

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Dzyne Technologies, LLC v. Spaceflight, Inc.

Dzyne Technologies · No. 2:23-cv-10188-MEMF-ADS · Decided November 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California denies DZYNE Technologies’ motion for summary judgment and grants Spaceflight’s motion in part in a dispute concerning a launch services agreement for the WeatherSAT project. The court holds that the Air Force Research Laboratory did not terminate the prime contract for convenience under FAR 52.249-2 and that DZYNE therefore lacked the contractual right to terminate its agreement with Spaceflight on that basis. The court also rejects DZYNE’s argument that the agreement granted it an unconditional right to terminate for its own convenience.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Maame Ewusi-Mensah Frimpong
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	November 18, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-10188-MEMF-ADS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Cross-motions for summary judgment in an action involving breach of contract, unjust enrichment, declaratory judgment, anticipatory breach, and breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when the movant shows that no genuine dispute as to any material fact exists and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court viewed facts and drew reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, considered each cross-motion on its own merits, and applied California contract-interpretation principles to the contract claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated
PARTIES	Dzyne Technologies, LLC v. Spaceflight, Inc.

TOPICS

government contracts

contract interpretation

breach of contract

summary judgment

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

contracts

commercial litigation

government contracts

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether AFRL's directives terminated the prime contract for the government's convenience under FAR 52.249-2 and thereby permitted Dzyne to terminate the amended Launch Services Agreement.
2. Whether the amended Launch Services Agreement gave Dzyne an unconditional right to terminate for its own convenience through section 12(F) and the incorporated FAR flow-down provisions.
3. Whether Spaceflight materially breached the transfer agreement or amended Launch Services Agreement by failing to provide a termination settlement proposal.
4. Whether Dzyne established unjust enrichment based on Spaceflight's retention of funds paid under the express contract.
5. Whether Dzyne anticipatorily breached and breached the amended Launch Services Agreement by terminating it, failing to deliver the spacecraft, failing to exercise its delay right, and rejecting remanifesting.
6. Whether Spaceflight waived its breach-of-contract claim by entering into the transfer agreement.
7. Whether Spaceflight was entitled to summary judgment on its implied-covenant claim or whether a genuine dispute existed concerning Dzyne's alleged bad faith.

HOLDINGS

1. AFRL's directives did not terminate the prime contract for the government's convenience because AFRL never issued the notice of termination required by FAR 52.249-2 and FAR 49.102. Dzyne therefore could not invoke section 12(F) of the amended Launch Services Agreement on that basis.
2. The amended Launch Services Agreement did not give Dzyne an unconditional right to terminate for Dzyne's convenience.
3. Spaceflight did not materially breach the agreement by failing to provide a termination settlement proposal because Dzyne was not entitled to terminate the amended Launch Services Agreement, so the settlement-proposal obligation was not triggered.
4. Dzyne was not entitled to summary judgment on unjust enrichment because Spaceflight did not improperly retain benefits at Dzyne's expense and an unjust-enrichment claim cannot stand where an enforceable express contract governs the parties' relationship.
5. Dzyne materially breached and anticipatorily breached the amended Launch Services Agreement by improperly terminating it, failing to deliver the spacecraft by the end of the launch window, failing to exercise its delay right, and rejecting Spaceflight's remanifest opportunity.

6. Spaceflight was entitled under sections 9(I) and 13 of the amended Launch Services Agreement to the unpaid balance of \$2,175,102.
7. Spaceflight did not waive its breach-of-contract claim because the transfer agreement did not relinquish Spaceflight's rights or obligations under the amended LSA and Dzyne presented no clear and convincing evidence of waiver.
8. Spaceflight was not entitled to summary judgment on its breach-of-implied-covenant claim because a genuine dispute of material fact remained as to whether Dzyne acted in bad faith.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“AFRL never terminated the contract for convenience under the FAR and therefore DZYNE never had the power to terminate the LSA under 12(F).” (at 6)

“DZYNE does not have an unconditional right to terminate the Amended LSA for DZYNE’s convenience.” (at 10)

“As the Court does not find that DZYNE was entitled to terminate the Amended LSA, Spaceflight’s termination settlement proposal obligation under the transfer agreement was not triggered.” (at 14)

“Therefore, DZYNE materially breached the Amended LSA and Spaceflight is entitled to damages under Section 9(I) and Section 13 of the Amended LSA.” (at 20)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Dzyne contracted with the Air Force Research Laboratory to procure a launch vehicle for the WeatherSAT project and entered into an amended Launch Services Agreement with Spaceflight for launch services. AFRL later directed Dzyne to cease WeatherSAT-related work but did not issue a notice expressly terminating the prime contract for the government's convenience under FAR 52.249-2 or FAR 49.102. Dzyne nevertheless attempted to terminate the amended agreement, refused a proposed remanifest opportunity, and did not deliver the spacecraft or exercise its contractual delay right. Dzyne had paid Spaceflight approximately \$7.84 million, while Spaceflight sought the remaining \$2,175,102 under the amended agreement.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Dzyne filed the action on December 4, 2023. Spaceflight answered and asserted counterclaims on January 26, 2024, and Dzyne answered the counterclaim on February 16, 2024. The parties filed a joint motion for summary judgment on April 18, 2025; the court denied Dzyne's motion and granted Spaceflight's motion in part.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Nat'l Ass'n of Optometrists & Opticians v. Harris, 682 F.3d 1144, 1147 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248-49, 252 (1986)

- United States v. Diebold, Inc., 369 U.S. 654, 655 (1962)
- Chevron Corp. v. Pennzoil Co., 974 F.2d 1156, 1161 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Nissan Fire & Marine Insurance Co. v. Fritz Cos., 210 F.3d 1099, 1102-03 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322-24 (1986)
- S.A. Empresa de Viacao Aerea Rio Grandense v. Walter Kidde & Co., 690 F.2d 1235, 1238 (9th Cir. 1982)
- Carmen v. San Francisco Unified School District, 237 F.3d 1026, 1029 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc. v. Riverside Two, 249 F.3d 1132, 1136 (9th Cir. 2001)
- S. Cal. Painters & Allied Trades, Dist. Council No. 36 v. Rodin & Co., 558 F.3d 1028, 1035 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Bayer v. Neiman Marcus Group, Inc., 861 F.3d 853, 867 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Klamath Water Users Protective Ass'n v. Patterson, 204 F.3d 1206 (9th Cir. 1999), opinion amended on denial of reh'g, 203 F.3d 1175, 1210 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Kennewick Irrigation District v. United States, 880 F.2d 1018, 1032 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Castaneda v. Dura-Vent Corp., 648 F.2d 612, 619 (9th Cir. 1981)
- VHC, Inc. v. Peters, 179 F.3d, 1363, 1364-65 (Fed. Cir. 1999)
- Rumsfeld v. Applied Cos., 325 F.3d 1328, 1333 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Coll. Point Boat Corp. v. United States, 267 U.S. 12, 15 (1925)
- Praecomm, Inc. v. United States, 78 Fed. Cl. 5, 11 (2007)
- Aspic Engineering and Construction Co. v. ECC Centcom Constructors LLC, 913 F.3d 1162, 1164, 1168-69 (9th Cir. 2019)
- Abdelhamid v. Fire Insurance Exchange, 106 Cal. Rptr. 3d 26, 32 (Cal. Ct. App. 2010)
- Tufeld Corp. v. Beverly Hills Gateway, L.P., 302 Cal. Rptr. 3d 203, 216 (Cal. Ct. App. 2022)
- Melchior v. New Line Productions, Inc., 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 347, 357 (Cal. Ct. App. 2003)
- Durell v. Sharp Healthcare, 108 Cal. Rptr. 3d 682, 699 (Cal. Ct. App. 2010)
- Taylor v. Johnston, 123 Cal. Rptr. 641, 646 (Cal. 1975)
- Quach v. California Commerce Club, Inc., 323 Cal. Rptr. 3d 126, 143 (Cal. 2024)
- 3500 Sepulveda, LLC v. Macy's West Stores, Inc., 980 F.3d 1317, 1324 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Foley v. Interactive Data Corp., 254 Cal. Rptr. 2d 211, 228 (Cal. 1988)
- Carma Development (Cal.), Inc. v. Marathon Development California, Inc., 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 467, 484 (Cal. 1992)
- Racine & Laramie, Ltd. v. Department of Parks & Recreation, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 335, 339 (Cal. Ct. App. 1992)
- United States v. Tamman, 782 F.3d 543, 552-53 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Fraser v. Goodale, 342 F.3d 1032, 1036-37 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Block v. City of Los Angeles, 253 F.3d 410, 418-19 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Fonseca v. Sysco Food Services of Arizona, Inc., 374 F.3d 840, 846 (9th Cir. 2004)

OPINION

Dzyne Technologies, LLC v. Spaceflight, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

1 O 2 3 4

5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

6 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7 Case No.: 2:23-cv-10188-MEMF-ADS

8 DZYNE TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

9 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING DZYNE’S MOTION FOR

SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND GRANTING

10 v. IN PART SPACEFLIGHT’S MOTION FOR

SUMMARY JUDGMENT [DKT NO. 61]

