

**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. 8306815 — Response to Assertion of Infringement**

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8306815 (the "8306815 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 concise summary of US Patent 8,306,815 is as follows:

Title: Speech dialog control based on signal pre-processing

Assignee: Harman Becker Automotive Systems GmbH and Cerence Operating Co are listed as current assignees. The original assignee was Nuance Communications Inc.

Inventors:

- Lars König
- Gerhard Uwe Schmidt
- Andreas Löw

Filing Date: December 6, 2007

Issue Date: November 6, 2012

Abstract:

A speech dialog system interfaces a user to a computer. The system includes a signal pre-processor that processes a speech input to generate an enhanced signal and an analysis signal. A speech recognition unit may generate a recognition result based on the enhanced signal. A control unit...

## **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 8306815 Patent:

Based on a review of the citations for US patent 8,306,815, the following prior art references are identified as most relevant to the patent's claims. The analysis focuses on the potential for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, which requires a single prior art reference to disclose each and every element of a claimed invention.

The core inventive concept of US 8,306,815, particularly in its independent claims, involves a specific dual-feedback control architecture:

1. An analysis signal, containing non-semantic information about the speech input (e.g., noise, pitch, location), is used to control a speech output unit.
2. A recognition result, containing the semantic content (the recognized words), is used to control the signal pre-processor unit.

The following prior art references touch upon key elements of this system but do not appear to disclose the complete, specific architecture claimed.

---

1. US 2004/0064315 A1

- Full Citation: US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0064315 A1, "Acoustic confidence driven front-end preprocessing for speech recognition in adverse..."

### **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:

Based on the provided prior art, an analysis of the obviousness of US patent 8,306,815 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is as follows.

---

Obviousness Analysis of US Patent 8,306,815

A determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires assessing whether 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 (PHOSITA). In this context, a PHOSITA would be an engineer or computer scientist with expertise in digital signal processing and speech recognition systems.

The core inventive concept of the '815 patent, as articulated in the independent claims (1, 20, 22, and 23), is a speech dialog system with a dual-feedback control architecture. This architecture involves two distinct control loops:

1. Analysis-to-Output Loop: Using non-semantic information from a speech input (the analysis signal) to control the system's speech output.
2. Recognition-to-Input Loop: Using the semantic meaning of the recognized words (the recognition result)...

### **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.*