

1 Bradley W. Madsen  
Nevada Bar No. 11644  
2 MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP  
2750 East Cottonwood Parkway, Suite 560  
3 Cottonwood Heights, UT 84121<sup>1</sup>  
Telephone: 801.833.0500  
4 Facsimile: 801.931.2500  
bwmadsen@michaelbest.com

5 *Attorney for Plaintiffs Krishna Okhandiar*  
6 *and Remilia Corporation LLC*

7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

9 KRISHNA OKHANDIAR, an individual,  
10 and REMILIA CORPORATION LLC, a  
11 Delaware limited liability company,  
12  
13 Plaintiffs,

Case No.: 2:23-cv-1409

14 v.

**COMPLAINT**

15 JOHN DUFF III, an individual,  
16 HENRY SMITH, an individual, and  
17 MAXWELL ROUX, an individual,  
18  
19 Defendants.

20 Plaintiffs Krishna Okhandiar and Remilia Corporation LLC, by and through their  
21 undersigned counsel, hereby complain against Defendants John Duff III, Henry Smith, and  
22 Maxwell Roux and for causes of action allege as follows:  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 <sup>1</sup> Pursuant to LR 11-1(b), attorney Jonathan Heaton is designated for local service at address  
28 7285 Dean Martin Dr. Ste 180, Las Vegas, NV 89118.

**PARTIES**

1  
2 1. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff Krishna Okhandiar is and was a citizen and  
3 resident of the State of Nevada. Krishna Okhandiar is also known, predominantly in internet  
4 contexts, by numerous aliases including “Charlotte Fang,” and “Charlie Fang.”

5 2. Plaintiff Remilia Corporation LLC (collectively, with Plaintiff Krishna Okhandiar,  
6 “Remilia”) is and was a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the  
7 State of Delaware with its principal place of business at 89 Arthur Hills Ct, Last Vegas, Nevada  
8 89074.

9  
10 3. At all times since its formation in July 2022, Okhandiar is and was the CEO and  
11 sole member of Remilia Corporation LLC.

12 4. Defendant John Duff III is an individual who, upon information and belief, is a  
13 citizen and resident of the State of New York. Defendant Duff is also known, predominantly in  
14 internet contexts, by numerous aliases including “ccc,” “ccccea,” “ywwv” and “ika.”

15  
16 5. Defendant Henry Smith is an individual who, upon information and belief, is a  
17 citizen and resident of New Zealand. Defendant Smith is also known, predominantly in internet  
18 contexts, by numerous aliases including “Sprite,” “Sonora Milady,” and “Nijino Saki.”

19 6. Defendant Maxwell Roux is an individual who, upon information and belief, is a  
20 citizen and resident of the State of Montana. Defendant Roux is also known, predominantly in  
21 internet contexts, by numerous aliases including “Reginald,” “Q,” “Hiro,” and “Peabody.”

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

22  
23  
24 7. The adverse parties are citizens of different States and of a foreign state, and the  
25 amount in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000, exclusive of interests and costs.

26 8. Remilia asserts causes of action arising under federal statutes and asserts other  
27  
28

1 causes of action that are related to, and form part of the same case or controversy as, the federal  
2 causes of action.

3 9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §  
4 1331 (federal question), 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (diversity of citizenship), and/or 28 U.S.C. § 1367  
5 (supplemental jurisdiction).

6 10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants  
7 purposely directed their activities toward Nevada, including by, without limitation, purposely  
8 agreeing to perform work as independent contractors for a business that conducts operations in  
9 Nevada, forming a conspiracy to seize control of virtual servers used for a business operating from  
10 Nevada and purchased by the business from Nevada, and furthering the goals of the conspiracy by  
11 causing extortive demands and communications about those demands to be sent to Remilia in  
12 Nevada.  
13 Nevada.

14 11. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391, as a substantial part of the  
15 events giving rise to the claims occurred in this District.  
16

17 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

18 12. In January 2021, Okhandiar formed a digital-art- and NFT-related business that  
19 publicly became known under the trade name Remilia.

20 13. Since its inception, Remilia has remained under Okhandiar's sole direction and  
21 leadership, a fact well-known and often acknowledged by Defendants, until now.  
22

23 14. In April 2019, Okhandiar created an account with DigitalOcean, a cloud-based data  
24 hosting and service provider, and in January 2021 began to pay for DigitalOcean virtual servers to  
25 host Remilia's digital assets, including, but not limited to, Remilia's merchant site data, digital art,  
26 codebase, and other intellectual property.  
27  
28

1           15.     Since its creation, the DigitalOcean account has been associated with Okhandiar's  
2 former residence in Illinois and now his current residence in Nevada, as well as with his personal  
3 email address.

4           16.     The monthly bills for the DigitalOcean virtual servers used for Remilia's business  
5 have always been sent by email to Okhandiar's personal email address and/or by mail to  
6 Okhandiar's home addresses.

7           17.     The monthly bills for the DigitalOcean virtual servers used for Remilia's business  
8 have always been paid from Okhandiar's personal accounts.

9           18.     In connection with its business, Remilia has established a number of accounts with  
10 social media platforms, including Instagram and Twitter, to market or otherwise promote its  
11 business.  
12

13           19.     In 2021, Defendant Smith began to perform work for Remilia as an independent  
14 contractor in the role of artist.  
15

16           20.     In 2022, Defendant Smith continued performing work for Remilia as an  
17 independent contractor in a new role as creative director.

18           21.     In connection with his work for Remilia, Defendant Smith executed a  
19 Confidentiality and Non-disclosure Undertaking on November 16, 2022 (the "Smith NDA"),  
20 which identifies Plaintiff Remilia Corporation LLC as the "Discloser" and Defendant Smith as the  
21 "Recipient."  
22

23           22.     In the Smith NDA, Defendant Smith agreed that:

24                   (a)     all rights, title and interest in any Intellectual Property,<sup>[2]</sup> and  
25                   any improvements thereto, that the Recipient conceives, develops, invents,

---

26 <sup>2</sup> The Smith NDA defines Intellectual Property to mean: "Confidential Information, copyright works, trademarks,  
27 industrial designs, design rights, inventions (whether patentable or not), unpublished patent applications, inventive  
28 ideas, discoveries, innovations, developments, or improvements thereto, or any other intellectual property rights  
relating to any of the foregoing, whether registered or non-registered, whether or not reduced to written form or

1 authors, creates or contributes to the creation or improvement of, in whole  
2 or in part, during the term of the Recipient's services are, will be and shall  
remain the exclusive property of the Discloser; and

3 (b) the Recipient shall have no interest in any Intellectual  
4 Property, and any other form of intellectual property, notwithstanding that  
5 the Recipient may have conceived, developed, authored, created or  
6 contributed to the creation or improvement of the same, solely or jointly  
with others at any time during the term of the Recipient's services.

