

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Wondershare Technology Group Co., Ltd., et al. v. Superace Software
Technology Co., Ltd., et al.

Wondershare · No. 25-cv-07322-JSC · Decided January 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California granted Defendants’ motions to dismiss and dismissed Plaintiffs’ complaint in its entirety under the doctrine of forum non conveniens. The Court held that China was an adequate alternative forum and that the private and public interest factors strongly favored dismissal. The dispute involved alleged false advertising and unfair competition concerning competing PDF software products.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jacqueline Scott Corley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	January 14, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-07322-JSC
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to dismiss Plaintiffs' complaint on forum non conveniens, personal-jurisdiction, subject-matter-jurisdiction, insufficient-service, and failure-to-state-a-claim grounds.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court applied a discretionary forum non conveniens analysis, considering whether an adequate alternative forum existed and whether the private and public interest factors favored dismissal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Wondershare Technology Group Co., Ltd., Wondershare Technology (Hunan) Co. v. Superace Software Technology Co., Ltd., Hongkong Superace Software Technology Co.

TOPICS

forum non conveniens

motions to dismiss

commercial litigation

deceptive trade practices

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

commercial litigation

intellectual property

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether China was an adequate alternative forum for Plaintiffs' false advertising and unfair competition claims.
2. Whether the private and public interest factors favored dismissal under the doctrine of forum non conveniens.

HOLDINGS

1. China was an adequate alternative forum because Defendants were amenable to process there and Chinese law provided Plaintiffs at least some potential avenue for redress.
2. The private and public interest factors strongly favored dismissal of Plaintiffs' complaint in favor of litigation in China.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Defendants have met their burden of showing China is an adequate forum, and the public and private factors strongly counsel in favor of dismissal." (at 1)

"A court may dismiss on forum non conveniens grounds even though the foreign forum does not provide the same range of remedies as are available in the home forum. However, the alternative forum must provide some potential avenue for redress." (at 3)

"So, Plaintiffs have not refuted Defendants' showing that China is an adequate forum." (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs, Chinese companies marketing PDFelement PDF software, alleged that Defendants, companies based in China and Hong Kong, engaged in false and misleading comparative advertising favoring Defendants' competing UPDF product. The challenged materials appeared on a globally accessible website and allegedly caused injury in California. Defendants submitted evidence that they had no United States offices, employees, executives, bank accounts, real property, or other assets, that nearly all relevant documents and employees were located abroad, and that China provided potential avenues for redress.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed claims arising from alleged false and misleading comparative advertising of competing PDF software products. Defendants moved to dismiss the complaint in its entirety. The district court granted Defendants' motions and dismissed the suit under forum non conveniens, stating that a separate judgment would be entered.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno, 454 U.S. 235, 241, 255 n.22, 257 (1981)
- Lueck v. Sundstrand Corp., 236 F.3d 1137, 1142, 1144-45 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Cheng v. Boeing Co., 708 F.2d 1406, 1411 (9th Cir. 1983)
- Ceramic Corp. of Am. v. Inka Mar. Corp. Inc., 1 F.3d 947, 949 (9th Cir. 1993)
- Dole Food Co., Inc. v. Watts, 303 F.3d 1104, 1118 (9th Cir. 2002)
- CYBERsitter, LLC v. People's Republic of China, 2010 WL 4909958, at *4-5 (C.D. Cal. 2011)
- In re Montage Tech. Grp. Ltd. Sec. Litig., 78 F. Supp. 3d 1215, 1222-23, 1226-27 (N.D. Cal. 2015)
- Tuazon v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., 433 F.3d 1163, 1181 (9th Cir. 2006)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ca/2026/wondershare-technology-group-co-ltd-et-al-v-superace-ls0f4qld>