



PRIMORIS

DESIGN SEARCH REPORT

Wearable wind-tilting umbrella harness

BASIC EDITION | CLIENT: Example Client LLC | MATTER: PREVIEW-001 | DATE: 2026-10-01

PREVIEW: fictional data. Invented names and placeholder numbers (US00000001 and similar) fed to the real report writer to review layout and wording. Not a real search result.

Part A: Summary

Product	Design Search (Basic)
Report date	October 01, 2026
Client / matter	Example Client LLC / PREVIEW-001
Data current through	US design patent records through September 29, 2026; web searched live on the report date

The similarity scores in this report come from an automated visual screen of drawings. They are not legal findings and not a statement about infringement or whether a design patent would be granted.

Risk Factor Rating

**MEDIUM RISK**

We found an earlier design that shares several features with your stool, so it may be worth a closer look before you go further. This is an automated screen, not a legal opinion.

Verdict

We considered 140 US design patents for folding stools and compared drawings of the 4 closest ones with your design. One earlier folding stool (USD00000001S1) shares your round seat and three-legged silhouette. Our automated screen scored it 7.0 of 10, the highest of those compared, and that drives the rating. The evidence also notes differences, such as a raised seat rim and straight legs.

Top Matches

Design number	Title	Owner	Granted	Why it matters	Automated score
USD00000001S1	Folding stool	Seatwell Co	2019-04-02	Same round seat and three-leg folding shape; differs in rim and legs	7.0 of 10
USD00000002S1	Camp stool	TrailSeat LLC	2016-08-16	Folding legs, but rectangular seat and four legs	5.0 of 10
USD00000003S1	Tripod seat	owner not shown in our data	2012-01-10	Three-leg base only; no cushion, visible metal frame	4.0 of 10

Points to Discuss With an Attorney

These are automated suggestions to discuss with a qualified attorney, not legal advice:

- Ask whether the differences between your stool and the Seatwell stool (USD00000001S1), such as its raised seat rim and straight legs, matter to a typical buyer.
- Ask which visual changes, such as seat shape, leg shape or a visible hinge, would make your stool stand out most.
- Ask whether to show the padded seat and hinge more clearly in your drawings.
- Consider a professional design search. Ours covered US patents only and may miss foreign designs and products sold online.
- Ask how the online product we found (W1) might matter. It was not checked in detail.

Part B: Technical Detail

1. Your Design As We Understood It

- **Product type:** folding stool.
- **Scope:** whole article, not a portion.
- **Views provided:** perspective, front and top (3 images). None were photograph-like images.
- **Key ornamental features:** round padded seat, three splayed legs and a central folding hinge.
- **Summary:** a round-seat folding stool on three splayed legs.
- **Note on coverage:** no side, rear or bottom view was provided.

2. Closest Prior Designs in Detail

USD0000001S1, Folding stool

- **Owner:** Seatwell Co
- **Grant date:** 2019-04-02
- **Class:** Locarno 06-01; US D6/300
- **What an ordinary observer would notice first:** the screen's reasoning was the same tripod silhouette and round seat, and a very close overall shape.
- **Shared features:** three-legged folding base, round seat, tripod legs.
- **Differences:** the seat has a raised rim, and its legs are straight rather than curved.
- **Similarity score:** 7.0 of 10. The two comparison runs both scored 7 and did not disagree. Each reported medium confidence.

USD0000002S1, Camp stool

- **Owner:** TrailSeat LLC
- **Grant date:** 2016-08-16
- **Class:** Locarno 06-01; US D6/300
- **What an ordinary observer would notice first:** the screen noted a different seat shape and leg count, and called it related but distinct.
- **Shared features:** folding legs.
- **Differences:** rectangular seat and four legs.
- **Similarity score:** 5.0 of 10. Both runs scored 5, each with medium confidence.

USD0000003S1, Tripod seat

- **Owner:** owner not shown in our data
- **Grant date:** 2012-01-10
- **Class:** Locarno 06-01; US D6/300
- **What an ordinary observer would notice first:** the screen noted it shares only the tripod idea and has a distinct look.
- **Shared features:** tripod base.
- **Differences:** no seat cushion, metal frame visible, different seat.
- **Similarity score:** 4.0 of 10. The two runs scored 3 and 5, which did not differ by more than 2 points. Each reported medium confidence.

3. Similar Products Found on the Web (Unverified)

- **W1:** "Round folding stool", <https://example.com/folding-stool>. The snippet reads "Three-legged folding stool." It was flagged for a similar silhouette, with low confidence.
 - **Date basis:** Internet Archive first capture on 2020-03-01. The date is not otherwise confirmed.
 - **Status:** unverified candidate, not visually compared with your drawings.

Finding few or no web results does not show that no similar products exist.

4. Assessment

What drives the rating. The rating is driven by USD0000001S1, which scored 7 of 10 in both runs. The screen noted the same tripod silhouette, round seat and very close overall shape. The differences noted are a raised seat rim and straight legs. The other two designs scored lower:

- USD0000002S1 has a rectangular seat and four legs.
- USD0000003S1 has no cushion and a visible metal frame.

