

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Hackett v. Skynet Industries, Inc.

No. 25-cv-03297-RFL (N.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2025) · No. 3:25-cv-03297 · Decided October 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California partially granted and partially denied Skynet Industries, Inc.’s motion to dismiss a putative nationwide class action concerning alleged omissions about the addictive nature and safety risks of kratom products. The court dismissed the implied warranty and California Consumer Legal Remedies Act section 1770(a)(9) claims with prejudice, while allowing the remaining claims and class allegations to proceed. The court also held that CAFA jurisdiction, reliance, a duty to disclose, and timeliness were adequately alleged at the pleading stage.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Rita F. Lin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	October 24, 2025
DOCKET	3:25-cv-03297
DISPOSITION	affirmed_in_part_and_reversed_in_part
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Motion to dismiss the first amended complaint
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Legal sufficiency of the complaint (Rule 12(b)(6))
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- consumer protection
- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss
- subject matter jurisdiction
- statute of limitations
- deceptive trade practices

PRACTICE AREAS

- consumer protection
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court has subject matter jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act
2. Whether Hackett's claims are barred by the applicable statutes of limitations
3. Whether Hackett sufficiently alleges reliance on Skynet's omissions
4. Whether Skynet had a duty to disclose kratom's addictive properties
5. Whether Hackett's unjust enrichment claim is viable
6. Whether Hackett's claims satisfy Rule 9(b) heightened pleading requirements

HOLDINGS

1. The court has subject matter jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act because the citizenship and amount in controversy requirements are met.
2. The claims are not barred as a matter of law by the statutes of limitations because the discovery rule applies to fraud claims and Hackett adequately alleges accrual in November 2024.
3. Hackett sufficiently alleges reliance by stating he would have behaved differently had the omitted information been disclosed.
4. Hackett adequately pleads that Skynet had a duty to disclose because the products' addictiveness constitutes an unreasonable safety hazard.
5. The unjust enrichment claim survives because it is construed as a quasi-contract claim seeking restitution, and Hackett sufficiently alleges an unjustly retained benefit.
6. Hackett's claims satisfy Rule 9(b)'s heightened pleading requirements; none of the purported deficiencies identified by Skynet require dismissal.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Over a five-year period, Deshaun Hackett purchased various kratom-based products at Skynet's San Francisco store. After spending thousands of dollars, he decided to cut back and suffered severe withdrawal symptoms, discovering he was addicted to kratom. He alleges that Skynet never disclosed the addictive nature of kratom, which the scientific community knows but the public at large does not.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hackett filed a putative nationwide class action against Skynet Industries, Inc. alleging fraudulent omissions and related consumer protection claims. Skynet moved to dismiss the first amended complaint.

DISPOSITION

affirmed_in_part_and_reversed_in_part

CASES CITED

- Washington v. Chimei Innolux Corp., 659 F.3d 842 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Rosenwald v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 152 F.4th 1167 (9th Cir. 2025)

- Robichaud v. Speedy PC Software, No. 12-cv-04730-LB, 2013 WL 818503 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2013)
- De Ciel v. Porter, No. 25-cv-03351-JSC, 2025 WL 2483160 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2025)
- Fox v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc., 35 Cal. 4th 797 (2005)
- Jolly v. Eli Lilly & Co., 44 Cal. 3d 1103 (1988)
- E-Fab, Inc. v. Accts., Inc. Servs., 153 Cal. App. 4th 1308 (6th Dist. 2007)
- Daniel v. Ford Motor Co., 806 F.3d 1217 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Hodsdon v. Mars, Inc., 891 F.3d 857 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Hammerling v. Google LLC, 615 F. Supp. 3d 1069 (N.D. Cal. 2022)
- L.S. v. Happy Hippo LLC, No. 24-cv-02849-DAD, 2025 WL 1993383 (E.D. Cal. July 17, 2025)
- Astiana v. Hain Celestial Grp., Inc., 783 F.3d 753 (9th Cir. 2015)
- ESG Cap. Partners, LP v. Stratos, 828 F.3d 1023 (9th Cir. 2016)
- Fukaya v. Daiso Cal. LLC, 23-cv-00099-RFL, 2024 WL 4784420 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2024)
- Sonner v. Premier Nutrition Corp., 971 F.3d 834 (9th Cir. 2020)