

## Case Brief

Civ Pro Unit F: personal jurisdiction, evolution of

Bauer, 2/14/15

### Identity of Case

International Shoe Co. v. Washington

Page 163 of the case brief

### Summary of Facts/Procedural History

International Shoe Co has some employees (salesmen who work on commission) located in Washington, which it laid off. Washington has a statute which requires unemployment benefits to laid off employees within its state. International Shoe doesn't want to pay unemployment benefits, and doesn't. Washington sues International Shoe to make it comply with its laws. International Shoe argues that the Washington state courts don't have personal jurisdiction. Since it is a state law it is trying to enforce, Washington pretty much has to sue in Washington. Trial and appellate court gave it to Washington, International Shoe appeals to the Supreme Court which says they consented to jurisdiction.

### Statement of the Issue

Does a corporation consent to suit in a state by having a few employees in the state? What is required for a corporation to consent to suit in a state?

### Holding

Where a corporation has employees in a state, which it pays and communicates with, and which it uses to sell its product in that state, that is sufficient to consent to suit in that state.

### Reasoning

It would be insane basically to let corporations sell product in a state and not be liable to suit in that state. What if they hurt a customer or an employee? Just a mess.

### Evaluation