The unverified web listing W1 describes a three-legged folding stool, with an archive capture from 2020-03-01.

What might lower the concern. It might ease if your design differed from USD0000001S1 in features that shape the first impression, for example:

- a clearly different seat outline or profile;
- a distinctive leg form or splay;
- a visible, ornamental hinge treatment.

Clearer views of the padded seat and hinge might also help a reviewer judge the differences.

Other candidates. The evidence also contains other_compared_designs (USD0000004S1, Portable chair, quick-screen score 5) and text_only_candidates. USD0000004S1 is listed in both: once as compared, and once as "drawings not available".

5. Points to Discuss With an Attorney

These are automated suggestions to discuss with a qualified attorney, not legal advice:

1. **Leg shape:** ask whether emphasizing the form of your splayed legs would separate your stool from the straight legs of USD0000001S1.
2. **Seat edge and profile:** USD0000001S1 has a raised rim. Ask whether a visibly different edge or padded profile would change the overall look.
3. **Seat outline:** ask whether a non-circular outline would help, given that a round seat is shared with the closest design.
4. **Hinge as an ornament:** ask whether making the central folding hinge a visible design feature would add a distinguishing element.
5. **Surface ornament:** ask whether any surface detail on the padded seat should be shown in the drawings.
6. **Drawing set:** ask whether to add side, rear and bottom views so that hinge and leg details are fully shown.
7. **Further steps:** consider a professional design search covering foreign registrations and designs that our US-only search may have missed.
8. **Web product W1:** ask whether to verify W1 (<https://example.com/folding-stool>). Its true first-sale date and appearance were not confirmed.

Part C: Appendix

Full Match Tables

Similarity Scores (Automated Visual Screen)

Rank	Design	Title	Granted	Average (of 10)	Independent scores	Note
1	USD0000001S1	Folding stool	2019-04-02	7.0	7, 7	
2	USD0000002S1	Camp stool	2016-08-16	5.0	5, 5	
3	USD0000003S1	Tripod seat	2012-01-10	4.0	3, 5	

Other designs compared in the first screen (lower similarity):

- USD0000004S1: Portable chair (granted 2021-06-22), first-screen score 5

Text-Only Candidates (Drawings Not Compared)

These designs matched your product type by title and class but their drawings could not be compared, so nothing about their appearance is judged here. Review them manually (for example on the USPTO's Patent Public Search):

- USD0000004S1: Portable chair (granted 2021-06-22); drawings not available

About This Screen

Scores come from an automated visual comparison of your drawings with each design's drawings and are a screening aid, not a legal opinion. A design patent protects the overall ornamental appearance shown in all of its views, so a similarity score for some views does not settle whether a design is new or too similar. Line drawings compare most reliably; photographs can understate or overstate similarity because colour, texture and lighting are ignored.

Web and public-use candidates (unverified; not compared in detail)

Ref	Title	URL	Date basis
W1	Round folding stool	https://example.com/folding-stool	first archived 2020-03-01

Method and Verification

Candidates were found by title, class and (where enabled) drawing-image matching, compared against your drawings by an automated visual model, and the closest received a deeper comparison. Afterwards every design number cited in Parts A and B was checked automatically against the retrieved results, and statements the results do not support were removed or reworded.

Verification: every reference and finding in Parts A and B of this report was checked against the search results retrieved for it; 13 unsupported statements removed or corrected.

Search Scope and Limitations

What this report searched: US design patents granted 2005 to September 29, 2026 (text and classes) were searched by title keywords (design classification D6/300); 140 candidate designs were considered and narrowed to 4 by text similarity. Drawings were fetched for 4 of those 4 (0 unavailable), 4 were compared visually against your drawings, and the closest 3 received a deep comparison with two independent comparisons each. By grant date: designs from 2005 on were matched by title keywords, Locarno class and the US design classes mapped from it. Designs granted before 1997 are not in the searched data. Only the closest candidates were compared visually, so a look-alike design outside them can be missed. The visual shortlist (matching your drawings against stored drawing images) was NOT used for this report: candidates came from title and design-class text search only. Designs granted from 2003 onward have drawings retrievable through the USPTO; earlier designs, foreign designs (EUIPO, Hague/WIPO, Japan, Korea, China), products not on the web, and look-alike designs filed under unrelated classes and titles may be missed. Web search for similar products: up to 8 web searches (excluding patent sites) using a text description of your design; 6 were run. Results are unverified candidates that were not visually compared, dates not confirmed unless an Internet Archive capture date is shown.

Data currency: US design patent records are current through September 29, 2026; designs granted after that date are not included. Product pages on the web were searched live on the day of this report.

The similarity scores in this report come from an automated visual screen of drawings. They are not legal findings and not a statement about infringement or whether a design patent would be granted. A gap in these results does not mean none exists. Consult a registered patent attorney or trademark attorney before filing or relying on it.

LEGAL DISCLAIMER: This report is generated by the Primoris AI Risk Intelligence Engine as an automated screening for informational and research purposes only. It is not legal advice and does not create an attorney-client relationship. Suggestions in it are automated ideas to discuss with a qualified attorney. Consult a qualified IP attorney before making any legal decision based on this data.