

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CROWDSTRIKE, INC.,
Petitioner
v.

GOSECURE, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2025-00070
U.S. Patent No. 9,954,872

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO
PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

1. “Computer Systems” is Not Limited to Individual Endpoint Devices

The claims recite (1) a “first computer system” that monitors activities and generates activity-identifying information and (2) transmitting said information to “one or more computer systems other than the first computer system” to protect it from attacks associated with the activities. Describing this claimed functionality, the ’872 Patent teaches a decoy computer system that monitors activities and transmits identifying information to a protected computer system. *See* Ex. 1001, Fig. 1 (depicting a “distributed computer system”), 4:5-5:9 (the distributed computer system of Fig. 1 includes a decoy computer system that “includes one or more decoy network device(s)” and a protected computer system that includes “protected network devices” and “an IDS/IPS system”), 18:44-58 (teaching the “decoy network device transmits” an activity-identifying “fingerprint to one or more protected network devices” or “to the IDS/IPS system”).

The POPR does not dispute that Capalik teaches a decoy computer system that transmits activity-identifying information to an IDS/IPS in a protected computer system. But the POPR argues that Capalik nonetheless fails to disclose the “transmitting limitation.” This argument is premised on an implicit narrow construction that the claimed “one or more computer systems other than the first computer system” are **individual endpoint devices** within a protected computer network. POPR, 24 (alleging “claim 1 expressly requires that the attack-identifying

information ultimately reach one or more protected network devices”). According to Patent Owner (“PO”), “sending the information to the IDS/IPS is not enough,” even where the IDS/IPS is coupled to protected endpoint devices in a protected network. *Id.* (insisting the information “must ultimately reach” the endpoint devices themselves). PO’s narrow construction of “computer systems” is unsupported by the intrinsic record and contradicts its allegations in parallel district court litigation.

The POPR’s argument turns entirely on whether the claimed “computer systems” should be construed narrowly to mean the individual endpoint devices themselves—as PO contends—or more broadly to capture the protected network, including protected endpoint devices and the IDS/IPS—as Petitioner contends. Only the broader construction finds support in the intrinsic record. Indeed, the patent uses “computer system” as a general term that captures everything from individual modules within a computing device to collections of multiple computer networks. On one end of the spectrum, the ’872 Patent uses “computer system” to refer to a virtual machine module within a decoy network device. Ex. 1001, 11:15-19 (“a computer system (e.g., the virtual machine 113-1)”), Fig. 2 (depicting virtual machine 113-1 as a module in “decoy network device 106”). On the other end of the spectrum, the patent uses “computer system” to describe the entire collection of devices and networks depicted in Fig. 1. *Id.* 3:26-28 (describing Fig. 1 as a distributed “computer system”). Because Fig. 1—a “computer system”—explicitly

depicts the protected computer network as well as the IDS/IPS and protected endpoint devices within that network, PO cannot be correct that the claimed “computer system” is limited to the protected endpoint devices themselves. Given the patent’s non-limiting use of “computer system,” the Board should interpret the claims broadly to include transmitting information from the decoy system to the protected system. It should not, as PO requests, more narrowly require that the information reaches the individual endpoint devices within the protected system.

Supporting Petitioner’s interpretation, the specification is clear that sending information to the IDS/IPS **and then** to the endpoint devices is contemplated in only **some** embodiments. Ex. 1001, 18:44-58 (teaching that only “some embodiments” involve transmitting the fingerprint to the IDS/IPS and then using it to modify the endpoint protected devices). “Even when the specification describes only a single embodiment, the claims of the patent will not be read restrictively unless the patentee has demonstrated a clear intention to limit the claim scope.” *Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 898, 906 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Finally, PO’s implicit narrow construction directly conflicts with the broader interpretation PO has advanced in parallel litigation. In its Complaint, PO asserts that Petitioner’s Accused Products infringe this limitation by transmitting information to the “CrowdStrike **cloud** via the Falcon platform,” rather than to any individual endpoint device. Ex. 1027 (Complaint), ¶69 (emphasis added).

Dated: March 25, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

ERISE IP, P.A.

BY: /s/ Paul R. Hart

Paul R. Hart, Reg. No. 59,646

Paul.Hart@eriseip.com

Erise IP, P.A.

717 17th St., Suite 1400

Denver, Colorado 80202

P: (913) 777-5600

F: (913) 777-5601

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE ON PATENT OWNER
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.105(a)**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e) and 42.105(b), the undersigned certifies that on March 25, 2025, a complete and entire copy of this Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response and Exhibits were served on Patent Owner via email at the following address:

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

S. Giri Pathmanaban - giri.pathmanaban@lw.com

Raghav Bajaj - raghav.bajaj@lw.com

Daniel S. Todd - daniel.todd@lw.com

Steven W. Peters - steven.peters@lw.com

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Paul R. Hart
Paul R. Hart, Reg. No. 59,646

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER