

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. 9269097 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9269097 (the "9269097 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 9,269,097 reveals its focus on enhancing natural language processing in voice-activated systems by using advertisements to interpret user commands. The patent is currently the subject of significant litigation initiated by its current owner.

Patent Details:

- Title: System and method for delivering targeted advertisements and/or providing natural language processing based on advertisements
- Assignee: The original assignee was VoiceBox Technologies Corp. As of the date of this report, the current assignee is VB Assets LLC.
- Inventors: Tom Freeman, Mike Kennewick
- Filing Date: November 10, 2014
- Issue Date: February 23, 2016
- Abstract: The patent...

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 9269097 Patent:

Prior Art Analysis for U.S. Patent 9,269,097

As a technical patent analyst, a thorough review of the prior art cited in U.S. Patent 9,269,097 is crucial to understanding the landscape of the invention and potential challenges to its validity. Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a patent claim is anticipated if each and every element of the claim is found in a single prior art reference. The following analysis details the most relevant prior art cited against patent 9,269,097 and assesses which claims each reference could potentially anticipate.

The analysis focuses on the independent claims of the '097 patent, which are the broadest claims and therefore most susceptible to an anticipation challenge. Independent claim 1 describes a method for interpreting a natural language utterance based on a presented advertisement, specifically by determining if a pronoun in the utterance refers to the advertised product, service, or provider. Independent claim 23 covers a system comprising one or more processors programmed to perform this method.

Key Prior Art References and Potential Anticipation
Based...

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 U.S. Patent 9,269,097

As a senior patent analyst, this analysis evaluates the obviousness of U.S. Patent 9,269,097 ('097 patent) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. This statute precludes issuing a patent if 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 the invention was made. The priority date of the '097 patent family is February 6, 2007, which establishes the critical date for evaluating the state of the art.

The analysis hinges on whether a PHOSITA, with knowledge of the technological landscape in and around 2007, would have found it obvious to combine existing elements of voice recognition, targeted advertising, and contextual analysis to arrive at the invention claimed in the '097 patent. The core of the invention is using a presented advertisement as the immediate context for interpreting a subsequent natural language utterance, particularly for resolving pronouns.

Based on the prior art, a strong case for...

4. Litigation History of the Patent

Public records reflect that the 9269097 Patent has been the subject of the following litigation, which informs our view of the asserted claims and your client's enforcement posture:

- VB Assets LLC v. Android International Inc et al. — 1:26-cv-00443 · Delaware District Court · filed 2026-04-17 · Open
- VB Assets, LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., LTD. et al. — 1:24-cv-01368 · U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware · filed 2024-11-22 · Active
- VB Assets, LLC v. General Motors Holdings LLC et al. — 1:24-cv-01279 · U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware · filed 2024-10-31 · Active
- VB ASSETS, LLC v. Apple Inc. — 1:19-cv-01410 · U.S. District Court for the District of

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.