11

12 SPACEFLIGHT, INC.,

Defendant. 13 14 15 16 17 Before the Court is the Joint Motion for Summary Judgment filed by the parties. Dkt. No. 61. 18 For the reasons stated herein, the Court hereby DENIES Plaintiff’s Motion and GRANTS in PART 19 Defendant’s Motion. 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 1 I. Background 2 A. Factual Background 3 Plaintiff DZYNE Technologies, LLC entered into a contract with the Air Force Research 4 Laboratory to procure launch vehicles for a military weather satellite project known as WeatherSAT. 5 To meet its obligations under the Prime Contract, DZYNE executed a Launch Services Agreement 6 with Spaceflight, Inc. to provide launch service capabilities for WeatherSAT. After AFRL canceled 7 WeatherSAT, DZYNE sought to terminate the Amended LSA. Spaceflight contests the validity of 8 DZYNE’s attempted termination under the Amended LSA. 9 B. Procedural History 10 On December 4, 2023, DZYNE filed its Complaint alleging claims for: (1) breach of 11 contract; (2) unjust enrichment; and (3) declaratory judgment. Dkt. No. 1 (“Compl.”). On January 12 26, 2024, Spaceflight filed its Answer and Counterclaim. Dkt. No. 22. In its Counterclaim, 13 Spaceflight alleges counterclaims for: (1) anticipatory breach; (2) breach of implied covenant of 14 good faith and fair dealing; (3) breach of contract; and (4) declaratory judgment. Id. at 31-34. On

15 February 16, 2024, DZYNE filed its Answer to Spaceflight’s Counterclaim. Dkt. No. 28.

16 On April 18, 2025, the parties filed the instant Joint Motion for Summary Judgment. Dkt. No. 17 61 (“MSJ”). For each party’s MSJ, the nonmoving party included its opposition, and the moving 18 party included its reply. See id. The parties also filed a Supplement Joint Statement of 19 Uncontroverted Facts and Genuine Disputes and a Joint Appendix of Evidence. Dkt. No. 61-2 20 (“SUF”); 61-3 (“Appendix”). 21 II. Applicable Law 22 Summary judgment should be granted if “the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute 23 as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 24 56(a). Material facts are those that may affect the outcome of the case. Nat’l Ass’n of Optometrists & 25 Opticians v. Harris, 682 F.3d 1144, 1147 (9th Cir. 2012) (citing Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 26 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986)). A dispute is genuine “if the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could 27 return a verdict for the nonmoving party.” Anderson, 477 U.S. at 248. 28 1 A court must view the facts and draw

inferences in the manner most favorable to the non- 2 moving party. *United States v. Diebold, Inc.*, 369 U.S. 654, 655 (1962); *Chevron Corp. v. Pennzoil 3 Co.*, 974 F.2d 1156, 1161 (9th Cir. 1992). “A moving party without the ultimate burden of 4 persuasion at trial—usually, but not always, a defendant—has both the initial burden of production 5 and the ultimate burden of persuasion on a motion for summary judgment.” *Nissan Fire & Marine 6 Ins. Co. v. Fritz Cos.*, 210 F.3d 1099, 1102 (9th Cir. 2000). To carry its burden of production, the 7 moving party must either: (1) produce evidence negating an essential element of the nonmoving 8 party’s claim or defense; or (2) show that there is an absence of evidence to support the nonmoving 9 party’s case. *Id.* 10 Where a moving party fails to carry its initial burden of production, the nonmoving party has 11 no obligation to produce anything, even if the nonmoving party would have the ultimate burden of 12 persuasion at trial. *Id.* at 1102–03. In such cases, the nonmoving party may defeat the motion for 13 summary judgment without producing anything. *Id.* at 1103. However, if a moving party carries its 14 burden of production, the burden shifts to the nonmoving party to produce evidence showing a 15 genuine dispute of material fact for trial. *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 248–49. Under these circumstances, 16 the nonmoving party must “go beyond the pleadings and by [its] own affidavits, or by the 17 depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, designate specific facts showing that 18 there is no genuine issue for trial.” *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 324 (1986) (internal 19 quotation marks omitted). If the nonmoving party fails to produce enough evidence to create a 20 genuine issue of material fact, the motion for summary judgment shall be granted. *Id.* at 322 (“Rule 21 56(c) mandates the entry of summary judgment, after adequate time for discovery and upon motion, 22 against a party who fails to make a showing sufficient to establish the existence of an element 23 essential to that party’s case, and on which that party will bear the burden of proof at trial.”). 24 A party cannot create a genuine issue of material fact simply by making assertions in its legal 25 papers. *S.A. Empresa de Viacao Aerea Rio Grandense v. Walter Kidde & Co.*, 690 F.2d 1235, 1238 26 (9th Cir. 1982). Rather, there must be specific, admissible evidence identifying the basis for the 27 dispute. See *id.* “If a party fails to properly support an assertion of fact or fails to properly address 28 another party’s assertion of fact . . . the court may . . . consider the fact undisputed.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 1 56(e)(2). The Court need not “comb the record” looking for other evidence; it is only required to 2 consider evidence set forth in the moving and opposing papers and the portions of the record cited 3 therein. *Id.* 56(c)(3); *Carmen v. S.F. Unified Sch. Dist.*, 237 F.3d 1026, 1029 (9th Cir. 2001). The 4 Supreme Court has held that “[t]he mere existence of a scintilla of evidence . . . will be insufficient; 5 there must be evidence on which the jury could reasonably find for [the opposing party].” *Anderson*, 6 477 U.S. at 252. To carry its ultimate burden of persuasion on the motion, the moving party must 7 demonstrate that there is no genuine issue of material fact for trial. *Nissan Fire*, 210 F.3d at 1102; 8 *Celotex Corp.*, 477 U.S. at 323. 9 Where parties file cross motions for summary judgment on the same issue, the court must 10 consider both motions and all evidence submitted by both parties. *Fair Hous. Council of Riverside 11 Cnty., Inc. v. Riverside Two*, 249 F.3d 1132, 1136 (9th Cir. 2001). “[E]ach

motion must be 12 considered on its own merits.” Id. Even if both parties assert that no genuine disputes of material fact 13 exist, the court must still review the record and determine that there are no disputes of material fact 14 before granting summary judgment to either party. See id. 15

III. Findings of Fact 16 A. The Prime Contract 17 On March 25, 2019, Air Force Research Laboratory (“AFRL”) entered into a government 18 contract (“Prime Contract”) with DZYNE to procure a space launch vehicle for an experimental 19 military weather satellite project, WeatherSAT. SUF ¶ 1. The Prime Contract incorporated Federal 20 Acquisition Rules (“FAR”)2, including FAR 52.249-2 which states: “The Government may 21 terminate performance of work under this contract in whole or, from time to time, in part, if [t]he 22 Contracting Officer determines that a termination is in the Government’s interest.” SUF ¶ 3. As part 23 of the Prime Contract, DZYNE was to engage a launch service provider. SUF ¶ 2. 24 25 1 The facts set forth below are taken from the SUF and the evidence on the record. To the extent that any statements of fact are omitted, the Court concludes they are not material to the disposition of this Motion. To the extent that any of the 26 facts below were allegedly disputed, the Court concludes that no actual dispute exists or that the adopted language resolves the dispute. Pursuant to Rule 56(g), the Court finds that these facts are “established in the case.” See Fed. R. 27 Civ. P. 56(g). 28 2 Federal Acquisition Rules are a primary set of rules that governs United States Government purchases and services 1 B. The LSA 2 DZYNE subsequently entered into the Launch Services Agreement (“LSA”) with 3 Spaceflight.3 SUF ¶ 4. Under the LSA, Spaceflight would provide launch services while DZYNE 4 produces the launch vehicle. Dkt. No. 61-7 at 1. The price payable to Spaceflight under the 5 Amended LSA was \$10,015,000.00. SUF ¶ 42. During the project, DZYNE advanced \$7,839,989.00 6 to Spaceflight. SUF ¶ 29. 7 The LSA preamble refers to DZYNE as “Customer” and to Spaceflight as “Spaceflight.” 8 SUF ¶ 5. The LSA incorporates a series of exhibits, including Exhibit G, entitled “FAR and DFARS 9 Flow Down Clauses.” SUF ¶ 6; Dkt. Nos. 61-7 at 34, 61-26 at 5-6. The preamble to Exhibit G states: 10 “The clauses in Section 52 of the [FAR] and Part 252 of the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation 11 Supplement (‘DFARS’) set forth below are each incorporated herein by reference or in full text and 12 made a part of the [LSA]. Unless the context of the clause requires otherwise, the term ‘Contractor’ 13 shall mean Subcontractor, the term ‘Contract’ shall mean the [LSA], and the terms ‘Government,’ 14 ‘Contracting Officer,’ and equivalent phrases shall mean DZYNE and the DZYNE Subcontracts 15 Manager, respectively.” SUF ¶ 9. Exhibit G specifically incorporates the clause at FAR 52.249-2, 16 “Termination for Convenience of the Government (FixedPrice).” SUF ¶ 11.

