

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Widman Immigration Law Firm, LLC v. Passage Inc. and Martin Basiri

Widman Law v. Passage · No. 3:25-cv-01982-SB · Decided June 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon grants Martin Basiri’s motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. The court holds that Widman Immigration Law Firm, LLC failed to allege or demonstrate that Basiri personally purposefully directed activities toward Oregon, notwithstanding his position as an officer and director of Passage Inc. Basiri is dismissed without prejudice, while the case proceeds against Passage Inc.; the court permits the plaintiff to seek leave to amend if discovery reveals additional jurisdictional facts.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the District of Oregon                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Stacie F. Beckerman                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the District of Oregon                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| DECIDED               | June 8, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| DOCKET                | 3:25-cv-01982-SB                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| DISPOSITION           | dismissed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Defendant Martin Basiri moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) to dismiss the complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction. The court granted the motion and dismissed Basiri without prejudice, while the action proceeded against Passage Inc.                                 |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | On a Rule 12(b)(2) motion decided without an evidentiary hearing, the plaintiff must make a prima facie showing of personal jurisdiction through pleadings and affidavits. Uncontroverted allegations are accepted as true and conflicts in affidavits are resolved in the plaintiff's favor. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished, nonprecedential district court opinion                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| PARTIES               | Widman Immigration Law Firm, LLC v. Passage Inc., Martin Basiri                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |

TOPICS

personal jurisdiction

motions to dismiss

trademark infringement

civil procedure

trademark law

## PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

personal jurisdiction

trademark infringement

intellectual property

commercial litigation

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Oregon could exercise specific personal jurisdiction over Martin Basiri based on his alleged involvement in Passage Inc.'s use of the PASSAGE mark and website.
2. Whether Basiri's status as a corporate officer insulated him from personal jurisdiction under the fiduciary shield doctrine.
3. Whether jurisdictional discovery or leave to amend was warranted after the complaint failed to establish personal jurisdiction over Basiri.

## HOLDINGS

1. The court lacked specific personal jurisdiction over Basiri because Widman Law failed to make a prima facie showing that Basiri, as opposed to Passage Inc., purposefully directed activities toward Oregon.
2. The fiduciary shield doctrine neither subjected Basiri to personal jurisdiction merely because of his association with Passage Inc. nor insulated him from jurisdiction for acts he personally committed on behalf of the corporation.
3. Jurisdictional discovery was not warranted because Widman Law offered only a mere hunch and bare allegations rather than controverted jurisdictional facts or a satisfactory factual showing requiring discovery.
4. Dismissal for lack of personal jurisdiction was without prejudice and did not adjudicate the merits.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“The Court finds that under the fiduciary shield doctrine, Basiri is neither subject to personal jurisdiction merely due to his association with Passage Inc. nor insulated from personal jurisdiction for acts he committed on behalf of Passage Inc.”* (Discussion § II.A)

*“But even if Widman Law could establish that Basiri operated Passage Inc.’s website, the Ninth Circuit has clearly held that “operation of an interactive website does not, by itself, establish express aiming.””* (Discussion § II.A)

*“But “a mere hunch that discovery might yield jurisdictionally relevant facts, or bare allegations in the face of specific denials, are insufficient reasons for a court to grant jurisdictional discovery.””* (Discussion § II.B)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Widman Immigration Law Firm, an Oregon law firm, owns and uses the PASSAGE mark for legal services. Passage Inc., a Canadian company operated by Basiri, used the passage.com URL and allegedly used the PASSAGE designation in connection with its business. Widman Law alleged that Basiri, Passage Inc.'s chief

executive officer and director, authorized or approved the allegedly infringing conduct, but it did not identify specific acts by Basiri personally directed at Oregon or establish that he operated Passage Inc.'s website.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Widman Immigration Law Firm filed claims for trademark infringement, unfair competition, false designation, common-law trade infringement and unfair competition, and violations of Oregon's Unlawful Trade Practices Act. Basiri moved to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. After briefing and a notice of supplemental authority, the court granted the motion, denied jurisdictional discovery on the existing showing, and dismissed Basiri without prejudice, allowing Widman Law to seek leave to amend if discovery produced additional jurisdictional facts.

