

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 19 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

KABAS KRASNICI, Sr.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UBS AG (Headquarters); DEUTSCHE
BANK AG (Headquarters); UBS
FINANCIAL SERVICES INC. (U.S.);
BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.; WELLS
FARGO BANK, N.A.; JPMORGAN
CHASE BANK, N.A.; CITIBANK, N.A.;
THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON;
HSBC BANK USA, N.A.; HSBC BANK
PLC (UK); HSBC HK (Hong Kong); HSBC
Jakarta (Indonesia); DEUTSCHE BANK
TRUST COMPANY AMERICAS, (NY
Office); STANDARD CHARTERED, PLC,
(NY Branch); STANDARD CHARTERED
BANK (Frankfurt),

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-6350

D.C. No. 3:25-cv-07694-CRB

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Charles R. Breyer, District Judge, Presiding

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

Submitted February 18, 2026**

Before: CALLAHAN, FRIEDLAND, and BRESS, Circuit Judges.

Kabas Krasnici, Sr., appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his action alleging bank misconduct and seeking hundreds of billions of dollars. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Immigrant Assistance Project of the L.A. County Fed'n of Lab. (AFL-CIO) v. INS*, 306 F.3d 842, 868 (9th Cir. 2002). We affirm.

The district court dismissed Krasnici's action for improper venue because Krasnici failed to establish that any of the defendants reside in the Northern District of California or that a substantial part of the events giving rise to his claims occurred there. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1), (2) (describing where a civil action may be brought). Krasnici's brief on appeal does not demonstrate how the district court erred in its determination.

Krasnici's motion (Docket Entry No. 24) for leave to file a replacement opening brief to correct clerical errors is granted. All other pending motions and requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).