7 23. In the Smith NDA, Defendant Smith further agreed that:

8 Upon the request of the Discloser, the Recipient shall, within seven (7) days  
9 of such request from the Discloser, either destroy and delete from any  
10 server, device or platform, all Confidential Information or return to the  
Discloser all Confidential Information, including all Copies thereof.

11 24. In the Smith NDA, Defendant Smith also agreed that:

12 The Recipient shall . . . not copy, scrape, extract, photocopy, store, copy and  
13 paste, or share, like, post or tweet screenshots from desktop, tablet or mobile  
14 devices, or otherwise reproduce, without the prior express written  
permission of the Discloser, any of the Confidential Information.

15 25. In December 2020, Defendant Duff met with Okhandiar in Nevada where he was  
16 first informed about Okhandiar's intentions to start Remilia and discussed a potential position to  
17 perform work for Remilia.

18 26. In 2021, Defendant Duff began to perform work for Remilia as an independent  
19 contractor in the role of smart contract developer.

20  
21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 practice, within the scope of the Discloser's business activities and the Services rendered." In turn, Confidential  
24 Information includes "all information, business strategies, plans, ongoing discussions and commitments, data,  
25 documents, agreements, files and other materials in whatever form (including, without limitation, in written, oral,  
26 visual or electronic or digital form in or on any media or platform), which is disclosed or otherwise furnished by the  
27 Discloser to the Recipient, or created, owned or controlled by the Discloser, whether or not such information is marked  
28 confidential, that relates directly or indirectly to the Discloser's business, products, services, suppliers, and trade  
secrets, overall strategy, or personal information relating to anonymous or other individuals" as well as "all or any  
portion of analysis, notations, plans, compilations, reports, forecasts, studies, samples, statistics, summaries,  
interpretations and other documents created, developed, prepared, received, obtained, or generated or derived from  
such information, data, documents, agreements, files or other materials by the Recipient in connection with the  
Services[.]"

1 27. In 2022, Defendant Duff continued performing work for Remilia as an  
2 independent contractor in a new role as director of software development.

3 28. In connection with his work for Remilia, Defendant Duff executed a Confidentiality  
4 and Non-disclosure Undertaking on December 28, 2022 (the “Duff NDA”), which identifies  
5 Plaintiff Remilia Corporation LLC as the “Discloser” and Defendant Duff as the “Recipient.”

6 29. In the Duff NDA, Defendant Duff agreed that:

7  
8 a. all rights, title and interest in any Intellectual Property,<sup>[3]</sup> and  
9 any improvements thereto, that the Recipient conceives, develops, invents,  
10 authors, creates or contributes to the creation or improvement of, in whole  
or in part, during the term of the Recipient’s services are, will be and shall  
remain the exclusive property of the Discloser; and

11 b. the Recipient shall have no interest in any Intellectual  
12 Property, and any other form of intellectual property, notwithstanding that  
13 the Recipient may have conceived, developed, authored, created or  
14 contributed to the creation or improvement of the same, solely or jointly  
with others at any time during the term of the Recipient’s services.

15 30. In the Duff NDA, Defendant Duff further agreed that:

16 Upon the request of the Discloser, the Recipient shall, within seven (7) days  
17 of such request from the Discloser, either destroy and delete from any  
server, device or platform, all Confidential Information or return to the  
18 Discloser all Confidential Information, including all Copies thereof.

19 31. In the Duff NDA, Defendant Duff also agreed that:

20 The Recipient shall . . . not copy, scrape, extract, photocopy, store, copy and  
21 paste, or share, like, post or tweet screenshots from desktop, tablet or mobile  
22 devices, or otherwise reproduce, without the prior express written  
permission of the Discloser, any of the Confidential Information.

23 32. In connection with his work for Remilia, Defendant Duff executed a Letter of Intent  
24 on December 28, 2022 (the “Duff LOI”) with Plaintiff Remilia Corporation LLC.

25 33. In the Duff LOI, Defendant Duff agreed that:

26  
27 <sup>3</sup> The Duff NDA’s definitions of Intellectual Property and Confidential Information are the same those of the Smith  
28 NDA.

1 All intellectual property created in the course of fulfilling the obligations  
2 included in the Role and Commitment sections above, as well as intellectual  
3 property created using Remilia resources, are the absolute property of  
4 Remilia, and by operating under this Letter of Intent as an employee, you  
5 agree to vest all such intellectual property in Remilia. For the purposes  
6 hereinabove, the CEO of Remilia is granted the power to sign and execute  
7 any instruments necessary to vest such intellectual property in Remilia.

8 34. In 2022, Defendant Roux first engaged with Remilia on a project basis as an  
9 independent contractor in the role of project manager.

10 35. In September 2022, Defendant Roux began to perform work for Remilia as an  
11 independent contractor in the role of gaming analyst.

12 36. In connection with his work for Remilia, Defendant Roux executed a  
13 Confidentiality and Non-disclosure Undertaking on November 16, 2022 (the “Roux NDA”), which  
14 identifies Plaintiff Remilia Corporation LLC as the “Discloser” and Defendant Roux as the  
15 “Recipient.”

16 37. In the Roux NDA, Defendant Roux agreed that:

17 a. all rights, title and interest in any Intellectual Property,<sup>[4]</sup> and  
18 any improvements thereto, that the Recipient conceives, develops, invents,  
19 authors, creates or contributes to the creation or improvement of, in whole  
20 or in part, during the term of the Recipient’s services are, will be and shall  
21 remain the exclusive property of the Discloser; and

22 b. the Recipient shall have no interest in any Intellectual  
23 Property, and any other form of intellectual property, notwithstanding that  
24 the Recipient may have conceived, developed, authored, created or  
25 contributed to the creation or improvement of the same, solely or jointly  
26 with others at any time during the term of the Recipient’s services.

