

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**VASCULAR SOLUTIONS, INC.,**  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

**BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION,**  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

---

2014-1185

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota in No. 0:13-cv-01172-JRT-SER, Judge John R. Tunheim.

---

Decided: April 15, 2014

---

J. THOMAS VITT, Dorsey & Whitney LLP, of Minneapolis, Minnesota, argued for plaintiff-appellee. With him on the brief was HEATHER D. REDMOND.

MATTHEW M. WOLF, Arnold & Porter LLP, of Washington, DC, argued for defendant-appellant. With him on the brief were EDWARD HAN, JOHN E. NILSSON, and SETH I. HELLER.

---

Before MOORE, PLAGER, and CHEN, *Circuit Judges*.

PLAGER, *Circuit Judge*.

A preliminary injunction is a “drastic and extraordinary remedy that is not to be routinely granted.” *Nat’l Steel Car, Ltd. v. Canadian Pac. Ry., Ltd.*, 357 F.3d 1319, 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (citing *Intel Corp. v. ULSI Sys. Tech., Inc.*, 995 F.2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). As evidenced by the extended argument before this court, there are too many unresolved issues at this stage of the case and the record is too incomplete on issues of claim construction, infringement, and ultimate validity to warrant the grant of a preliminary injunction. For these reasons, we vacate the preliminary injunction.

**VACATED**

Each party shall bear its costs.