17 Section 12(E) of the LSA states: “Customer may terminate this Agreement for the 18 Government’s convenience in accordance with FAR 52.249-2.” SUF ¶ 12. Section 12(F) of the 19 Amended LSA contains identical language. Section 5 of the Amended LSA provides DZYNE with 20 the right to “request a delay of the Launch at any time up until the Launch Date.” Dkt. No. 61-26 at 21 3. Section 9(I) of the Amended LSA states that if DZYNE “fails to deliver its Spacecraft for 22 Launch” by the launch window “without exercising its right to delay under

Section 5,” DZYNE will be liable for “any remaining payments of the full Price and Spaceflight may opt in its sole discretion to delay the Launch or terminate” the Amended LSA. Dkt. No. 61-26 at 5. Section 13 of the 25 26 27 3 The parties’ motions reference sections from the LSA and Amended LSA. References to “LSA” are to the initial contract entered into between DZYNE and Spaceflight regarding the WeatherSAT project. Dkt. No. 61-7. References to 28 section 12(F) are to the executed Amended LSA. Dkt. No. 61-26. The parties do not contest the validity of either 1 Amended LSA indicates that Spaceflight is “entitled to retain and/or be paid all payments made and 2 owed to date” if DZYNE “materially defaults in the performance of any of its duties or obligations 3 under” the Amended LSA. Dkt. No. 61-26 at 6. 4 As part of the Amended LSA, the parties agreed to a launch window of December 15, 2022 5 to April 30, 2023. 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045 1046 1047 1048 1049 1050 1051 1052 1053 1054 1055 1056 1057 1058 1059 1060 1061 1062 1063 1064 1065 1066 1067 1068 1069 1070 1071 1072 1073 1074 1075 1076 1077 1078 1079 1080 1081 1082 1083 1084 1085 1086 1087 1088 1089 1090 1091 1092 1093 1094 1095 1096 1097 1098 1099 1100 1101 1102 1103 1104 1105 1106 1107 1108 1109 1110 1111 1112 1113 1114 1115 1116 1117 1118 1119 1120 1121 1122 1123 1124 1125 1126 1127 1128 1129 1130 1131 1132 1133 1134 1135 1136 1137 1138 1139 1140 1141 1142 1143 1144 1145 1146 1147 1148 1149 1150 1151 1152 1153 1154 1155 1156 1157 1158 1159 1160 1161 1162 1163 1164 1165 1166 1167 1168 1169 1170 1171 1172 1173 1174 1175 1176 1177 1178 1179 1180 1181 1182 1183 1184 1185 1186 1187 1188 1189 1190 1191 1192 1193 1194 1195 1196 1197 1198 1199 1200 1201 1202 1203 1204 1205 1206 1207 1208 1209 1210 1211 1212 1213 1214 1215 1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225 1226 1227 1228 1229 1230 1231 1232 1233 1234 1235 1236 1237 1238 1239 1240 1241 1242 1243 1244 1245 1246 1247 1248 1249 1250 1251 1252 1253 1254 1255 1256 1257 1258 1259 1260 1261 1262 1263 1264 1265 1266 1267 1268 1269 1270 1271 1272 1273 1274 1275 1276 1277 1278 1279 1280 1281 1282 1283 1284 1285 1286 1287 1288 1289 1290 1291 1292 1293 1294 1295 1296 1297 1298 1299 1300 1301 1302 1303 1304 1305 1306 1307 1308 1309 1310 1311 1312 1313 1314 1315 1316 1317 1318 1319 1320 1321 1322 1323 1324 1325 1326 1327 1328 1329 1330 1331 1332 1333 1334 1335 1336 1337 1338 1339 1340 1341 1342 1343 1344 1345 1346 1347 1348 1349 1350 1351 1352 1353 1354 1355 1356 1357 1358 1359 1360 1361 1362 1363 1364 1365 1366 1367 1368 1369 1370 1371 1372 1373 1374 1375 1376 1377 1378 1379 1380 1381 1382 1383 1384 1385 1386 1387 1388 1389 1390 1391 1392 1393 1394 1395 1396 1397 1398 1399 1400 1401 1402 1403 1404 1405 1406 1407 1408 1409 1410 1411 1412 1413 1414 1415 1416 1417 1418 1419 1420 1421 1422 1423 1424 1425 1426 1427 1428 1429 1430 1431 1432 1433 1434 1435 1436 1437 1438 1439 1440 1441 1442 1443 1444 1445 1446 1447 1448 1449 1450 1451 1452 1453 1454 1455 1456 1457 1458 1459 1460 1461 1462 1463 1464 1465 1466 1467 1468 1469 1470 1471 1472 1473 1474 1475 1476 1477 1478 1479 1480 1481 1482 1483 1484 1485 1486 1487 1488 1489 1490 1491 1492 1493 1494 1495 1496 1497 1498 1499 1500 1501 1502 1503 1504 1505 1506 1507 1508 1509 1510 1511 1512 1513 1514 1515 1516 1517 1518 1519 1520 1521 1522 1523 1524 1525 1526 1527 1528 1529 1530 1531 1532 1533 1534 1535 1536 1537 1538 1539 1540 1541 1542 1543 1544 1545 1546 1547 1548 1549 1550 1551 1552 1553 1554 1555 1556 1557 1558 1559 1560 1561 1562 1563 1564 1565 1566 1567 1568 1569 1570 1571 1572 1573 1574 1575 1576 1577 1578 1579 1580 1581 1582 1583 1584 1585 1586 1587 1588 1589 1590 1591 1592 1593 1594 1595 1596 1597 1598 1599 1600 1601 1602 1603 1604 1605 1606 1607 1608 1609 1610 1611 1612 1613 1614 1615 1616 1617 1618 1619 1620 1621 1622 1623 1624 1625 1626 1627 1628 1629 1630 1631 1632 1633 1634 1635 1636 1637 1638 1639 1640 1641 1642 1643 1644 1645 1646 1647 1648 1649 1650 1651 1652 1653 1654 1655 1656 1657 1658 1659 1660 1661 1662 1663 1664 1665 1666 1667 1668 1669 1670 1671 1672 1673 1674 1675 1676 1677 1678 1679 1680 1681 1682 1683 1684 1685 1686 1687 1688 1689 1690 1691 1692 1693 1694 1695 1696 1697 1698 1699 1700 1701 1702 1703 1704 1705 1706 1707 1708 1709 1710 1711 1712 1713 1714 1715 1716 1717 1718 1719 1720 1721 1722 1723 1724 1725 1726 1727 1728 1729 1730 1731 1732 1733 1734 1735 1736 1737 1738 1739 1740 1741 1742 1743 1744 1745 1746 1747 1748 1749 1750 1751 1752 1753 1754 1755 1756 1757 1758 1759 1760 1761 1762 1763 1764 1765 1766 1767 1768 1769 1770 1771 1772 1773 1774 1775 1776 1777 1778 1779 1780 1781 1782 1783 1784 1785 1786 1787 1788 1789 1790 1791 1792 1793 1794 1795 1796 1797 1798 1799 1800 1801 1802 1803 1804 1805 1806 1807 1808 1809 1810 1811 1812 1813 1814 1815 1816 1817 1818 1819 1820 1821 1822 1823 1824 1825 1826 1827 1828 1829 1830 1831 1832 1833 1834 1835 1836 1837 1838 1839 1840 1841 1842 1843 1844 1845 1846 1847 1848 1849 1850 1851 1852 1853 1854 1855 1856 1857 1858 1859 1860 1861 1862 1863 1864 1865 1866 1867 1868 1869 1870 1871 1872 1873 1874 1875 1876 1877 1878 1879 1880 1881 1882 1883 1884 1885 1886 1887 1888 1889 1890 1891 1892 1893 1894 1895 1896 1897 1898 1899 1900 1901 1902 1903 1904 1905 1906 1907 1908 1909 1910 1911 1912 1913 1914 1915 1916 1917 1918 1919 1920 1921 1922 1923 1924 1925 1926 1927 1928 1929 1930 1931 1932 1933 1934 1935 1936 1937 1938 1939 1940 1941 1942 1943 1944 1945 1946 1947 1948 1949 1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1957 1958 1959 1960 1961 1962 1963 1964 1965 1966 1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2080 2081 2082 2083 2084 2085 2086 2087 2088 2089 2090 2091 2092 2093 2094 2095 2096 2097 2098 2099 2100 2101 2102 2103 2104 2105 2106 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113 2114 2115 2116 2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2132 2133 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141 2142 2143 2144 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 2152 2153 2154 2155 2156 2157 2158 2159 2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165 2166 2167 2168 2169 2170 2171 2172 2173 2174 2175 2176 2177 2178 2179 2180 2181 2182 2183 2184 2185 2186 2187 2188 2189 2190 2191 2192 2193 2194 2195 2196 2197 2198 2199 2200 2201 2202 2203 2204 2205 2206 2207 2208 2209 2210 2211 2212 2213 2214 2215 2216 2217 2218 2219 2220 2221 2222 2223 2224 2225 2226 2227 2228 2229 2230 2231 2232 2233 2234 2235 2236 2237 2238 2239 2240 2241 2242 2243 2244 2245 2246 2247 2248 2249 2250 2251 2252 2253 2254 2255 2256 2257 2258 2259 2260 2261 2262 2263 2264 2265 2266 2267 2268 2269 2270 2271 2272 2273 2274 2275 2276 2277 2278 2279 2280 2281 2282 2283 2284 2285 2286 2287 2288 2289 2290 2291 2292 2293 2294 2295 2296 2297 2298 2299 2300 2301 2302 2303 2304 2305 2306 2307 2308 2309 2310 2311 2312 2313 2314 2315 2316 2317 2318 2319 2320 2321 2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327 2328 2329 2330 2331 2332 2333 2334 2335 2336 2337 2338 2339 2340 2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346 2347 2348 2349 2350 2351 2352 2353 2354 2355 2356 2357 2358 2359 2360 2361 2362 2363 2364 2365 2366 2367 2368 2369 2370 2371 2372 2373 2374 2375 2376 2377 2378 2379 2380 2381 2382 2383 2384 2385 2386 2387 2388 2389 2390 2391 2392 2393 2394 2395 2396 2397 2398 2399 2400 2401 2402 2403 2404 2405 2406 2407 2408 2409 2410 2411 2412 2413 2414 2415 2416 2417 2418 2419 2420 2421 2422 2423 2424 2425 2426 2427 2428 2429 2430 2431 2432 2433 2434 2435 2436 2437 2438 2439 2440 2441 2442 2443 2444 2445 2446 2447 2448 2449 2450 2451 2452 2453 2454 2455 2456 2457 2458 2459 2460 2461 2462 2463 2464 2465 2466 2467 2468 2469 2470 2471 2472 2473 2474 2475 2476 2477 2478 2479 2480 2481 2482 2483 2484 2485 2486 2487 2488 2489 2490 2491 2492 2493 2494 2495 2496 2497 2498 2499 2500 2501 2502 2503 2504 2505 2506 2507 2508 2509 2510 2511 2512 2513 2514 2515 2516 2517 2518 2519 2520 2521 2522 2523 2524 2525 2526 2527 2528 2529 2530 2531 2532 2533 2534 2535 2536 2537 2538 2539 2540 2541 2542 2543 2544 2545 2546 2547 2548 2549 2550 2551 2552 2553 2554 2555 2556 2557 2558 2559 2560 2561 2562 2563 2564 2565 2566 2567 2568 2569 2570 2571 2572 2573 2574 2575 2576 2577 2578 2579 2580 2581 2582 2583 2584 2585 2586 2587 2588 2589 2590 2591 2592 2593 2594 2595 2596 2597 2598 2599 2600 2601 2602 2603 2604 2605 2606 2607 2608 2609 2610 2611 2612 2613 2614 2615 2616 2617 2618 2619 2620 2621 2622 2623 2624 2625 2626 2627 2628 2629 2630 2631 2632 2633 2634 2635 2636 2637 2638