27 38. In the Roux NDA, Defendant Roux further agreed that:

28 Upon the request of the Discloser, the Recipient shall, within seven (7) days  
of such request from the Discloser, either destroy and delete from any  
server, device or platform, all Confidential Information or return to the  
Discloser all Confidential Information, including all Copies thereof.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Roux NDA’s definitions of Intellectual Property and Confidential Information are the same those of the Smith NDA.

1 39. In the Roux NDA, Defendant Roux also agreed that:

2 The Recipient shall not copy, scrape, extract, photocopy, store, copy and  
3 paste, or share, like, post or tweet screenshots from desktop, tablet or mobile  
4 devices, or otherwise reproduce, without the prior express written  
5 permission of the Discloser, any of the Confidential Information.

6 40. In the independent-contractor relationships between Defendants and Remilia, each  
7 Defendant agreed to receive consulting fees for his work.

8 41. At no time during the negotiation of any contract with Remilia did any Defendant  
9 attempt to negotiate any equity share in Remilia in lieu of the consulting fee each Defendant agreed  
10 to receive.

11 42. Contrary to any claim that Defendants sought equity shares in Remilia while  
12 negotiating their contracts due their belief in Remilia's values and continued success, Defendants  
13 agreed to cash payments without any complaint or hesitation.

14 43. Contrary to any claim that Defendants agreed to lower cash payment in the  
15 expectation of receiving equity shares, the cash payments Defendants received were above the  
16 going market rates for the roles they agreed to perform in view of their work experience at the  
17 time.

18 44. Upon information and belief, no Defendant had any professional work experience  
19 or management experience prior to their roles with Remilia.

20 45. When each Defendant took on a management role, each failed to perform at an  
21 adequate level. Due to poor performance in management, each Defendant was then placed into an  
22 individual contributor role. At the time of the complaint, no Defendant managed any Remilia  
23 personnel who reported directly to them.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



1           46. Each Defendant received consulting fees as agreed despite their demotion in  
2 responsibility.

3           47. In approximately March 2023, Remilia informed Defendant Roux of plans to raise  
4 capital for additional projects and endeavors of Remilia.

5           48. In response to learning of plans to raise capital, Defendant Roux expressed his  
6 opinion that he and the other Defendants deserved greater compensation.

7           49. In April 2023, Defendants, including Roux, attended an event organized by Remilia  
8 in Tokyo, Japan, known as “Remilia Con.” The event occurred on April 14 and 15, 2023, with  
9 Defendants arriving in Tokyo before and staying after the event.  
10

11           50. Defendants met and communicated in private during Remilia Con and, on  
12 information and belief, used their time together to coordinate and agree to the activities described  
13 hereinafter.

14           51. While in Tokyo and at other times through apps and electronic devices that  
15 Defendants commonly used to communicate with each other and others, Defendants and others  
16 jointly agreed to commit the torts against Remilia described herein, forming or joining a  
17 conspiracy.  
18

19           52. In April 2023, near the time of Defendants’ meetings in Tokyo during Remilia Con,  
20 Defendant Duff surreptitiously and wrongfully seized control of specific Remilia NFT assets by  
21 knowingly exceeding the limited business access and authority granted to him by Remilia and in  
22 violation of his duties under the aforementioned agreements.  
23

24           53. Defendant Duff’s surreptitious and wrongful seizure included taking technical  
25 measures to cause the revenue produced by Remilia’s NFT assets to be delivered to an account  
26 (i.e., a “wallet”) subject to his control and not Remilia’s control.  
27  
28

1           54.     Because Defendant Duff took steps to conceal his actions, Remilia was unaware  
2 until September 2023 that Defendant Duff had surreptitiously and wrongfully seized control of  
3 Remilia’s NFT assets by causing the revenue produced by the assets to be delivered to an account  
4 or wallet subject to his control and not Remilia’s control.

5           55.     In approximately July 2023, Defendant Roux acknowledged to Remilia personnel  
6 that he had disclosed to others Remilia’s plans to raise capital, despite being directed to keep the  
7 information confidential.

8           56.     On August 21, 2023, at approximately 6:00 P.M. EDT, Remilia personnel  
9 discovered that an unknown person had seized control of one of Remilia’s Twitter accounts, called  
10 the Milady Maker Twitter account and known by the identifier “@miladymaker.”

11           57.     The person seized control of the Milady Maker Twitter account by changing the  
12 account’s login information and logging out Remilia personnel without authorization, which  
13 prevented Remilia personnel responsible for the account from accessing it.

14           58.     Soon thereafter, Remilia personnel began investigating the incident and  
15 implementing security procedures, including by, among other things, assessing the status of  
16 Remilia’s other social media accounts.

17           59.     During the investigation, Remilia personnel became aware of attempts, occurring  
18 around the same time, by an unknown person to seize control of several other of Remilia’s social  
19 media accounts, including Remilia’s Instagram account (known by the identifier “@remiliaco”),  
20 its Soundcloud account (known by the identifier “remiliaco”), its Bonkler Twitter account (known  
21 by the identifier “@BonklerNFT”), and its Remilio Twitter account (known by the identifier  
22 “@Remilionaire), using the same or a similar method.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           60.     During the investigation, Remilia personnel obtained records from Instagram  
2 showing that the person attempting to seize control of Remilia’s Remiliaco Instagram account had  
3 attempted to change the email address associated with the account to the personal email address  
4 of Defendant Smith without authorization.

5           61.     The personal email address described above was known by Remilia personnel to  
6 belong to Defendant Smith and contains one of Defendant Smith’s aliases.

7           62.     During the investigation, Remilia personnel obtained records from Twitter showing  
8 that the person attempting to seize control of Remilia’s Bonkler account had attempted to change  
9 the email address associated with the account to the personal email address of Defendant Smith  
10 and that the attempts to initiate the account changes originated from an IP address located in New  
11 Zealand, where Defendant Smith resides.

12           63.     During the investigation, Remilia personnel obtained records from its email  
13 provider showing that Defendant Smith had attempted to change the password associated with the  
14 Remilia Soundcloud account without authorization.

15           64.     Remilia personnel were able to re-obtain access to the Bonkler Twitter and Remilia  
16 Soundcloud through their support systems, but lost control of the Milady Maker Twitter, Remilio  
17 Twitter, and Remiliaco Instagram, the primary social media of the business.

18           65.     Due to the seizure in whole or in part of Remilia’s social media accounts in the  
19 manner described above, Remilia has lost, among other things, operational control over its social  
20 media marketing and presence.

