DOWNLOAD PDF THE DOMAIN OF THE COURTS

Chapter 1 : History Of The Federal Use Of Eminent Domain | ENRD | Department of Justice

the domain of courts rules that will be used exclusively by the prosecution-the United States-and some designed exclusively for criminal defendants, who, as.

The owners, including lead plaintiff Susette Kelo of 8 East Street, sued the city in Connecticut courts, arguing that the city had misused its eminent domain power. The Takings Clause reads: The plaintiffs argued that economic development, the stated purpose of the taking and subsequent transfer of land to the New London Development Corporation, did not qualify as a public use under the Fifth Amendment. The Connecticut Supreme Court heard arguments on December 2, The state court issued its decision Conn. Borden , Richard N. Palmer and Christine Vertefeuille. Zarella wrote the dissent, joined by Chief Justice William J. Sullivan and Justice Joette Katz. The court held that if a legislative body has found that an economic project will create new jobs, increase tax and other city revenues, and revitalize a depressed urban area even if that area is not blighted , then the project serves a public purpose, which qualifies as a public use. Parker , U. Midkiff , U. Incorporation of the Bill of Rights , protect landowners from takings for economic development, rather than, as in Berman, for the elimination of slums and blight? Kelo was the first major eminent domain case heard at the Supreme Court since In that time, states and municipalities had slowly extended their use of eminent domain, frequently to include economic development purposes. There was also an additional twist in that the development corporation was ostensibly a private entity; thus the plaintiffs argued that it was not constitutional for the government to take private property from one individual or corporation and give it to another, if the government was simply doing so because the repossession would put the property to a use that would generate higher tax revenue. Kelo became the focus of vigorous discussion and attracted numerous supporters on both sides. Some 40 amicus curiae briefs were filed in the case, 25 on behalf of the petitioners. The latter groups signed an amicus brief arguing that eminent domain has often been used against politically weak communities with high concentrations of minorities and elderly. The case was argued on February 22, Oral arguments were presented on behalf of the petitioners plaintiffs by Scott G. Bullock of the Institute for Justice in Washington D. During arguments, several of the Justices asked questions that forecast their ultimate positions on the case. Justice Antonin Scalia , for example, suggested that a ruling in favor of the city would destroy "the distinction between private use and public use," asserting that a private use which provided merely incidental benefits to the state was "not enough to justify use of the condemnation power. Virginia , U. Parrish , U. However, he does not explicitly limit these criteria to eminent domain, nor to minimum scrutiny, suggesting that they may be generalized to all health and welfare regulation in the scrutiny regime. A court confronted with a plausible accusation of impermissible favoritism to private parties should [conduct] City of New London did not establish entirely new law concerning eminent domain. In the majority opinion, Justice Stevens wrote the "Court long ago rejected any literal requirement that condemned property be put into use for the general public" U. Thus precedent played an important role in the 5â€”4 decision of the Supreme Court. The Fifth Amendment was interpreted the same way as in Midkiff U. The dissenting opinion suggested that the use of this taking power in a reverse Robin Hood fashionâ€” take from the poor, give to the richâ€” would become the norm, not the exception: Any property may now be taken for the benefit of another private party, but the fallout from this decision will not be random. The beneficiaries are likely to be those citizens with disproportionate influence and power in the political process, including large corporations and development firms. Though citizens are safe from the government in their homes, the homes themselves are not. Allowing the government to take property solely for public purposes is bad enough, but extending the concept of public purpose to encompass any economically beneficial goal guarantees that these losses will fall disproportionately on poor communities. Those communities are not only systematically less likely to put their lands to the highest and best social use, but are also the least politically powerful. Underneath the white paint can just barely be read the words "Thank you Gov. Rell for your support" and the web URLs of two organizations protesting over-use of eminent domain, Castle Coalition and Institute for Justice. The same house, June 10, The "thank you" is still visible, but some windows are broken and others are boarded up, and

"No Trespassing" has been spray-painted on it, as well as the URLs being obscured by spray paint. Following the decision, many of the plaintiffs expressed an intent to find other means by which they could continue contesting the seizure of their homes. The city contended that the residents have been on city property for those five years and owe tens of thousands of dollars of rent. In June , Governor M. Jodi Rell intervened with New London city officials, proposing the homeowners involved in the suit be deeded property in the Fort Trumbull neighborhood so they may retain their homes. As of the beginning of , the original Kelo property was a vacant lot, generating no tax revenue for the city. Pfizer chose to retain the Groton campus on the east side of the Thames River , closing its New London facility in late with a loss of over jobs. The well-laid plans of redevelopers, however, did not pan out. The proposed hotel-retail-condo "urban village" has not been built. And earlier this month, Pfizer Inc. As of the area remains an empty lot. Many owners of family farms also disapproved of the ruling, as they saw it as an avenue by which cities could seize their land for private developments. The American Conservative Union condemned the decision. Prior to the Kelo decision, only seven states specifically prohibited the use of eminent domain for economic development except to eliminate blight. Since the decision, forty-four states have amended their eminent domain laws, although some of these changes are cosmetic. Eventually, the City of New London extended an apology to Susette Kelo and her neighbors, and so did one of the Connecticut Supreme Court Justices who voted for the city. Bush issued an executive order [34] instructing the federal government to restrict the use of eminent domain The operative language prohibits the federal government from exercising eminent domain power if the only justifying "public use" is economic development; and imposes the same limit on state and local government exercise of eminent domain power "through the use of Federal funds. As some small-scale eminent domain condemnations including notably those in the Kelo case can be local in both decision and funding, it is unclear how much of an effect the bill would have if it passed into law. Scholarly reaction[edit] In , land use Professor Daniel R. Mandelker argued that the public backlash against Kelo is rooted in the historical deficiencies of urban renewal legislation. In , Professor Edward J. Lopez of San Jose State University studied passed laws and found that states with more economic freedom, greater value of new housing construction, and less racial and income inequality were more likely to have enacted stronger restrictions sooner. Of those states, 22 enacted laws that severely inhibited the takings allowed by the Kelo decision, while the rest enacted laws that place some limits on the power of municipalities to invoke eminent domain for economic development. The remaining eight states have not passed laws to limit the power of eminent domain for economic development.

