Full Citation: US 2013/0346078 A1, "Mixed model speech recognition," assigned to Google Inc.
- Publication Date: December 26, 2013 (Filed June 26, 2012)
- Brief Description: This reference describes a hybrid speech recognition system that uses both a local, on-device recognizer and a server-based (cloud) recognizer. It details a process...

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 11,929,073

I. Introduction

This analysis evaluates the obviousness of the claims of U.S. Patent 11,929,073 ("the '073 patent") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The '073 patent, titled "Hybrid arbitration system," describes a method for selecting a speech recognition result from either a local (on-device) processor or a cloud-based service. The core of the claimed invention is a two-stage arbitration process. First, it determines whether the local result is sufficiently reliable to be used immediately, without waiting for the cloud result (a "short-circuit" decision). If not, it then compares the local and cloud results to select the better one.

An invention is considered obvious if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the invention as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art (a "POSITA"). This analysis will demonstrate that the claims of the '073 patent would have been obvious to a POSITA by combining the teachings of existing prior art...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 11929073 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- Cerence Operating Company v. Amazon.com, Inc. et al. — 2:2026cv00372 · U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · filed 2026-05-04 · 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.