21           66.     The seizure in whole or in part of Remilia’s social media accounts required the  
22 involved Defendants to knowingly and intentionally exceed the scope of the limited business  
23 access and authorization to those accounts that they had been granted by Remilia.

1           67.    On August 22, at approximately 2:30 P.M. EDT, Remilia personnel also became  
2 aware that an unknown person had seized control of Remilia’s GitHub software-development  
3 account.

4           68.    Soon thereafter, Remilia personnel began investigating the incident and  
5 implementing additional security procedures, including by, among other things, assessing or re-  
6 assessing the status of Remilia’s software-development accounts and assets.

7           69.    During the investigation, Remilia personnel became aware that an unknown person  
8 had also seized control of multiple servers hosted on Remilia’s DigitalOcean virtual server  
9 account.  
10

11           70.    During the investigation, Remilia personnel obtained records from DigitalOcean  
12 showing that, on Sunday, August 20, 2023, at approximately 8:30 P.M. EDT, the person had  
13 commenced copying the virtual servers and had then transferred copies of the files stored on the  
14 servers to a separate account.  
15

16           71.    The DigitalOcean records showed that the person who had copied the virtual  
17 servers had accessed the account using Defendant Duff’s alias, ccccaa.

18           72.    The DigitalOcean records also showed that the separate account to which the person  
19 had transferred the copied virtual servers and affiliated files was associated with the personal email  
20 address of Defendant Duff.  
21

22           73.    The personal email address described above was known by Remilia personnel to  
23 belong to Defendant Duff and contains one of Defendant Duff’s aliases.

24           74.    The DigitalOcean records further showed that about six hours later, on August 21,  
25 2023, at approximately 2:30 A.M. EDT, the person who had copied the virtual server and  
26  
27  
28

1 transferred the copies commenced destroying the server files in Remilia’s account that had been  
2 copied and transferred.

3 75. The DigitalOcean records also showed that the person who had destroyed the  
4 virtual server files had accessed the account using Defendant Duff’s alias, ccccaa.

5 76. The day following the seizure of the Remilia’s DigitalOcean virtual server, August  
6 22, 2023, the head of Remilia’s project management office (“PMO”) had been scheduled to meet  
7 with Defendant Duff to conduct an audit of security practices employed by Defendant Duff.  
8

9 77. Defendant Duff failed to attend the scheduled meeting.

10 78. Defendant Duff’s seizure of Remilia’s Digital Ocean virtual server, described  
11 above, required Defendant duff to knowingly exceed the limited business access and authorization  
12 to protected computers granted to him by Remilia.

13 79. Due to the seizure of Remilia’s DigitalOcean virtual server, as well as the seizure  
14 in whole or in part of Remilia’s other software-development accounts and assets, in the manner  
15 described above, Remilia has lost, among other things, operational control over its codebases for  
16 its active and in-development projects and over its NFT merchant site.  
17

18 80. From the evening of August 21, 2023, when Remilia personnel first became aware  
19 of efforts to seize control of its accounts and assets, to the evening of August 22, 2023, Remilia  
20 personnel engaged in numerous attempts to communicate with Defendant Smith and Defendant  
21 Duff using the apps through which Remilia personnel had normally communicated with them.  
22

23 81. Neither Defendant Smith nor Defendant Duff responded to the attempted  
24 communications, despite the apps showing that both Defendant Smith and Defendant Duff had  
25 read or seen many of the attempts to message or call them.  
26  
27  
28

1           82. After reading several messages from Remilia personnel without responding,  
2 Defendant Smith changed the settings on one of his apps so that he could no longer be contacted.

3           83. Both Defendant Smith's and Defendant Duff's personal social media accounts  
4 show that they were actively online and using the very same apps through which Remilia personnel  
5 attempted to communicate with them at or near the time of Remilia' personnel's numerous  
6 attempts to communicate with them.

7           84. On August 22, 2023, at approximately 9:30 P.M. EDT, Remilia personnel  
8 attempted to communicate with Defendant Roux via the app normally used to do so regarding the  
9 seizure of Remilia's accounts and assets, but Defendant Roux did not respond despite the app  
10 showing that Defendant Roux had read message sent to him.

11           85. At this time, it became clear Defendant Roux had also wrongfully seized control of  
12 the social media account assigned to him and that he did so by knowingly exceeding the limited  
13 business authorization and access granted to him by Remilia.

14           86. On August 23, 2023, at approximately 2:30 A.M. EDT, hours after Okhandiar and  
15 other Remilia personnel had messaged him regarding the seizure of Remilia's assets and accounts,  
16 Defendant Duff finally responded by sending a text message to Okhandiar in Nevada directing  
17 him to check his Remilia email account.

18           87. The only relevant email that had been received recently in the email account was  
19 an email from Defendant Duff's attorney, Jonathan Hersey.

20           88. Remilia received the email on August 22, 2023, at approximately 7:18 P.M. EDT,  
21 roughly only 48 hours after the DigitalOcean virtual servers had been copied, transferred, and  
22 destroyed from Remilia's account and only approximately 12 hours after Remilia personnel first  
23 became aware of attempts to seize control of Remilia's accounts and assets.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           89. Attached to the Hersey Email was a letter to Remilia from Jonathan Hersey, an  
2 attorney, on behalf of Defendant Smith, Defendant Duff, Defendant Roux, and Bruno Nispel,  
3 demanding, among other things, that Remilia give each of them varying amounts of additional  
4 compensation, appoint each of them executive officers and board members of an entity controlling  
5 Remilia’s business, issue to each of them shares in that entity totaling 80% of its equity, and  
6 transfer all Remilia’s assets to that entity (the “Demand Letter”).  
7

8           90. The Demand Letter gave Remilia until 12:00 P.M. EDT, on August 25, 2023—less  
9 than 3 days—to respond Defendants’ and Mr. Nispel’s demands.

10           91. On August 23, 2023, Defendant Duff caused the revenue produced by Remilia’s  
11 NFT assets that he had surreptitiously and wrongfully seized control of in April 2023 to be  
12 delivered to a different account or wallet subject to his control and not Remilia’s control.

