CASE STUDY

From One Strong Claim Chart to a Portfolio-Wide Infringement Strategy

IIPRD • IP Asset Management | Patent Research & Analytics

PROBLEM STATEMENT

A client approached IIPRD with a **technically robust infringement claim chart** demonstrating how and why a competitor's product allegedly infringed one of the client's patents. The existing analysis provided a strong starting point for identifying potential infringement across a much larger patent portfolio.

The client owned a portfolio of **approximately 250 patents** distributed across multiple jurisdictions and complex patent-family structures, including continuation, continuation-in-part (CIP), and divisional applications.

The key objective was to determine how the existing infringement analysis could be expanded to identify **additional patents and claims** that could potentially be asserted against the competitor's broader product line.

KEY CHALLENGES

- **Large and complex patent portfolio:** Approximately 250 patents spread across multiple technology domains, jurisdictions, and interrelated patent families.
- **Identifying relevant technology spaces:** Determining which portions of the portfolio covered technologies implemented in the competitor's product line.
- **Scaling infringement analysis:** Moving beyond a single successful claim chart to systematically identify additional patent claims with potential infringement relevance.
- **Prioritizing claim-chart opportunities:** Distinguishing patents with substantial technical overlap from those requiring further investigation, avoiding unnecessary analysis of lower-potential candidates.

SOLUTION APPROACH — Portfolio-Wide Patent-to-Product Mapping

1

Patent Portfolio Analysis & Technology Clustering

Conducted a comprehensive review of the client's approximately 250 patents and categorized them into seven to eight distinct technology spaces based on their technical subject matter, claimed features, and functional applications.

2

Identification of Relevant Technology Domains

Evaluated the identified technology clusters against the competitor's infringing product and associated product lines. This screening exercise narrowed the portfolio to technology domains most relevant to the competitor's products and their underlying technical functionality.

3

Extraction of Essential Claim Features

Identified and extracted the essential technical features from the relevant patent claims. These features served as the basis for evaluating potential overlap between the client's patents and the competitor's products.

4

Product-Line Feature Investigation

Analyzed the competitor's product line to determine whether the product already charted for infringement, as well as other related products, incorporated the essential features identified in the shortlisted patent claims.

5

Development of a Patent-to-Product Matrix

Prepared a structured patent-product matrix mapping essential claim features against the competitor's products. The matrix highlighted which features appeared to be implemented across the product line and identified additional patents and claims warranting detailed infringement analysis.

6

Prioritization Based on Extent of Technical Overlap

Assigned priority rankings to candidate claims based on the extent of apparent technical overlap between the claimed features and the competitor's products. This enabled the client to focus subsequent claim-charting efforts on the most promising candidates.

BREAKTHROUGH INSIGHT

The analysis demonstrated that the existing infringement claim chart was not an isolated opportunity. It provided a technical reference point for systematically screening the client's broader patent portfolio.

~250
Patents
Multi-jurisdiction portfolio

›

7–8
Technology clusters
Grouped by subject matter

›

Essential claim features
Extracted from relevant claims

›

Patent-product matrix
Features mapped to product line

›

9–10+
Additional claim charts
From continuation & CIP patents

By organizing approximately 250 patents into technology clusters, extracting essential claim features, and mapping those features against the competitor's product line, IIPRD identified additional patent claims that warranted detailed infringement investigation.

The resulting patent-product matrix transformed a single-product infringement analysis into a structured framework for identifying and prioritizing further claim-charting opportunities across continuation, continuation-in-part, and divisional patents.

The client's subsequent internal evaluation indicated that **at least 9–10 additional claim charts** could potentially be developed from the identified continuation and CIP patents.

IMPACT ON CLIENT

Expanded infringement opportunities: Identified a pathway to develop at least 9–10 additional claim charts beyond the initial analysis, subject to detailed validation.

Improved portfolio visibility: Organized a complex, multi-jurisdictional portfolio into distinct technology spaces aligned with the competitor's product line.

Enabled data-driven prioritization: Established a ranking framework based on the extent of technical overlap between patent claims and product features.

Improved analytical efficiency: Reduced the need to evaluate every patent independently for every product by using technology clustering and essential-feature mapping to screen candidates.

Strengthened enforcement planning: Provided a structured basis for selecting the next patents and claims for detailed infringement analysis.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

A technically strong claim chart can serve as a starting point for broader portfolio-level infringement investigations.

Patent-family relationships, including continuations, CIPs, and divisionals, can provide additional avenues for identifying relevant claims.

Technology clustering helps narrow large portfolios to domains relevant to a competitor's products.

Essential-feature mapping provides a systematic approach to screening patent claims against product implementations.

Prioritization based on technical overlap enables clients to allocate claim-charting resources toward the most promising candidates.

VALUE DELIVERED

By extending the client's initial infringement analysis into a portfolio-wide patent-to-product mapping exercise, IIPRD helped uncover additional opportunities for potential infringement investigation across a portfolio of approximately 250 patents.

The technology clusters, essential-feature analysis, and prioritized patent-product matrix provided the client with a repeatable framework for identifying further claim-charting candidates. The client's internal evaluation subsequently indicated the potential to develop at least 9–10 additional claim charts from continuation and CIP patents, creating a more scalable foundation for its patent enforcement strategy.