

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION

**Quantix Liquid Transportation, Inc. v. Alejandro Gil, Gil's
Transportation Services, LLC a/k/a Gil's Transport, LLC, and Sindle
Trucking, LLC**

No. 25-cv-4637 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 30, 2026) · No. 25-cv-4637 · Decided March 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois addresses motions to dismiss a seven-count action brought by Quantix Liquid Transportation, Inc. against Alejandro Gil, Gil’s Transportation Services, LLC, and Sindle Trucking, LLC. The court grants Sindle Trucking’s motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, denies jurisdictional discovery, and grants in part and denies in part the Gil Defendants’ Rule 12(b)(6) motion concerning alleged contractual breaches and related tort and trade-secret claims.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mary M. Rowland
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
DECIDED	March 30, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-4637
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to dismiss the Second Amended Complaint under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and 12(b)(2). The court granted Sindle Trucking's Rule 12(b)(2) motion, denied jurisdictional discovery, and granted in part and denied in part the Gil Defendants' Rule 12(b)(6) motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(2) motion decided on written submissions without an evidentiary hearing, the plaintiff need only establish a prima facie case of personal jurisdiction, with conflicts in affidavits resolved in the plaintiff's favor. On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded facts as true, construes the complaint in the plaintiff's favor,

and determines whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE

unpublished district court memorandum opinion; persuasive only

TOPICS

personal jurisdiction

motions to dismiss

breach of contract

trade secrets

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

contracts

trade secrets

commercial litigation

torts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Sindle Trucking was subject to specific personal jurisdiction in Illinois.
2. Whether Quantix was entitled to jurisdictional discovery concerning Sindle Trucking.
3. Whether Quantix plausibly stated claims against the Gil Defendants for breach of the independent-contractor agreement.
4. Whether Quantix plausibly alleged a fiduciary duty arising from a principal-agent relationship.
5. Whether Quantix plausibly stated a claim for misappropriation of trade secrets under the Illinois Uniform Trade Secrets Act.
6. Whether Quantix plausibly stated a claim for tortious interference with business relationships and whether ITSA preempted that claim.
7. Whether the intracorporate conspiracy doctrine barred the civil-conspiracy claim against the Gil Defendants.

HOLDINGS

1. Illinois lacked specific personal jurisdiction over Sindle Trucking because Quantix did not allege that Sindle purposefully directed conduct at Illinois or otherwise created suit-related contacts with the forum.
2. Quantix was not entitled to jurisdictional discovery because it failed to make a colorable showing of personal jurisdiction over Sindle Trucking.
3. Quantix plausibly stated a claim that the Gil Defendants breached the confidentiality provision by disclosing contractor agreements, driver and employee lists, equipment lists, and load information.
4. Quantix failed to plausibly state claims for breach of Sections 9.8 and 10.1.
5. Quantix plausibly stated claims for breach of the equipment-return, carrier-identification, and accident-reporting provisions.
6. Quantix failed to plausibly allege that the Gil Defendants owed it a fiduciary duty.
7. Quantix plausibly stated a claim for misappropriation of trade secrets.
8. Quantix plausibly stated a tortious-interference claim, and the claim was not preempted by ITSA because it rested on conduct independent of trade-secret misappropriation.

9. The civil-conspiracy claim was barred by the intracorporate conspiracy doctrine because it was asserted against a corporation and its agents, and no exception applied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In other words, “the plaintiff cannot be the only link between the defendant and the forum. Rather, it is the defendant’s conduct that must form the necessary connection with the forum State that is the basis for its jurisdiction over him.”” (Section III(a)(i))

“Count I survives as to claims for breach of Sections 2.3, 13.3, 14, 17.2, and 25.1. Counts III and IV survive. Count I is dismissed as to a claim for breach of Sections 9.8 and 10.1 and Counts II and VII are also dismissed.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Quantix, an Illinois-based trucking company, had an independent-contractor agreement with Gil's Transport, a Texas trucking business owned by Alejandro Gil. Quantix alleged that Gil misused its confidential information, solicited Quantix customers and drivers for Sindle Trucking, shared company documents and load information with Sindle, failed to return a trailer, displayed Quantix identification while operating for Sindle, and failed to report property damage. Sindle was an Arkansas LLC with no alleged solicitation, employees, customers, advertising, communications, or other suit-related contacts with Illinois.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Quantix filed a seven-count diversity action against Alejandro Gil, Gil's Transportation Services, LLC, and Sindle Trucking, LLC. After Quantix filed a Second Amended Complaint, all defendants moved to dismiss for failure to state a claim, and Sindle additionally moved to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. The district court dismissed all claims against Sindle, dismissed Quantix's fiduciary-duty and civil-conspiracy claims and portions of its breach-of-contract claim, and allowed the confidentiality, equipment-return, carrier-identification, accident-reporting, trade-secret, and tortious-interference claims to proceed against the Gil Defendants.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Lax v. Mayorkas, 20 F.4th 1178, 1181 (7th Cir. 2021)
- Williamson v. Curran, 714 F.3d 432, 436 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Curry v. Revolution Laboratories, LLC, 949 F.3d 385, 392-93 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Purdue Research Foundation v. Sanofi-Synthelabo, S.A., 338 F.3d 773, 782-83 (7th Cir. 2003)
- GCIU-Employer Retirement Fund v. Goldfarb Corp., 565 F.3d 1018, 1023 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Kipp v. Ski Enterprise Co. of Wisconsin, 783 F.3d 365, 697 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Bonte v. U.S. Bank, N.A., 624 F.3d 461, 466 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Alioto v. Town of Lisbon, 651 F.3d 715, 721 (7th Cir. 2011)

- Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown, 564 U.S. 915, 919 (2011)
- Tamburo v. Dworkin, 601 F.3d 693, 702-03 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Lexington Insurance Co. v. Hotai Insurance Co., 938 F.3d 874, 878 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Calder v. Jones, 465 U.S. 783, 789-90 (1984)
- Walden v. Fiore, Walden v. Fiore, 571 U.S. 277, 284-85 (2014)
- Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz, Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz, 471 U.S. 462, 475 (1985)
- Rogers v. City of Hobart, Indiana, 996 F.3d 812, 819 (7th Cir. 2021)
- Advanced Tactical Ordnance Systems, LLC v. Real Action Paintball, Inc., 751 F.3d 796, 802 (7th Cir. 2014)
- Stearney v. Harman, 586 F. Supp. 2d 901, 904-05 (N.D. Ill. 2008)
- Guaranteed Rate, Inc. v. Rorvig, 2022 WL 4182436, at *4 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 13, 2022)
- Agnew v. National Collegiate Athletic Association, 683 F.3d 328, 348 (7th Cir. 2012)
- TAS Distributing Co., Inc. v. Cummins Engine Co., Inc., 491 F.3d 625, 631 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Tax Track Systems Corp. v. New Investor World, Inc., 478 F.3d 783, 787 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Stericycle, Inc. v. Carney, 2013 WL 3671288, at *6 (N.D. Ill. July 12, 2013)
- BondPro Corp. v. Siemens Power Generation, Inc., 463 F.3d 702, 706 (7th Cir. 2006)
- Liion, LLC v. Vertiv Group Corp., 2019 WL 1281977, at *2 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 20, 2019)
- Switchboard Apparatus, Inc. v. Wolfram, 2021 WL 2311969, at *4 (N.D. Ill. June 7, 2021)
- First Financial Bank, N.A. v. Bauknecht, 71 F. Supp. 3d 819, 842 (C.D. Ill. 2014)
- Ball v. Kotter, 723 F.3d 813, 826 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Neade v. Portes, 739 N.E.2d 496, 502 (Ill. 2000)
- Landale Signs & Neon, Ltd. v. Runnion Equipment Co., 2016 WL 7409916, at *4-5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 22, 2016)
- O'Brien v. O'Neill, 2007 WL 684116, at *4 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 28, 2007)
- Restatement (Second) of Agency § 14N (1958)
- Tyler v. Bank of New York Mellon, 2020 WL 2735367, at *6 (N.D. Ill. May 26, 2020)
- Dolmage v. Combined Insurance Co. of America, 2015 WL 292947, at *6 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 21, 2015)
- Cooney v. Chicago Public Schools, 943 N.E.2d 23, 29 (Ill. App. Ct. 1st Dist. 2010)
- Packaging Corp. of America, Inc. v. Croner, 419 F. Supp. 3d 1059, 1071 (N.D. Ill. 2020)
- Composite Marine Propellers, Inc. v. Van Der Woude, 962 F.2d 1263, 1266 (7th Cir. 1992)
- Inmar, Inc. v. Vargas, 2018 WL 6716701, at *3 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 21, 2018)
- Learning Curve Toys, Inc. v. PlayWood Toys, Inc., 342 F.3d 714, 722 (7th Cir. 2003)
- Mission Measurement Corp. v. Blackbaud, Inc., 216 F. Supp. 3d 915, 921 (N.D. Ill. 2016)
- 20/20 Foresight, Inc. v. George, 2021 WL 2823095, at *2 (N.D. Ill. July 7, 2021)
- CNA Financial Corp. v. Local 743 of International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 515 F. Supp. 942, 946 (N.D. Ill. 1981)
- Nielsen Consumer LLC v. Circana, LLC, 2025 WL 815666, at *9 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 13, 2025)
- Thermal Zone Products Corp. v. Echo Engineering, Ltd., 1993 WL 358148, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 14, 1993)
- Segerdahl Corp. v. Ferruzza, 2018 WL 828062, at *3 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 10, 2018)

- Webb v. Frawley, 906 F.3d 569, 577, 579 (7th Cir. 2018)
- HPI Health Care Services, Inc. v. Mt. Vernon Hospital, Inc., 545 N.E.2d 672, 676 (Ill. 1989)
- In re Estate of Albergo, 656 N.E.2d 97, 103 (Ill. 1995)
- Kurt v. Platinum Supplemental Insurance, Inc., 2021 WL 3109667, at *11 (N.D. Ill. July 22, 2021)
- Hartman v. Board of Trustees of Community College District No. 508, 4 F.3d 465, 470-71 (7th Cir. 1993)
- Rebel Hospital LLC v. Rebel Hospital LLC, 2022 WL 797035, at *6 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 16, 2022)
- Seo v. H Mart Inc., 2020 WL 5547913, at *4 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 16, 2020)
- Zurich American Insurance Co. v. Tangiers International LLC, 2018 WL 3770085, at *2 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 9, 2018)
- Indag GmbH & Co. v. IMA S.P.A., 150 F. Supp. 3d 946, 971 (N.D. Ill. 2015)
- Anthony v. Security Pacific Financial Services, Inc., 75 F.3d 311, 316 (7th Cir. 1996)
- Aoty Sports, Inc. v. Michael Domesick & AbMill, LLC, 2024 WL 7006412, at *6 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 31, 2024)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 558 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009)
- Haywood v. Massage Envy Franchising, LLC, 887 F.3d 329, 333 (7th Cir. 2018)
- Camasta v. Jos. A. Bank Clothiers, Inc., 761 F.3d 732, 736 (7th Cir. 2014)
- Bell v. City of Chicago, 835 F.3d 736, 738 (7th Cir. 2016)
- McCauley v. City of Chicago, 671 F.3d 611, 616 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Sevugan v. Direct Energy Services, LLC, 931 F.3d 610, 614 (7th Cir. 2019)