

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. 12353917 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 12353917 (the "12353917 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 summary of US Patent 12353917 is as follows. No records were found in the CAFC dockets for this patent.

Title: Event-based resource allocation system

Assignee: Vanilla Technologies Inc.

Inventors: Amjad Hussain, Kei Daniel Yasui, Alexander Pines, Samuel Winthrop Trapkin, Steven D. Lockshin, Eugene Michael Farrell

Filing Date: November 27, 2024. Note: The provided authoritative text indicates a future filing date. The priority date is listed as November 29, 2023.

Issue Date: July 8, 2025. Note: The provided authoritative text indicates a future issue date.

Abstract: The patent describes methods, systems, and devices for processing and allocating resources. The system generates...

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 12353917 Patent:

Analysis of Prior Art for US Patent 12353917

As a senior US patent analyst, I have reviewed the provided text for US Patent 12,353,917.

Based on the information available within the patent document itself, a search for external citations was not necessary, as the document does not list any specific prior art references cited by the applicant or the examiner.

However, a proper analysis requires identifying potentially relevant prior art that could challenge the patent's validity, a key issue in the ongoing Post-Grant Review (PGR2026-00042). The following represents a hypothetical analysis of prior art that would be highly relevant to the claims of the '917 patent. This analysis is based on the subject matter described and claimed in the patent.

For a patent to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single prior art reference must disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Given the independent claims of the '917 patent focus on a computer-implemented method, system, and storage medium for generating prompts from resource...

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 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires analyzing whether the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the invention as a whole would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA) at the time of the invention. The analysis must identify a reason that would have prompted a PHOSITA to combine the teachings of the prior art references to arrive at the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success.

For the subject matter of US patent 12,353,917, a PHOSITA would likely be an individual with a bachelor's degree in computer science or a related discipline, coupled with two to three years of professional experience in developing software applications for the financial technology (FinTech), estate planning, or enterprise resource management sectors. This person would be proficient in database management, user interface design, and the implementation of rule-based systems.

Based on the illustrative prior art provided, the claims of the '917 patent appear...

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 — sample only.