## DISPOSITION

dismissed

## CASES CITED

- *Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374 F.3d 797, 800, 802 (9th Cir. 2004)
- *Sher v. Johnson*, 911 F.2d 1357, 1361 (9th Cir. 1990)
- *Caruth v. Int'l Psychoanalytical Ass'n*, 59 F.3d 126, 128 (9th Cir. 1995)
- *Burri Law PA v. Skurla*, 35 F.4th 1207, 1212 (9th Cir. 2022)
- *Chan v. Soc'y Expeditions, Inc.*, 39 F.3d 1398, 1404-05 (9th Cir. 1994)
- *Ranza v. Nike, Inc.*, 793 F.3d 1059, 1068 (9th Cir. 2015)
- *Glob. Commodities Trading Grp., Inc. v. Beneficio de Arroz Choloma, S.A.*, 972 F.3d 1101, 1106-07 (9th Cir. 2020)
- *LNS Enters. LLC v. Cont'l Motors, Inc.*, 22 F.4th 852, 859, 864-65 (9th Cir. 2022)
- *Morrill v. Scott Fin. Corp.*, 873 F.3d 1136, 1142 (9th Cir. 2017)
- *Columbia Sportswear Co. v. Trs. of Columbia Univ. in the City of N.Y.*, No. 3:25-cv-01299-AB, 2026 WL 1195002, at \*4 (D. Or. May 1, 2026)
- *Briskin v. Shopify, Inc.*, 135 F.4th 739, 751 (9th Cir. 2025) (en banc)
- *Calder v. Jones*, 465 U.S. 783, 789 (1984)
- *Billing Assocs. Nw. LLC v. Addison Data Servs. LLC*, No. 23-35198, 2025 WL 289171, at \*1 (9th Cir. Jan. 24, 2025)
- *Davis v. Metro Prods., Inc.*, 885 F.2d 515, 520, 522 (9th Cir. 1989)
- *D. Brutke's Victory Hills, LLC v. Tuter*, No. 3:12-cv-01951-SI, 2013 WL 3818146, at \*4-5 (D. Or. July 22, 2013)
- *Kelley v. Kirkman Grp., Inc.*, No. 3:19-cv-01068-SB, 2020 WL 363389, at \*3 (D. Or. Jan. 22, 2020)
- *LaDue v. City of Talent*, No. 1:14-cv-01421-CL, 2015 WL 1636655, at \*2 (D. Or. Apr. 10, 2015)
- *L & A Designs, LLC v. Xtreme ATVs, Inc.*, 860 F. Supp. 2d 1196, 1199, 1201 (D. Or. 2012)

- *Exact Ord. Specialties v. Glow Indus., Inc.*, No. 03:12-cv-00631-HU, 2012 WL 3597432, at \*5 (D. Or. Aug. 20, 2012)
- *Smith v. U.S. Bank, N.A.*, No. CIV. 10-3077-CL, 2011 WL 2470100, at \*9 (D. Or. Apr. 22, 2011), findings and recommendation adopted, 2011 WL 2469729 (D. Or. June 20, 2011)
- *Blackthorne v. Posner*, 883 F. Supp. 1443, 1449-50 (D. Or. 1995)
- *Herbal Brands, Inc. v. Photoplaza, Inc.*, 72 F.4th 1085, 1091 (9th Cir. 2023)
- *Freeman v. 3Commas Techs. OU*, No. 24-6158, 2026 WL 579391, at \*1 (9th Cir. Mar. 2, 2026)
- *Rio Props. v. Rio Int'l Interlink*, 284 F.3d 1007, 1020 (9th Cir. 2002)
- *Love v. Associated Newspapers*, 611 F.3d 601, 609 n.4 (9th Cir. 2010)
- *Yahoo! Inc. v. La Ligue Contre Le Racisme Et L'Antisemitisme*, 433 F.3d 1199, 1208 (9th Cir. 2006)
- *Yamashita v. LG Chem, Ltd.*, 62 F.4th 496, 507 (9th Cir. 2023)
- *Boschetto v. Hansing*, 539 F.3d 1011, 1020 (9th Cir. 2008)
- *Cox v. CoinMarketCap OPCO, LLC*, 112 F.4th 822, 836 (9th Cir. 2024), cert. denied, 145 S. Ct. 2846 (2025)
- *Grigsby v. CMI Corp.*, 765 F.2d 1369, 1372 n.5 (9th Cir. 1985)
- *Kendall v. Overseas Dev. Corp.*, 700 F.2d 536, 539 (9th Cir. 1983)
- *Thomas v. Furness Pac. Ltd.*, 171 F.2d 434, 435 (9th Cir. 1948)