provide a detailed accounting of expenses incurred and expected. See *SUF* ¶¶ 17, 59-60. In response, 10 Spaceflight requested a meeting with DZYNE to discuss the AFRL's Directive. *SUF* ¶ 20. 11 Following the parties' meeting, DZYNE issued an updated LSA termination notice to Spaceflight on

12 June 12, 2023. *SUF* ¶ 21.

13 Spaceflight then asserted that DZYNE "only has the right to invoke FAR 52.249-2" if AFRL 14 terminates the Prime Contract for its convenience. *SUF* ¶ 22. On June 30, 2023, DZYNE sent 15 Spaceflight a letter reiterating the AFRL's Directive to Spaceflight and requested Spaceflight 16 "immediately to stop work for all efforts under [the LSA]." *SUF* ¶ 23. Spaceflight did not produce a 17 termination settlement proposal before or on July 8, 2023. *SUF* ¶ 24. 18 On July 13, 2023, Spaceflight notified DZYNE that the remanifest provisions of the 19 Amended LSA controlled the circumstances and that Spaceflight was prepared to work with 20 DZYNE to provide remanifest opportunities with alternative launch vehicle providers. *SUF* ¶ 66. 21 DZYNE refused a remanifest opportunity, stating: "There is no remanifest opportunity. The Air 22 Force does not have a satellite to launch, nor do they plan to provide one." *Id.* 23 On October 16, 2023, AFRL issued a second Directive to DZYNE, directing DZYNE to 24 "cease any and all effort related to the WeatherSAT Project Launch," and stated that no 25 "WeatherSAT Project Launch or any other spacecraft launch activities will continue under the 26 subject contract." *SUF* ¶ 25. The October AFRL Directive further directed DZYNE to provide 27 AFRL with "[c]onfirmation that all work has stopped related to the WeatherSAT Project Launch," 28 including "all subcontracted efforts." *SUF* ¶ 26. On October 20, 2023, DZYNE forwarded the 1 October AFRL Directive to Spaceflight. *SUF* ¶ 27. A launch vehicle was never delivered by 2 DZYNE. See *SUF* ¶ 66 (indicating DZYNE did not intend to provide a launch vehicle following 3 AFRL's directives). 4 E. Damages 5 During the project, DZYNE sent \$7,839,989 to Spaceflight. *SUF* ¶ 29. Spaceflight paid 6 \$800,000 to Virgin Orbit. *SUF* ¶ 30. Spaceflight also delivered a motorized lightband system to 7 DZYNE valued at \$165,000. *SUF* ¶ 31. On November 10, 2023, Spaceflight invoiced DZYNE for 8 the remaining outstanding balance of the Amended LSA in the amount of \$2,175,102. *SUF* ¶ 69. On 9 March 25, 2025, six days after DZYNE transmitted its motion for summary judgment, Spaceflight

10 transmitted to DZYNE an accounting of direct and indirect costs incurred related to the Amended 11 LSA totaling \$2,335,682.36. *SUF* ¶ 32.

12 DZYNE'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

13 I. Discussion 14 DZYNE moves for summary judgment in its favor on the following claims: (1) breach of 15 contract; (2) unjust enrichment; and (3) declaratory judgment. Dkt. No. 61-1 at 11. DZYNE's motion 16 is based upon its contentions that (1) the AFRL terminated the Prime Contract for AFRL's 17 convenience; (2) the Amended LSA provides DZYNE with the unconditional right to terminate the 18 LSA for DZYNE's convenience; and (3) DZYNE is entitled to a damages award of \$6,874,898 for 19 the balance of the amount paid to Spaceflight.

For the reasons discussed below, the Court finds that 20 AFRL did not “terminate for convenience” and DZYNE did not have the right to terminate for 21 convenience. 22 A. DZYNE is Not Entitled to Summary Judgment In Its Favor On Its Declaratory 23 Judgment Claim as It Was Not Entitled to Terminate Based Upon the AFRL 24 Directives Or Its Own Convenience 25 In its third cause of action DZYNE seeks declaratory judgment regarding the meaning of the 26 LSA. In particular, DZYNE seeks the following: “this Court declare the express terms of the LSA 27 provided DZYNE the unilateral right to terminate the LSA for its convenience; or, in the alternative, 28 the express terms of the LSA provided DZYNE the right to terminate the LSA based upon the 1 express direction received from AFRL following cancellation of the [WeatherSAT].” Dkt. No. 1 at 2 15. 3 To obtain declaratory relief, there must be a “substantial controversy between parties having 4 adverse legal interests, of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of declaratory 5 judgement.” S. Cal. Painters & Allied Trades, Dist. Council No. 36 v. Rodin & Co., 558 F.3d 1028, 6 1035 (9th Cir. 2009); Bayer v. Neiman Marcus Gr., Inc., 861 F.3d 853, 867 (9th Cir. 2017). Here, 7 DZYNE and Spaceflight seek declaratory relief with respect to the LSA. Dkt. Nos. 61-1 at 11, 61-22 8 at 35. The parties dispute a contractual right: DZYNE’s right to terminate the LSA, which has 9 significant implications as to the causes of actions alleged and damages sought. Given this, the Court 10 finds the instant matter appropriate for declaratory relief. 11 Having determined that a real controversy exists, the Court proceeds to examine the 12 undisputed facts and the legal questions presented by this claim. 13 i. Even Reading All the Undisputed Facts in DZYNE’s Favor, AFRL Did 14 Not Terminate the Prime Contract For Convenience Under the FAR 15 DZYNE argues that it is entitled to summary judgment because the AFRL explicitly or 16 constructively terminated the Prime Contract for the AFRL’s convenience pursuant to FAR 52.249- 17

2. MSJ at 27. Thus, DZYNE has the burden of establishing there is no genuine dispute of fact that 18 the AFRL terminated the Prime Contract for AFRL’s convenience. Nissan Fire, 210 F.3d at 1102. 19 The Court applies standard rules of contract interpretation to determine whether the AFRL 20 terminated the Prime Contract for the AFRL’s convenience. “A written contract must be read as a 21 whole and every part interpreted with reference to the whole, with reasonable preference given to 22 reasonable interpretations.” Klamath Water Users Protective Ass’n v. Patterson, 204 F.3d 1206 (9th 23 Cir. 1999, opinion amended on denial of reh’g, 203 F.3d 1175, 1210 (9th Cir. 2000); Kennewick Irr. 24 Dist. v. United States, 880 F.2d 1018, 1032 (9th Cir. 1989). “Whenever possible, the plain language 25 of the contract should be considered first.” Id. “Contract terms are to be given their ordinary 26 meaning, and when the terms of a contract are clear, the intent of the parties must be ascertained 27 from the contract itself.” Id. “A contract is ambiguous if reasonable people could find its terms 28 1 susceptible to more than one interpretation.” Kennewick, 880 F.2d at 1032; Castaneda v. Dura-Vent 2 Corp., 648 F.2d 612, 619 (9th Cir. 1981). 3 It is undisputed that FAR 52.249-2(a) permits AFRL to terminate performance of work under 4 the Prime Contract “if the Contracting Officer determines that a termination is in the

Government's 5 interest." 12. This is referred to as a "termination for convenience," and there is a 6 considerable body of law that has grown up around this right of the government to terminate a 7 contract for its convenience. See *VHC, Inc. v. Peters*, 179 F.3d, 1363, 1364-65 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 8 (involving clear termination by the government); *Rumsfeld v. Applied Cos.*, 325 F.3d 1328, 1333 9 (9th Cir. 2003) (same). Not only does FAR 52.249-2(a) permit termination for convenience, it 10 specifies how the Government may exercise this right. In fact, FAR 52.249-2(a) requires that to 11 terminate for convenience, the Government must issue a Notice of Termination that contains certain 12 proscribed information: "The Contracting Officer shall terminate by delivering to the Contractor a 13 Notice of Termination specifying the extent of termination and the effective date." 48 C.F.R. § 14 52.249-2(a). Another section of the FAR sets forth additional requirements on the Notice of 15 Termination when the Government seeks to exercise its right to terminate for convenience: FAR 16 49.102. According to FAR 49.102, 17 [T]he contracting officer shall terminate contracts for convenience . . . only by a written 18 notice to the contractor (see 49.601). . . . The notice shall state — . . .

