

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.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	James Donato
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	December 12, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-03798-JD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant Sandeep Nailwal moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. The court denied the motion without prejudice and authorized limited jurisdictional discovery.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(2) motion, the plaintiff bears the burden of establishing that personal jurisdiction is proper. Where no federal statute authorizes jurisdiction, the court applies the forum state's long-arm statute, which in California extends to the limits of federal due process. For specific jurisdiction over tort claims, the court applied the purposeful-direction test.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Interdata Network, Inc., Cerebellum Networks, Inc. v. Sandeep Nailwal, Kenzi Wang, et al.

TOPICS

personal jurisdiction

civil procedure

motions to dismiss

commercial litigation

torts

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

personal jurisdiction

commercial litigation

torts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint plausibly established specific personal jurisdiction over Nailwal in California.
2. Whether limited jurisdictional discovery concerning Nailwal's allegedly tortious conduct within California was warranted before resolving the Rule 12(b)(2) motion.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint did not plausibly establish specific personal jurisdiction over Nailwal because it did not clearly tie his allegedly tortious conduct to California.
2. Limited jurisdictional discovery targeted specifically at Nailwal's conduct within California was warranted, so the Rule 12(b)(2) motion was denied without prejudice and could be renewed after an amended complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court concludes, by the thinnest of margins, that limited jurisdictional discovery targeted specifically at Nailwal’s allegedly tortious conduct within California is warranted.” (at 1)

“It is the defendant, not the plaintiff or third parties, who must create contacts with the forum State.” (at 2)

“The record is just barely enough to make the possibility of personal jurisdiction here more than a hunch or pure speculation.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Nailwal is a permanent UAE resident, the CEO of a UAE-headquartered company, and has never resided, worked, or owned property in the United States. The complaint alleged that he participated in a meeting in Dubai where Cerebellum's CEO was threatened, echoed threats made by another defendant, later offered a mild apology, and met with the CEO in Dubai. The complaint also contained vague allegations that Nailwal participated in a scheme to spread false rumors and sow discord, but it did not clearly connect his allegedly tortious conduct to California.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed a federal civil action alleging, among other things, extortion, false imprisonment, cryptocurrency theft, aiding and abetting fraud, and attempted extortion. Nailwal, a UAE resident named in two claims, moved to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. The court concluded that the complaint did not clearly establish specific jurisdiction but that limited jurisdictional discovery was warranted before dismissal.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Malmquist v. Malmquist, No. 17-cv-04831-JD, 2019 WL 4194310, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 4, 2019)
- Panavision Int'l, L.P. v. Toeppen, 141 F.3d 1316, 1320 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co., 374 F.3d 797, 800-01 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Walden v. Fiore, Walden v. Fiore, 571 U.S. 277, 283-84, 291 (2014)
- Daramola v. Oracle America, Inc., No. 19-cv-07910-JD, 2020 WL 5577146, at *1-2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2020)
- Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Superior Ct. of California, 582 U.S. 255, 262, 264-65 (2017)
- Ayla, LLC v. Alya Skin Pty. Ltd., 11 F.4th 972, 979 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Axiom Foods, Inc. v. Acerchem Int'l, Inc., 874 F.3d 1064, 1069 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Yahoo! Inc. v. La Ligue Contre le Racisme et L'Antisemitisme, 433 F.3d 1199, 1206 (9th Cir. 2006) (en banc)
- Boschetto v. Hansing, 539 F.3d 1011, 1015 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Zithromia Limited v. Gazeus Negocios de Internet SA, No. 17-cv-06475-JD, 2018 WL 6340875, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2018)
- McCarthy v. Intercontinental Exchange, Inc., No. 20-cv-05832-JD, 2023 WL 6631708, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2023)
- Yamashita v. LG Chem, Ltd., 62 F.4th 496, 508-09 (9th Cir. 2023)