

**Book Review: Internet Jurisdiction: Law and Practice by
Julia Hörnle, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2021, 544pp,
ISBN: 978-0-19-880692-9, £95.00 (h/bk)**

Tobias Lutzi

Angaben zur Veröffentlichung / Publication details:

Lutzi, Tobias. 2022. "Book Review: Internet Jurisdiction: Law and Practice by Julia Hörnle, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2021, 544pp, ISBN: 978-0-19-880692-9, £95.00 (h/bk)." *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*. Cambridge University Press (CUP).
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0020589321000531>.

***Internet Jurisdiction. Law and Practice* by JULIA HÖRNLE [Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2021, ISBN: 978-0-19-880692-9, 544pp, £95.00 (h/bk)]**

At the first Global Internet and Jurisdiction Conference 2016 in Paris, former Swedish Prime Minister Carl Bildt explained that ‘how the jurisdiction challenges on the Internet are addressed will define our digital future.’ Shortly thereafter, Dan Svantesson explained in *Solving the Internet Jurisdiction Puzzle* (OUP 2017) that the only way to achieve the necessary degree of international coordination in this area would be ‘to generate a common understanding of jurisdiction’ (ibid., p. 227). To that endeavour, Julia Hörnle now makes a significant contribution with her own remarkable book.

The book contains ten studies of specific problems of internet jurisdiction (chapters 3–12), which are sandwiched between two additional chapters engaging with the overarching challenge of how to establish prescriptive, adjudicative, and enforcement jurisdiction with regard to a medium that often lacks any significant connection to the territory of a particular country (chapters 2 and 13).

The fields covered in the chapters dedicated to individual problems range from the enforcement of public law through internet gatekeepers (chapter 3) and jurisdiction for cybercrime (chapters 4 to 6) to data protection (chapter 7) and jurisdiction for private-law disputes (chapters 8 to 12). The wide scope covered by these individual chapters makes their respective depths all the more impressive. Indeed, there are few scholars, if any, who are able to cover such a wide range of topics in such detail (although it should be mentioned that the chapters on criminal jurisdiction and civil and commercial jurisdiction in the EU have been co-authored by Elif Mendos Kuskonmaz and Ioannis Revolidis, respectively).

It is somewhat surprising, though, that many of these individual studies have noticeably incongruent scopes. While some of them take a relatively wide perspective to a whole area of law (such as chapter 4 on criminal jurisdiction, focusing on the interplay with public international law), others compare the answers found in different legal systems to more specific problems (such as chapter 3 on the problem of gatekeeper liability or chapter 6 on criminal enforcement cooperation), often focussing on two systems (such as chapter 5 on jurisdiction in cybercrime cases, comparing German and English law, or chapter 10 on consumer protection, comparing the EU to the US approach), or even just one (such as chapters 8 and 9, discussing a slightly different set of questions of private international law with regard to EU instruments and US law, respectively). Some of the chapters on private international law (such as chapters 8 and 11) also discuss conflict-of-laws rules while others (such as chapters 9 and 10) are limited to questions of international jurisdiction.

One of the reasons for this selection can presumably be found in the author’s aim to identify recurrent themes that can be observed across different fields and legal systems. Indeed, the book reveals an urgent need for further international cooperation in virtually any area it discusses. It highlights the importance of private international law as a means of international coordination in the internet age, especially when contrasted to the lack of a similarly recognized set of rules in other areas of law. The book repeatedly raises the question of the extent to which the mere accessibility of online content provides a viable basis for jurisdiction. And it emphasises how closely many questions of internet jurisdiction are linked to the protection of fundamental rights.

Still, the discussion of some of those themes would arguably have profited from a more consistent structure across the different chapters. The role of private intermediaries as the *de facto* gatekeepers of the internet, for instance, is discussed in chapters 3 and 6 with regard to the ability of states and public authorities to harness their power for the enforcement of public law, although they are arguably just as important with regard to the effective enforcement of private law – as the public debate about the new EU Copyright Directive (No. 2019/790), which carves out a significant exception from the privileges previously enjoyed by online platforms under Art. 14(1) of the e-Commerce Directive (No. 2000/31), aptly demonstrates. Similarly, the problem of national courts issuing injunctions with worldwide effects is discussed in chapter 3 with regard to the obligations of hosting providers but barely feature in the more general chapters on international jurisdiction.

Even for questions that feature more consistently across the different chapters – such as the mosaic approach to online torts developed by the CJEU in Case C-68/93 *Fiona Shevill* and the potential of targeting as a more nuanced alternative (see pp. 284–86, 308, 328–30, 370–78, 403–05, 412–20) – their discussion(s) often remains surprisingly isolated. With regard to targeting, for instance, the author proposes (on pp. 404–05) to combine it with both a centre-of-interests approach, seemingly along the lines of the CJEU’s decision in Joined Cases C-509/09 and C-161/10 *eDate* and *Martinez*, and an ‘objective foreseeability’ criterion, presumably along the lines of the Opinions by AGs Cruz Villalón and Bobek on *eDate* and on Case C-800/19 *Mittelbayerischer Verlag*, respectively, (which the CJEU has regrettably rejected on both occasions) in order to identify the applicable law to infringements of personality rights. Yet, the proposal is neither linked to the parallel problem of adjudicative jurisdiction (where all three criteria originate from) nor mentioned in any of the other chapters.

Interestingly, the proposal is also not picked up in the book’s final chapter, which pulls together the strings from the previous chapters and identifies some overarching trends and challenges (including the targeting criterion: pp. 443–446) in the broader context of establishing jurisdiction over online content and arguably provides the most intriguing part of the book. The cautious style of this final chapter is testimony to the continuously evolving nature of the quest to generate the ‘common understanding’ of internet jurisdiction mentioned earlier. Julia Hörnle has added a veritable treasure trove of extensive studies and astute observations to this endeavour, which reminds the reader of both the many unresolved questions and the importance of continuing to work towards their resolution.