

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. 9531665 — Response to Assertion of Infringement

Dear Counsel,

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9531665 (the "9531665 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

Here is a concise summary of US Patent 9,531,665.

Title: Information messaging system

Assignee: The patent was originally assigned to "Individual." However, extensive litigation activity indicates the current entity asserting the patent is Contactwave LLC. According to the USPTO assignment database, the patent was assigned to MIRA ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS, INC. on October 9, 2024, and subsequently to CONTACTWAVE LLC on October 30, 2024.

Inventors: Nitesh Ratnakar

Filing Date: February 10, 2015

Issue Date: December 27, 2016

Abstract:

A method of transmitting contact information to an approved mobile communication device includes receiving an input representative of desired contact...

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 9531665 Patent:

Prior art analysis

A thorough review of the prior art cited during the prosecution of US patent 9,531,665 reveals the landscape of existing technology the examiner considered before granting the patent. The patent itself cites only one prior art reference. This analysis examines that reference to determine its potential impact on the patent's claims, particularly independent claims 1 and 7.

Cited Prior Art References

Only one prior art reference was cited by the examiner and listed on the face of the granted US patent 9,531,665.

1. US 2006/0178903 A1 ("Commoca")

- Full Citation: US Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0178903 A1
- Title: Method and system for converged communications directory search and advertising services
- Publication Date: August 10, 2006
- Filing Date: January 21, 2005
- Assignee: Commoca, Inc.

Brief Description:

The Commoca reference describes a unified system for managing communications, directory searches, and advertising. A central server provides a directory service that users can query from various devices, including mobile phones. The...

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:

An obviousness analysis under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for US patent 9,531,665, based on the provided prior art, is detailed below.

Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (PHOSITA)

As of the patent's priority date of November 17, 2005, a person having ordinary skill in the art (PHOSITA) would have a Bachelor's degree in Computer Science or a related field, along with two to three years of experience in developing web or early mobile applications, particularly those involving client-server architecture, databases, and online advertising or customer relationship management (CRM) systems. This individual would be familiar with common internet advertising models, such as keyword targeting and behavioral targeting, as well as mobile communication protocols like SMS and WAP.

Obviousness Ground 1: US 2006/0178903 A1 (Commoca) in view of General Knowledge in the Art

Independent claims 1 and 7 are rendered obvious by the teachings of US 2006/0178903 A1 ("Commoca") when combined with the general knowledge of a PHOSITA regarding common and well-established competitive advertising strategies.

1....

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 ihatepatenttrolls.com — sample only.