

EX 1019

IPR2024-00948
U.S. Pat. No. 11,050,097

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ASCEND ELEMENTS, INC.

Petitioner,

v.

DUESENFELD GMBH

Patent Owner.

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2024-00948
U.S. Patent No. 11,050,097

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

Mail Stop “PATENT BOARD”
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 2213-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE '097 PATENT	4
A. Overview of U.S. Patent No. 11,050,097	4
B. Challenged claims	6
III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	7
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	8
V. LEGAL STANDARDS	10
VI. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE	11
A. Ground 1 — The petition fails to prove that Hanisch '419 alone or in combination with Dunagan renders the Challenged Claims unpatentable.....	11
1. Overview of Hanisch '419	12
2. Claim 1[b]: The low temperature pre-dryer of Hanisch '419 alone or in view of a POSITA does not teach “inactivating the comminuted material such that an inactivated comminuted material is obtained”	14
3. Claim 1[e]: Hanisch '419 alone or in view of a POSITA does not teach “wherein the drying occurs at a maximum pressure of 300 hPa”	17
4. Claim 9: Hanisch '419 alone does not render obvious “The method according to claim 1 wherein drying occurs at a temperature of less than 80° C”	21
5. Claim 12[d]: Hanisch '419 alone or in combination with Dunagan does not render obvious “a vacuum installation connected to the drying device and configured to generate a vacuum in the drying device”	22
B. Ground 2 — The Petition fails to prove that Hanisch '419 in view of Dunagan, Meador, Shin, and/or Hayashi renders the Challenged Claims unpatentable	24
1. Overview of Meador	25

2.	Overview of Hayashi.....	28
3.	Overview of Shin.....	29
4.	Claim 1[e]: Hanisch '419 alone or in view of Hayashi, Meador, or Shin does not render obvious “wherein the drying occurs at a maximum pressure of 300 hPa”	30
a.	Hanisch '419 alone or in view of a POSITA does not disclose this limitation.....	30
b.	A POSITA would not combine Hanisch '419 and Dunagan with Meador, Shin, or Hayashi	31
i.	A POSITA would not be motivated to combine Meador with Hanisch '419	31
(1)	A POSITA would have understood that Meador does not teach using a vacuum level of less than 300 hPa	31
(2)	A POSITA would not combine Meador with the system of Hanisch '419 to teach a vacuum level of less than 300 hPa.....	35
ii.	Hayashi teaches away from Hanisch '419 and a POSITA would not be motivated to combine these references	37
(1)	The continuous processing requirement of Hanisch imposes constraints on the pressure ranges that would be compatible	38
(2)	Hayashi's batch process is incompatible with Hanisch '419, and its pressure ranges are uninformative	42
(3)	A POSITA would not look to Hayashi to learn advantages of improved electrolyte evaporation at a given temperature when lower ambient pressures are used	44
(4)	A POSITA would not look to Hayashi to achieve the attenuation of toxic hydrogen fluoride production during the heating process	46
(5)	A POSITA would not look to Hayashi to achieve control over potentially flammable compounds and gasses generated during heating	47
(6)	The fundamental premise of Hayashi teaches away from Hanisch '419	48

iii.	Shin teaches away from Hanisch '419 and a POSITA would not be motivated to combine.....	50
5.	Claim 12[d]: Hanisch '419 alone or in view of Hayashi, Meador, or Shin does not render obvious “a vacuum installation connected to the drying device and configured to generate a vacuum in the drying device”.....	52
C.	Objective indicia of non-obviousness support patentability	55
1.	Secondary considerations compel a finding of non-obviousness	55
2.	Long-felt but unmet need and unexpected results	55
3.	Duesenfeld’s battery recycling processes practice the challenged claims	57
4.	Duesenfeld’s battery recycling processes have been commercially successful	58
5.	Rebuttable presumption of nexus.....	60
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	63

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.