Chapter 2 : Minnesota Judicial Branch - Contact Us

All information provided by the Superior Court of California, County of Alameda through this Internet service is provided 'as is", with no warranties, expressed or implied, including the implied warranty of fitness for a particular purpose.

These cases also address the use of such marks in the domain names of sites that do not sell competitive products, or which contain criticisms of the trademark holder. We also provide links to useful domain name dispute resources, including the rules that govern UDRP proceedings, searchable databases of Panel decisions resolving UDRP proceedings, and sample forms used in such proceedings, including the complaint. You can find these links in the Additional Resources section of this page, located after our case descriptions. Court holds that issues of fact preclude it from determining whether defendant acted in bad faith in selecting this domain name, given that he had been doing business under the name "American Basic Craft Carpet and Home Restoration" since , and claimed to have adopted the domain name at issue, "ABcarpetandhome. Active Media International, Inc. Illinois, July 17, In this domain name dispute, Court, at behest of owner of federal trademark in "ActMedia," enjoined defendant from continuing to use "actmedia. As Respondent was found to have acted in bad faith because, inter alia, he only registered the domain after receipt of a cease and desist letter from Complainant, the Panel directed the transfer of the domain name to Complainant, the Anti-Defamation League. Internet Entertainment Group, Inc. Louis, as well as advertising for, and links to, separate adult websites operated by the defendant. These adult sites, in turn, solicited membership for use of the sites, and offered to sell various adult entertainment products and services. These contacts with Missouri were held sufficient to confer specific personal jurisdiction over the defendant on the Missouri District Court. Tarnishment arose by the association of the mark with "websites advertising and promoting adult entertainment materials and services. Robinson WL N. It further held that under US law, a party could not hold a valid trademark in the name of a geographical place. Michael Steven Kremer F. To run afoul of the Lanham Act, a mark must be used in connection with the sale of goods or services. The ACPA does not have a commercial use requirement, and, accordingly, establishing that the mark was used as the domain for a non-commercial gripe site does not absolve the griper from potential liability under the ACPA. The matter was remanded to the District Court to determine whether defendant used the mark with a bad faith intent to profit therefrom, in violation of the ACPA. The Panel refused to grant such relief because Mr. Brees did not establish that he held common law trademark rights in his name at the time of the registration of the domain name in dispute. West Coast Entertainment Corp. While defendant had used the mark in a domain name registered with NSI before plaintiff commenced its use of the mark on the Internet, defendant did not commence operation of a site at that domain name until well after plaintiff commenced use of the mark. In reaching this conclusion, the court relied on the fact that the marks at issue were identical, and were both using the Internet to marketed related products. Significantly, the court held that the addition of ". In reaching this conclusion, the court found that use of the "moviebuff" mark in meta tags would cause prohibited "initial interest confusion. Although there is no source confusion in the sense that consumers know they are patronizing West Coast rather than Brookfield, there is nevertheless initial interest confusion in the sense that, by using "moviebuff. The court did hold that West Coast could use the descriptive phrase "Movie Buff" in its meta tags, provided it included a space between the two words. Gaddoor Saidi Case No. Plaintiff and defendant are direct competitors who offer information to investment professionals. Plaintiff offers its information for free at a web site it operates at "streetevents. Plaintiff sought a preliminary injunction, enjoining defendant from continuing this conduct. Neither party possessed a federally registered trademark. Accordingly, their respective rights turned on which party first commenced use of their mark in commerce. The court, on the record before it, was unable to determine which party had first commenced use of the mark. The evidence plaintiff presented of its usage was insufficient to show that it had test marketed the mark. The court further held that plaintiff had not established sufficient likelihood of consumer confusion to entitle it to the requested relief. The court reached this result notwithstanding the fact that plaintiff submitted evidence of approximately 20 incidents in which investment professionals had actually confused the two services. Said the

court "de minimus confusion, which is easily resolved and does not affect the ultimate purchasing decision, is of minimal relevance. August 7, Plaintiff, holder of a federally registered trademark in the mark "Chambord" for sale of a liqueur and assorted food products, brought this action under the Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act, and for trademark infringement and dilution, against defendant, who holds a federally registered trademark in the mark "Chambord" for the sale of coffee makers. Coca-Cola Company, et al. This anti-abortion website also contained links to other sites which solicited funds, via the sale of goods or donations, to aid anti-abortion causes. Julie Hogan Case No. Rose Marie Dorer and Forrms, Inc. Brian Arel 60 F. Plaintiffs thereafter argued that the domain name was subject to a writ of "fieri facias", a Virginian device which authorizes a sheriff to seize and sell property of the judgment debtor and deliver the proceeds to the judgment creditor in satisfaction of an outstanding judgment. Holding that this procedure presented "several problematic issues," the court declined to resolve "the knotty issue of whether a domain name is personal property subject to the lien of fieri facias. Del Fabbro Laurent Case No. Defendants had also registered some other domain names, a number of which contained the names of famous companies, cities and buildings. Tmark Guagliardo dba Ecash. Plaintiff operates a website at the domain name "edgar-online. Relying on Jews for Jesus v. As in Jews for Jesus v. In Jews for Jesus, confronted with such circumstances, the Court determined that the false designation of origin occurred in interstate commerce "in connection with goods and services" within the meaning of Section 43 a. The same is true here. Experian Information Solutions, Inc. Express Corporation, et al. C WHA N. Because plaintiffs had never voluntarily transferred the domain, the seller was a thief who could not transfer good title to defendant. As a result, defendant was not a good faith purchaser for value, but was instead, guilty of conversion. First Jewellery Company of Canada, Inc. Plaintiffs own the federally registered trademark First Jewellery, which they use in connection with their business of selling jewelry at wholesale to jewelry retailers in both Canada and the United States. Plaintiff does not sell its products at retail. Jewellery is a British variant of the word Jewelry. Plaintiffs first registered their trademark in Defendant commenced its use of this domain on or about June 23, Plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction enjoining defendant from continuing to operate a web site at the firstjewelry. Nonetheless, because of the extensive promotional expenditures defendant had made in connection with its site, and its lack of bad faith, the court did not direct defendant to immediately cease its infringing activities. Garden of Life, Inc. Barry Letzer, et al. The Court further directed plaintiff to remove the existing content on the sites found at those domains and replace it with an "under construction" notification, and pay all registration fees for these domains which may become due. The Court reached this result notwithstanding the fact that defendants had registered the main domain at issue, gardenoflife. As a result, and because defendants registered many of the domains at issue after plaintiff had entered into negotiations with defendants for the purchase of the gardenoflife. The Court holds that such relief is appropriate here, given the fact that the Korean domain name registrar with whom the domain name at issue was registered refused to transfer the domain as directed in a prior judgment issued by the Court. After the Court issued this order, the domain registrant obtained an injunction from a Korean court, enjoining the registrar from transferring the domain. The Court, on default, found that the domain registrant had violated the ACPA by registering the domain name at issue â€" globalsantafe. Independence Corn By-Products Co. The Court determined that plaintiff had registered the domain name with a bad faith intent to profit therefrom, in large part because plaintiff had offered to transfer the domain to Microfinancial if it refunded certain lease payments plaintiff had made which were at the heart of his dispute with defendant, as well as funds plaintiff claims defendant improperly received from third parties. During this period of time, Hasbro has spent millions of dollars advertising its mark, which, according to the Court, "has gained widespread recognition [both] in the United States and abroad. In reaching this result, the court relied primarily on the fact that "clue", the mark in question, was a common term used in a significant number of trademarks not owned by plaintiff. Holders of a famous mark are not automatically entitled to use that mark as their domain name; trademark law does not support such a monopoly. If another Internet user has an innocent and legitimate reason for using the famous mark as a domain name and is the first to register it, that user should be able to use the domain name, provided that it has not otherwise infringed upon or diluted the trademark. Internet Entertainment Group, Ltd. Defendants were, however, permitted by the

