

Compare two different

Law



Insert Introduction There are similarities and differences between the cases Bombliss v. Cornelsen and Internet Solutions Corp. v. Marshall, as shall be seen in the ensuing discourse.

1. How the Two Cases Are Similar

The two cases are similar in three respects. For one, Bombliss v. Cornelsen and Internet Solutions Corp. v. Marshall are all about defamation and injurious falsehood, also known as trade libel. Concerning the latter, Tabitha Marshall is charged with airing information that defames and injures Internet Solutions Corp's business interests. Cornelsen also airs information that defames and injures Bombliss' business interests. The second point of similarity is that both cases have the plaintiff being dismissed on the basis of the absence of personal jurisdiction. The third aspect of similarity is that both rulings are appealed, the absence of personal jurisdiction is challenged and the rulings are reversed.

2. How the Cases Are Different

The cases are different in that in Bombliss v. Cornelsen, Bombliss is the plaintiff and Cornelsen, the defendant. In Internet Solutions Corp. v. Marshall, Internet Solutions Corp is the plaintiff and Tabitha Marshall, the defendant. In Internet Solutions Corp. v. Marshall, the final ruling is made in the Florida Supreme Court while Bombliss v. Cornelsen is settled in the Appellate Court of Illinois. In Internet Solutions Corp. v. Marshall, the contention is Fla. Stat. section 48. 193(1) (b): whether or not the material posted online on a Florida resident must only have its access restricted to Florida. In the case, Bombliss v. Cornelsen the contention is whether or not the contacts between Cornelsen and Bombliss are adequate to establish personal jurisdiction, and thereby satisfying due process.

<https://assignbuster.com/compare-two-different/>

3. What Else (if anything) Can Be Done If Marshall Had Committed Defamation

in the event that Tabitha Marshall had committed the defamation, the court would establish whether the claim the plaintiff pressed for in the court are commensurate with the damages. The court would then make a ruling to the effect that Marshall pays for the damages that the plaintiff, Internet Solutions Corp incurred because of the information she had posted in the website. In the event that Marshall is unable to pay for the damages, Marshall would be subjected to a prison term.