



VALIDITY / INVALIDITY SEARCH

How sturdy is the claim?

An issued claim charted limitation by limitation against the references that could bear on its validity — with the precise passages that matter, not a reference dump.

■ SPECIMEN

This is a **format sample**. The subject, parties, identifiers, counts, confidence values, and evidence references below are **fabricated to demonstrate the report's structure and look** — they are not real search results, not a real client engagement, and contain no legal conclusions.

SUBJECT PATENT US 1X,XXX,XXX B2 (illustrative)	PREPARED FOR [Sample Client]	SCOPE Post-grant validity	CLAIM PRIORITY 2017-03 (illustrative)
REPORT ID VI-SPEC-0000	METHOD Claim-chart mapping		

01 The read, in one page

Against this illustrative issued claim, one reference reads on every limitation but one (a §102 anticipation candidate); a second pair, combined, reaches the remaining element (a §103 obviousness path). Both grounds turn on effective dates and how the claim is construed — flagged below.

The chart maps each limitation of independent claim 1 to the specific disclosing passage in the primary reference, with a confidence score for each link. Where the primary reference is silent, the chart points to the secondary combination.

This report does not opine that the claim is invalid. It shows where each limitation is met in the art and hands you the chart behind that reading.

02 Scope & method

WHAT WAS CHARTED

- ◆ **Claim** — independent claim 1, split into limitations [a]–[f].
- ◆ **Chartable reference standard** — a reference is charted only where a passage maps to a limitation.
- ◆ **Priority boundary** — each reference's effective date tested against the claim's priority date.

HOW A GROUND IS JUDGED

- ◆ **Anticipation (§102)** — a single reference disclosing every limitation.
- ◆ **Obviousness (§103)** — a combination of references plus a motivation signal a reader could follow.
- ◆ **Construction** — limitations read on their plain terms; claim construction can move the result.
- ◆ **Evidence** — every mapped limitation tied to a passage and byte span.

03 Priority of the cited art

Validity is bounded by dates: a reference only counts as prior art if its effective date precedes the claim's priority. Three of the four candidates qualify in this illustrative timeline; one falls after and is set aside.

Effective dates of the cited art vs. the subject claim

ILLUSTRATIVE LAYOUT · FABRICATED DATES



■ Effective date before subject priority (usable art) □ After priority (not prior art here) Dates are fabricated

04 Candidate grounds


Each ground is stated, then supported by the chart. Ground G1 is the anticipation chart against the primary reference; G2 is the obviousness combination that reaches the one limitation G1 leaves open.

R1 reads on the claim but for the key-rotation limitation

R1 discloses the tokenization chain end to end — account storage, token generation, contactless transmission, single-use restriction, and server de-tokenization. The chart below maps each limitation to its passage. The one gap is per-device key rotation (1[f]).

WHY IT READS AS ANTICIPATION

Five of six limitations map to R1 on their face, at confidence ≥ 0.79 , and R1's effective date precedes the claim priority. The strength of the ground rests on whether 1[f] is essential to the claim as construed.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1 – LIMITATION	DISCLOSURE IN R1 (PRIMARY REFERENCE)	CONFIDENCE
1[a] a payment device storing a primary account number	"a card element retaining a funding account identifier" ¶0021 · 6,140–6,295	 0.90
1[b] generating a token mapped to the account number	"deriving a surrogate value referencing the funding identifier" ¶0033 · 11,002–11,180	 0.86
1[c] transmitting the token over a contactless interface	"emitting the surrogate value via a near-field radio" ¶0041 · 14,330–14,498	 0.88
1[d] limiting the token to a single transaction	"restricting the surrogate value to one authorization event" ¶0047 · 16,720–16,884	 0.79
1[e] de-tokenizing at a server to authorize	"resolving the surrogate value at a host to clear the transaction" ¶0052 · 18,090–18,255	 0.82
1[f] rotating a device key between transactions	<i>Not disclosed in R1. Addressed by R2 + R3 (see ground G2).</i> —	 0.28



ILLUSTRATIVE CLAIM CHART – FABRICATED FOR LAYOUT; NOT LIVE CORPUS OUTPUT.

R2 + R3 supply the key-rotation limitation R1 lacks

R2 discloses rotating a cryptographic key per transaction; R3 places that practice in the same contactless-payment context. Combined with R1, they address 1[f] — an obviousness question rather than straight anticipation.





WHY IT MATTERS

If 1[f] is construed as a material limitation, validity turns on whether R1 + R2/R3 would have been an obvious combination to a skilled reader as of the priority date.

COMBINABLE REFERENCE	MAPPED LIMITATION	PARAGRAPH · BYTE SPAN	CONFIDENCE
US 9,771,402 B1	"rotating a device cryptographic key for each transaction"	¶0036 · 12,840–13,004	 0.85
US 2016/0119440 A1	"applying per-transaction key rotation in a contactless terminal"	¶0028 · 9,210–9,377	 0.77

ILLUSTRATIVE – FABRICATED FOR LAYOUT; NOT LIVE CORPUS OUTPUT.

05 Priority & status of the cited art

REFERENCE	TYPE	EFFECTIVE DATE	BEFORE PRIORITY?
R1 · US 10,xxx,xxx B2	Issued patent	2015-06 (illustrative)	 yes – usable
R2 · US 9,771,402 B1	Issued patent	2016-02 (illustrative)	 yes – usable
R3 · US 2016/0119440 A1	Publication	2016-04 (illustrative)	 yes – usable
R4 · US 2019/0xxxxxx A1	Publication	2019-09 (illustrative)	 no – set aside

06 How to read this report

EVERY CHART ROW CARRIES

- ◆ **Limitation** — the exact claim element being tested.
- ◆ **Disclosure** — the mapped passage in the reference that meets it.
- ◆ **Paragraph · byte span** — the precise location of that passage in the source.
- ◆ **Confidence** — the system's match strength for the limitation-to-passage link.

WHAT THIS REPORT DOES NOT DO

- ◆ It does not opine that the claim is invalid or unenforceable.
- ◆ Chartability is an evidence mapping, not a tribunal ruling.
- ◆ Claim construction can change which limitations are met.
- ◆ It is not legal advice and does not set litigation strategy.

◆ Scope & boundaries

- § **This is a specimen.** All identifiers, dates, passages, byte spans, and confidence values are fabricated to demonstrate format. They are not live search results and describe no real patent or engagement.
- § **Evidence mapping, not an opinion.** A validity/invalidity search charts where claim limitations are met in the art. Whether a claim is valid, invalid, or enforceable is a legal judgment for your counsel and, ultimately, a tribunal.
- § **Not legal advice.** Lambeth IP is a patent technology service. It is not a law firm and does not provide legal advice. Services are governed by the executed Order Form and Terms and Conditions for Patent Search Services.
- § **Scope-bound.** A live report is limited to the claim(s), reference set, corpus window, and method agreed in the order form, and to the claim construction supplied or assumed.