

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Interdata Network, Inc., et al. v. Kenzi Wang, et al.

Interdata Network · No. 25-cv-03798-JD · Decided December 12, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California considers defendant Sandeep Nailwal’s motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. The court finds the complaint insufficiently establishes specific jurisdiction but permits limited jurisdictional discovery concerning Nailwal’s allegedly tortious conduct in California, denies the motion without prejudice, and allows the motion to be renewed after an amended complaint.

OPINION

Wang

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 INTERDATA NETWORK, INC., et al., Case No. 25-cv-03798-JD 8 Plaintiffs,

ORDER RE PERSONAL

9 v. JURISDICTION

10 KENZI WANG, et al., Defendants. 11 12 As aptly described by plaintiffs Interdata Network, Inc., and Cerebellum Networks, Inc. 13 (Cerebellum), this case alleges a “Hollywood noir” saga of extortion, false imprisonment, and 14 cryptocurrency theft. Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 1. The ins and outs of the rather overheated allegations in the 15 complaint will be taken up as warranted on another occasion. This order concerns a request for 16 dismissal by defendant Sandeep Nailwal, a United Arab Emirates (UAE) resident, for lack of 17 personal jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2). Dkt. No. 9. The Court 18 concludes, by the thinnest of margins, that limited jurisdictional discovery targeted specifically at 19 Nailwal’s allegedly tortious conduct within California is warranted. The motion to dismiss is 20 denied without prejudice and may be renewed after an amended complaint is filed.

21 BACKGROUND

22 As alleged in the complaint, Nailwal is a resident of Dubai, UAE. Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 7. Nailwal 23 is named in only two of the fifteen claims in the complaint, namely the third claim for aiding and 24 abetting fraud, and the fourth claim for attempted extortion. Id. at 28-29. The facts alleged in 25 support of the claims against Nailwal are scant. There are vague allegations to the effect that 26

Nailwal was part of “a scheme to spread false rumors” and “sow discord in Cerebellum’s 27 community.” Id. ¶ 82. These allegations are not accompanied by facts establishing that this 1 A handful of slightly more developed allegations against Nailwal involve events in Dubai, 2 UAE. Nailwal is said to have participated in a meeting in Dubai with Fred Jin, the CEO of 3 Cerebellum, in which Jin was threatened with accusations of fraud and left in “fear for his life.” 4 Id. ¶¶ 89-98.1 The complaint says that Nailwal “echoed” threats made by defendant Kenzi Wang, 5 and implies he was not a lead player. Id. ¶ 96. It also alleges that Nailwal “reached out to Jin” the 6 next day with a “mild apology” and met with Jin at a hotel in Dubai before Jin returned to the 7 United States. Id. ¶¶ 100-101. 8 That is the sum total of the material allegations in the complaint against Nailwal. Nailwal 9 stated in a declaration that he is a permanent resident of UAE, is CEO of a company headquartered 10 in UAE, and has never resided, worked, or owned property in the United States. Dkt. No. 9-1. 11 Plaintiffs did not challenge any of these facts.

12 DISCUSSION

13 Nailwal says that the allegations in the complaint are not sufficient to establish specific 14 jurisdiction over him in this District. Where, as here, no federal statute authorizes personal 15 jurisdiction, the Court applies the law of California, the state in which it sits. See *Malmquist v. 16 Malmquist*, No. 17-cv-04831-JD, 2019 WL 4194310, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 4, 2019); *Panavision 17 Int’l, L.P. v. Toeppen*, 141 F.3d 1316, 1320 (9th Cir. 1998). California’s long-arm statute, 18 Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10, is coextensive with the limits of the Constitution’s due process 19 clause, so the dispositive test is whether personal jurisdiction in this Court comports with 20 traditional concepts of fair play and due process. *Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor. Co.*, 21 374 F.3d 797, 800-01 (9th Cir. 2004). 22 Specific jurisdiction focuses on the defendant’s contacts with the forum state for the claims 23 at issue. *Walden v. Fiore*, 571 U.S. 277, 283-84 (2014); see also *Daramola v. Oracle America, 24 Inc.*, No. 19-cv-07910-JD, 2020 WL 5577146, at *1-2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2020). This is “case- 25 linked” jurisdiction, and it looks to whether the defendant undertook a claim-related activity in the 26 forum state “and is therefore subject to the State’s regulation.” *Walden*, 571 U.S. at 283 n.6 27 1 (internal quotation omitted). It is the defendant’s “suit-related conduct” that “must create a 28 substantial connection with the forum State.” Id. at 284. The claims must relate to the defendant’s 29 contacts “with the forum” for specific personal jurisdiction to arise. *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. 30 Superior Ct. of California*, 582 U.S. 255, 262 (2017) (internal quotation omitted) (emphasis in 31 original); see also *Sharpe v. Puritan’s Pride, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-06717-JD, 2019 WL 188658, at *4 6 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2019). 7 The claims against Nailwal sound in tort, and so the jurisdictional inquiry is focused on the 8 purposeful direction of conduct by the defendant to California. See *Ayla, LLC v. Ayla Skin Pty. 9 Ltd.*, 11 F.4th 972, 979 (9th Cir. 2021) (citation omitted). The purposeful direction test asks 10 whether the defendant has “(1) committed an intentional act, (2) expressly aimed at the forum 11 state, (3) causing harm that the defendant knows is likely to be suffered in the forum state.” *Axiom 12 Foods, Inc. v. Acerchem Int’l, Inc.*, 874 F.3d 1064, 1069 (9th Cir. 2017) (internal quotation 13

