

[Date]

[Client Name]

[Client Address]

[City, State, Zip Code]

Re: Invalidity Opinion Regarding U.S. Patent No. [Patent Number]

Dear [Client Name],

At your request, we have conducted an investigation and analysis regarding the validity of U.S. Patent No. [Patent Number] (the "[Short Name] Patent"). Based on our review of the patent, its prosecution history, and the identified prior art, it is our professional opinion that one or more claims of the [Short Name] Patent are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for anticipation and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness.

I. Executive Summary

[Briefly state the conclusion that the claims are invalid over specific prior art references.]

II. The Subject Patent

The [Short Name] Patent, entitled "[Patent Title]," was issued on [Date] and contains [Number] claims. We have focused our analysis on independent claim(s) [Claim Numbers].

III. Legal Standards

Anticipation (35 U.S.C. § 102): A claim is invalid as anticipated if a single prior art reference discloses each and every element of the claim, either expressly or inherently.

Obviousness (35 U.S.C. § 103): A claim is invalid as 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 (PHOSITA).

IV. Prior Art Analyzed

Our analysis relies primarily on the following references:

- [Prior Art Reference 1: e.g., U.S. Patent No. X,XXX,XXX to Name]
- [Prior Art Reference 2: e.g., Publication/Journal Article]

V. Invalidity Analysis

A. Anticipation under § 102

Claim [Number] is anticipated by [Reference 1]. Specifically, [Reference 1] discloses:

- [Claim Limitation A]: Disclosed in [Reference 1] at [Column/Line/Figure].
- [Claim Limitation B]: Disclosed in [Reference 1] at [Column/Line/Figure].

B. Obviousness under § 103

Even if [Reference 1] is found to lack a specific limitation, Claim [Number] is obvious over [Reference 1] in view of [Reference 2].

[Explain why a PHOSITA would combine the teachings of the references and how the combination meets all claim limitations.]

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is our opinion that the challenged claims of the [Short Name] Patent are unpatentable and would be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction or the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB).

Sincerely,

[Attorney Name]
[Law Firm Name]