

ACADÉMIE DE DROIT INTERNATIONAL

FONDÉE EN 1923 AVEC LE CONCOURS DE LA
DOTATION CARNEGIE POUR LA PAIX INTERNATIONALE

RECUEIL DES COURS

COLLECTED COURSES OF THE HAGUE
ACADEMY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

2021

Tome 415 de la collection

BRILL | NIJHOFF

Leiden/Boston

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.	21
Chapter I. Introduction and overview	23
A. A practitioner addresses the legal challenges for private international law created by new technology	23
B. Overall approach to private international law and importance of understanding its principles	28
C. Overview of globalization and pertinence to private international law: Some perspectives pertinent to our study	32
D. Defining the Internet and its relationship with globalization	38
E. Some models for the future in light of the cases from the United States and other jurisdictions.	44
Chapter II. Personal jurisdiction: establishing a framework for understanding the US Supreme Court decisions on personal jurisdiction under the US constitution	45
A. Personal jurisdiction: Brief theoretical overview	45
B. The von Mehren-Trautman framework for personal jurisdiction	48
C. The problem with trying to be comprehensive	49
D. Evolution of due process requirements in US Supreme Court cases: Keeton and Calder decisions.	51
1. <i>Keeton v. Hustler Magazine</i> (1984): Jurisdiction based on distribution of libelous publications	54
2. <i>Calder v. Jones</i> (1984): Jurisdiction based on publication of a libelous article focused on the location where the injured party lived and worked	56
E. The role of long-arm statutes in US personal jurisdiction cases	58
F. Early examples of American Internet cases before the most recent Supreme Court decisions.	63
1. <i>Zippo Mfr. Co. v. Zippo Dot Com, Inc.</i> : Focus on the extent of interactivity of websites.	64
2. <i>Gorman v. Ameritrade</i> (2002): Applying <i>Zippo</i> to general jurisdiction issues arising from website activities	66
3. <i>Dudnikov v. Chalk & Vermilion Fine Arts, Inc.</i> (2008): Specific jurisdiction over copyright infringement directed to one state for impact in another	68
4. <i>uBID, Inc. v. The GODaddy Group, Inc.</i> (2010): Specific jurisdiction based on cybersquatting damaging residents of a particular state	70
5. <i>Clemens v. McNamee</i> (2010): Denial of specific jurisdiction – publication not sufficiently focused on residence state of plaintiff	72
G. Two new Supreme Court decisions on general jurisdiction: <i>Goodyear</i> and <i>Daimler</i>	73
1. <i>Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown</i> : General jurisdiction only if the defendant is “essentially at home”.	74
(a) Facts and Court of Appeals holding	74
(b) Position of several amici briefs.	75
(c) Position of the Solicitor General of the United States.	77
(d) Decision of the Supreme Court.	77