13           92. On information and belief, Defendant Duff caused the revenue to be delivered to a  
14 different account or wallet because of his concern that Remilia would take steps to obtain access  
15 to and control of the initial account or wallet to which Defendant Duff had caused the revenue to  
16 be delivered in April 2023.  
17

18           93. Because Defendant Duff took steps to conceal his actions, Remilia was unaware  
19 until September 2023 that Defendant Duff had surreptitiously and wrongfully seized control of  
20 Remilia’s NFT assets by causing the revenue produced by the assets to be delivered to accounts  
21 or wallets subject to his control and not Remilia’s control.  
22

23           94. On August 24, 2023, the day before the demand letter’s deadline, Defendant Duff  
24 removed all Remilia personnel’s access to the seized codebases and informed Remilia personnel  
25 in group chats that projects and chat groups related to the codebases were temporarily disbanded.  
26  
27  
28

1 95. Also on August 24, 2023, Defendant Duff corresponded with one of two lead  
2 project managers contracted to Remilia and instructed him to ignore any directions from Remilia  
3 through Okhandiar and falsely informed him that Okhandiar was not the sole member and a chief  
4 officer of Remilia Corporation, LLC.

5 96. Remilia did not respond by the deadline stated in the Demand Letter.

6 97. On August 25, 2023, at or about 12:09 P.M. EDT—only minutes after the  
7 deadline— Remilia learned that the virtual server hosting one of Remilia’s live digital products,  
8 which had previously been seized by Defendant Duff, was shut down.  
9

10 98. During the time the virtual server was shut down, and before Remilia’s counsel had  
11 contacted Mr. Hersey, one of the social media accounts that Defendant Smith had previously  
12 seized, was used to post a message subtly referring to the Demand Letter.

13 99. Specifically, on August 25, 2023, at approximately 1:30 P.M. EDT, the Milady  
14 Maker Twitter account posted a message displaying art associated with one of Remilia’s NFT  
15 projects, along with text reading “Celebrating the start of Milady as NFT by celebrating what came  
16 first. Celebrating her by celebrating what’s next.”  
17

18 100. The image posted to the Milady Maker Twitter account on August 25, 2023, was  
19 identical to an image included in the Demand Letter. Additionally, the Demand letter included  
20 language describing the same image as being the “original,” “first created,” and “most valuable.”  
21

22 101. The post to Twitter and its references to the contents of the Demand Letter, along  
23 with the circumstance of the virtual server being shut down, were intended to communicate to  
24 Remilia that if the requests of the Demand Letter were not met, the Defendants would continue to  
25 exert their control over Remilia’s assets to the detriment of Remilia’s operations.  
26  
27  
28



1           102. Following the shutdown of the virtual server, counsel for Remilia contacted Mr.  
2 Hersey stating that Remilia planned to reply to the Demand Letter in due course.

3           103. Within hours after Remilia’s counsel contacted Mr. Hersey, the virtual server that  
4 had been shut down became fully active again.

5           104. On August 28, 2023, Defendant Duff again sent a text message to Okhandiar in  
6 Nevada, stating that Defendants and Mr. Nispel were waiting for a response to the Demand Letter  
7 and further threatening to make the issues raised in the Demand Letter public.  
8

9           105. Due to the seizure of Remilia’s servers, codebases, intellectual property and social  
10 media accounts, Remilia has been forced to freeze business operations since August 20, 2023,  
11 including all active software development and all primary social media.

12           106. Due to the seizure of Remilia’s accounts and assets described above, Remilia has  
13 been forced to cancel or diminish public, customer- and investor-facing events, partnerships and  
14 product launches that had long been planned, resulting in harm to Remilia’s reputation and good  
15 will and other harm in the form of expenditure of resources that cannot be regained.  
16

17           107. Upon information and belief, Defendants were aware that Remilia was about to  
18 engage in a substantial fundraising effort, and Defendants timed their actions to increase the risk  
19 of financial injury to Remilia and to thereby obtain additional leverage to coerce Remilia to accede  
20 to the demands made in the Demand Letter.

21           108. Defendants’ scheme to seize and hold hostage Remilia’s accounts and assets, as  
22 described above, has caused, and, if permitted to continue, will cause further, irreparable damage  
23 and injury to Remilia in myriad ways by, among other things, harming Remilia’s reputation and  
24 good will with customers and investors, decreasing the value of its digital-art- and NFT-related  
25 products, and depriving it of the exclusive use of its property.  
26  
27  
28

**COUNT I**  
**Conversion**

1  
2 109. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of  
3 this Complaint by reference into this Count as if fully set forth herein.  
4

5 110. Defendants committed distinct acts of dominion wrongfully exerted over Remilia's  
6 personal property by, including without limitation, accessing Remilia's accounts and assets for the  
7 purpose of seizing exclusive control over them; seizing exclusive control over Remilia's accounts  
8 and assets; preventing Remilia personnel from accessing Remilia's accounts, assets, or data  
9 contained therein; copying data contained in Remilia's accounts or assets; transferring data from  
10 Remilia's accounts or assets to other locations; removing, deleting, or otherwise destroying data  
11 contained in Remilia's accounts or assets; using Remilia's accounts or assets to engage in an  
12 extortionate scheme; and using Remilia's accounts or assets to cease, interrupt, or control  
13 Remilia's business operations.  
14

15 111. Defendants' acts were in denial of, or inconsistent with, the Remilia's title or rights  
16 in the accounts and assets.

17 112. Defendants' acts were in derogation, exclusion, or defiance of Remilia's title or  
18 rights in the accounts and assets.  
19

20 **COUNT II**  
**Trespass to Chattels**

21 113. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of  
22 this Complaint by reference into this Count as if fully set forth herein.  
23

24 114. Defendants intentionally used, intermeddled with, and dispossessed Remilia of,  
25 Remilia's chattels, including, without limitation, Remilia's accounts and assets described herein,  
26 and the data contained therein.  
27  
28

1 115. Defendants dispossessed Remilia of chattels by, among other things, seizing  
2 Remilia's chattels without Remilia's consent, barring Remilia's access to Remilia's chattels, and  
3 destroying Remilia's chattels that were in Remilia's possession.

4 116. The condition, quality, and value of Remilia's chattels have been impaired by  
5 Defendants' trespass.

6 117. Remilia is entitled to immediate possession of Remilia's chattels.

7  
8 118. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions, Remilia has been deprived  
9 of the use of Remilia's chattels for a substantial time and continues to be so deprived.

10 **COUNT III**

11 **Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage**

12 119. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of  
13 this Complaint by reference into this Count as if fully set forth herein.

14 120. At the time Defendants' seized Remilia's accounts and assets, Remilia had  
15 prospective contractual business relationships with third parties, including, among others,  
16 investors Remilia was in the process of approaching in a substantial fundraising effort.

