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A small plane crashed in Scotland in July 1976. Five passengers and the pilot were killed on the spot; all the passengers in the plane were from Scotland. At the time of the crash, there were no eyewitnesses to the crash, and the plane was controlled by the Scotland air traffic. The plane was a Piper Aztec with a twin engine, which was manufactured in the USA, and was operated by an air taxi service (McDonald Aviation) in Scotland.

According to reports the plane had crashed after spinning, and the reason was a mechanical breakdown in the propellers of the plane. But after further investigation it was found that there was a possibility of the pilot’s fault also for the plane to crash. The California court appointed Gaynell Reyno as the attorney for this case; she was legal secretary to the attorney who filed the lawsuit. Reyno filed a case against Piper and Hartzell in California, alleging carelessness and severe responsibility.

According to Reyno the case was filed in USA because the rules and law there were more positive for her case, than the law in Scotland. The defendants than moved the case to the Middle District court in Pennsylvania, and tried to obtain a forum non conveniens dismissal. The defendants were arguing that it would be more appropriate to move the case to the UK court, as the crash had taken place in Scotland, and all the descendants of the crash were based in Scotland.

The court acknowledged that it would be better to move the case to Scotland, as it has many links related to the proceedings, and it would be easier to solve the case in Scotland. Finally the Judgment of the Court of Appeals was reversed, maintaining that the District Court has harmed its judgment in carrying out the Gilbert analysis, and holding that dismissal of the case is expelled when the alternative forum is not encouraging to the petitioner compared to the law of medium selected by the petitioner. And finally the case was remanded for further trial.