omitted); see also *Yahoo! Inc. v. La Ligue Contre le Racisme et L'Antisemitisme*, 433 F.3d 1199, 14 1206 (9th Cir. 2006) (en banc) (same). Plaintiffs bear “the burden of establishing that jurisdiction 15 is proper.” *Boschetto v. Hansing*, 539 F.3d 1011, 1015 (9th Cir. 2008). 16 Overall, the complaint does little to plausibly allege jurisdiction over Nailwal. Most of the 17 complaint consists of allegations about Wang and others. Nailwal is presented as a distinctly 18 minor character. The most substantive allegations against him are very cursory descriptions of 19 events said to have happened in Dubai. Nothing in the complaint clearly ties any allegedly 20 tortious conduct by Nailwal to California. The possibility that Nailwal may have had 21 “continuous” business dealings within California, or a “relationship” within the state with a third 22 party such as Jin, is not enough for a finding of specific jurisdiction. See *Zithromia Limited v. 23 Gazeus Negocios de Internet SA*, No. 17-cv-06475-JD, 2018 WL 6340875, at *2 (N.D. Cal.

24 Dec. 5, 2018) (quoting *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*, 582 U.S. at 264-65). The fact that a plaintiff 25 may have its own contacts with California is also of no moment. “[I]t is the defendant, not the 26 plaintiff or third parties, who must create contacts with the forum State.” *Walden*, 571 U.S. at 27 291. “The proper question is not where the plaintiff experienced a particular injury or effect but 1 All of this points toward dismissal of Nailwal, all the more so because plaintiffs did not 2 || proffer facts beyond the bare allegations in the complaint in response to Nailwal’s jurisdiction 3 objection. See *McCarthy v. Intercontinental Exchange, Inc.*, No. 20-cv-05832-JD, 4 || 2023 WL 6631708, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2023) (“When a defendant moves to dismiss for lack 5 || of personal jurisdiction, the plaintiff is obligated to come forward with facts, by affidavit or 6 || otherwise, supporting personal jurisdiction.”) (internal quotation omitted). The mention of a 7 || consulting agreement between Nailwal and Cerebellum in the complaint, Dkt. No. 1 7, and in an 8 attorney declaration, Dkt. No. 20-1, Ex. 1, establishes nothing about Nailwal’s allegedly tortious 9 || conduct within California. 10 Even so, a short period of jurisdictional discovery is warranted. The record is just barely 11 enough to make the possibility of personal jurisdiction here more than a hunch or pure 12 speculation. See *Yamashita v. LG Chem, Ltd.*, 62 F.4th 496, 508-09 (9th Cir. 2023). 5 13 Consequently, plaintiffs may pursue discovery targeted to Nailwal’s conduct within California in a 14 || manner consistent with this order. The discovery is limited to jurisdictional facts only. The 3 15 discovery will be completed by March 6, 2026. Plaintiffs may file by March 16, 2026, an 16 amended complaint plausibly alleging facts establishing specific jurisdiction over Nailwal. 3 17 Nailwal may ask again to dismiss on jurisdictional grounds as warranted. Alternatively, plaintiffs 18 || may dismiss Nailwal as a defendant. 19 IT IS SO ORDERED. 20

Dated: December 12, 2025 21

JAMES MONATO

22 United States District Judge 23 24 25 26 27 28