court to post for 90 days a referral notice at their former URL address http: The Panel further held that Respondent had a legitimate interest in this domain, which had not been registered in bad faith, because Respondent had used the domain for seven years as the home of a web site critical of Home Depot. The Panel accordingly found that Complainant had failed to establish its entitlement to relief under the UDRP, and denied its complaint. Image Online Design, Inc. Core Association, et al. Lexis , F. Seventh Summit Ventures Claim No. The Panel reached this result because the domain name Indb. Interactive Products, Corporation v. A2Z Mobile Office F. As such, use of the mark in the path of a site would not confuse users as to the source of the products sold thereon, and thus would not typically serve as the basis for a trademark infringement claim. The false advertising claims were dismissed because the statements in question were either true or non-actionable opinion. Interstellar Starship Services Ltd. Jews for Jesus v. Gary Kremen, et al. Stephen Michael Cohen, et al. NSI transferred the domain name to this third party as a result of its receipt of a forged "facially suspect" letter purporting to authorize such a transfer, without validating the request with plaintiffs.

Chapter 3 : Kelo v. City of New London - Wikipedia

A Boutique Hotel at The Domain, Austin TX Lone Star Court Domain Austin - Boutique Hotel Lodging Redefined. Kick your boots off and stay awhile. If you're nostalgic for the bygone days when travel was a true adventure, set your sights on a way at Lone Star Court.

Public domain in copyrighted works in the United States[edit] Congress has restored expired copyrights several times: Works published with notice of copyright or registered in unpublished form on or after January 1, , and prior to January 1, , had to be renewed during the 28th year of their first term of copyright to maintain copyright for a full year term. However, works created by a contractor for the government are still subject to copyright. Even public domain documents may have their availability limited by laws limiting the spread of classified information. The claim that "pre works are in the public domain" is correct only for published works; unpublished works are under federal copyright for at least the life of the author plus 70 years. For a work for hire , the copyright in a work created before , but not theretofore in the public domain or registered for copyright, subsists from January 1, , and endures for a term of 95 years from the year of its first publication, or a term of years from the year of its creation, whichever expires first. DeMille; and the musical London Calling! Sound recordings fixed in a tangible form before February 15, , have been generally covered by common law or in some cases by anti-piracy statutes enacted in certain states, not by federal copyright law, and the anti-piracy statutes typically have no duration limit. The Sound Recordings Act, effective , [4] and the Copyright Act, effective , provide federal copyright for unpublished and published sound recordings fixed on or after February 15, Recordings fixed before February 15, , are still covered, to varying degrees, by common law or state statutes. For sound recordings fixed on or after February 15, , the earliest year that any will go out of copyright and into the public domain in the U. Recordings from to will enter the public domain in Abend to enforce its claim of copyright because the film was a derivative work of a short story that was under a separate, existing copyright, to which Republic owned the film adaptation rights, effectively regaining control of the work in its complete form. Charles Chaplin re-edited and scored his film The Gold Rush for reissue in Laws may make some types of works and inventions ineligible for monopoly; such works immediately enter the public domain upon publication. Many kinds of mental creations, such as publicized baseball statistics , are never covered by copyright. However, any special layout of baseball statistics, or the like, would be covered by copyright law. For example, while a phone book is not covered by copyright law, any special method of laying out the information would be. This was true prior to March 1, , but is no longer the case. Any work of certain, enumerated types now receives copyright as soon as it is fixed in a tangible medium. Although most of the Act was codified into Title 17 of the United States Code , there is a very interesting provision relating to "public domain shareware" which was not, and is therefore often overlooked. Recordation of Shareware a IN GENERALâ€” The Register of Copyrights is authorized, upon receipt of any document designated as pertaining to computer shareware and the fee prescribed by section of title 17, United States Code, to record the document and return it with a certificate of recordation. Such publications shall be offered for sale to the public at prices based on the cost of reproduction and distribution. All regulations established by the Register are subject to the approval of the Librarian of Congress. One purpose of this legislation appears to be to allow "public domain shareware" to be filed at the Library of Congress , presumably so that the shareware would be more widely disseminated. This could have the effect of "certifying" that the author intended to release the software into the public domain. It does not seem that registration is necessary to release the software into the public domain, because the law does not state that public domain status is conferred by registration. Judicial rulings supports this conclusion, see below. By comparing paragraph a and c , one can see that Congress distinguishes "public domain" shareware as a special kind of shareware. Because this law was passed after the Berne Convention Implementation Act of , Congress was well aware that newly created computer programs two years worth, since the Berne Act was passed would automatically have copyright attached. Therefore, one reasonable inference is that Congress intended that authors of shareware would have the power to release their programs into the public domain. This

interpretation is followed by the Copyright Office in 37 C. Berne Convention Implementation Act[edit] The Berne Convention Implementation Act of states in section twelve that the Act "does not provide copyright protection for any work that is in the public domain. Although the only part of the act that does mention "public domain" does not speak to whether authors have the right to dedicate their work to the public domain, the remainder of the committee report does not say that they intended copyright to be an indestructible form of property. Rather the language speaks about getting rid of copyright formalities in order to comply with Berne non-compliance had become a severe impediment in trade negotiations and making registration and marking optional, but encouraged. Section of the Copyright Act[edit] Although there is support in the statutes for allowing work to be dedicated to the public domain, there cannot be an unlimited right to dedicate work to the public domain because of a quirk of U.