(1) That the contract is being terminated for the convenience of the Government . . . under 19 the contract clause authorizing the termination.

20 48 C.F.R. § 49.102

21 It is also undisputed that the LSA provided DZYNE with certain "Customer Termination 22 Rights." Dkt. No. 61-26 at 5-6. Among them was the following: "Customer may terminate this 23 Agreement for the Government's convenience in accordance with FAR 52.249-2." *Id.* 24 Finally, it is undisputed that AFRL never transmitted to DZYNE any document described as 25 a "Notice of Termination," and that at no point did it provide notice "that the contract is being 26 terminated for the convenience of the Government . . . under the contract clause authorizing the 27 termination" pursuant to FAR 49.102. In fact, it is undisputed that DZYNE requested that AFRL 28 provide such a notice, and AFRL did not do so. Dkt. No. 61-46. 1 Accordingly, given these undisputed facts, the question before this Court is whether AFRL's 2 Directives permitted DZYNE to terminate the Prime Contract pursuant to Paragraph 12(F). The 3 Court finds that they do not. 4 As a preliminary matter, the plain language of the Prime Contract is that any right DZYNE 5 had to terminate the contract for the Government's convenience had to be "in accordance with FAR 6 52.249-2." 7 Given that, this Court must determine whether the Government ever terminated the work 8 under the Prime Contract "in accordance with FAR 52.249-2." It did not. Terminating for 9 convenience in accordance with FAR 52.249-2 required that the Government transmit a notice to 10 DZYNE explicitly stating that the Government was "terminating for convenience." AFRL never 11 transmitted any such notice, even when asked. Dkt. No. 61-46. And this cannot be treated as a mere 12 oversight or a technical requirement that this Court can overlook. As stated above, there is a large 13 body of law regarding terminations for convenience, and the FAR is explicit about the requirements, 14 given the breadth of the right and the important implications that flow from a termination being 15 considered a termination for convenience as opposed to some other

termination. *VHC, Inc.*, 179 F.3d 16 at 1364-65 (involving clear termination by the government); *Rumsfeld*, 325 F.3d at 1333 (same); 17 *Coll. Point Boat Corp v. United States*, 267 U.S. 12, 15 (1925) (determining there was no finding of 18 fact the contract was cancelled because the Navy failed to give the notice requisite to terminate the 19 contract). 20 AFRL never terminated the contract for convenience under the FAR and therefore DZYNE 21 never had the power to terminate the LSA under 12(F). 22 DZYNE argues in the alternative that AFRL “constructively terminated” the contract, which 23 then permitted DZYNE to invoke 12(F). MSJ at 29-30 (citing *Praecomm, Inc. v. United States*, 78 24 Fed. Cl. 5, 11 (2007)). DZYNE cites to the AFRL’s Contracting Officer’s June 5, 2023 AFRL 25 directive (Dkt. No. 61-11) and the October 16, 2023 AFRL directive (Dkt. No. 61-16) discussing the 26 cancellation of WeatherSAT. DZYNE claims that the directives constitute a termination for the 27 AFRL’s convenience under FAR 52.249-2. The June 5, 2023 AFRL directive to DZYNE stated that 28 AFRL “no longer wishes to pursue further research and development” under WeatherSAT and 1 instructed DZYNE to “cease any and all effort related to the WeatherSAT Project Launch, to include 2 any effort being performed by Subcontractors and/or vendors.” Dkt. No. 61-11; SUF ¶ 16. The

3 October 16, 2023 AFRL directive to DZYNE referred DZYNE to the June directive reiterating that

4 no WeatherSAT related activity will continue, and requested confirmation that WeatherSAT related 5 work, including subcontracted efforts, had ceased. Dkt. No. 61-16; SUF ¶ 25. DZYNE asserts that 6 because the AFRL directives instruct DZYNE to “cease all activity” on WeatherSAT and provide 7 AFRL with “confirmation that all work has stopped,” the directives constitute AFRL’s unequivocal 8 termination for AFRL’s convenience. MSJ at 28. 9 But, as Spaceflight points out, and as the case law makes clear, constructive termination is a 10 judge made doctrine which has developed to save the Government from the alternative – a finding of 11 breach. *Maxima Corp. v. United States*, 847 F.2d 1549, 1552-54 (9th Cir. 1988). There is no 12 authority for reading the phrase “in accordance with FAR 52.249-2” to mean “in accordance with 13 FAR 52.249-2 or under the judge-made doctrine of constructive termination for convenience.” Even 14 those cases which address constructive termination make clear that it is a means of retroactively 15 justifying what would otherwise be a government breach.⁴ This Court declines to read the contract to 16 also incorporate this principle because to do so would introduce uncertainty into the contract. There 17 is nothing which suggests that the parties intended to introduce this level of uncertainty into the 18 contract, and as a practical matter, enforcement of this reading of the contract would be extremely 19 difficult, if not impossible. Contracts are intended to provide clear expectations to the parties, and 20 this one did. DZYNE’s reading would do the opposite and there is no reason to find that this was the 21 parties’ intent. 22 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to Spaceflight, the Court finds DZYNE has 23 failed to establish that AFRL terminated performance for convenience “in accordance with FAR 24 52.249-2” and therefore has failed to establish that it was permitted to terminate the LSA under 25 26 27 4 The Court also notes that in *Praecomm*, the

Government directly invoked the termination for convenience clause. *Id.* Here, as argued by Spaceflight, the AFRL directives did not invoke the termination for convenience clause at all and the 28 1 paragraph 12(F). DZYNE is therefore not entitled to summary judgment on this ground on its 2 declaratory judgment claim. 3 ii. The Amended LSA Does Not Provide DZYNE an Unconditional Right to 4 Terminate the Amended LSA for DZYNE's Convenience 5 DZYNE next argues that, even if the Court finds that the AFRL did not terminate the Prime 6 Contract for AFRL's convenience, it is undisputed that the Amended LSA provides DZYNE an 7 unconditional right to terminate the Amended LSA for DZYNE's convenience. 8 DZYNE bases its argument on section 12(F) of the Amended LSA and Exhibit G of the LSA, 9 in which numerous FAR provisions including FAR 52.249-2 are incorporated by reference. MSJ at 10 16; Dkt. Nos. 61-7 at 34, 61-26. DZYNE emphasizes that the FAR provisions are "flow-down 11 clauses," meaning that the rights and responsibilities transfer from the contractor (AFRL) to the 12 subcontractor (DZYNE). MSJ at 16. Exhibit G contains a substitution clause whereby the terms 13 'Government,' 'Contracting Officer,' and equivalent phrases shall mean DZYNE and DZYNE's 14 Subcontracts manager. *Id.*; SUF ¶ 9. DZYNE posits that because of the substitution clause, the 15 Amended LSA shall be read to include the following provision: "DZYNE may terminate 16 performance of work under this contract in whole or, from time to time, in part if DZYNE determines 17 that a termination is in DZYNE's best interest." MSJ at 17 (emphasis added). Thus, DZYNE submits 18 that there is no genuine dispute of fact that the Amended LSA provides DZYNE a right to terminate 19 the Amended LSA for DZYNE's convenience. 20 Spaceflight, however, contends that DZYNE's reading, and application of the flow-down 21 clause would contradict the purpose of FAR 52.249-2 as it would "take a clause intended to 22 accommodate the Government and convert it into a clause to accommodate" DZYNE. MSJ at 21. 23 Spaceflight also points to DZYNE's request to the AFRL Contracting Officer to include 24 "Termination for Convenience" language in an updated directive as an implicit admission by 25 DZYNE that the substitution clause alone does not provide DZYNE with an unconditional right to 26 terminate for its convenience. *Id.*; Dkt. No. 61-48. Spaceflight, thus, contends that there is nothing in 27 the Amended LSA expressly authorizing DZYNE to terminate the Amended LSA for DZYNE's 28 convenience and the parties did not intend DZYNE to possess a right to terminate the Amended LSA 1 for DZYNE's convenience.⁵ Given this, Spaceflight argues that a reasonable interpretation of section 2 12(F) is that the right to terminate the Amended LSA is limited to the AFRL. MSJ at 21. 3 Here, the Court finds that given the plain language of section 12(F) and Exhibit G of the 4 Amended LSA, DZYNE does not have an unconditional right to terminate the Amended LSA for 5 DZYNE's convenience. 6 First, the preamble to Exhibit G stating "unless the context of the clause requires otherwise" 7 qualifies the substitution clause. Dkt. No. 61-7 at 34. The Court finds that, through the qualifying 8 language, the contract can be read harmoniously.⁶ The flow-down clauses, including the substitution 9 clause discussed by the parties regarding section 12(F) and Exhibit G are not innately in conflict as 10 their application is dependent on the "context of the