17 121. Upon information and belief, Defendant knew Remilia was commencing  
18 substantial fundraising efforts and coordinated their seizure of Remilia's accounts and assets to  
19 occur at a time when doing so would impose significant leverage on Remilia to accede to  
20 Defendants' demands.

21  
22 122. Upon information and belief, Defendants intended to harm Remilia by preventing  
23 Remilia from entering some of its contractual business relationships in furtherance of Defendants'  
24 plan to exert pressure on Remilia to accede to Defendants' demands.

25 123. There was no privilege or justification for Defendants' actions.

26  
27 124. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions, Remilia has been prevented  
28

1 from and has been forced to discontinue engaging in the planned substantial fundraising efforts,  
2 has been prevented from entering contractual business relationships with potential investors and  
3 others, and has been further damaged to the extent Remilia incurred costs commencing fundraising  
4 activities that it has been forced to discontinue.

5  
6 **COUNT IV**  
**Breach of Contract**

7 125. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of  
8 this Complaint by reference into this Count as if fully set forth herein.

9 126. Valid contracts exist between each Defendant and Remilia, including, without  
10 limitation, the Smith NDA, the Duff NDA, the Duff LOI, and the Roux NDA.

11 127. The Smith NDA is a binding and enforceable contract between Defendant Smith  
12 and Remilia.

13 128. The Duff NDA is a binding and enforceable contract between Defendant Duff and  
14 Remilia.

15 129. The Duff LOI is a binding and enforceable contract between Defendant Duff and  
16 Remilia.

17 130. The Roux NDA is a binding and enforceable contract between Defendant Roux and  
18 Remilia.

19 131. Defendants breached the contracts between them, individually, on the one hand and  
20 Remilia on the other hand by, among other things, asserting, seizing, and attempting to seize rights,  
21 title, and interest in Remilia's Intellectual Property, as defined by the relevant contracts; failing to  
22 vest in Remilia intellectual property created using Remilia resources and instead vesting or  
23 attempting to vest that intellectual property in another; copying, extracting, storing, copying-and-  
24 pasting, or reproducing Confidential Information, as defined by the relevant contracts, without  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 authorization; and refusing to destroy, delete, or return Confidential Information, as defined by the  
2 relevant contracts, and copies thereof.

3 132. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breaches, Remilia has incurred,  
4 and is continuing to incur, damages in an amount to be proven at trial, but in any event no less  
5 than the value of accounts and assets Defendants have seized, which is well in excess of \$75,000  
6 exclusive of interest and costs.

7  
8 **COUNT V**

9 **Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing**

10 133. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of  
11 this Complaint by reference into this Count as if fully set forth herein.

12 134. Valid contracts exist between each Defendant and Remilia, including, without  
13 limitation, the Smith NDA, the Duff NDA, the Duff LOI, and the Roux NDA.

14 135. The Smith NDA is a binding and enforceable contract between Defendant Smith  
15 and Remilia.

16 136. The Duff NDA is a binding and enforceable contract between Defendant Duff and  
17 Remilia.

18 137. The Duff LOI is a binding and enforceable contract between Defendant Duff and  
19 Remilia.

20 138. The Roux NDA is a binding and enforceable contract between Defendant Roux and  
21 Remilia.

22 139. In connection with their contracts with Remilia, each Defendant owed to Remilia a  
23 duty of good faith and fair dealing, which included, among other things, duties to not seize  
24 Remilia's accounts and assets for Defendants' benefit; to not refuse or fail to respond to Remilia's  
25 communications concerning their use and misuse of Remilia's accounts and assets; to not  
26  
27  
28

1 otherwise conceal, or attempt to conceal, from Remilia their use and misuse of Remilia's accounts  
2 and assets; to not deprive Remilia of Remilia's accounts and assets necessary to, or beneficial in,  
3 operating Remilia's business; and to not cause Remilia's business operations, in whole or in part,  
4 to cease.

5         140. Each Defendant breached the duty of good faith and fair dealing owed to Remilia,  
6 performing in a manner that was unfaithful to the purposes of their contracts, by, among other  
7 things, seizing Remilia's accounts and assets for Defendants' benefit; refusing or failing to respond  
8 to Remilia's communications concerning their use and misuse of Remilia's accounts and assets;  
9 concealing, or attempting to conceal, from Remilia their use and misuse of Remilia's accounts and  
10 assets; depriving Remilia of Remilia's accounts and assets necessary to, or beneficial in, operating  
11 Remilia's business; and causing Remilia's business operations, in whole or in part, to cease.

12  
13         141. Due to Defendants' breaches the duty of good faith and fair dealing the each owed  
14 to Remilia, Remilia's justified expectations under the contracts with Defendants were denied.

15  
16         142. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breaches, Remilia has incurred, and  
17 is continuing to incur, damages in an amount to be proven at trial, but in any event no less than the  
18 value of accounts and assets Defendants have seized, which is well in excess of \$75,000 exclusive  
19 of interest and costs.

20  
21                                   **COUNT VI**  
                                  **Breach of Fiduciary Duty**

22         143. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of  
23 this Complaint by reference into this Count as if fully set forth herein.

24         144. Due to the nature of Remilia's business, Defendants were each entrusted by Remilia  
25 with a degree of control over Remilia's accounts and assets such that they each had fiduciary duties  
26 to Remilia, including, without limitation, duties to use Remilia's accounts and assets, as well as  
27  
28

1 their access to Remilia’s accounts and assets, for Remilia’s benefit and to not misappropriate  
2 Remilia’s accounts and assets or use their access to Remilia’s accounts and assets for their own  
3 benefit.

4 145. Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to Remilia by, among other things, using  
5 Remilia’s accounts and assets, as well as their access to Remilia’s accounts and assets, not for  
6 Remilia’s benefit, but to misappropriate Remilia’s accounts and assets and use their access to  
7 Remilia’s accounts and assets for their own benefit.

8 146. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ breaches, Remilia has incurred, and  
9 is continuing to incur, damages in an amount to be proven at trial, but in any event no less than the  
10 value of accounts and assets Defendants have seized, which is well in excess of \$75,000 exclusive  
11 of interest and costs.  
12

13 **COUNT VII**

14 **Violation of the Defend Trade Secrets Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1836 et seq.**

15 147. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of  
16 this Complaint by reference into this Count as if fully set forth herein.