Chapter 4 : Website Terms of Use and Disclaimers - DomainWeb

Lone Star Court at The Domain, located at The DomainÂ®: Welcome to Valencia Group's newest addition to our award-winning hotel collection â€" Lone Star Court, an authentic Americana roadside hotel.

Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC. The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a. Howard Coble [chairman of the subcommittee] Presiding. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The subcommittee will come to order. Permit me to, first of all, dismiss some housekeeping duties. The funeral is today. That left us with the decision of doing it today or assuming the risk of maybe running over into next week. We elected to go today. With that in mind, I think it would be in order and appropriate for us to have a moment of silence in the memory of our departed friend, George Brown. Today, we are here to focus our attention on the rapidly changing world of the Internet. The number of domain name registrations has increased, according to one estimate, from approximately , at the beginning of to about 7. As we all know, the expansion of the Internet creates many exciting opportunities for businesses and entrepreneurs. At the same time, however, the Internet also presents many challenges to the enforcement of intellectual property rights. During the last session of the Congress, this subcommittee conducted two hearings on Internet domain names to access their impact on intellectual property rights, particularly the Lanham Act. At that time, Network Solutions, Inc. The general consensus of the Internet and intellectual property communities was that congressional action was not needed. Today, however, with the creation of ICANN and the introduction of competition in the registration of domain names, there is a need to revisit this issue. As noted in the WIPO report, the assignment of domain names is a privately administered system and gives rise to registrations that result in a global presence, accessible from anywhere in the world. Contrast that to intellectual property rights, which are publicly administered on a territorial basis and are exercisable only within that territory. That is the crux of the problem before us. Because the domain name system represents a fertile ground for both trademark and copyright violations, this is an area of special importance to this subcommittee. Although the introduction of competition into the registration of domain names is a positive step for the Internet, it raises significant questions for the intellectual property community. Will the new domain name governance structure adequately protect American intellectual property interests? Finally, can the current system adopt policies to effectively protect intellectual property owners from cybersquatters or is Federal legislation needed? Some would argue that these issues should not be at the top of the agenda for the domain name industry. I do not agree. The issues we will discuss today are indicative of the challenges facing all of us as the governance of the Internet is shifted from the government to the private market. This subcommittee must ensure that, as the Internet grows and transforms itself into the dominant commerce medium of the 21st century, intellectual property concerns are adequately protected. I am now pleased to recognize the ranking member of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. Berman, for his opening statement. First, let me express my appreciation, and I think that I speak for all of us from California, with your efforts to try and accommodate our needs, and I understand what you were trying to go through both in terms of witness schedules and in terms of hearing rooms. We are very grateful for those efforts. You have nothing to apologize for. I think it is very timely for you, Mr. Chairman, to hold this hearing on the intersection of two very important aspects of the development of the Internet. It has been said before that the Internet is the engine driving our economy in the information age. Intellectual property is at the core of the Internet. In fact, what is information? Facts and intellectual property. The information age really is the intellectual property age. Some have said that, in light of the technological advances, a new paradigm is evolving where intellectual property no longer can be nor should it be protected by law. I hope this is a minority view. Some simply believe that we should get the technology in place, get the market working, and then deal with the more complex legal and policy issues. Simply because we can distribute intellectual property to vastly wider audiences than ever before with incredible efficiency, the fundamental reasons to protect intellectual property are no less valid today than they were prior to the invention of the Internet. As technology facilitates the more efficient sharing of ideas and creative thinking, the means to evolve knowledge are more efficient. As the Internet grows, people are

recognizing and realizing new ways to exploit their intellectual property and are finding new and extraordinary economic value in it. I see evidence of this every time the question of copyright comes up. Academics argue for their proprietary interests, publishing houses, song writers, scientists, movie studios, individuals and large corporations all fight to protect their interests in their creative works, as they should. This really is the intellectual property age. But I agree that there is a new paradigm. No longer is it only the responsibility of the individual to protect his or her own rights or the responsibility of the government to protect the rights of the individual. Here, to a large extent, we are privatizing that responsibility. The design of the domain name system and the rules by which registrars and registrants have to play are critical to the ability of intellectual property owners to protect their interests. It is necessary for there to be new, privately established mechanisms and rules to assist individuals in protecting their rights. So what I hope to hear today is a recognition that, above all, as the architecture of the domain name system is being designed and implemented, at the fore of the people who are doing this, that at the fore of your thinking is how best to facilitate the protection of intellectual property. That is important to the protection of the intellectual property and especially to consumers in e-commerce. I am concerned that there be an appropriate mechanism to address trademark disputes. WIPO has made recommendations to address this. In light of the pace at which competition is developing in this area, I urge ICANN to act promptly in establishing the uniform means to protect intellectual property which is placed at greater risk with every day of growth of the Internet and to enforce the terms of their accreditation agreements when those terms are not met. I look forward to hearing from the witnesses, Mr. I thank the gentleman. As evidenced by the number of the members of the subcommittee who are here and the fact that this room is filled, there is obviously great interest in this subject. We are not in the full hearing room because there is a hearing being conducted there now. That is why we are in this room. I think we may well have a second round of questions, particularly for the next panel. Beyond his legal responsibilities, Mr. Pincus also serves as a senior policy advisor for the Secretary and the Department on a broad range of domestic and international issues, including electronic commerce, international trade, telecommunications, intellectual property rights, environmental issues, export controls, and technology. Pincus, we are delighted to have you with us. We on this subcommittee try to adhere to what has become known on the Hill as the 5-minute rule. When the red light illuminates in your eyes, you know that you have exhausted your time. So if you could adhere to the time limit, we would be appreciative, and we would be pleased to hear from you. It is an honor to appear before the subcommittee on this important issue. We at the Commerce Department are very much aware of the importance of intellectual property to the functioning of our economy and of the need to ensure that the domain name has consistent structure to ensure that IP owners have the tools they need to protect their rights in cyberspace just as they can do in the physical world. Indeed, this is one of the basic principles underlying our domain name policy. In , President Clinton directed Secretary Daley to transition management of the domain name system to the private sector in a way that promoted robust competition and international participation. That was the response to Internet stakeholders who were calling for change in the way that Internet names and addresses were assigned for a number of reasons. Pincus, if could you pull the mike a little closer to you, I think the folks in the back of the room could probably hear you better. When a trademark is unlawfully used as a domain name, consumers may be misled about the source of the product or service that is offered on the Internet, and trademark owners may not be able to protect their rights without very expensive litigation. For cyberspace to function effectively as a commercial market, businesses must have confidence that their trademarks can be protected in that environment. It called upon the private sector to create a new, not-for-profit corporation to assume responsibility for management of that system and also set forth a policy framework to govern that transition. The White Paper contains specific recommendations to ensure that this transition would preserve the rights that the trademark holders have in the physical word. I can briefly summarize the recommendations on IP issues that were contained in the White Paper. First of all, access to contact information. The White Paper made quite clear that key elements of contact information that we specified with respect to the ownership and the location of particular web sites would be available for anyone with access to the Internet. That information had to be accurate and up to date. This included a requirement that domain name registrants should pay the registration fees at the time of registration in order to discourage

