

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

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

QUAD/TECH, INC.,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

**Q.I. PRESS CONTROLS B.V. AND
Q.I. PRESS CONTROLS NORTH AMERICA LTD.,
INC.,**
Defendants-Appellees,

and

PRINT2FINISH, LLC,
Defendant-Appellee.

2010-1354

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Eastern District of Pennsylvania in case No. 09-CV-2561,
Judge Eduardo C. Robreno.

Decided: March 21, 2011

CHARLES W. SHIFLEY, Banner & Witcoff, Ltd., of Chi-
cago, Illinois, argued for plaintiff-appellant. With him on
the brief was DAVID R. GERK, of Washington, DC.

DAVID D. LANGFITT, Montgomery, McCracken, Walker & Rhoads, LLP, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, argued for all defendants-appellees. With him on the brief for Q.I. Press Controls B.V., et al. was ROBERT R. AXENFELD.

MICHAEL N. ONUFRAK, White and Williams, LLP, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for defendant-appellee Print2Finish, LLC. With him on the brief was JUSTIN E. PROPER.

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

PER CURIAM.

The district court denied a motion by appellant Quad/Tech, Inc., for a preliminary injunction. The district court issued its order after finding that Quad/Tech had failed to demonstrate either that it had a reasonable likelihood of success on the merits of its infringement claim or that it would be likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary injunctive relief.

We review the denial of a preliminary injunction for abuse of discretion. *Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk, A/S*, 108 F.3d 1361, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (abuse of discretion may be established “by showing that the court made a clear error of judgment in weighing relevant factors or exercised its discretion based upon an error of law or clearly erroneous factual findings”). Based on our review of the record before the district court in connection with the preliminary injunction motion, we uphold the district court’s conclusion that, in light of the court’s construction of one of the terms of the asserted claim, Quad/Tech failed to demonstrate a reasonable likelihood of success. We therefore hold that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying preliminary injunctive relief.

AFFIRMED