

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 AQUARIAN FOUNDATION,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 BRUCE KIMBERLY LOWNDES, et al.,

14 Defendants.  
15

Case No. C19-1879RSM

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS  
ALLEN AND ANNE JENNE'S MOTION  
TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF PERSONAL  
JURISDICTION

16 This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Allen M. and Anne S. Jenne's  
17 Motion to Dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and failure to state a claim. Dkt. #67.  
18 Plaintiff Aquarian Foundation ("AF") opposes. Dkt. #78. Given the limited nature of this  
19 Motion, the Court has determined that the entire set of alleged facts need not be recited.  
20

21 As an initial matter, the Court finds that the instant Motion is procedurally proper given  
22 that these Defendants have not filed an Answer to AF's *Amended* Complaint, which was filed  
23 with leave of the Court during the briefing on this Motion. No party has asked for leave to re-  
24 brief these issues and the Court finds that such is entirely unnecessary given the limited  
25 changes to the Complaint's allegations against these Defendants. In any event, the Court could  
26 also convert Defendants' Rule 12(b)(6) Motion to a ruling on the pleadings under Rule 12(c)  
27  
28

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS ALLEN AND ANNE JENNE'S MOTION TO DISMISS

1 and adopt the analysis below under the identical standard. Again, this is unnecessary because  
2 of the filing of the Amended Complaint.

3 AF's 20-page Amended Complaint barely mentions these Defendants. Dkt. #73. It  
4 states that Defendant Allen Jenne "is a former Spiritual Leader of Plaintiff, and was removed  
5 for cause from Spiritual Leadership in the Church, **during which all of his privileges were**  
6 **revoked.**" Dkt. #73 at 4 (emphasis in original). He is alleged to have "willfully sponsored,  
7 assisted, supported, helped to conceal, and otherwise enable acts by [Defendant Bruce  
8 Kimberly Lowndes] herein." *Id.* Specifics are lacking. For example, Allen Jenne is accused of  
9 "continu[ing] to sympathetically communicate with and knowingly encourage and assist  
10 [Defendant Bruce Kimberly Lowndes], receiving select reports and invitations regarding  
11 [Lowndes's] anti-Aquarian activities and openly and knowingly encouraging them..." *Id.*  
12 Details on Anne Jenne are even more lacking. She is believed to have assisted Allen Jenne by  
13 participating in communications as described above. *Id.*

14  
15  
16 The Amended Complaint alleges that Defendants violated AF's copyrights and stole  
17 trade secrets by assisting Defendant Bruce Kimberly Lowndes as his "cohorts." According to  
18 AF, Bruce Kimberly Lowndes has "published on-line e-mails to his cohorts in which he  
19 describes how his cohorts must subvert Aquarian's published and unpublished works, and has  
20 named Defendants Allen and Anne Jenne [] in such e-mails." *Id.* at 10. AF alleges that Allen  
21 and Anne Jenne had access to copyrighted works "during a long period of time, and therefore,  
22 have either copied or taken copies that were entrusted to them, and ultimately provided to  
23 [Defendant Bruce Kimberly Lowndes], many of these items." *Id.* at 12. Later AF pleads that  
24 these Defendants converted its property by using mere labels and conclusions. *Id.* at 17.  
25  
26  
27  
28

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS ALLEN AND ANNE JENNE'S MOTION TO DISMISS

1 These Defendants have not lived in Washington State since 1975; they currently live in  
2 North Carolina. Dkts. #68 and #69. They deny having requested or acquired access to AF  
3 materials in or from the State of Washington since being excommunicated in 1999, or  
4 soliciting, advertising, or disseminating any AF information in this state. *Id.*

5 “In opposing a defendant’s motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, the  
6 plaintiff bears the burden of establishing that jurisdiction is proper.” *CollegeSource, Inc. v.*  
7 *AcademyOne, Inc.*, 653 F.3d 1066, 1073 (9th Cir. 2011). “Where, as here, the defendant’s  
8 motion is based on written materials rather than an evidentiary hearing, ‘the plaintiff need only  
9 make a *prima facie* showing of jurisdictional facts to withstand the motion to dismiss.’” *Id.*  
10 (quoting *Brayton Purcell LLP v. Recordon & Recordon*, 606 F.3d 1124, 1127 (9th Cir. 2010)).  
11 A plaintiff may not simply rest on the “bare allegations of [the] complaint.” *Schwarzenegger v.*  
12 *Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374 F.3d 797, 800 (9th Cir. 2004) (quoting *Amba Mktg. Sys., Inc. v.*  
13 *Jobar Int’l, Inc.*, 551 F.2d 784, 787 (9th Cir. 1977)). But uncontroverted allegations must be  
14 taken as true, and “[c]onflicts between parties over statements contained in affidavits must be  
15 resolved in the plaintiff’s favor.” *Id.*