speculation; that registrants should agree to submit themselves and to be bound by alternate dispute resolution processes so there would be an efficient and effective and inexpensive way to adjudicate disputes between trademark holders and domain name registrants; and that domain name registrants should agree at the time of registration to abide by processes that the new corporation would develop to deal with the issue of famous trademarks being used as domain names. In the years since we issued the White Paper, a lot has happened. As I mentioned, the private sector did come together to create ICANN; and we have recognized that entity and entered into a joint Memorandum of Understanding to jointly design, develop and test the mechanisms that have to be in place in order to transition management responsibility to the private sector. I am pleased that, as ICANN has been up and running in the little more than 7 months since we recognized it, a number of the intellectual property recommendations that were in the White Paper have been implemented. It also requires prepayment of registration fees, and it also includes an agreement to comply with policies on cybersquatting and famous marks as they will become developed. We are also happy that WIPO expeditiously completed their worldwide process and developed what we believe is a very insightful and good report. That confirms a number of the recommendations we made in the White Paper as well as filling in the bones of those issues, and we look forward to the implementation of that agreement. It is imperative that intellectual property owners have the tools they need to enforce their rights in cyberspace. We strongly support the development of appropriate mechanisms to deter actors who in bad faith register domain names to mislead consumers and wrongly capitalize on the good will of trademark owners. Intellectual property owners should be active participants in the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ICANN process, and the ICANN process should take into account the needs of intellectual property owners in developing policies for the domain name system. They map to unique Internet Protocol IP numbers e. The domain name system DNS translates Internet names into the IP numbers needed for transmission of information across the network. As a legacy, major components of the domain name system are still performed by or subject to agreements with agencies of the U.

Chapter 5 : Domain Name Disputes - Internet Library of Law and Court Decisions

The Superior Court of California, County of Alameda, provides the public with online access to civil case records (documents and information) through DomainWeb. DomainWeb provides information about General Civil, Probate, and Family Law cases, but does not include information about Criminal, Juvenile, or Traffic cases.

Dissent, Harlan Syllabus 1. The XIVth Amendment is prohibitory upon the States only, and the legislation authorized to be adopted by Congress for enforcing it is not direct legislation on the matters respecting which the States are prohibited from making or enforcing certain laws, or doing certain acts, but is corrective legislation such as may be necessary or proper for counteracting and redressing the effect of such laws or acts. Whether the accommodations and privileges sought to be protected by the 1st and 2d sections of the Civil Rights Act are or are not rights constitutionally demandable, and if they are, in what form they are to be protected, is not now decided. Nor is it decided whether the law, as it stands, is operative in the Territories and District of Columbia, the decision only relating to its validity as applied to the States. Nor is it decided whether Congress, under the commercial power, may or may not pass a law securing to all persons equal accommodations on lines of public conveyance between two or more States. These cases were all founded on the first and second sections of the Act of Congress known as the Civil Rights Act, passed March 1st, , entitled "An Act to protect all citizens in their civil and legal rights. The jury rendered a verdict for the defendants in this case upon the merits, under a charge of the court to which a bill of exceptions was taken by the plaintiffs. The case was brought here by writ of error at the suit of the plaintiffs. The cases of Stanley, Nichols, and Singleton came up on certificates of division of opinion between the judges below as to the constitutionality of the first and second sections of the act referred to, and the case of Ryan on a writ of error to the judgment of the Circuit Court for the District of California sustaining a demurrer to the information. The Stanley, Ryan, Nichols, and Singleton cases were submitted together by the solicitor general at the last term of court, on the 7th day of November, There were no appearances, and no briefs filed for the defendants. The Robinson case was submitted on the briefs at the last term, on the 9th day of arch, After stating the facts in the above language, he continued: It is obvious that the primary and important question in all [p9] the cases is the constitutionality of the law, for if the law is unconstitutional, none of the prosecutions can stand. The sections of the law referred to provide as follows: That all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theatres, and other places of public amusement, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law and applicable alike to citizens of every race and color, regardless of any previous condition of servitude. But this provision shall not apply to criminal proceedings, either under this act or the criminal law of any State; and provided further, that a judgment for the penalty in favor of the party aggrieved, or a judgment upon an indictment, shall be a bar to either prosecution respectively. Are these sections constitutional? The first section, which is the principal one, cannot be fairly understood without attending to the last clause, which qualifies the preceding part. The essence of the law is not to declare broadly that all persons shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, [p10] public conveyances, and theatres, but that such enjoyment shall not be subject to any conditions applicable only to citizens of a particular race or color, or who had been in a previous condition of servitude. In other words, it is the purpose of the law to declare that, in the enjoyment of the accommodations and privileges of inns, public conveyances, theatres, and other places of public amusement, no distinction shall be made between citizens of different race or color or between those who have, and those who have not, been slaves. Its effect is to declare that, in all inns, public conveyances, and places of amusement, colored citizens, whether formerly slaves or not, and citizens of other races, shall have the same accommodations and privileges in all inns, public conveyances, and places of amusement as are enjoyed by white citizens, and vice versa. The second section makes it a penal offence in any person to deny to any citizen of any race or color, regardless of previous servitude, any of the accommodations or privileges mentioned in the first section. Has Congress constitutional power to make such a law? Of course, no one will

