

**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. 8355484 — Response to Assertion of Infringement**

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8355484 (the "8355484 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 8,355,484, including its involvement in recent intellectual property litigation, is provided below.

Summary of US Patent 8,355,484

Title: Methods and apparatus for masking latency in text-to-speech systems

Assignee: The current assignee is listed as Cerence Operating Co.

Inventors: Ellen Marie Eide, Wael Mohamed Hamza

Filing Date: January 8, 2007

Issue Date: January 15, 2013

Abstract: A technique for masking latency in an automatic dialog system is provided. A communication is received from a user at the automatic dialog system. The communication is processed in the automatic dialog system to provide a response. At least one transitional message is...

## **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 8355484 Patent:

Analysis of Prior Art for U.S. Patent 8,355,484

Based on a thorough review of the patent file for U.S. Patent 8,355,484, entitled "Methods and apparatus for masking latency in text-to-speech systems," the following prior art references are considered most relevant. This analysis examines the examiner-cited references and their potential to anticipate the claims of the '484 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The core of the '484 patent is a method to make the delay in a text-to-speech (TTS) system feel more natural to a user. This is achieved by playing "transitional messages," like "um" or "let me see," while the system is processing the user's request and before the final synthesized speech response is ready.

---

#### Key Prior Art References and Potential Anticipation

##### 1. U.S. Patent 5,737,393 A

- Full Citation: Wolf, E. (1998). Script-based interactive voice mail and voice response system. U.S. Patent No. 5,737,393. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.
- Publication Date: April 7, 1998
- Filing Date: July 31, 1995
- Brief Description: This patent describes an interactive voice response...

### 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:

#### Analysis of Obviousness for US Patent 8,355,484

##### Introduction

This analysis examines the obviousness of the independent claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,355,484 ('484 patent) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The analysis is based on prior art references cited within the patent's own documentation, with publication dates preceding the patent's priority date of January 8, 2007. An invention is considered 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).

The core inventive concept of the '484 patent is to mask processing latency in an automatic dialog system by playing "transitional messages"—such as paralinguistic sounds ("um," "uh") or short phrases ("let's see...")—to make the delay feel more natural to the user, as opposed to using silence or non-human sounds like music or beeps.

The following combination of prior art references renders the independent claims (Claims 1, 3, and 6) of the '484 patent obvious.

----

### 4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 8355484 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. — 2:26-cv-00372 · U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas · filed 2026-05-03 · 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.*