PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND THE INTERNET: AN INTRODUCTION
By Brian Covotta

Over 35,000,000 consumers and 190,000 businesses presently use the Internet. This concentration of consumers and producers in cyberspace has led to the phenomenal growth of electronic commerce, including electronic data interchange, on-line retailing, and electronic financial services such as home banking, electronic funds transfer, and payment processing. With the growth of electronic commerce also came a rising tide of litigation arising out of these transactions. One of the primary issues in many of these cases is whether the defendant has sufficient minimum contacts with the forum state such that the court can exercise personal jurisdiction over the distant defendant. At the present time, it is difficult for busi-
nesses conducting commerce over the Internet to assess their risks of exposure to suit in a distant forum. Until personal jurisdiction analysis is consistently applied to contacts arising from transactions over the Internet, the threat of defending suits in any state where the defendant’s web site is accessible may serve to slow the rise of electronic commerce.

A court cannot assert personal jurisdiction over a defendant unless there is statutory authorization for the exercise of that jurisdiction. In general, a federal district court must comply with the personal jurisdiction statute of the state in which the district court sits. Despite this necessity for statutory authorization, the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment constrains a court’s ability to assert personal jurisdiction.


4. See cases and holdings cited supra note 3.
7. U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1 ("nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.").
over a defendant. Because states and nations are defined as political and legal entities in terms of their geographical boundaries, presence of the person or thing within the state has always been important to personal jurisdiction analysis. Indeed, in the landmark case of *Pennoyer v. Neff*, the Supreme Court of the United States held that "no State can exercise direct jurisdiction and authority over persons or property without its territory." However, personal jurisdiction analysis has proven sensitive to technological advancements. Subsequent to the Court's holding in *Pennoyer*, the increasing use of the train and the inventions of the automobile and the airplane, created more opportunities for potential defendants to have effects in multiple states and reduced the burden upon these defendants to defend the suits.

In response to these new circumstances, the Supreme Court abandoned the rigid formulation of personal jurisdiction espoused in *Pennoyer*. Instead, the Court held that due process requires only that in order to subject a defendant to a judgment in personam, if he be not present within the territory of the forum, he have certain minimum contacts with it such that the maintenance of the suit does not offend 'traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.'

These minimum contacts must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. However, certain principles are clear. In order to comport with "traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice," the defendant must purposefully avail itself of the privileges of conducting activities within the
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Moreover, the unilateral activity of those who claim some relationship with a defendant and placing products in the stream-of-commerce with knowledge that they will reach the forum state cannot satisfy these minimum contacts.

With the rising globalization of the world economy, courts were granted even more flexibility to address additional factors beyond the defendant’s minimum contacts, including the burden on the defendant of defending suit within the forum state, the forum state’s interest in adjudicating the dispute, the plaintiff’s interest in obtaining convenient and effective relief, the interest of the interstate judicial system in the efficient resolution of controversies, and the shared interests of the states in furthering fundamental substantive policies. After considering these factors, a court may assert jurisdiction upon a lesser showing of minimum contacts. Conversely, these factors may defeat jurisdiction even if a defendant has established minimum contacts with the forum state.

A major new technological innovation of the 1990s is the Internet. Because the Internet transcends territorial boundaries, courts have been confronted with difficult personal jurisdiction issues and the results have been far from consistent. Two of these cases have been selected for in-depth analysis: *Bensusan Restaurant Corp. v. King* and *Zippo Manufacturing Co. v. Zippo Dot Com, Inc.* In *Bensusan*, the Second Circuit held that the New York district court lacked jurisdiction over a Missouri
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resident whose only contact with New York was the placing of a web site on the Internet. In contrast, in *Zippo Manufacturing*, the district court in Pennsylvania held that it could constitutionally assert jurisdiction over a California resident whose contacts with Pennsylvania occurred almost exclusively over the Internet. Specifically, three thousand Pennsylvania residents subscribed to the defendant's Internet news service and the defendant contracted with seven Pennsylvania Internet access providers to permit these subscribers to access the news service. The case comments explore how personal jurisdiction analysis should be tailored to accommodate this new technology.
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