contend that the power to pass it was contained in the Constitution before the adoption of the last three amendments. The power is sought, first, in the Fourteenth Amendment, and the views and arguments of distinguished Senators, advanced whilst the law was under consideration, claiming authority to pass it by virtue of that amendment, are the principal arguments adduced in favor of the power. We have carefully considered those arguments, as was due to the eminent ability of those who put them forward, and have felt, in all its force, the weight of authority which always invests a law that Congress deems itself competent to pass. But the responsibility of an independent judgment is now thrown upon this court, and we are bound to exercise it according to the best lights we have. The first section of the Fourteenth Amendment which is the one relied on , after declaring who shall be citizens of the United States, and of the several States, is prohibitory in its character, and prohibitory upon the States. It is State action of a particular character that is prohibited. Individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject matter of the amendment. It has a deeper and broader scope. It nullifies and makes void all State legislation, and State action of every kind, which impairs the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States or which injures them in life, liberty or property without due process of law, or which denies to any of them the equal protection of the laws. It not only does this, but, in order that the national will, thus declared, may not be a mere brutum fulmen, the last section of the amendment invests Congress with power to enforce it by appropriate legislation. To enforce the prohibition. To adopt appropriate legislation for correcting the effects of such prohibited State laws and State acts, and thus to render them effectually null, void, and innocuous. This is the legislative power conferred upon Congress, and this is the whole of it. It does not invest Congress with power to legislate upon subjects which are within the domain of State legislation, but to provide modes of relief against State legislation, or State action, of the kind referred to. It does not authorize Congress to create a code of municipal law for the regulation of private rights, but to provide modes of redress against the operation of State laws and the action of State officers executive or judicial when these are subversive of the fundamental rights specified in the amendment. Positive rights and privileges are undoubtedly secured by the Fourteenth Amendment, but they are secured by way of prohibition against State laws and State proceedings affecting those rights and privileges, and by power given to Congress to legislate for the purpose of carrying such prohibition into effect, and such legislation must necessarily be predicated upon such supposed State laws or State proceedings, and be directed to the correction [p12] of their operation and effect. A quite full discussion of this aspect of the amendment may be found in United Sates v. An apt illustration of this distinction may be found in some of the provisions of the original Constitution. Take the subject of contracts, for example. The Constitution prohibited the States from passing any law impairing the obligation of contracts. This did not give to Congress power to provide laws for the general enforcement of contracts, nor power to invest the courts of the United States with jurisdiction over contracts, so as to enable parties to sue upon them in those courts. It did, however, give the power to provide remedies by which the impairment of contracts by State legislation might be counteracted and corrected, and this power was exercised. The remedy which Congress actually provided was that contained in the 25th section of the Judiciary Act of , 1 Stat. By this means, if a State law was passed impairing the obligation of a contract and the State tribunals sustained the validity of the law, the mischief could be corrected in this court. The legislation of Congress, and the proceedings provided for under it, were corrective in their character. No attempt was made to draw into the United States courts the litigation of contracts generally, and no such attempt would have been sustained. We do not say that the remedy provided was the only one that might have been provided in that case. Probably Congress had power to pass a law giving to the courts of the United States direct jurisdiction over contracts alleged to be impaired by a State law, and under the broad provisions of the act of March 3d , ch. But under that, or any other law, it must appear as [p13] well by allegation, as proof at the trial, that the Constitution had been violated by the action of the State legislature. Some obnoxious State law passed, or that might be passed, is necessary to be assumed in order to lay the foundation of any federal remedy in the case, and for the very sufficient reason that the constitutional prohibition is against State laws impairing the obligation of contracts. And so, in the present case, until some State law has been passed, or some State action through its officers or agents has been taken, adverse to the rights of citizens sought to be protected by the Fourteenth Amendment, no legislation of the

United States under said amendment, nor any proceeding under such legislation, can be called into activity, for the prohibitions of the amendment are against State laws and acts done under State authority. Of course, legislation may, and should, be provided in advance to meet the exigency when it arises, but it should be adapted to the mischief and wrong which the amendment was intended to provide against, and that is State laws, or State action of some kind, adverse to the rights of the citizen secured by the amendment. Such legislation cannot properly cover the whole domain of rights appertaining to life, liberty and property, defining them and providing for their vindication. That would be to establish a code of municipal law regulative of all private rights between man and man in society. It would be to make Congress take the place of the State legislatures and to supersede them. It is absurd to affirm that, because the rights of life, liberty, and property which include all civil rights that men have are, by the amendment, sought to be protected against invasion on the part of the State without due process of law, Congress may therefore provide due process of law for their vindication in every case, and that, because the denial by a State to any persons of the equal protection of the laws is prohibited by the amendment, therefore Congress may establish laws for their equal protection. In fine, the legislation which Congress is authorized to adopt in this behalf is not general legislation upon the rights of the citizen, but corrective legislation, that is, such as may be necessary and proper for counteracting such laws as the States may [p14] adopt or enforce, and which, by the amendment, they are prohibited from making or enforcing, or such acts and proceedings as the States may commit or take, and which, by the amendment, they are prohibited from committing or taking. It is not necessary for us to state, if we could, what legislation would be proper for Congress to adopt. It is sufficient for us to examine whether the law in question is of that character. An inspection of the law shows that it makes no reference whatever to any supposed or apprehended violation of the Fourteenth Amendment on the part of the States. It is not predicated on any such view. It proceeds ex directo to declare that certain acts committed by individuals shall be deemed offences, and shall be prosecuted and punished by proceedings in the courts of the United States. It does not profess to be corrective of any constitutional wrong committed by the States; it does not make its operation to depend upon any such wrong committed. It applies equally to cases arising in States which have the justest laws respecting the personal rights of citizens, and whose authorities are ever ready to enforce such laws, as to those which arise in States that may have violated the prohibition of the amendment. In other words, it steps into the domain of local jurisprudence, and lays down rules for the conduct of individuals in society towards each other, and imposes sanctions for the enforcement of those rules, without referring in any manner to any supposed action of the State or its authorities. If this legislation is appropriate for enforcing the prohibitions of the amendment, it is difficult to see where it is to stop. Why may not Congress, with equal show of authority, enact a code of laws for the enforcement and vindication of all rights of life, liberty, and property? If it is supposable that the States may deprive persons of life, liberty, and property without due process of law and the amendment itself does suppose this , why should not Congress proceed at once to prescribe due process of law for the protection of every one of these fundamental rights, in every possible case, as well as to prescribe equal privileges in inns, public conveyances, and theatres? The truth is that the implication of a power to legislate in this manner is based [p15] upon the assumption that, if the States are forbidden to legislate or act in a particular way on a particular subject, and power is conferred upon Congress to enforce the prohibition, this gives Congress power to legislate generally upon that subject, and not merely power to provide modes of redress against such State legislation or action. The assumption is certainly unsound. It is repugnant to the Tenth Amendment of the Constitution, which declares that powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people. We have not overlooked the fact that the fourth section of the act now under consideration has been held by this court to be constitutional. That section declares that no citizen, possessing all other qualifications which are or may be prescribed by law, shall be disqualified for service as grand or petit juror in any court of the United States, or of any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and any officer or other person charged with any duty in the selection or summoning of jurors who shall exclude or fail to summon any citizen for the cause aforesaid, shall, on conviction thereof, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and be fined not more than five thousand dollars. In Ex parte Virginia, U. Disqualifications for service on juries are

