

FIFTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

Abdulfotikh Suleymanov v. Winston Premier Logistics, LLC, and
Otabek Umarov

Suleymanov · No. 5D2025-0443 · Decided May 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The Fifth District Court of Appeal of Florida reverses a final judgment against a Connecticut resident because the record did not establish sufficient minimum contacts with Florida to support personal jurisdiction. The court remands with instructions to dismiss the case for lack of personal jurisdiction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Fifth District Court of Appeal of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Edwards; Soud; Kilbane
JURISDICTION	Fifth District Court of Appeal of Florida
DECIDED	May 8, 2026
DOCKET	5D2025-0443
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from a final judgment entered after the trial court denied Suleymanov's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and entered a judicial default against him.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The existence of personal jurisdiction over a nonresident defendant is determined through a fact-specific inquiry concerning the Florida long-arm statute and constitutional minimum contacts.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion
PARTIES	Abdulfotikh Suleymanov v. Winston Premier Logistics, LLC, Otabek Umarov

TOPICS

- personal jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- appellate procedure
- default judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- personal jurisdiction
- appellate procedure
- contracts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Florida trial court had personal jurisdiction over Suleymanov, a Connecticut resident, under Florida's long-arm statute and the constitutional minimum-contacts requirement.

HOLDINGS

1. The record did not establish sufficient facts showing that Suleymanov engaged in substantial and not isolated activities in Florida or otherwise had sufficient minimum contacts with Florida to permit the trial court to exercise personal jurisdiction over him.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“due process requires that the defendant have certain minimum contacts with the forum such that the maintenance of the suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.” (2)

“Here, we conclude the record before us fails to present sufficient facts that would permit the trial court to exercise personal jurisdiction over Suleymanov and adjudicate the claims brought against him by Winston Premier and Umarov.” (3)

“Accordingly, we reverse the final judgment entered below and remand the case to the trial court with instructions to dismiss the case for want of personal jurisdiction over Suleymanov.” (3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Winston Premier, a Florida interstate trucking company, and its manager, Otabek Umarov, alleged that Umarov loaned Suleymanov money for truck-driver certification tuition and family support. The alleged agreement required Suleymanov to repay the loan if he drove for Winston Premier for one year, but Suleymanov quit approximately one month after a cross-country delivery to Connecticut. Suleymanov was a Connecticut resident and submitted an affidavit stating that he had never conducted business in Florida or entered into a contract to be performed in Florida. The appellees relied on evidence that Winston Premier hired him as a driver, paid him from a Florida bank account, and suffered damages in Florida.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Winston Premier Logistics, LLC, and Otabek Umarov sued Connecticut resident Abdulfotikh Suleymanov in Marion County Court over an alleged oral loan-and-employment agreement. Suleymanov specially appeared and moved to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, supporting the motion with an affidavit denying Florida contacts. The trial court denied the motion, entered a judicial default, and entered final judgment for the appellees. The Fifth District Court of Appeal reversed and remanded with instructions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The trial court must dismiss the case for want of personal jurisdiction over Suleymanov.

CASES CITED

- Venetian Salami Company v. Parthenais, Venetian Salami Co. v. Parthenais, 554 So. 2d 499 (Fla. 1989)
- International Shoe Co. v. State of Washington, International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945)
- World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson, 444 U.S. 286 (1980)
- May v. Needham, 820 So. 2d 430 (Fla. 4th DCA 2002)
- Woods v. Nova Cos. Belize Ltd., 739 So. 2d 617 (Fla. 4th DCA 1999)
- Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz, Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz, 471 U.S. 462 (1985)
- Nw. Aircraft Cap. Corp. v. Stewart, 842 So. 2d 190 (Fla. 5th DCA 2003)
- Wartski v. Sencer, 615 So. 2d 794 (Fla. 5th DCA 1993)
- Rautenberg v. Falz, 193 So. 3d 924 (Fla. 2d DCA 2016)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/fifth-district-court-of-appeal-of-florida-fifth-district-court-of-appeal-of-florida/2026/abdufotikh-suleymanov-v-winston-premier-logistics-llc-and-gvdc27y0>