17 148. Remilia’s trade secret and confidential information relates to products or services  
18 used, sold, purchased, or transported, or intended for use, sale, purchase, or transport, across the  
19 United States and throughout the world.  
20

21 149. The data and information contained in Remilia’s accounts and assets that  
22 Defendants seized or attempted to seize constitute “trade secrets” within the meaning of 18 U.S.C.  
23 § 1839(3).

24 150. The above-described trade secret and confidential information derives independent  
25 economic value, both actual and potential, from not being generally known to and not being readily  
26 ascertainable through proper means by Remilia’s competitors or to other persons or entities who  
27  
28

1 might obtain economic value from their disclosure or use.

2 151. At all relevant times, Remilia has taken reasonable measures to protect the secrecy  
3 of its trade secrets and confidential information, including that which Defendants have  
4 misappropriated.

5 152. Remilia derives great value from the fact that this information is not readily  
6 ascertainable by others, including competitors.

7 153. Defendants misappropriated Remilia's trade secrets by acquiring them through  
8 improper means, including, but not limited to, theft, copying, concealment, failing to return  
9 Remilia's trade secrets, and breach of duties.

10 154. Defendants' misappropriation of Remilia's trade secrets and proprietary  
11 information constitutes a violation of the Defend Trade Secrets Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1836 et seq.

12 155. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' misappropriation, Remilia has  
13 incurred, and is continuing to incur, damages including, but not limited to, loss of information,  
14 loss of the secrecy of the information, lost customers, potential lost business opportunities, and a  
15 disadvantaged market position. These and other damages suffered by Remilia are irreparable.

16 156. Remilia is entitled to an award of damages in the amount of Remilia's actual losses  
17 and Defendants' unjust enrichment, including attorney fees and costs.

18 157. Defendants' duplicitous activities to misappropriate Remilia's trade secrets  
19 constitute willful and malicious conduct warranting an award of exemplary damages.

20  
21  
22 **COUNT VIII**

23 **Violation of the Nevada Trade Secrets Act, Nev. Rev. Stat. § 600A.010 et. seq.**

24 158. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of  
25 this Complaint by reference into this Count as if fully set forth herein.

26 159. The data and information contained in Remilia's accounts and assets that  
27  
28



1 Defendants seized or attempted to seize constitute “trade secrets” within the meaning of the  
2 Nevada Uniform Trade Secrets Act.

3 160. The above-described trade secret and confidential information derives independent  
4 economic value, both actual and potential, from not being generally known to and not being readily  
5 ascertainable through proper means by Remilia’s competitors or to other persons or entities who  
6 might obtain economic value from their disclosure or use.

7  
8 161. At all relevant times, Remilia has taken reasonable measures to protect the secrecy  
9 of its trade secrets and confidential information, including that which Defendants have  
10 misappropriated.

11 162. Remilia derives great value from the fact that this information is not readily  
12 ascertainable by others, including competitors.

13 163. Defendants misappropriated Remilia’s trade secrets by acquiring them through  
14 improper means, including, but not limited to, theft, copying, concealment, failing to return  
15 Remilia’s trade secrets, and breach of duties.

16  
17 164. Defendants’ misappropriation of Remilia’s trade secrets and proprietary  
18 information constitutes a violation of the Nevada Uniform Trade Secrets Act, Nev. Rev. Stat. §  
19 600A.010 et seq.

20 165. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ misappropriation, Remilia has  
21 incurred, and is continuing to incur, damages including, but not limited to, loss of information,  
22 loss of the secrecy of the information, lost customers, potential lost business opportunities, and a  
23 disadvantaged market position. These and other damages suffered by Remilia are irreparable.

24  
25 166. Remilia is entitled to an award of damages in the amount of Remilia’s actual losses  
26 and Defendants’ unjust enrichment, including attorney fees and costs.

1 167. Defendants’ duplicitous activities to misappropriate Remilia’s trade secrets  
2 constitute willful and malicious conduct warranting an award of exemplary damages.

3 **COUNT IX**  
4 **Violation of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1830**

5 168. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of  
6 this Complaint by reference into this Count as if fully set forth herein.

7 169. Remilia’s computers, computer systems, computer programs, computer websites,  
8 computer files, databases, and/or servers (together, “Computers”) constitute protected computers  
9 within the meaning of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (the “CFAA”), 18 U.S.C. § 1830.

10 170. Defendants intentionally accessed Remilia’s Computers without authorization or in  
11 a manner that exceeded their authorization.

12 171. By intentionally accessing Remilia’s Computers without authorization or in a  
13 manner that exceeded their authorization, Defendants obtained information therefrom.

14 172. Defendants intentionally accessed Remilia’s Computers without authorization and  
15 as a result of such conduct caused damage and loss, as defined in the CFAA, to Remilia.

16 173. With the intent to extort from Remilia money and other things of value, Defendants  
17 and their co-conspirators transmitted in interstate and foreign commerce communications  
18 containing a demand or request for money and other things of value in relation to damage caused  
19 to Remilia’s Computers, and such damage was caused to facilitate Defendants’ extortion.

20 174. Defendants’ actions described herein have caused loss to one or more persons  
21 during a one-year period, aggregating at least \$5,000 in value.

22 **COUNT X**  
23 **Unjust Enrichment**

24 175. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 this Complaint by reference into this Count as if fully set forth herein.

2 176. Remilia conferred benefits on Defendants by granting them access to Remilia's  
3 accounts and assets in connection to the work Defendants performed on Remilia's behalf.

4 177. Defendants appreciated the benefits conferred on them by Remilia, as Defendants  
5 knew of their access to Remilia's accounts and assets and used that access.

6 178. Defendants accepted and retained the benefits Remilia conferred on them by using,  
7 maintaining, and continuing to maintain access to Remilia's accounts and assets.

8 179. Defendants' retention of the benefits Remilia conferred on them by continuing to  
9 use and maintain their access to Remilia's accounts and assets is inequitable and unjust, as  
10 Defendants have employed, and continue to employ, the access granted to them to commit torts  
11 against, breach duties owed to, extort, and otherwise cause harm to Remilia.  
12

13 **COUNT XI**  
14 **Civil Conspiracy**

15 180. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of  
16 this Complaint by reference into this Count as if fully set forth herein.

17 181. Defendants have committed torts against Remilia, as described herein.

18 182. Defendants and others jointly agreed to commit the torts against Remilia described  
19 herein, forming or joining a conspiracy.