only created by the law, and the first part of the section is aimed at certain disqualifying laws, namely, those which make mere race or color a disqualification, and the second clause is directed against those who, assuming to use the authority of the State government, carry into effect such a rule of disqualification. In the Virginia case, the State, through its officer, enforced a rule of disqualification which the law was intended to abrogate and counteract. Whether the statute book of the State actually laid down any such rule of disqualification or not, the State, through its officer, enforced such a rule, and it is against such State action, through its officers and agents, that the last clause of the section is directed. These sections, in the objectionable features before referred to, are different also from the law ordinarily called the "Civil Rights Bill," originally passed April 9th, , 14 Stat. This law is clearly corrective in its character, intended to counteract and furnish redress against State laws and proceedings, and customs having the force of law, which sanction the wrongful acts specified. In the Revised Statutes, it is true, a very important clause, to-wit, the words "any law, statute, ordinance, regulation or custom to the contrary notwithstanding," which gave the declaratory section its point and effect, are omitted; but the penal part, by which the declaration is enforced, and which is really the effective part of the law, retains the reference to State laws by making the penalty apply only to those who should subject [p17] parties to a deprivation of their rights under color of any statute, ordinance, custom, etc. The Civil Rights Bill here referred to is analogous in its character to what a law would have been under the original Constitution, declaring that the validity of contracts should not be impaired, and that, if any person bound by a contract should refuse to comply with it, under color or pretence that it had been rendered void or invalid by a State law, he should be liable to an action upon it in the courts of the United States, with the addition of a penalty for setting up such an unjust and unconstitutional defence. In this connection, it is proper to state that civil rights, such as are guaranteed by the Constitution against State aggression, cannot be impaired by the wrongful acts of individuals, unsupported by State authority in the shape of laws, customs, or judicial or executive proceedings. The wrongful act of an individual, unsupported by any such authority, is simply a private wrong, or a crime of that individual; an invasion of the rights of the injured party, it is true, whether they affect his person, his property, or his reputation; but if not sanctioned in some way by the State, or not done under State authority, his rights remain in full force, and may presumably be vindicated by resort to the laws of the State for redress. An individual cannot deprive a man of his right to vote, to hold property, to buy and sell, to sue in the courts, or to be a witness or a juror; he may, by force or fraud, interfere with the enjoyment of the right in a particular case; he may commit an assault against the person, or commit murder, or use ruffian violence at the polls, or slander the good name of a fellow citizen; but, unless protected in these wrongful acts by some shield of State law or State authority, he cannot destroy or injure the right; he will only render himself amenable to satisfaction or punishment, and amenable therefor to the laws of the State where the wrongful acts are committed. Hence, in all those cases where the Constitution seeks to protect the rights of the citizen against discriminative and unjust laws of the State by prohibiting such laws, it is not individual offences, but abrogation and [p18] denial of rights, which it denounces and for which it clothes the Congress with power to provide a remedy. This abrogation and denial of rights for which the States alone were or could be responsible was the great seminal and fundamental wrong which was intended to be remedied. And the remedy to be provided must necessarily be predicated upon that wrong. It must assume that, in the cases provided for, the evil or wrong actually committed rests upon some State law or State authority for its excuse and perpetration. Of course, these remarks do not apply to those cases in which Congress is clothed with direct and plenary powers of legislation over the whole subject, accompanied with an express or implied denial of such power to the States, as in the regulation of commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes, the coining of money, the establishment of post offices and post roads, the declaring of war, etc. In these cases, Congress has power to pass laws for regulating the subjects specified in every detail, and the conduct and transactions of individuals in respect thereof. But where a subject is not submitted to the general legislative power of Congress, but is only submitted thereto for the purpose of rendering effective some prohibition against particular State legislation or State action in reference to that subject, the power given is limited by its object, and any legislation by Congress in the matter must necessarily be corrective in its character, adapted to counteract and

redress the operation of such prohibited State laws or proceedings of State officers. If the principles of interpretation which we have laid down are correct, as we deem them to be and they are in accord with the principles laid down in the cases before referred to, as well as in the recent case of United States v. That amendment prohibits the States from denying to any person the equal protection of the laws, and declares that Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of the amendment. The law in question, without any reference to adverse State legislation on the subject, [p19] declares that all persons shall be entitled to equal accommodations and privileges of inns, public conveyances, and places of public amusement, and imposes a penalty upon any individual who shall deny to any citizen such equal accommodations and privileges. This is not corrective legislation; it is primary and direct; it takes immediate and absolute possession of the subject of the right of admission to inns, public conveyances, and places of amusement.

Chapter 6 : DomainWeb - County of Alameda - Superior Court of California

Domain receive the bulk of their compensation through their share of the carried interest. The investment funds and their general partners are designed to have limited lives. As with many venture capital funds, the expected lifespan of a Domain fund is ten years.

