

Internet Jurisdiction Cases in the United States and Minimum Contacts

Chunhsien Sung

National Taiwan Normal University

Taipei 162, Taiwan

c.sung@ntnu.edu.tw

Received 13 November 2012; Revised 21 December 2012; Accepted 28 December 2012

Abstract. This article will discuss the United States' rulings regarding Internet jurisdiction matters in commercial applications, i.e., jurisdiction in e-commerce. While the application of Internet technologies created unlimited possibilities to business, education, and leisure, these unlimited possibilities also referred to issues of law that our legal system did not really correspond to the Internet technology. The United States legal system has dealt with Internet jurisdiction issues since the early 1990s, and there has been long-term evolution in the case law. Once the system, from the point of technology, tried to establish a "passive and active" Internet activities approach to apply Internet jurisdiction matters, but the system now turned back to reuse old and traditional approaches to Internet jurisdiction cases rather than apply the "passive and active" approach.

Keywords: internet, internet jurisdiction, minimum contacts, Zippo test, and Calder test

References

- [1] *Attaway v. Omega*, No. 11A01-0712-CV-608 (Ind. Ct. App. March 13, 2009).
- [2] A. Ben-Ezer, A. Bendor, "Conceptualizing Yahoo! v. L.C.R.A.: Private Law, Constitutional Review, and International Conflict of Laws", *Cardozo Law Review*, Vol. 25, pp. 2089-2142, 2004.
- [3] *Bensusan Restaurant Corp., v. King*, 937 F.Supp. 295 (S.D.N.Y.1996).
- [4] *Boschetto v. Hansing*, 539 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 2008).
- [5] *Calder v. Jones*, 465 U.S 783, 789 (1984).
- [6] *Calder v. Jones*, 465 U.S 783 (1984) at 798-90.
- [7] *CompuServe, Inc. v. Patterson*, 89 F.3d 1257 (6th Cir. 1996).
- [8] R. Corn-Revere, "Caught in the Seamless Web: Dose the Inter's Global Reach Justify Less Freedom of Speech?" *BRIEFING PAPER*, No. 71, 2002.
- [9] *Cybersell, Inc. v. Cybersell, Inc.*, 130 F.3d 414 (9th Cir. 1997).
- [10] Document Drawn up by Catherine Kessedjian Deputy Secretary General "Electronic Data Interchange, The internet and Electronic Commerce", Prel. Doc. No 7, pp. 20, 2000.
- [11] *Euromarket Designs Inc. v. Crate & Barrel Ltd.*, 96 F.Supp.2d 824 (N.D. Ill., 2000).
- [12] *Inset Systems Inc. v. Instruction Set*, 937 F.Supp. 161 (D. Conn. 1996).
- [13] *International Shoe v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945).
- [14] D. Johnson, D. Post, "Law and Borders- The Rise of Law in Cyberspace," *Stanford Law Review*, Vol. 48, pp. 1367, 1996.
- [15] *Maritz, Inc. v. Cybergold, Inc.*, 947 F.Supp. 1328 (E.D. Mo. 1996).
- [16] *Millenium Enterprises, Inc. v. Millenium Music L.P.*, 33 F.Supp.2d 907 (D. Or., 1999).
- [17] *Mink v. AAAA Development L.L.C.*, 190 F.3d 333 (5th Cir. 1999).
- [18] *Panavision International, L.P. v. Toeppen*, 938 F. Supp. 616 (C.D. Cal. 1996).

- [19] *Panavision International, L.P. v. Toeppen*, 141 F.3d 1316 (9th Cir. (Cal), 1998) and *Cybersell, Inc. v. Cybersell, Inc.*, 130 F. 3d. 414 (9th Cir. 1997).
- [20] *People ex rel. Vacco v. World Interactive Gaming Corp*, 185 Misc.2d 852, 714 N.Y.S. 2d 844 (N.Y.Sup. 1999), 1999 N.Y. Misc. LEXIS 425 (S.C. N.Y. 1999).
- [21] A. Thierer, C. Crews, *Who Rules the Net? The internet Governance and Jurisdiction*, Cato Institute, pp. 468, 2003.
- [22] *Toys "R" Us, Inc. v. Step Two, S.A.*, 318 F.3d 446, C.A.3 (N.J.), 2003.
- [23] *Waterview Resolution Corp. v. Allen*, 274 Kan. 1016, 58 P.3d 1284, Kan., 2002.
- [24] H. Watt, "Yahoo! Cyber-collision of Cultures: Who Regulates?" *Michigan Journal of International Law*, pp. 673-693, 2003.
- [25] *Zippo Manufacturing Co. v. Zippo Dot Com, Inc.*, 952 F. Supp. 1119 (W.D. Pa. 1997).