

**international law of contemporary media**  
**session 5: internet governance (part two)**

**mira burri, dr.iur.,**  
**fall term 2015, 28 october 2014**

The National Centres of Competence in Research (NCCR) are a research instrument of the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF)



Swiss National Science Foundation

---

---

---

---

---

---

## goals of the day

- internet governance as broadly conceived
- understanding regulation in cyberspace
- the state and state jurisdiction in cyberspace
- case-law

2

The National Centres of Competence in Research (NCCR) are a research instrument of the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF).

---

---

---

---

---

---

**IG: infrastructure**

*inner circle (strong, direct impact on the internet)*

- root server system, interconnection, routing
- names and numbers
- technical standardization
- network security

*outer circle (less direct/narrowly bounded impact)*

- **international telecommunications**
- international trade in services and goods
- **international radio frequency spectrum**
- **international satellite regime**
- international development programmes

3

The National Center of Competence in Research (NCCR) are a research instrument of the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF)

---

---

---

---

---

---

nccr trade regulation

swiss national centre of competence in research

### IG: communication and commerce

**inner circle (strong, direct impact on the internet)**

- information content and cross-border flows
- cyber-crime and cyber-security
- intellectual property
- international trade in services
- e-commerce (contracting, authentication, taxation, jurisdiction/choice of law)

**outer circle (less direct/narrowly bounded impact)**

- information content and cross-border flows
- privacy protection
- spam and consumer protection

The National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) is a research institution of the Swiss Confederation, established in 2002. It is a joint venture of the Swiss Confederation and the Swiss Cantons. The NCCR is a research institution of the Swiss Confederation, established in 2002. It is a joint venture of the Swiss Confederation and the Swiss Cantons. The NCCR is a research institution of the Swiss Confederation, established in 2002. It is a joint venture of the Swiss Confederation and the Swiss Cantons.

4

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

nccr trade regulation

swiss national centre of competence in research

### state sovereignty and the internet (1)

**Goldsmith:**

- territorial sovereignty supports national regulation of persons within the territory who use the Internet; supports national regulation of the means of communication (internet hardware and software) located in the territory; finally, a nation's prerogative to control events within its territory entails the power to regulate the local effects of extraterritorial acts
- regulation need not be perfect to be effective (i.e. heighten the costs of activity sufficiently to achieve acceptable control)

The National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) is a research institution of the Swiss Confederation, established in 2002. It is a joint venture of the Swiss Confederation and the Swiss Cantons. The NCCR is a research institution of the Swiss Confederation, established in 2002. It is a joint venture of the Swiss Confederation and the Swiss Cantons. The NCCR is a research institution of the Swiss Confederation, established in 2002. It is a joint venture of the Swiss Confederation and the Swiss Cantons.

6

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

2



## local laws on a global internet

10

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### case study: Yahoo! (1)

- **La Ligue Contre le Racisme et l'Antisémitisme v. Yahoo!, Inc.**, Superior Court of Paris, 22 May 2000
- **facts of the case:**
  - Nazi items available on Yahoo.com auction site through which various private parties could purchase items from each other
  - the Jewish Students' Union of France (UEJF) and the League Against Racism and Antisemitism (LICRA) sued Yahoo! for violating the French Penal Code which prohibits the public display of Nazi-related objects

11

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### case study: Yahoo! (2)

#### Presiding Judge, Jean-Jacques Gomez:

"Whereas by allowing the viewing of these items in France and by allowing the eventual participation of a surfer in France in such an exhibition-sale, **Yahoo!, Inc. commits a wrong on French territory** – the unintentional nature of which is apparent, but which causes the damage to LICRA and the UEJF, both of which have as their mission to pursue in France any form of trivialization of Nazism – notwithstanding that the activity at issue is marginal in relation to the general activity of the auction services that *Yahoo.com* offers on its site;

Whereas **damage was suffered in France, and we are therefore competent to exercise jurisdiction over the present dispute [...]**"

12

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### case study: Yahoo! (3)

- Yahoo! was ordered to take all measures to prevent access to the auction service for Nazi items or any other service that constitutes an apology for Nazism or questions Nazi crimes
- **enforcement of the judgment?**
- **Yahoo!, Inc. v. La Ligue Contre le Racisme et l'Antisémitisme**, US District Court, 2001, 169 F.Supp. 2d 1181
- Yahoo! stated that banning Nazi-materials would infringe its rights under the First Amendment
- Yahoo! sought a declaratory judgment that the French Court's orders are **not cognizable nor enforceable** under US law

13

### case study: Yahoo! (4)

- **the extent to which the US honours the judicial decrees of foreign nations is a matter of choice governed by "the comity of nations"** (which is "neither of matter of absolute obligation, on the one hand, nor a mere courtesy and good will, upon the other" (*Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 US 113 (1895)))
- "absent a body of law that established int'l standards with respect to speech on the Internet (...), **the principle of comity is outweighed by the Court's obligation to uphold the First Amendment**"
- In 2006, this judgment was **reversed by the US Court of Appeals** – not on First Amendment grounds; dismissal for lack of jurisdiction

14

### post-Yahoo Qs

- **forum-shopping (JHH Weiler case)**
- **libel tourism in the UK**
- **general questions regarding standards on the int'l level:**
  - with Yahoo, we encounter the "lowest common denominator" argument: if websites are subject to the laws of *all jurisdictions* from which they can be accessed, *the legal norms of the most restrictive community will prevail*
  - **reversely**: if foreign courts cannot reach websites located in other jurisdictions, will the legal norms of the least restrictive community prevail? In the context of Yahoo, if foreign courts cannot reach US-based entities, has the US then imposed its relatively unrestrictive First Amendment on global Internet speech? Is this also problematic?

15

## extending jurisdiction (1)

### US doctrine:

- A state may exercise personal jurisdiction over an out-of-state defendant, so long as that defendant has **"sufficient minimum contacts"** with the forum state, from which the complaint arises, such that the exercise of jurisdiction **"will not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice"** (*International Shoe*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945))
- the Zippo test: a three prong (sliding) test: **"likelihood that personal jurisdiction can be constitutionally exercised is directly proportionate to the nature and quality of commercial activity that an entity conducts over the Internet"** (*Zippo Manufacturing Company v. Zippo Dot Com, Inc.*, 952 F.Supp. 1119 (1997))

16

## extending jurisdiction (2)

### EU law:

- COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 44/2001 of 22 December 2000 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters (in force until 2015)
- **update:** REGULATION (EU) No 1215/2012 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 12 December 2012 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters
  - establishes a general rule that individuals are to be sued in their state of domicile
  - diverse exceptions
  - recognition of judgements made in other countries

17

## case study: regulation of data protection and its beyond border implications

18

### interactive sessions: the rules of the game

- **15 minutes** per group for the presentation of the arguments
- **5 minutes** per group for counter-arguments (i.e. arguments that “destroy” the arguments of the opposing party)
- **2 minutes** for in-group discussion and tactic-building
- **5 minutes** for rebutting these counter-arguments
- a day before: arguments in a key-word-fashion description; no more than 1 page

19

- thank you.
- contact: [mira.burri@wti.org](mailto:mira.burri@wti.org)

20