

No. 20221 - Julio Surrillo, et al. v. Drilake Farms, Inc. v. William Ocasio, et al. v. Irvin King, Carmelo Rosairo Vasquez v. Irvin King, et al.

Neely, J., dissenting:

I dissent on the grounds that the undisputed facts demonstrate conclusively that there were no contacts with Puerto Rico sufficient to justify jurisdiction under International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945). Complying with appropriate rules and regulations of the government of the United States does not constitute a "contact" with any other state or territory, and being "apparently aware" (supra, p. 11) does not constitute a jurisdiction-giving voluntary act.

While the majority pays lip service to the "minimum contacts" test by citing International Shoe; Asahi Metal Indus. Co. v. Superior Court, 480 U.S. 102, 94 L. Ed. 2d 92, 107 S. Ct. 1026 (1987); World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson, 444 U.S. 286, 62 L. Ed. 2d 490, 100 S. Ct. 559 (1980); and Hanson v. Denckla, 357 U.S. 235, 2 L. Ed. 2d 1283, 78 S. Ct. 1228 (1958), they effectively ignore U. S. Supreme Court precedent by quoting from a dissent by a New York intermediate level court (supra, pp. 7-9). The majority may cite Asahi and World-Wide Volkswagen as often as they like, and quote as many pages of Justice Levine's dissent as they like, but pages and pages of citations will make the majority no less wrong.