

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Edmonds v. D2IQ Inc.

Edmonds · No. 23-cv-02741-VC · Decided June 20, 2025

SUMMARY

The Northern District of California granted summary judgment to Nutanix and Knaup in Edmonds’s action against D2IQ and related defendants. The court held that Edmonds offered no evidence that Nutanix employed him and that his evidence was insufficient to establish Knaup as his employer, leaving D2IQ as the sole remaining defendant and prompting a status report and case management conference regarding D2IQ’s current legal status.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Vince Chhabria
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	June 20, 2025
DOCKET	23-cv-02741-VC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought employment-related claims against D2IQ Inc., Nutanix, and Knaup. Nutanix and Knaup moved for summary judgment.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- employment law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- employment law
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether summary judgment should be granted to Nutanix where Edmonds produced no evidence that Nutanix employed him.

2. Whether Knaup could be held individually liable where the only evidence connecting him to Edmonds's employment relationship was his awareness of Edmonds's complaint while serving as D2IQ's CEO.

HOLDINGS

1. Summary judgment was granted to Nutanix because Edmonds produced no evidence that Nutanix ever employed him and did not respond to that issue in his opposition.
2. Summary judgment was granted to Knaup because awareness of Edmonds's complaint while serving as D2IQ's CEO was insufficient to establish that Knaup was Edmonds's employer; consequently, Knaup could not be individually liable on the asserted claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This is insufficient to support a conclusion that Knaup was Edmonds’ employer.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Edmonds asserted claims involving an alleged employment relationship with Nutanix and Knaup. He produced no evidence that Nutanix employed him, and his only evidence connecting Knaup to the employment relationship was that Knaup knew of Edmonds's complaint while serving as D2IQ's CEO.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The district court considered the summary-judgment motion filed by Nutanix and Knaup. It granted the motion as to both defendants, leaving D2IQ as the sole remaining defendant, and ordered the plaintiff to file a status report addressing whether and how he intends to proceed against D2IQ.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand was ordered. The court scheduled a case-management conference for July 11, 2025, and directed Edmonds to file a status report by July 7, 2025, addressing whether he intends to proceed against D2IQ and, if so, how proceeding is feasible given the entity's current status.

CASES CITED

- Miller v. Maxwell's International Inc., 991 F.2d 583, 587 (9th Cir. 1993)
- Raines v. U.S. Healthworks Medical Group, 15 Cal. 5th 268, 276 (2023)
- Reno v. Baird, 18 Cal. 4th 640, 663 (1998)

OPINION

Edmonds v. D2IQ Inc.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARK EDMONDS, Case No. 23-cv-02741-VC Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR

v. SUMMARY JUDGMENT

D2IQ INC., et al., Re: Dkt. No. 68 Defendants. The motion for summary judgment filed by Nutanix and Knaup is granted. Edmonds has produced no evidence that Nutanix ever employed him, nor does he even respond to that issue in his opposition brief. And Edmonds's claims against Knaup fail because Edmonds's only evidence of his employment relationship with Knaup is that Knaup was aware of his complaint while Knaup was serving as CEO of D2IQ. This is insufficient to support a conclusion that Knaup was Edmonds' employer. Under these circumstances, then, there can be no individual liability for Knaup. *Miller v. Maxwell's International Inc.*, 991 F.2d 583, 587 (9th Cir. 1993); *Raines v. U.S. Healthworks Medical Group*, 15 Cal. 5th 268, 276 (2023) (citing *Reno v. Baird*, 18 Cal.4th 640, 663 (1998)). This leaves D2IQ as the sole remaining defendant. The Court is unclear whether D2IQ is an entity that can be sued at this point. A Zoom case management conference is scheduled for Friday, July 11, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. to discuss this matter. Edmonds should file a status report by Monday, July 7, discussing whether he plans to proceed against D2IQ, and if so, explaining how it is feasible to do so given the entity's current status. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: June 20, 2025 =

VINCE CHHABRIA

United States District Judge