clause.” MSJ at 24-25; Dkt. No. 61-7 at 34. For 11 instance, a reasonable person could find that the context of section 12(F) does not warrant Exhibit G 12 taking effect. A reasonable interpretation of section 12(F) is that the right to terminate the Amended 13 LSA is limited to the AFRL and the context renders Exhibit G’s substitution effect inapplicable. This 14 understanding aligns the Court’s preference to give effect to the parties’ shared intent when they 15 entered into the agreement. Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1636, 1652 (“Repugnancy in a contract must be 16 reconciled, if possible, by such an interpretation as will give some effect to the repugnant clauses, 17 subordinate to the general intent and purpose of the whole contract.”). Because the express terms of 18 the contract and the parties’ conduct do not explicitly set forth the application of the flow-down 19 clauses pertaining to section 12(F) and Exhibit G, there is a genuine dispute of fact as to whether the 20 21 5 Spaceflight’s opposition contains citations to Chierchella declaration, the SUF, and exhibits contained in the MSJ. DZYNE argues that the Chierchella declaration should not be considered because it is “inadmissible expert opinion on 22 legal conclusions and unfounded speculation” regarding DZYNE’s state of mind. MSJ at 23-24; see *United States v. Tamman*, 782 F.3d 543, 552-53 (9th Cir. 2015) (“An expert cannot testify to a matter of law amounting to a legal 23 conclusion.”). Spaceflight does not directly address this contention. Because the underlying facts regarding the timeline of events as to the Prime Contract and Amended LSA in Chierchella’s declaration can be provided in admissible form at 24 trial, the Court determines that the factual contents contained in Chierchella’s declaration are proper for summary judgment. *Fraser v. Goodale*, 342 F.3d 1032, 1036–37 (9th Cir. 2003) (“At the summary judgment stage, we do not 25 focus on the admissibility of the evidence’s form. We instead focus on the admissibility of its contents.”); *Block v. City of L.A.*, 253 F.3d 410, 418–19 (9th Cir. 2001) (“To survive summary judgment, a party does not necessarily have to 26 produce evidence in a form that would be admissible at trial, as long as the party satisfies the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56.”); *Fonseca v. Sysco Food Servs. of Ariz., Inc.*, 374 F.3d 840, 846 (9th Cir. 2004) (finding 27 “declarations that ... contain[ed] hearsay [were] admissible for summary judgment purposes because they could be presented in an admissible form at trial” (internal quotation marks omitted)). 28 6 Spaceflight states that section 12(F) and Exhibit G are “most certainly” in conflict and cannot be read harmoniously. 1 Amended LSA permits DZYNE to ‘substitute’ itself for the AFRL and terminate the Amended LSA 2 for DZYNE’s convenience. 3 Second, DZYNE fails to provide binding on point authority as to the effect of flow-down 4 clauses. DZYNE relies on *Aspic Engineering and Construction Co. v. ECC Centcom Constructors 5 LLC*, 913 F.3d 1162, 1168-69 (9th Cir. 2019) where FAR 52.249-2 is implicated, to argue that the 6 flow-down clauses “imposed the same termination for convenience procedures onto the parties to the 7 subcontract.” MSJ at 18. *Aspic* is distinguishable. There, the Government explicitly terminated the 8 prime contract “for convenience,” which allowed the contractor to subsequently terminate the 9 subcontracts. *Aspic*, 913 F.3d at 1164. Unlike *Aspic*, the AFRL directives do not explicitly state that 10 the AFRL terminated the Prime Contract for AFRL’s convenience or refer to

FAR 52.249-2. See 11 Dkt. Nos. 61-11, 61-16. Thus, the Court does not find Aspic to be persuasive in this matter. 12 Third, DZYNE's reading of Exhibit G would render 12(F)—and, indeed, all of 12— 13 superfluous. If DZYNE, pursuant to Exhibit G, could terminate the LSA at any time for its 14 convenience, why would the contract contain a clause permitting DZYNE to terminate the LSA for 15 the Government's convenience? In fact, why would the contract contain any clauses outlining 16 DZYNE's "Customer Termination Rights." There is nothing in the record which supports the idea 17 that the parties' intent in Exhibit G was to obliterate paragraph 12 altogether and the Court declines 18 to read it that way. 19 Accordingly, viewing the evidence in the light most favorably as to Spaceflight, the Court 20 finds that DZYNE has failed to establish that it had an unconditional right to terminate the Amended 21 LSA for DZYNE's convenience. It is therefore not entitled to summary judgment in its favor on this 22 ground on its declaratory judgment claim. 23 B. DZYNE is Not Entitled to Summary Judgment In Its Favor On Its Breach of 24 Contract Claim as Spaceflight Did Not Materially Breach the Transfer 25 Agreement. 26 In its first cause of action DZYNE seeks the Court to determine that Spaceflight breached the 27 Amended LSA by failing to provide a termination settlement proposal within 30 days of DZYNE's 28 termination of the Amended LSA for DZYNE's convenience. Dkt. No. 1 at 13. In particular, 1 DZYNE seeks the following: "this Court declare the express terms of the LSA provided DZYNE the 2 unilateral right to terminate the LSA for its convenience; or, in the alternative, the express terms of 3 the LSA provided DZYNE the right to terminate the LSA based upon the express direction received 4 from AFRL following cancellation of the [WeatherSAT]." Dkt. No. 1 at 15. 5 The elements of a breach of contract claim are: (1) the existence of a contract; (2) plaintiff's 6 performance of the contract; (3) defendant's material breach of the contract; and (4) damages to 7 plaintiff resulting from the breach. *Abdelhamid v Fire Ins. Exchange*, 106 Cal. Rptr. 3d 26, 32 (Cal. 8 Ct. App. 2010). 9 i. There is a valid and enforceable contract 10 It is undisputed that the parties entered in a valid and enforceable contract: the LSA, and 11 subsequently the Amended LSA. *SUF* ¶ 4. It is further undisputed that the parties executed a transfer 12 agreement on May 23, 2023 wherein Firefly "acquired all of Spaceflight's outstanding equity," and 13 the agreement provided that "in the event that [DZYNE] terminate[s] the [LSA] for any reason other 14 than as a result of the Transfer, and such termination occurs within forty-five days of the date of this 15 letter agreement, [Spaceflight] (a) shall provide a termination settlement proposal to [DZYNE] with 16 respect to such termination of the [LSA] no later than thirty days after notice of termination by 17 [DZYNE], notwithstanding any longer time provided for by the [LSA] or any regulations 18 incorporated therein." *SUF* ¶¶ 14-15. The parties do not dispute that Spaceflight has not provided a 19 termination settlement proposal to DZYNE. *SUF* ¶ 24. Therefore, the Court finds the existence of a 20 valid and enforceable contract. 21 ii. Spaceflight did not breach the Amended LSA 22 DZYNE argues that following AFRL's directive on June 5, 2023, the Prime Contract was 23 terminated for the AFRL's convenience and thus, DZYNE had the right to terminate the Amended 24 LSA. MSJ at 5-6. Acting on this belief, DZYNE, on June 7, 2023,

notified Spaceflight that it was terminating the Amended LSA. See *SUF* ¶¶ 17, 59-60. Because DZYNE terminated the Amended LSA within 45 days of the transfer agreement, DZYNE asserts that it met its contractual duties under the transfer agreement and Spaceflight was obligated to “provide a termination settlement proposal” within 30 days. *MSJ* at 9. As Spaceflight never produced a termination settlement proposal, DZYNE contends that Spaceflight breached the transfer agreement and “DZYNE is entitled to an entry of a 2 damages award of \$6,874,898.” *MSJ* at 15. 3 In response, Spaceflight reiterates that because AFRL did not terminate the Prime Contract 4 for AFRL’s convenience and DZYNE had no unconditional right to terminate the Amended LSA, 5 Spaceflight was not required to provide a termination settlement proposal to DZYNE. *MSJ* at 34. 6 According to Spaceflight, a termination settlement proposal is implicated upon the proper 7 termination of the Amended LSA. *MSJ* at 34-35. As DZYNE had no right to terminate the Amended 8 LSA, Spaceflight claims that it did not breach the Amended LSA by failing to produce a termination 9 settlement proposal. *Id.* 10 It is undisputed that DZYNE terminated the Amended LSA on June 7, 2023, following the 11 AFRL’s June 5, 2023 directive. See *SUF* ¶¶ 17, 59-60. Thus, if the Court found that DZYNE was 12 entitled to terminate the Amended LSA, and because Spaceflight never submitted a termination 13 settlement proposal (*SUF* ¶ 24), then Spaceflight would have breached the Amended LSA. 14 *Abdelhamid*, 106 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 32. However, as discussed, the AFRL never provided DZYNE 15 with any document stating that the Prime Contract was terminated for AFRL’s convenience per FAR 16 52.249-2. In fact, the AFRL never sent DZYNE a “Notice of Termination” under FAR 49.102, even 17 after DZYNE requested one. *Dkt. No.* 61-46. Additionally, the plain language of the Amended LSA 18 does not entitle DZYNE to terminate the Amended LSA for DZYNE’s convenience. The parties’ 19 conduct does not support an intent to provide DZYNE with an unconditional right to terminate the 20 Amended LSA, and DZYNE has not provided any authority substantiating such a right through 21 Exhibit G and section 12(F). As the Court does not find that DZYNE was entitled to terminate the 22 Amended LSA, Spaceflight’s termination settlement proposal obligation under the transfer 23 agreement was not triggered. Therefore, Spaceflight did not materially breach the Amended LSA by 24 failing to provide a termination settlement proposal to DZYNE. *Abdelhamid*, 106 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 32. 25 iii. The Court does not need to reach the issue of damages 26 Because the Court finds the DZYNE failed to establish that the AFRL terminated the Prime 27 Contract for its Convenience or DZYNE had an unconditional right to terminate for its convenience, 28 the Court finds there is a genuine dispute of fact as to whether Spaceflight breached the Amended 1 LSA. As such, the Court need not reach the issue of “damages resulting from [a] breach.” 2 *Abdelhamid*, 106 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 32. Further, as the Court concludes there was not termination for 3 convenience, the Court need not reach the issue of what costs are permitted under a termination for 4 convenience. 5 Accordingly, viewing the evidence in the light most favorably as to Spaceflight, the Court 6 finds that DZYNE has failed to establish that Spaceflight breached the Amended LSA. 7 C. DZYNE is Not Entitled to Summary Judgment In Its Favor On Its Unjust 8