16 Personal jurisdiction over a nonresident defendant is proper if permitted by a state’s  
17 long-arm statute and if the exercise of that jurisdiction does not violate federal due process.  
18 *Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Nat'l Bank of Coops.*, 103 F.3d 888, 893 (9th Cir. 1996). Since  
19 Washington’s long arm statute reaches only as far as the Due Process Clause, the Court need  
20 only analyze whether the exercise of jurisdiction would comply with due process. *Omeluk v.*  
21 *Langsten Slip & Batbyggeri A/S*, 52 F.3d 267, 269 (9th Cir. 1995). For the exercise of  
22 jurisdiction to satisfy due process, a nonresident defendant, if not present in the forum, must  
23 have “minimum contacts” with the forum such that the assertion of jurisdiction “does not  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS ALLEN AND ANNE JENNE'S MOTION TO DISMISS

1 offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.” *Int’l Shoe Co. v. Washington*,  
2 326 U.S. 310, 316, 66 S. Ct. 154, 90 L. Ed. 95 (1945) (internal quotation marks omitted). A  
3 federal district court may exercise either general or specific personal jurisdiction. *See*  
4 *Helicopteros Nacionales de Colombia, S.A. v. Hall*, 466 U.S. 408, 414-15, 104 S. Ct. 1868, 80  
5 L. Ed. 2d 404 (1984). To establish general jurisdiction, the plaintiff must demonstrate that the  
6 defendant has sufficient contacts to “constitute the kind of continuous and systematic general  
7 business contacts that approximate physical presence.” *Glencore Grain Rotterdam B.V. v.*  
8 *Shivnath Rai Harnarain Co.*, 284 F.3d 1114, 1124 (9th Cir. 2002) (internal quotation marks  
9 omitted). This court uses the following three-part test to analyze whether a party’s “minimum  
10 contacts” meet the due process standard for the exercise of specific personal jurisdiction: (1)  
11 The non-resident defendant must purposefully direct his activities or consummate some  
12 transaction with the forum or resident thereof; or perform some act by which he purposefully  
13 avails himself of the privilege of conducting activities in the forum, thereby invoking the  
14 benefits and protections of its laws; (2) the claim must be one which arises out of or relates to  
15 the defendant’s forum-related activities; and (3) the exercise of jurisdiction must comport with  
16 fair play and substantial justice, *i.e.* it must be reasonable. *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d at 802.  
17 “If any of the three requirements is not satisfied, jurisdiction in the forum would deprive the  
18 defendant of due process of law.” *Omeluk v. Langsten Slip & Batbyggeri A/S*, 52 F.3d 267, 270  
19 (9th Cir. 1995). While all three requirements must be met, this court has stated that in its  
20 consideration of the first two prongs, “[a] strong showing on one axis will permit a lesser  
21 showing on the other.” *Yahoo! Inc. v. La Ligue Contre Le Racisme Et L’Antisemitisme*, 433  
22 F.3d 1199, 1210 (9th Cir. 2006) (en banc).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS ALLEN AND ANNE JENNE'S MOTION TO DISMISS

1 AF claims it has made a prima facie case of general personal jurisdiction based on the  
2 fact that these Defendants' continuously lived in Washington until 1975 and did business in this  
3 state up until 1999 when they were excommunicated. Dkt. #78 at 9–11. The Court finds that  
4 living in this state 45 years ago cannot serve as the sole basis for continuing general personal  
5 jurisdiction in perpetuity. The allegations of business dealings in this state are entirely too  
6 vague to show continuous business contacts, and in any event appear to have stopped over 20  
7 years ago. Accordingly, the Court finds Plaintiffs have failed to establish a prima facie case of  
8 general personal jurisdiction.  
9

10 As for specific personal jurisdiction, AF argues:

11 Aquarian's claims arise out of or result from defendant Jenne's  
12 forum-related activities. They became trusted agents, helped to  
13 create and acquire the copyrighted works that are the subject of  
14 this litigation, applied for and received funds from Seattle to  
15 develop such works in the 1980's and held the responsibility to  
16 safeguard these works for Seattle from 1977—1999 in New York.  
17 Their position, their knowledges, and their career as agents of  
18 Aquarian of Seattle were all forum-related activities. Only through  
19 those activities did they obtain access to and possession of  
20 copyrighted and secret works of Aquarian, including some of the  
21 oldest and rarest.

22 Dkt. #78 at 13. Attached declarations to AF's briefing indicate that Anne Jenne is a Facebook  
23 friend of Defendant Bruce Kimberly Lowndes, and that her name has been included in an email  
24 as part of Lowndes's "team." See Dkt. #79. As the Court has become well aware, Defendant  
25 Lowndes lives and operates out of Tasmania. See Docket.

26 The Court finds that the alleged facts and the other similarly deficient facts in AF's  
27 briefing fail to make a prima facie case for specific personal jurisdiction. AF's claims do not  
28 arise from Defendants' lawful handling of copyrighted materials in Washington State several  
decades ago. The allegations of what these Defendants have done in violation of copyright law

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS ALLEN AND ANNE JENNE'S MOTION TO DISMISS

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.