NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

In Re MEDICAL COMPONENTS, INC.,
Petitioner

2026-151

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the District of Utah in No. 2:12-cv-00032-JNP-DAO, Judge Jill N. Parrish.

ON PETITION

Before DYK, MAYER, and STARK, *Circuit Judges*.

DYK, *Circuit Judge*.

O R D E R

Medical Components, Inc. ("MedComp") petitions for a writ of mandamus directing the United States District Court for the District of Utah to, inter alia, order all asserted patent claims invalid for lack of novelty. C.R. Bard, Inc. and Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. (collectively, "Bard") oppose the petition. MedComp replies.

Bard has opposed MedComp, and MedComp's competitor, AngioDynamics, Inc., in multiple forums over Bard's patents directed to systems and methods for identifying whether a venous access port is power injectable. Those

cases have led to multiple prior appeals that form the background of this petition. *See C.R. Bard, Inc. v. AngioDynamics, Inc.*, No. 2023-2056, 2025 WL 3627397 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 15, 2025) ("*AngioDynamics III*"); *C.R. Bard, Inc v. Med. Components, Inc.*, No. 2022-1136, 2023 WL 2064163 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 17, 2023); *C.R. Bard Inc. v. AngioDynamics, Inc.*, 979 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2020) ("*AngioDynamics II*"); *C.R. Bard, Inc. v. AngioDynamics, Inc.*, 748 F. App'x 1009 (Fed. Cir. 2018) ("*AngioDynamics I*").

Several years before the summary judgment ruling at issue here, Bard sued AngioDynamics in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware, alleging infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,475,417; 8,545,460; and 8,805,478. The district court found the asserted claims invalid and ineligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101. On appeal, we reversed the court's § 101 determination and left open the issue of anticipation to be decided on remand. We recognized that the content of the information conveyed by the claimed markers was printed matter not entitled to patentable weight; however, the claims, as a whole, were directed to patent eligible subject matter: the means by which that information was conveyed. *AngioDynamics II*, 979 F.3d at 1381–84. Ultimately, in *AngioDynamics III*, we affirmed the Delaware court's judgment that the claims were anticipated by prior art not at issue here.[1]

In the present action from the District of Utah, Bard alleges that MedComp infringes claims of three other patents: U.S. Patent Nos. 7,785,302; 7,947,022; and

---

[1] As Bard notes, the patents at issue here have different priority dates than the patents at issue in *AngioDynamics II* and *III* and the prior art references asserted there were power injectable. ECF No. 15 at 25.

7,959,615.[2] Like the Delaware court, the Utah court initially ruled that the asserted claims were invalid under § 101. Based on *AngioDynamics II* and the similarity of the issues presented in both cases, this court reversed that § 101 ruling and remanded the case for further proceedings. *See MedComp*, 2023 WL 2064163, at *2.

On remand, MedComp moved for summary judgment on the grounds that the claims are anticipated by prior-art reference U.S. Patent No. 6,287,293 ("Jones"). The district court denied the motion. It rejected MedComp's argument that certain claim terms, including "power injectable/suitable for power injection," were directed to ineligible printed matter, instead concluding that the limitations do "not represent mere identification of the access port's functionality, but rather the functionality of the port itself," Appx0157.[3] Based on that construction, the district court found Jones did not anticipate the asserted patent claims because "[t]he invention in Jones is not power injectable." Appx0184. After the district court denied MedComp's motion for reconsideration, MedComp filed this petition seeking to compel the district court to find the claims invalid.

Issuance of a writ "is a drastic and extraordinary remedy reserved for really extraordinary causes." *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004) (cleaned up). To obtain this extraordinary relief, a petitioner must generally show: (1) "no other adequate means to attain the relief [it] desires," (2) a "clear and indisputable" right to

---

[2] MedComp counterclaimed for infringement of its own patent. This petition involves, and therefore only discusses, Bard's patents.

[3] The district court found support from *AngioDynamics I*, 748 F. App'x at 1016 ("Bard contends that these claims require the access ports to be power injectable and that the Board erred by holding otherwise. We agree.").

relief, and (3) the writ is "appropriate under the circumstances." *Id.* at 380–81 (cleaned up). The Supreme Court has recognized that mandamus relief may be available "where it [is] necessary to confine a lower court to the terms of an appellate tribunal's mandate." *Will v. United States*, 389 U.S. 90, 95–96 (1967) (citations omitted).

MedComp contends the district court was precluded on remand from giving patentable weight to the disputed claim limitations, in substance arguing the district court's decision in this case was inconsistent with the decision and mandate in *AngioDynamics II*. This case is not like the *Will* case, where the mandate involved was entered in the same proceeding.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

The petition is denied.

FOR THE COURT



Jarrett B. Perlow
Clerk of Court

September 30, 2026
Date