

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 23 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ESTEBAN CHAVEZ,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MORGAN OLSON, LLC,

Defendant - Appellee,

DAIMLER TRUCKS NORTH AMERICA  
LLC, NAVISTAR, INC., NORTHROP  
GRUMMAN CORPORATION, THE  
SHYFT GROUP, INC., FORD MOTOR  
COMPANY, FREIGHTLINER CUSTOM  
CHASSIS CORPORATION, DOES, 1  
through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

No. 25-4052

D.C. No.

2:24-cv-08781-JLS-E

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California

Josephine L. Staton, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 21, 2026\*\*  
Pasadena, California

---

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

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

Before: N.R. SMITH and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges, and ORRICK, District Judge.\*\*\*

Esteban Chavez appeals the district court’s grant of Morgan Olson, LLC’s (Morgan) motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

1. We affirm the district court’s conclusion that Chavez failed to sufficiently allege a prima facie case for personal jurisdiction over Morgan. Assuming *arguendo* that Morgan purposefully availed itself of the privileges of conducting business in California, Chavez did not allege that his son’s injury either “arises out of or relates to [Morgan’s] forum-related activities.” *See Briskin v. Shopify, Inc.*, 135 F.4th 739, 750–51 (9th Cir. 2025) (quoting *Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374 F.3d 797, 802 (9th Cir. 2004)). Chavez did not show that his son’s injury arose out of Morgan’s contacts because he did not show that Morgan’s contacts were a but-for cause of his son’s injury. *See Yamashita v. LG Chem, Ltd.*, 62 F.4th 496, 506 (9th Cir. 2023). Nor did he show that Morgan’s contacts sufficiently relate to his son’s injury. *See Ford Motor Co. v. Mont. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 592 U.S. 351, 365 (2021) (holding that specific jurisdiction existed where the defendant “had systematically served a market in [the forum States] for the very vehicles that the plaintiffs allege malfunctioned and injured them in those States”). Chavez did not allege systematic

---

\*\*\* The Honorable William Horsley Orrick, United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, sitting by designation.

service of the California market by Morgan in promoting or servicing van bodies for Model MT45s such that Morgan's forum-related contacts would tend to cause the injury at issue.

2. The district court did not abuse its discretion when it denied jurisdictional discovery. "The district court's refusal to provide [jurisdictional] discovery will not be reversed except upon the clearest showing that denial of discovery results in actual and substantial prejudice to the complaining litigant." *Boschetto v. Hansing*, 539 F.3d 1011, 1020 (9th Cir. 2008) (citation modified). Chavez did not make such a showing. Chavez failed to demonstrate that permitting discovery regarding (a) "Morgan's knowledge about its direct and indirect vehicle sales for the California market," (b) its actions at the ACT Expos, or (c) its partnerships with California-based upfitters and electric auto makers would impact the determination that his claims do not arise out of or relate to Morgan's forum-related conduct. As a result, Chavez cannot show that the "denial of discovery results in actual and substantial prejudice" to him. *Id.* (quoting *Data Disc, Inc. v. Sys. Tech. Assocs., Inc.*, 557 F.2d 1280, 1285 n.1 (9th Cir. 1977)).

**AFFIRMED.**