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Monestier on Personal Jurisdiction

Professor Tanya Monestier explains why a Canadian company was subject to personal jurisdiction in Mass., though its only "direct contacts" were email and phone.

From Massachusetts Lawyers Weekly: "Canadian co. subject to state’s jurisdiction" by Pat Murphy

November 20, 2014: A Canadian company was subject to personal jurisdiction in Massachusetts even though its direct contacts with the state essentially consisted of emails and phone calls to the plaintiff in the breach of contract suit, the 1st U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals has decided. […]

Tanya J. Monestier, a professor at Roger Williams University School of Law in Bristol, Rhode Island, said the 1st Circuit decision makes “perfect sense” given the contractual nature of the parties' relationship.

“If you have a four-year relationship, be it actual or virtual, there’s going to be personal jurisdiction in the place where you are having the relationship,” she said. “When you’re dealing with breach of contract and someone is acting in the jurisdiction pursuant to the arrangements under the contract, you can get there both for relatedness and purposeful availment.”

For full story, click here.

********

CASE: C.W. Downer & Company v. Bioriginal Food & Science Corporation, Lawyers Weekly No. 01-291-14
COURT: 1st U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals

ISSUE: Is a Canadian company subject to personal jurisdiction in Massachusetts when its direct contacts with the state largely consisted of emails and phone calls concerning the plaintiff’s performance of the parties’ contract?

DECISION: Yes