

**UNITED STATES**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

Washington, D.C. 20549

**FORM 8-K**

**CURRENT REPORT**

Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the  
Securities Exchange Act of 1934

Date of Report (Date of earliest event reported): April 24, 2017

**Cardiovascular Systems, Inc.**

(Exact name of Registrant as Specified in its Charter)

**Delaware**  
(State or Other Jurisdiction  
of Incorporation)

**000-52082**  
(Commission  
File Number)

**41-1698056**  
(IRS Employer  
Identification No.)

**1225 Old Highway 8 Northwest**  
**St. Paul, Minnesota 55112-6416**  
(Address of Principal Executive Offices and Zip Code)

**(651) 259-1600**  
(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

**Not Applicable**  
(Former Name or Former Address, if Changed Since Last Report)

Check the appropriate box below if the Form 8-K filing is intended to simultaneously satisfy the filing obligation of the registrant under any of the following provisions:

- Written communications pursuant to Rule 425 under the Securities Act (17 CFR 230.425)
- Soliciting material pursuant to Rule 14a-12 under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14a-12)
- Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 14d-2(b) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14d-2(b))
- Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 13e-4(c) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.13e-4(c))

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is an emerging growth company as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act of 1933 (§ 230.405 of this chapter) or Rule 12b-2 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (§ 240.12b-2 of this chapter).

Emerging growth company

If an emerging growth company, indicate by check mark if the registrant has elected not to use the extended transition period for complying with any new or revised financial accounting standards provided pursuant to Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act.

---

**Item 8.01. Other Events.**

Cardiovascular Systems, Inc. (the “Company”) is party to *Steven Babyak v. Cardiovascular Systems, Inc.* , originally filed in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, on November 16, 2015. The plaintiff, a former Regional Sales Manager of the Company, made claims relating to whistleblower retaliation; defamation; discrimination on the basis of association with protected group; harassment on the basis of sex in violation of FEHA; retaliation for exercising rights under FEHA; failure to prevent discrimination, harassment & retaliation in violation of FEHA; wrongful termination in violation of public policy; and violation of business & professions code. Following a jury trial that commenced on April 17, 2017, on April 24, 2017, the jury awarded the plaintiff \$2.7 in compensatory damages with respect to his claims for whistleblower retaliation and wrongful termination in violation of public policy, and on April 25, 2017, the jury awarded the plaintiff \$22.4 million in punitive damages with respect to the same claims. The Company strongly believes that this case was incorrectly decided as to liability, the amount of compensatory damages, and the appropriateness and amount of punitive damages. The Company intends to vigorously challenge the verdict in the trial court and appeal. The Company is assessing the impact of this verdict on its financial results and condition and will provide further updates accordingly.

---

