NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

## United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

CORDIS CORPORATION, Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION AND BOSTON SCIENTIFIC SCIMED, INC., Defendants-Appellees.

## 2012 - 1647

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Delaware in No. 10-CV-0039, Judge Sue L. Robinson.

Decided: May 13, 2013

CONSTANTINE L. TRELA, JR., Sidley Austin, LLP, of Chicago, Illinois, argued for plaintiff-appellant. With him on the brief were DAVID T. PRITIKIN, WILLIAM H. BAUMGARTNER, JR., and ANTHONY BALKISSOON. Of counsel was LINDA R. FRIEDLIEB.

MATTHEW M. WOLF, Arnold & Porter LLP, of Washington, DC, argued for defendants-appellees. With him on the brief were Edward Han, John E. Nilsson and Seth I. Heller.

Before O'MALLEY, SCHALL, and WALLACH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

We affirm the judgment of the district court without opinion. We vacate, however, the portion of the district court's decision "nullifying" (invalidating) dependent claims 14–16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,547,817. See Cordis Corp. v. Boston Scientific Corp., 868 F. Supp. 2d 342, 356-57 (D. Del. 2012).

## AFFIRMED IN PART AND VACATED IN PART

 $\mathbf{2}$