20 183. Defendant Smith agreed to join the conspiracy with Defendant Duff, Defendant  
21 Roux, and others through, among other means, Defendants' meetings together in Tokyo, Japan, in  
22 April 2023 and through apps on electronic devices and that Defendants commonly used to  
23 communicate with each other and others.  
24

25 184. Defendant Duff agreed to join the conspiracy with Defendant Smith, Defendant  
26 Roux, and others through, among other means, Defendants' meetings together in Tokyo, Japan, in  
27  
28

1 April 2023 and through apps on electronic devices and that Defendants commonly used to  
2 communicate with each other and others.

3 185. Defendant Roux agreed to join the conspiracy with Defendant Smith, Defendant  
4 Duff, and others through, among other means, Defendants' meetings together in Tokyo, Japan, in  
5 April 2023 and through apps on electronic devices and that Defendants commonly used to  
6 communicate with each other and others.

7  
8 186. Defendant Smith participated in the torts against Remilia described herein by,  
9 among other things, accessing Remilia's accounts and assets for the purpose of seizing control  
10 over them; seizing control over Remilia's accounts and assets; preventing Remilia personnel from  
11 accessing Remilia's accounts, assets, or data contained therein; concealing Defendants' tortious  
12 actions by refusing to communicate with Remilia personnel; causing extortive demands to be  
13 asserted against Remilia in connection with the seizure of Remilia's accounts and assets; using  
14 Remilia's accounts or assets to cease, interrupt, or control Remilia's business operations; and using  
15 Remilia's accounts or assets to inform Remilia of Defendants' demands in relation to Remilia's  
16 seized accounts and assets.

17  
18 187. Defendant Duff participated in the torts against Remilia described herein by, among  
19 other things, accessing Remilia's accounts and assets for the purpose of seizing control over them;  
20 seizing control over Remilia's accounts and assets; preventing Remilia personnel from accessing  
21 Remilia's accounts, assets, or data contained therein; concealing Defendants' tortious actions by  
22 refusing to communicate with Remilia personnel; causing extortive demands to be asserted against  
23 Remilia in connection with the seizure of Remilia's accounts and assets; using Remilia's accounts  
24 or assets to cease, interrupt, or control Remilia's business operations; and informing Remilia of  
25 Defendants' demands in relation to Remilia's seized accounts and assets.  
26  
27  
28

1 188. Defendant Roux participated in the torts against Remilia described herein by,  
2 among other things, concealing Defendants' tortious actions by refusing to communicate with  
3 Remilia personnel; concealing Defendants' tortious actions by deleting files concerning the  
4 conspiracy's actions; and causing extortive demands to be asserted against Remilia in connection  
5 with the seizure of Remilia's accounts and assets.

6 189. As a result of the conspiracy described herein, each Defendant is jointly and  
7 severally liable for actions taken, whether by one of the Defendants or any other co-conspirator,  
8 in furtherance of the conspiracy, and judgment should be entered against Defendants jointly and  
9 severally.  
10

11 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

12 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter judgment in their favor  
13 and against Defendants, granting the following relief:

14 A. On Plaintiffs' first Count of Conversion, for monetary damages, for actual  
15 compensatory, consequential, and punitive damages to be determined with specificity at trial, and  
16 injunctive relief;  
17

18 B. On Plaintiffs' second Count of Trespass to Chattel, for actual compensatory,  
19 consequential, and punitive damages to be determined with specificity at trial, and injunctive relief;

20 C. On Plaintiffs' third Count of Intentional Interference With Prospective Economic  
21 Advantage, for actual compensatory, consequential, and punitive damages to be determined with  
22 specificity at trial, and injunctive relief;  
23

24 D. On Plaintiff's fourth Count of Breach of Contract, for damages in an amount to be  
25 determined at trial, costs, attorney fees, consequential damages, exemplary damages, and any other  
26 relief to which Plaintiffs are entitled;  
27  
28

1 E. On Plaintiffs' fifth Count of Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair  
2 Dealing, for damages in an amount to be determined at trial, costs, attorney fees, consequential  
3 damages, exemplary damages, and any other relief to which Plaintiffs are entitled;

4 F. On Plaintiffs' sixth Count of Breach of Fiduciary Duty, for damages in an amount  
5 to be determined at trial, costs, attorney fees, consequential damages, exemplary damages, and any  
6 other relief to which Plaintiffs are entitled;

7  
8 G. On Plaintiffs' seventh Count of Violation of the Defendant Trade Secrets Act, 18  
9 U.S.C. § 1836 et seq., for damages in an amount to be determined at trial, costs, attorney fees,  
10 consequential damages, statutory damages, injunctive relief, the value of the benefits obtained as  
11 a result of all Defendants' misappropriation of trade secrets, and any other relief to which Plaintiffs  
12 are entitled;

13 H. On Plaintiff's eighth Count of Violation of the Nevada Uniform Trade Secrets Act,  
14 Nev. Rev. Stat. § 600A.010 et seq., for damages in an amount to be determined at trial, costs,  
15 attorney fees, consequential damages, statutory damages, injunctive relief, the value of the benefits  
16 obtained as a result of all Defendants' misappropriation of trade secrets, and any other relief to  
17 which Plaintiffs are entitled;

18  
19 I. On Plaintiffs' ninth Count of Violation of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, 18  
20 U.S. C. § 1830, for damages in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than \$5,000,  
21 including revenue lost, costs incurred, or other consequential damages, and any other relief to  
22 which Plaintiffs are entitled;

23  
24 J. On Plaintiffs' tenth Count of Unjust Enrichment, for an award in an amount to be  
25 determined at trial, in no event less than the value of the benefit unjustly retained by Defendants;

1 K. On Plaintiffs' eleventh Count of Civil Conspiracy, for damages in an amount to be  
2 determined at trial, including compensatory damages for the injuries and harm suffered by  
3 Plaintiffs, for exemplary damages, and any other relief to which Plaintiffs are entitled; and

4 L. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

5  
6 DATED this 11th day of September 2023.

7 **MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP**

8 /s/ Bradley W. Madsen

9 Bradley Madsen

10 Nevada Bar No. 11644

2750 East Cottonwood Parkway, Suite 560

Cottonwood Heights, UT 84121

11 Telephone: 801.833.0500

12 Facsimile: 801.931.2500

bwmadsen@michaelbest.com

13 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Krishna Okhandiar*  
14 *and Remilia Corporation LLC*