It requires no constitutional recognition; it is an attribute of sovereignty. However, the Fifth Amendment to the U. United States, U. Supreme Court first examined federal eminent domain power in in Kohl v. United States, 91 U. The Supreme Court again acknowledged the existence of condemnation authority twenty years later in United States v. Gettysburg Electric Railroad Company. Congress wanted to acquire land to preserve the site of the Gettysburg Battlefield in Pennsylvania. The railroad company that owned some of the property in question contested this action. From Transportation to Parks Eminent domain has been utilized traditionally to facilitate transportation, supply water, construct public buildings, and aid in defense readiness. Early federal cases condemned property for construction of public buildings e. United States and aqueducts to provide cities with drinking water e. Great Falls Manufacturing Company, U. The Land Acquisition Section and its earlier iterations represented the United States in these cases, thereby playing a central role in early United States infrastructure projects. Condemnation cases like that against the Gettysburg Railroad Company exemplify another use for eminent domain: Some of the earliest federal government acquisitions for parkland were made at the end of the nineteenth century and remain among the most beloved and well-used of American parks. The Department of Justice became involved when a number of landowners from whom property was to be acquired disputed the constitutionality of the condemnation. This is merely one small example of the many federal parks, preserves, historic sites, and monuments to which the work of the Land Acquisition Section has contributed. Land Acquisition in the Twentieth Century and Beyond The work of federal eminent domain attorneys correlates with the major events and undertakings of the United States throughout the twentieth century. The needs of a growing population for more and updated modes of transportation triggered many additional acquisitions in the early decades of the century, for constructing railroads or maintaining navigable waters. Albert Hanson Lumber Company v. The s brought a flurry of land acquisition cases in support of New Deal policies that aimed to resettle impoverished farmers, build large-scale irrigation projects, and establish new national parks. See Morton Butler Timber Co. United States, 91 F. For example, condemnation in United States v. United States, F. Louis associated with the Louisiana Purchase and the Oregon Trail. Property was transformed into airports and naval stations e. United States F. They facilitated infrastructure projects including new federal courthouses throughout the United States and the Washington, D. The numbers of land acquisition cases active today on behalf of the federal government are below the World War II volume, but the projects undertaken remain integral to national interests. In the past decade, Section attorneys have been actively involved in conservation work, assisting in the expansion of Everglades National Park in Florida e. In the aftermath of the September 11, terrorist attacks, Land Acquisition Section attorneys secured space in New York for federal agencies whose offices were lost with the World Trade Towers. Today, Section projects include acquiring land along hundreds of miles of the United States-Mexico border to stem illegal drug trafficking and smuggling, allow for better inspection and customs facilities, and forestall terrorists. Properties acquired over the hundred years since the creation of the Environment and Natural Resources Section are found all across the United States and touch the daily lives of Americans by housing government services, facilitating transportation infrastructure and national defense and national security installations, and providing recreational opportunities and environmental management areas. For information on the history of the Land Acquisition Section, click here.

Chapter 7 : Internet Domain Names and Intellectual Property Rights

The multi-phased Domain development is anchored by Neiman Marcus, Macy's, Dillard's and Dick's Sporting Goods and also offers more than residential units and ample Class A office space, in addition to four on site hotels - Westin Austin at The Domain, Lone Star Court by Valencia Group, The Archer Hotel and Aloft Austin.

Domain of Vabbi â€" 10 AP Complete the 8 renown hearts around the map. Help the royals of Vehjin Palace. At Court of the Dead there will periodically be a trial pre-event Maintain order to help the court reach rulings on the Vabbian dead. About 10 minutes after completion of the event, one of the three judge event will spawn. The judge events are not soloable and they require a couple players to complete. You are transformed as a wurm for this event and must navigate the course while avoiding quicksand traps which can be revealed by the 1 skill. If you get injured, you can either use 2 to heal yourself or 3 to go invisible. Now for the Master Certification part, you will need to hit targets along the way using either your 5 ranged skill or go up to it and use your 4 skill. There are 8 targets along the track with 2 targets right before the finish line. The map below has all the targets. You have to klll the legendary dogs Tegon and Temar at the end of the meta event. The meta starts with Defeat the Priests of Balthazar powering up the Forged Cannonades, and then destroy the cannonades. During this event an Awakened commander will lead some Awakened troops into the foundry. You must go up and defeat the four Priests of Balthazar that spawns up top on the ramps above the foundry and then drop down to defeat the Cannonades that spawn on the bottom once all the priests are killed. Once the cannonades are dispatched, a Champion Forged Commander will spawn. He dies quickly and after he is defeated, Tegon and Temar spawns for the Dogs of War achievement. If you kill Temar first, the encounter will bug out. Tegon will go immune and go back to his pedestal and the entire event fails once the timer goes to 0. Do not kill any of the dogs unless the other one is close to dying or the whole encounter can bug out. This race starts in Vehtendi Arena semi regularly and you will need the griffon mount for some of the sections. He can be found SE of Vehtendi Academy. It has many tongues though it cannot taste; it can always be fed and never gain weight â€" A Fire The greater amount you have of me, the less of others you will see â€" Darkness Regal in color, though born of earth; when crushed and aged. I can eb of great worth â€" Grapes Some wish to be rid of me; for me others greatly yearn. He is found west of Kodash Bazaar. When I go, I might reveal a gift; when I return, I can provide a life â€" The tide Unseen and silent, I arrive in the night; friendly or frightening, I flee at first light â€" A dream To paupers and kings, I give just the same measure. To spawn them, you need to defeat the 8 veteran djinns in Hanging Gardens first. You can do this part solo but you need to kill the vets fast as the torches despawn after a while. Once all 8 torches are lit up, the four champion djinns will spawn. Having 5 or more players is recommended for this part. To talk to them and start the fight, you must have all 8 masteries from this map that involve the djinns they are listed above. Luckily you only need one person in your squad with this and the event will begin.

Chapter 8 : Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

At Court of the Dead there will periodically be a trial pre-event (Maintain order to help the court reach rulings on the Vabbian dead). About 10 minutes after completion of the event, one of the three judge event will spawn.

Chapter 9 : Civil Rights Cases | US Law | LII / Legal Information Institute

CH4: Discuss the similarities and differences between justice of the peace courts and municipal courts. CH4: List the four primary problems confronting the lower courts in the United States. CH4: Identify the types of civil and criminal cases filled in trial courts of general jurisdiction.