

Consider an NFA $N = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, s, A)$. A standard mental exercise is to try and negate it. Namely, consider the NFA $\bar{N} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, s, Q \setminus A)$.

1. $L(\bar{N}) = \overline{L(N)}$:



$$L(N) = \{0,1\}^*, \text{ and } L(\bar{N}) = \emptyset.$$

2. $L(N) \subsetneq L(\bar{N})$:



$$L(N) = (0+1)^*1(0+1)^*, \text{ and } L(\bar{N}) = \Sigma^*.$$

3. $L(N) \not\subseteq L(\bar{N})$:



$$L(N) = \Sigma^* \text{ and } L(\bar{N}) = (0+1)^*1(0+1)^*.$$

In conclusion, that is no meaningful relation between $L(N)$ and $L(\bar{N})$.