



DIAGNOSTIC REPORT · LVR-2026-001

date of review: July 17, 2026

prepared for: design-partner submission · client identity withheld

subject: claim-construction legal-standard excerpt · 5 authorities · 6 quotations

VERDICT: FAIL

Do not file as written. After the corrective actions below, resubmit for re-verification; a passing revision is eligible for a Lavir Verified record.

authorities checked: 5
fabricated case: 1 ·
fabricated quotation: 1
defective citation: 1 ·
misquotation: 1
fully verified: 2

Findings

Moore v. Newman, 326 F.3d 976, 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2020)

× F-1 · CASE DOES NOT EXIST

No such decision could be located in any public source. Independent grounds:

× existence — no matching case in searched public corpora or indices

× volume/date — F.3d vol. 326 published c. 2003; a "(Fed. Cir. 2020)" decision in it is impossible (2020 opinions appear c. vols. 950-983)

× pagination — pin cite 1111 vs. first page 976 implies a 135-page opinion; no such opinion exists at this location

△ pattern — caption pairs the surnames of two sitting Federal Circuit judges (Moore, Newman), whose only joint appearance in the record is a 2023-24 judicial-conduct matter, not a claim-construction case; this construction is characteristic of AI-fabricated captions

Sources: nclalegal.org — the only Moore/Newman matter on record (judicial-conduct, not a case) · fedsoc.org — same · negative existence checks across courtlistener.com and law.justia.com (no opinion exists to link — that absence is the finding)

"decides what the terms of the claim mean in plain English"

× F-2 · FABRICATED QUOTATION

The quotation attributed to the nonexistent authority above appears in no located opinion. A quotation with no source is an independent defect from the fabricated caption it is pinned to: even re-cited to a real case, these words would need a genuine source before appearing in quotation marks.

02 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., 521 F.3d 135, 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008)

⚠ F-3 · REAL CASE, DEFECTIVE CITATION

The authority is real and supports the stated proposition, but the citation is corrupted in three particulars:

- First page is **1351**, not 135 (verified against the published opinion).
- Party name is **"O2 Micro"** (letter O), not "02 Micro" (zero) — a transcription artifact.
- As written, the pin cite (1361) sits 1,226 pages past the stated first page (135) — internally impossible on its face.

✓ existence — 02 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008), decided Apr. 3, 2008

✓ substance — the court-resolves-claim-scope-disputes holding appears at 1360-62; pin cite 1361 is within the opinion

Read the real opinion: [CourtListener — O2 Micro, 521 F.3d 1351 \(full text\)](#) · [casemine.com](#) · [leagle.com](#)

"the meaning it would have to a POSITA at the time of invention" – attributed to Phillips, 415 F.3d at 1313

⚠ F-4 · QUOTATION DOES NOT MATCH SOURCE

Phillips at 1313 states the meaning a term "would have to a **person of ordinary skill in the art in question** at the time of the invention." The opinion does not use the acronym "POSITA" in this sentence; the filing places a paraphrase inside quotation marks. Substantively accurate; formally a misquotation.

Read the real language: [Phillips en banc slip opinion \(PDF\)](#), at 1313 · [background: Wikipedia](#)

Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303, 1313, 1314–18, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2005) ✓ VERIFIED (en banc)

✓ existence, court, year, en banc designation confirmed

✓ quotation at 1317 – "was created by the patentee in attempting to explain and obtain the patent" – verbatim

✓ quotation at 1317 – "the prosecution history can often inform the meaning of the claim language..." – verbatim

✓ pin spans 1313, 1314–18 consistent with the opinion's intrinsic-evidence discussion

Read the opinion: [Phillips en banc slip opinion \(PDF\)](#) · [background: Wikipedia](#)

Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 517 U.S. 370, 372 (1996)

✓ VERIFIED

✓ existence, court, year, first page and pin cite confirmed

✓ quotation – "a matter of law reserved entirely for the court" – verbatim at 372

Read the opinion: [Justia — Markman v. Westview Instruments, 517 U.S. 370 \(full text\)](#) · [Cornell LII — slip opinion, No. 95-26](#)

Corrective actions

#	ACTION
1	Delete the Moore v. Newman citation and its quotation (F-1, F-2). If the "plain-English" proposition is retained, counsel must select genuine supporting authority — Lavir verifies citations and does not recommend authority.
2	Correct the O2 Micro citation to: O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., 521 F.3d 1351, 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (F-3).
3	Re-set the Phillips language at 1313 as a verbatim quotation or remove the quotation marks (F-4).
4	Resubmit the revised passage for re-verification; a passing revision receives a dated Lavir Verified record for the matter file.

Appendix — source index (where each authority was verified)

AUTHORITY	PRIMARY SOURCE CONSULTED
O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/1302705/o2-micro-intern-v-beyond-innovation-technolog y/
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	https://patentlyo.com/media/docs/2005/08/Phillips_20En_20Banc.pdf
Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 517 U.S. 370 (1996)	https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/517/370/
"Moore v. Newman, 326 F.3d 976 (Fed. Cir. 2020)"	No opinion exists — that absence is finding F-1. Negative existence established across courtlistener.com and law.justia.com ; the only Moore/Newman matter of record is a judicial-conduct proceeding: https://nclalegal.org/case/re-complaint-against-circuit-judge-pauline-newman/

All links are to free public sources — no subscription is required to re-verify any finding in this report. Production reports resolve against the CourtListener/RECAP corpus and, where needed, the underlying PACER docket.

Scope & method. Lavir verifies existence, citation accuracy (reporter, volume, page, year, court), and quotation fidelity against primary public sources. Whether a genuine authority supports the proposition it is cited for (holding support) is flagged for counsel's review and is never auto-verified. The check pipeline contains no generative AI: citations are extracted deterministically, existence is resolved by lookup against public court records, and quotations are matched textually. This engagement was performed under Lavir's v0 protocol: engine extraction and screening with analyst-performed source resolution; every finding above carries the public source against which it can be independently re-checked. A source that cannot be retrieved is reported as "needs review" — never as verified, and never as fabricated.

Confidentiality. This submission was reviewed under Lavir's confidentiality commitments ([lavir.org/confidentiality](#)): used solely for this check, never used to train any AI system, deleted on request. This report is the client's property.