

**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. 12236947 — Response to Assertion of Infringement**

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 12236947 (the "12236947 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**

A detailed analysis of U.S. Patent 12,236,947 reveals a system for processing voice commands with greater flexibility, a departure from the rigid formats required by many existing voice-activated assistants.

Title: Flexible-format voice command

Assignee: Cerence Operating Company

Inventors: Bart D'hoore, Christoph Halboth, Holger Quast, Dino Seppi, Markus Funk, Tom Claes, Christophe Ris

Filing Date: July 10, 2023

Issue Date: February 25, 2025

Abstract:

The patent describes a voice-based system designed to process commands in a flexible format. This system allows a "wake word" to be positioned at various points within an utterance, not just at the beginning. The abstract suggests that,...

## **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 12236947 Patent:

## Prior Art Analysis for U.S. Patent 12,236,947

An analysis of the prior art cited during the prosecution of U.S. Patent 12,236,947, "Flexible-format voice command," reveals several key references that the patent examiner considered. This review is critical in understanding the novel contributions of the '947 patent as determined by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). The following analysis details the most relevant cited patents and their potential relationship to the claims of the '947 patent.

It is important to note that anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each and every element of a claimed invention. The following analysis identifies claims that are potentially anticipated by the cited references, reflecting the examiner's likely considerations.

---

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2013/0297319A1

• Full Citation: Kim, Yongsin. "Mobile device having at least one microphone sensor and method for controlling the same." U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2013/0297319A1, published November 7,...

### **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 12,236,947

Date of Analysis: May 8, 2026

Patent under Review: US 12,236,947 ("the '947 patent")

Relevant Legal Standard: Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, a patent claim is invalid as obvious 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 (POSITA).

This analysis examines the independent claims of the '947 patent in light of the cited prior art. The core of the invention, as outlined in the independent claims, is a multimodal system for recognizing voice commands by processing both audio and video inputs to determine user intent.

Claim 1 Analysis: Multimodal Command Recognition

Independent claim 1 claims a method of processing voice commands by:

1. Receiving a first audio input.
2. Receiving a first video input of the user.
3. Determining the utterance is a system-directed command based on processing both the audio and video, including identifying a "visual characteristic" of the user.
- 4....

### **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 [ihatepatentrolls.com](http://ihatepatentrolls.com) — sample only.*