2. <i>Daimler AG v. Bauman</i> : No general jurisdiction for "continuous and systematic general business contacts" unless the defendant is essentially at home	80
(a) Facts and Court of Appeals decision.	80
(b) Position of amici briefs.	82
(c) Position of the Solicitor General of the United States.	83
(d) Oral argument.	85
(e) Decision of the Supreme Court.	85
(f) Some of the many issues raised by commentators on <i>Good-year</i> and <i>Daimler</i>	88
3. <i>BNSF Railway Co. v. Tyrrell</i> : <i>Daimler</i> applies domestically and internationally	90
H. Two Supreme Court cases on specific jurisdiction and attempts to persuade the Court to address aspects of personal jurisdiction arising from Internet usage.	93
1. <i>J. McIntyre Machinery Ltd. v. Nicastro</i> : No specific jurisdiction when nationwide sales are not directed at a particular state	93
(a) Facts and New Jersey Supreme Court decision	93
(b) Specific jurisdiction issue raised during the <i>Daimler</i> oral argument.	93
(c) Other amici briefs in <i>McIntyre</i>	94
(d) Exchanges during oral argument reflecting issues raised in amici briefs	96
(e) Decision of the Supreme Court in <i>McIntyre</i>	97
(f) Some of the commentary on <i>McIntyre</i>	100
(g) Jurisdictional implications of establishing and operating subsidiary companies: A European approach	101
2. <i>Walden v. Fiore</i> : No specific jurisdiction for claim based on alleged tortious conduct not focused on forum state (with an Internet footnote)	106
(a) Facts and Court of Appeals decision.	106
(b) Amici briefs raises Internet issues	107
(c) Internet precedents raised during oral argument.	108
(d) Decision of the Supreme Court.	109
I. Supreme Court clarifies the relatedness requirement and need for causal link: <i>Bristol-Myers Squibb v. Superior Court of California</i> . . .	111
1. Post- <i>Walden</i> specific jurisdiction issues	111
2. Decision of the Supreme Court.	114
J. Applying recent Supreme Court cases in US Courts of Appeal cases involving use of the Internet	117
1. <i>In Re Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Products Liability Litigation</i> : Sale of defective Chinese drywall	117
2. <i>Mavrix Photo, Inc. v. Brand Technologies, Inc.</i> : Copyright infringement arising from Internet sales	121
3. <i>Louis Vuitton Malletier v. Mosseri</i> : Trademark Infringement through Internet Sales.	122
4. <i>Advanced Tactical Ordnance Sys. v. Real Action Paintball</i> : <i>Walden</i> applied to alleged trademark infringement over the Internet	124
5. <i>C. W. Downer & Co. v. Bioriginal Food & Science</i> : Canadian company engaging and interacting in cyberspace with Massachusetts investment bank	127
6. <i>Waldman et al. v. Palestinian Liberation Organization et al.</i> : Denial of personal jurisdiction for alleged terrorist attack	128

(a) Precedents in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals	128
(b) Decision of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in <i>Waldman v. Palestinian Liberation Organization</i>	132
(c) Note criticizing the Second Circuit opinion in <i>Waldman</i> <i>v. Palestinian Liberation Organization</i>	135
Chapter III. The European Union Court of Justice, the Brussels I Regula- tion and the Internet	137
A. Brief word on the role of the Advocate General in the CJEU	138
B. Overview of Brussels I Regulation provisions on personal juris- diction and their pre-Internet interpretation by the CJEU.	139
1. <i>Bier v. Mines de Potasse</i> : Jurisdiction at the place of wrongful conduct and the place of injury.	141
2. <i>Shevill v. Presse Alliance SA</i> : Mosaic principle – damages limited to losses incurred in state asserting jurisdiction based on place of injury.	143
3. Initial perceived difficulty with extending CJEU rulings to cases involving Internet usage	145
C. <i>Société Pneu-Online Suisse v. Société Delticom</i> : Do French courts consider website accessibility enough under the Brussels I Regulation for personal jurisdiction?	146
D. Evolution of interpretation of personal jurisdiction under Brussels I Regulation and Brussels I <i>bis</i> Regulation in eleven key CJEU cases	150
1. <i>Pammer and Hotel Alpenhof</i> : When does jurisdiction exist for contract claims under the consumer protection provisions of the Brussels Regulation?	151
(a) Facts	152
(b) Position of the Advocate General	154
(c) Decision of the CJEU.	158
(d) Commentary.	159
2. <i>eDate Advertising/Martinez</i> : Jurisdiction under the Brussels Regu- lation for torts publicized over the Internet and damaging personality rights	166
(a) Facts	166
(b) Opinion of the Advocate General	167
(c) Decision of the CJEU.	169
(d) Commentary.	171
3. <i>Wintersteiger v. Products 4U</i> : Jurisdiction over alleged infring- ement of intellectual property (trademark) rights	177
(a) Facts	177
(b) Position of the Advocate General	178
(c) Decision of the CJEU.	180
(d) Commentary.	181
4. <i>Daniela Mühlleitner v. Ahmad Yusufi and Wadat Yusufi</i> : Does jurisdiction under the consumer protection provisions of the Brussels I Regulation require conclusion of the contract over the Internet?	183
(a) Facts	184
(b) Position of the Advocate General	185
(c) Decision of the CJEU.	187
(d) Commentary.	189
5. <i>Football Dataco and Others v. Yahoo! UK Ltd and Others</i> : Is targeting required for jurisdiction over alleged infringement of <i>sui generis</i> rights?	190