Enrichment Claim as Spaceflight Did Not Improperly Retain Funds. 9 In its second cause of action DZYNE seeks the Court to conclude that Spaceflight has 10 unjustly enriched itself by retaining funds which DZYNE advanced to Spaceflight that “were not 11 spent on activities related to” the Amended LSA prior to DZYNE’s termination. Dkt. No. 1 at 14. 12 Under California law, “[t]he elements of a cause of action for unjust enrichment are simply 13 stated as receipt of a benefit and unjust retention of the benefit at the expense of another.” Tufeld 14 Corp. v. Beverly Hills Gateway, L.P., 302 Cal. Rptr. 3d 203, 216 (Cal. Ct. App. 2022). However, 15 California courts have held that there is no standalone unjust enrichment claim in California. See 16 Melchior v. New Line Prods, Inc., 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 347, 357 (Cal. Ct. App. 2003) (“[T]here is no 17 cause of action in California for unjust enrichment.”). “As a matter of law, an unjust enrichment 18 claim does not lie where parties have an enforceable express contract.” Durell v. Sharp Healthcare, 19 108 Cal. Rptr. 3d 682, 699 (Cal. Ct. App. 2010)). 20 It is undisputed that DZYNE transferred \$7,839,898 to Spaceflight under the LSA for 21 WeatherSAT related work. SUF ¶¶ 6, 29. The parties further agree that Spaceflight incurred costs of 22 at least \$965,000. SUF ¶ 30-31. DZYNE claims there is no evidence of any other cost incurred by 23 Spaceflight and thus, DZYNE is owed \$6,874,898 in damages.7 MSJ at 34. Because Spaceflight 24 continues to retain \$6,874,898, DZYNE contends that Spaceflight has been unjustly enriched. Id. 25 26 27 28 7 DZYNE calculates its damages by taking the initial transfer amount (\$7,839,898), th en subtracting Spaceflight’s 1 Spaceflight, however, contends: (1) DZYNE is not entitled to damages because AFRL never 2 submitted a notice of termination for its convenience as required by FAR 52.249-2(e); and (2) even 3 if damages can be proven (i.e. AFRL terminated the Prime Contract for its convenience), Spaceflight 4 produced evidence amounting to \$2,335,682.36 in incurred costs (Dkt. No. 61-30). MSJ at 34-35. 5 DZYNE counters that Spaceflight’s accounting constituted a late disclosure as they were not 6 previewed to the accounting prior to their MSJ. MSJ at 37. As DZYNE improperly terminated the 7 Amended LSA, never delivered the AFRL satellite, and rebuffed Spaceflight’s offer to remanifest 8 under section 12(C) of the Amended LSA, Spaceflight argues that DZYNE breached the Amended 9 LSA, and it has not unjustly retained \$6,874,898. MSJ at 38. 10 Given that the Court has found that DZYNE failed to establish entitlement to terminate the 11 Amended LSA, the Court determines that Spaceflight has not breached the Amended LSA and not 12 unjustly retained benefits at the expense of DZYNE. Tufeld Corp., 302 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 216. In 13 addition, because the Court finds there is a valid and enforceable contract, an unjust enrichment 14 claim cannot stand. Durell, 108 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 699. 15 Accordingly, viewing the evidence most favorable to Spaceflight, DZYNE is not entitled to 16 summary judgment as to DZYNE’s unjust enrichment claim.

17 SPACEFLIGHT’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

18 I. Discussion 19 Spaceflight seeks summary judgment, or in the alternative, partial summary judgment, in its 20 favor on the following counterclaims: (1) anticipatory breach; (2) breach of implied covenant of 21 good faith and fair dealing; (3) breach of contract; and (4) declaratory

judgment. Dkt. No. 28 at 31- 22 34. For the reasons set forth below, the Court GRANTS in PART Spaceflight's motion for summary 23 judgment. 24 A. Spaceflight is Entitled to Summary Judgment In Its Favor On Its Declaratory 25 Judgment Claim as DZYNE Was Not Entitled to Terminate Based Upon the 26 AFRL's Directives Or Its Own Convenience. 27 In its fourth cause of action Spaceflight seeks declaratory judgment regarding the meaning of 28 the LSA. In particular, Spaceflight seeks the following: "this Court declare the Amended LSA does 1 not provide DZYNE the unilateral right to terminate the Amended LSA for DZYNE's convenience; 2 and, declare that the Amended LSA does not provide DZYNE the right to terminate the Amended 3 LSA under Section 12(F) for anything less than the Government's actual termination of DZYNE's 4 prime contract (in whole or in part)." Dkt. No. 28 at 34. 5 To obtain declaratory relief, there must be a "substantial controversy between parties having 6 adverse legal interests, of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of declaratory 7 judgement." Rodin, 558 F.3d at 1035; Bayer, 861 F.3d at 867. 8 To reiterate, Spaceflight disputes DZYNE's termination of the Amended LSA, arguing that: 9 (1) AFRL did not terminate the Prime Contract for AFRL's convenience pursuant to FAR 52.249-2, 10 and (2) the Amended LSA does not provide DZYNE with an unconditional right to terminate the 11 Amended LSA for DZYNE's convenience. MSJ at 19-21, 30. Spaceflight explains that the AFRL's 12 directives should not be regarded as a "termination for convenience" as they "do[]" not comply with 13 FAR Termination for Convenience requirements" under FAR 49.102. MSJ at 31. Spaceflight further 14 details that the "evidence proves that despite multiple urgings by DZYNE, AFRL adamantly avoided 15 terminating the Prime Contract for convenience." MSJ at 30. Additionally, Spaceflight discusses 16 how reading section 12(F) and Exhibit G as authorizing DZYNE to terminate the Amended LSA for 17 its convenience would contravene the plain language of the contract. MSJ at 19-20; Klamath, 203 18 F.3d at 1210. 19 As explained, DZYNE did not have right to terminate the Amended LSA for its convenience. 20 Although DZYNE asserts that the AFRL either explicitly or constructively terminated the Prime 21 Contract for the AFRL's convenience through the AFRL's directives, the Court, applying standard 22 rules for contract interpretation, finds no record of the AFRL providing DZYNE with any Notice of 23 Termination or document complying with FAR 49.102 or invoking FAR 52.249-2. In fact, evidence 24 supports the AFRL failing to do so when requested by DZYNE. Dkt. No. 61-46. Also, DZYNE's 25 arguments that it had an unconditional right to terminate the Amended LSA through section 12(F) 26 and Exhibit G are unfounded. DZYNE's reading of section 12(F) and Exhibit G as providing 27 DZYNE the right to substitute itself for the Government is unsupported by precedent, fails to 28 consider the qualifying language contained in the preamble to Exhibit G, and would render the 1 Amended LSA superfluous. Therefore, the Court concludes that DZYNE did not have the right to 2 terminate the Amended LSA. 3 Accordingly, viewing the evidence most favorably as to DZYNE, the Court finds that 4 Spaceflight established that DZYNE did not have an unconditional right to terminate the Amended 5 LSA for DZYNE's convenience. It is therefore entitled to summary judgment in its favor on this

