

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. 9203972 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9203972 (the "9203972 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

An analysis of U.S. Patent No. 9,203,972 reveals the following details regarding its origin, ownership, and the technological advancements it protects.

Title: Efficient audio signal processing in the sub-band regime

Assignee: The current assignee of record is Cerence Operating Co. The original assignee was Nuance Communications Inc.

Inventors: Gerhard Uwe Schmidt, Hans-Jörg Köpf, and Günther Wirsching.

Filing Date: September 14, 2012

Issue Date: December 1, 2015

Abstract:

The patent describes a signal processing system designed to enhance an audio signal. The method involves dividing the audio signal into multiple audio sub-band signals. A portion of these sub-band signals is then...

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 9203972 Patent:

Analysis of Prior Art for U.S. Patent No. 9,203,972

The following analysis details the most relevant prior art cited against U.S. Patent No. 9,203,972, which pertains to "Efficient audio signal processing in the sub-band regime." The core invention of the '972 patent is a method for enhancing an audio signal by dividing it into sub-band signals, excising some of these sub-bands to reduce computational load, processing the remaining sub-bands to remove noise or echo, and then reconstructing the excised sub-bands to form an enhanced full-band audio signal.

The analysis below examines key prior art references cited in the '972 patent's file history. Each reference is assessed for its potential to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Key Prior Art and Potential Anticipation of Claims:

1. U.S. Patent No. 5,272,695

- Full Citation: US Patent 5,272,695, "Subband echo canceller with adjustable coefficients using a series of step sizes."
- Publication Date: December 21, 1993
- Filing Date: September 14, 1990
- Description: This patent discloses a sub-band echo...

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 my analysis of U.S. Patent No. 9,203,972 and the cited prior art, several of the patent's claims appear vulnerable to an obviousness challenge under 35 U.S.C. § 103. A person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) in audio signal processing at the time of the invention (with a priority date of October 1, 2007) would have been motivated to combine existing technologies to achieve the claimed invention for predictable reasons, primarily to reduce computational complexity.

The core innovation of US 9,203,972 is not merely processing audio in sub-bands, but rather the three-step process of excising some sub-bands to save computational resources, processing the remaining sub-bands, and then reconstructing the excised ones before final synthesis. This approach seeks to balance processing efficiency with acceptable audio quality.

Combination of Prior Art for Obviousness

A strong obviousness argument can be constructed by combining a primary reference that teaches sub-band audio processing with a secondary reference that teaches the reconstruction of missing audio data.

•...

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 — sample only.