(a) Facts and position of the Advocate General	190
(b) Decision of the CJEU.	191
6. <i>Peter Pinckney v. KDG Mediatech AG</i> : Does website accessibility alone support jurisdiction of a copyright infringement claim facilitated through Internet advertising?	192
(a) Scholarly anticipation of the issues	192
(b) Facts	194
(c) Position of the Advocate General	194
(d) Decision of the CJEU.	197
(e) Commentary.	198
7. <i>Lokman Emrek v. Vlado Sabranovic</i> (2013): Jurisdiction over cross-border sales to consumers supported by website publicity	204
(a) Facts	204
(b) Position of the Advocate General	205
(c) Decision of the CJEU.	209
(d) Commentary.	210
8. <i>Coty Germany GmbH v. First Note Perfumes NV</i> (2014): Jurisdiction over defendant for third-country tortious conduct having indirect effects in the forum state	212
(a) Facts, position of Advocate General and decision.	212
(b) Decision of the CJEU.	214
(c) Commentary.	215
9. <i>Pez Hejduk v. EnergieAgentur.NRW GmbH</i> (2015): Extent of Damages Allowed for Copyright Infringement Through Internet Sales	216
(a) Facts	216
(b) Position of the EU Commission and the Advocate General.	217
(c) Decision of the CJEU.	219
(d) Commentary.	221
10. <i>H. Kolassa v. Barclays Bank plc</i> : Bearer bonds decision raising significant issues about relationship between the claimant's domicile and commercial links of the underlying claim.	225
11. <i>Concurrence Sàrl v. Samsung Electronics France SAS and Amazon Services Europe Sàrl</i> (2016): Jurisdiction to grant injunctive relief against Internet sales by third-country websites for violation of exclusive contract rights	227
(a) Facts	227
(b) Position of the parties, member states, the EU Commission and the Advocate General	229
(c) Decision of the CJEU.	234
(d) Commentary.	235
12. <i>Bolagsupplysningen OÜ and Ingrid Ilsjan v. Svensk Handel AB</i> (2017): Where may corporations file claims for infringement of personality rights and in which forum may they seek injunctive relief?	238
(a) Facts	238
(b) Position of the Advocate General	239
(c) Decision of the CJEU.	240
(d) Commentary.	243
(e) Status after <i>Bolagsupplysningen</i> of CJEU holdings on personal jurisdiction from a US perspective	247

Chapter IV. Personal jurisdiction cases from other nations involving uses of the Internet.	249
A. Canadian cases: Rethinking required connecting factors from Internet use to show “real and substantial connection” to support personal jurisdiction	249
1. <i>Equustek Solutions v. Google Inc.</i> : Controversy over reach of Canadian personal jurisdiction and scope of injunctive powers.	249
2. Commentary and more recent Canadian personal jurisdiction cases	256
B. Japanese perspectives and cases: Specific jurisdiction for related causes of action arising from Internet usage.	262
C. Chinese cases: Courts allow favorable grounds for jurisdiction over infringement claims for nationwide damages arising from Internet usage.	264
D. Latin American cases: Initial study shows parallels with CJEU cases and place of injury focus in Internet usage cases	268
E. Cases from India: Jurisdiction over infringement cases.	270
Chapter V. Defining and agreeing on the principles of personal jurisdiction for cases arising from Internet usage	276
A. The first try: Preliminary draft Convention on Jurisdiction and Foreign Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters (1999).	276
B. Success at last: 2019 Hague Convention on Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil or Commercial Matters	280
1. Overview of the contract and tort provisions of the 2019 Convention.	280
2. Background to the contract and tort provisions of the 2019 Convention	282
C. American Law Institute: Principles governing intellectual property jurisdiction (2008)	285
D. European Max Planck Group: Principles on conflict of law in intellectual property (2011).	291
E. Latest proposals to restate the law of personal jurisdiction in cases arising from Internet usage.	304
1. International Law Association: Draft guidelines on jurisdiction and applicable law (2019)	304
2. Institute of International Law: Issues of jurisdiction, applicable law and enforcement of foreign judgments (2019)	305
Bibliography.	310