6 ground on its declaratory judgment claim. 7 B. Spaceflight is Entitled to Summary Judgment In
Its Favor On Its Breach of 8 Contract and Anticipatory Breach Claims as DZYNE Wrongfully
Terminated 9 the Amended LSA. 10 In its first and third cause of action Spaceflight seeks the
Court to hold that DZYNE 11 anticipatorily breached and breached the Amended LSA. Dkt. No.
28 at 31, 33. 12 The elements of a breach of contract claim are: (1) the existence of a contract; (2)
plaintiff's 13 performance of the contract; (3) defendant's material breach of the contract; and (4)
damages to 14 plaintiff resulting from the breach. Abdelhamid, 106 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 32. An
"[a]nticipatory breach 15 occurs when one of the parties to a bilateral contract repudiates the
contract. The repudiation may be 16 express or implied. An express repudiation is a clear, positive,
unequivocal refusal to perform." 17 Taylor v. Johnston, 123 Cal. Rptr. 641, 646 (Cal. 1975). 18
Spaceflight alleges breach of contract claims against DZYNE. First, Spaceflight claims 19
DZYNE anticipatorily breached the Amended LSA by terminating the Amended LSA on June 7,
20 2023 without providing Spaceflight the opportunity to remanifest the spacecraft pursuant to
section 21 12(C) of the Amended LSA. MSJ at 38; SUF ¶ 66. And second, Spaceflight asserts
DZYNE 22 breached the Amended LSA because it is undisputed that DZYNE did not exercise its
right to delay 23 under section 5 of the Amended LSA, did not deliver the satellite spacecraft, and
denied 24 Spaceflight's attempts to remanifest under section 12. MSJ at 38-39; Dkt. No. 61-26 at
5; SUF ¶¶ 45 25 ("[T]he [] LSA provided a launch window of December 15, 2022 to April 30,
2023."), 49 ("DZYNE 26 does not dispute that it did not invoke the delay provision of the []
LSA."), 66. 27 DZYNE argues that it is entitled to terminate the Amended LSA under section
12(F) and 28 Exhibit G and thus, DZYNE was not required to provide Spaceflight an opportunity
to remanifest or 1 deliver the satellite. MSJ at 16, 27. As such, whether DZYNE breached the
Amended LSA is a 2 matter of contract interpretation regarding whether DZYNE had a right to
terminate the Amended 3 LSA. 4 i. The Amended LSA is valid and enforceable 5 First, as held, the
Amended LSA constitutes a valid and enforceable contract between 6 DZYNE and Spaceflight.
Abdelhamid, 106 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 32. This is undisputed. SUF ¶ 4. 7 ii. Spaceflight was ready to
perform its duties under the Amended

8 LSA

Second, Spaceflight states that it "was ready to perform under the Amended LSA, and time 9 for
performance had not yet arrived" because the right to delay as well as the right to remanifest 10
were still available when DZYNE terminated the Amended LSA on June 7, 2023. MSJ at 38; SUF
11 ¶¶ 45, 49, 66; see Abdelhamid, 106 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 32. 12 iii. DZYNE materially breached the
Amended LSA 13 Third, Spaceflight argues that DZYNE materially breached the Amended LSA
by failing to 14 exercise its right to delay and then subsequently failing to deliver the satellite
spacecraft, and by 15 rebuffing Spaceflight's attempt to remanifest. MSJ at 38-39. 16 Here, the
Court determines that the record demonstrates that the AFRL never terminated the 17 Prime
Contract for its convenience and DZYNE is not entitled to terminate the Amended LSA for its 18
convenience. Thus, DZYNE improperly terminated the Amended LSA on June 7, 2023, and the 19

terms set forth in the Amended LSA bind the parties' obligations. Because it is undisputed that 20 DZYNE did not deliver the satellite spacecraft by the end of the launch window, did not exercise its 21 right to delay under section 5, and rejected Spaceflight's attempt to remanifest under section 12(C), 22 DZYNE failed to comply with its contractual duties under the Amended LSA. *SUF ¶¶ 45, 49, 66.* 23 Therefore, DZYNE materially breached the Amended LSA and Spaceflight is entitled to damages 24 under Section 9(I) and Section 13 of the Amended LSA. 25 26 27 28 1 iv. Spaceflight is entitled to damages 2 Fourth, due to DZYNE's breach of the Amended LSA, Spaceflight asserts that it is "entitled 3 to the unpaid amount remaining under the Amended LSA in the amount of \$2,175,102, for which 4 Spaceflight invoiced DZYNE on November 10, 2023." *MSJ at 39.* 5 It is undisputed that the price payable to Spaceflight under the Amended LSA was 6 \$10,015,000 and that DZYNE had paid Spaceflight \$7,839,898 during the project. *SUF ¶¶ 42, 44.* 7 As such, the remaining amount payable to Spaceflight is \$2,175,102. Because the Court concludes 8 that DZYNE materially breached the Amended LSA, the Court finds that sections 9(I) and 13 govern 9 the damages Spaceflight is entitled to. Under section 9(I), DZYNE is liable to Spaceflight for the full 10 price of the Amended LSA if DZYNE fails to deliver a spacecraft by the end of the launch window 11 without exercising its right to delay under section 5. *Dkt. No. 61-26 at 5.* Section 13 reinforces 12 section 9(I), stating that Spaceflight is entitled to "retain and/or be paid all payments made and 13 owed" in the event DZYNE materially defaults in its performance of the Amended LSA. *Dkt. No. 14 61-26 at 7.* Therefore, the plain language of the Amended LSA establishes that Spaceflight is entitled 15 to the remaining \$2,175,102 unpaid by DZYNE. 16 v. Spaceflight did not waive its breach of contract claim 17 "To establish waiver under generally applicable contract law, the party opposing enforcement 18 of a contractual agreement must prove by clear and convincing evidence that the waiving party knew 19 of the contractual right and intentionally relinquished or abandoned it." *Quach v. Cal. Commerce 20 Club, Inc., 323 Cal. Rptr. 3d 126, 143 (Cal. 2024).* "The waiver inquiry is exclusively focused on the 21 waiving party's words or conduct; neither the effect of that conduct on the party seeking to avoid 22 enforcement of the contractual right nor that party's subjective evaluation of the waiving party's 23 intent is relevant." *Id.* 24 DZYNE claims that "Spaceflight waived is claim that DZYNE breached the LSA" because 25 "Spaceflight 'intentionally relinquished' its breach claim by executing the Transfer Agreement in 26 May 2023." *MSJ at 40.*

27 Under the transfer agreement, Firefly was to "acquire all of the outstanding equity of" 28 Spaceflight. *SUF ¶ 14; see SUF ¶ 53* ("The Transfer Agreement did not modify the permitted 1 grounds for termination under the Amended LSA."). The transfer agreement also provides that 2 Spaceflight "will remain a party to the Agreement and any and all obligations arising under the 3 Agreement will remain an obligation of" Spaceflight. *Dkt. No. 61-3 at 5.* 4 Nothing in the transfer agreement indicates that Spaceflight relinquished its rights or 5 obligations under the Amended LSA. *Quach, 323 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 143; Dkt. No. 61-3 at 5.* In fact, it 6 explicitly provides that

Spaceflight will remain a party to the Amended LSA. Id. DZYNE has not 7 pointed to any other evidence showcasing, by clear and convincing evidence, that Spaceflight knew 8 it would or intended to relinquish its breach claim by entering into the transfer agreement. Thus, the 9 Court does not find that DZYNE has set forth sufficient evidence to find that Spaceflight waived its 10 breach claim. 11 Accordingly, viewing the evidence most favorably as to DZYNE, the Court GRANTS 12 summary judgment on Spaceflight's anticipatory breach and breach of contract claims. 13 C. Spaceflight is Not Entitled to Summary Judgment In Its Favor On Its Breach of 14 Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing as There is No Indication of 15 Bad Faith. 16 Under California law, "there is an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing in every 17 contract." 3500 Sepulveda, LLC v. Macy's W. Stores, Inc. 980 F.3d 1317, 1324 (9th Cir. 2020) 18 (citing Foley v. Interactive Data Corp., 254 Cal. Rptr. 2d 211, 228 (Cal. 1988)). "A party can breach 19 the covenant without 'breach of a specific provision of the contract.'" Id. (citing Carma Dev. (Cal.), 20 Inc. v. Marathon Dev. Cal., Inc., 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 467, 484 (Cal. 1992)). The "question is whether the 21 party's conduct, 'while not technically transgressing the express covenants . . . frustrates the other 22 party's rights to the benefits of the contract.'" Id. (citing Racine & Laramie, Ltd. v. Dep't of Parks & 23 Rec., 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 335, 339 (Cal. Ct. App. 1992)). 24 Spaceflight argues that DZYNE acted in bad faith by willfully attempting to evade its 25 contractual obligations when it attempted to terminate the Amended LSA. MSJ at 38-39. Spaceflight 26 points to DZYNE's conduct before and after the June 5, 2023 AFRL directive as proof. MSJ at 38; 27 Dkt No. 61-46. Spaceflight contends that DZYNE knew AFRL had not terminated the Prime 28 Contract for its convenience yet purported to terminate the Amended LSA under section 12(F). MSJ I || at 38; 3500 Sepulveda, 980 F.3d at 1324. DZYNE reiterates that its attempt to terminate the LSA is 2 | based on a genuine belief that the WeatherSAT cancellation entitled DZYNE to terminate the 3 || contract under section 12(F). MSJ at 39. The Court finds that Spaceflight alleges but does not 4 | provide factual evidence as to DZYNE's purported intention to evade its obligations under the 5 | Amended LSA. Therefore, there is a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether DZYNE acted in 6 || bad faith. 7 Accordingly, viewing the evidence most favorably as to DZYNE, the Court DENIES 8 || summary judgment on Spaceflight's implied good faith and fair dealing claim.

9 CONCLUSION

10 For the reasons stated herein, the Court ORDERS as follows: 1] 1. DZYNE's Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED: 12 2. Spaceflight's Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED in PART: 13 a. The Court GRANTS summary judgment on its declaratory relief claim; 14 b. The Court GRANTS summary judgment on its anticipatory breach claim; 15 c. The Court GRANTS summary judgment on its breach of contract claim; and 16 d. The Court DENIES summary judgment on its implied good faith and fair dealing 17 claim. 18 19 IT IS SO ORDERED. 20 Mf 21 Dated: November 18, 2025

22 MAAME EWUSI-MENSAH FRIMPONG

23 United States District Judge 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/dzyne-technologies-llc-v-spaceflight-inc-3o953ukw>