

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

MAHESWAR MIKKILINENI,	§
	§ No. 484, 2025
Plaintiff Below,	§
Appellant,	§ Court Below–Superior Court
	§ of the State of Delaware
v.	§
	§ C.A. No. N20C-10-135
PAYPAL, INC.; SHIJIL TS,	§
CEO; GODADDY.COM, LLC;	§
HARVARD COLLEGE	§
OBSERVATORY, and	§
UPWORK INC.,	§
	§
Defendants Below,	§
Appellees.	§
	§

Submitted: June 19, 2026
Decided: August 19, 2026

Before **SEITZ**, Chief Justice; **LEGROW** and **GRIFFITHS**, Justices.

ORDER

After consideration of the parties’ briefs, the Superior Court record, and the motion for attorney’s fees and costs, it appears to the Court that:

(1) In 2019, the appellant, Maheswar Mikkilineni, filed suit in the Superior Court against the appellees—PayPal, Inc.; Shijil TS/SparkSupport Infotech Pvt. Ltd. (“Spark”); GoDaddy.com, LLC; the Chandra X-Ray Center of the Harvard Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics and its director (together, “CXC”); and Upwork, Inc.—alleging that they had stymied “his attempts to host, encode, and

grow a website designed to commercialize his scientific and religious views about the atomic underpinnings of the universe.”¹

(2) CXC removed the case to Delaware’s federal district court, which dismissed Mikkilineni’s claims against CXC on the basis of sovereign immunity and then remanded the case to the Superior Court.² On July 1, 2021, the Superior Court granted PayPal’s, GoDaddy’s, and Upwork’s motions to dismiss,³ leaving Spark, an India-based entity, the remaining defendant. On September 30, 2025, the Superior Court dismissed the remainder of Mikkilineni’s complaint under Superior Court Civil Rule 41(e) for Mikkilineni’s failure to diligently prosecute the case against Spark. Mikkilineni did not appeal.

(3) Instead, on November 3, 2025, Mikkilineni moved to set aside the court’s judgment under Superior Court Civil Rule 60(b)(6), alleging that the court’s “dismissal with prejudice under Rule 41(e) must be a fraud upon the court.” The Superior Court denied the motion, finding that Mikkilineni’s motion had failed to

¹ *Mikkilineni v. PayPal, Inc.*, 2021 WL 2763903, at *1 (Del Super. Ct. July 1, 2021) (“*Mikkilineni I*”).

² *Mikkilineni v. PayPal, Inc.*, 2021 WL 810359, at *1 (D. Del. Mar. 3, 2021). Mikkilineni then attempted to substitute the Harvard College Observatory (“HCO”) for CXC by way of an amended complaint. *But see* Del. Super. Ct. Civ. R. 15(a) (permitting an amendment without leave of court only when a responsive pleading has not yet been served). In any event, Mikkilineni’s allegations against HCO, which indirectly controls CXC, were identical to the allegations that Mikkilineni made against CXC and failed for the same reasons.

³ *Mikkilineni I*, at *13.

demonstrate that relief was warranted under Rule 60(b)(6)’s exacting standards. This appeal followed.

(4) We review a Superior Court order denying a motion to vacate under Rule 60(b) for an abuse of discretion.⁴ “An abuse of discretion occurs when a court has exceeded the bounds of reason in view of the circumstances or so ignored recognized rules of law or practice so as to produce injustice.”⁵

(5) In his opening brief on appeal, Mikkilineni alleges that the Superior Court erred when it dismissed his claims against PayPal, GoDaddy, and Upwork in July 2021 and when it dismissed his claims against Spark in September 2025. But Mikkilineni did not appeal the Superior Court’s September 30, 2025 final order. And on appeal from the Superior Court’s denial of his Rule 60(b) motion, Mikkilineni “may only attack the propriety of that order; Rule 60(b) does not permit the appellant to attack the underlying judgment for an error that he could have complained of on appeal from it.”⁶ Mikkilineni does not maintain that the Superior Court abused its discretion when it denied his request for relief under Rule 60(b)(6), and we find it evident from the record that the Superior Court’s actions in this case did not constitute “fraud upon the court” or otherwise justify relief under Rule 60(b)(6).

⁴ *Wilson v. Montague*, 2011 WL 1661561, at *2 (Del. May 3, 2011).

⁵ *MCA, Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd.*, 785 A.2d 625, 633-34 (Del. 2001) (cleaned up).

⁶ *Wilson*, 2011 WL 1661561, at *2 (cleaned up).

(6) PayPal has moved for attorney's fees and costs under Supreme Court Rule 20(f). After careful review, we decline PayPal's invitation to award fees and costs here.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED. The motion for attorney's fees and costs is DENIED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ N. Christopher Griffiths
Justice