In the case of Jeremy Jaynes v. Commonwealth of Virginia, Jeremy Jaynes was initially convicted for nine years’ imprisonment for sending “spam” mail out on three occasions to AOL subscribers. The Court of Appeals of Virginia ultimately reversed the final judgement and vacated all the convictions due to the statute being unconstitutionally overbroad by violating the First Amendment. An interesting issue arose in the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court of Loudoun County over Jaynes. Was Jaynes in the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court of Loudoun County while using his computer in Raleigh, South Carolina?

Jaynes argued the jurisdiction of the circuit court being that he only used his computer which is in his house in Raleigh, South Carolina. He claimed that he sent emails and magically all of them were routed through the AOL servers, which were in Loudoun County and Prince William County in Virginia. Both the circuit court and the court of appeals found this claim to fail because the evidence clearly expressed that Jaynes intended to send emails to only those that ended in “@aol.com”, which would then route through AOL’s servers in the two Virginia counties before ultimately being received by the recipient. Jaynes also argues with the “immediate result doctrine”, which would protect him if the emails were sent and routed randomly to any emails. The court of appeals found this claim also fails due to the fact that the evidence shows he only targeted the AOL emails which in turn would use the AOL servers causing the “immediate result” to be the AOL servers being used to deliver the emails.

The court of appeals final rule on the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court of Loudoun County over Jaynes was confirmed. Overall this ruling allowed the court of appeals to further investigate the other arguments that were brought by Jaynes. If the court of appeals found that the circuit court didn’t have jurisdiction then immediately all the convictions would be waived. I believe that the ruling was appropriate for the situation. Jaynes explicitly used AOL email addresses to send the emails which in turn used the AOL servers located in Virginia and since the location of the servers is easily accessed by the public it seems only trivial that the jurisdiction is given to the circuit court.

Online shopping has become a must in the 21st century. I buy a lot of items online because it is simple, fast, convenient, and gives access to much more than you would traditionally find in a store. Let’s assume that I lived in California and I owned a marijuana shop. I also have a website for this shop that automatically distributes the ordered quantity to the address provided. A customer orders a package of marijuana and gets it delivered to an address in Virginia, assuming I didn’t set up the delivery that restricted to California and Colorado addresses only. The package gets confiscated in Virginia and I get summoned by the Circuit Court of Loudoun County. The circuit court would have jurisdiction over me because the package was delivered by me to Virginia, where it is illegal to distribute marijuana. Although I accidentally didn’t restrict the addresses, I am still held accountable due to the fact that is known that only California and Colorado allow marijuana use and this information can be easily found by myself with a quick Google search. The “immediate result doctrine” would also not apply to me because the “immediate result” is an address located in Virginia, which shows it was deliberately sent to Virginia. Now if the delivery was going to Colorado and was confiscated in Nevada, then the “immediate result doctrine” would apply because Nevada is a third party in the transaction.

The ruling of the court of appeals to uphold the jurisdiction of the circuit court over Jaynes was supported heavily by the evidence. It was clear that the intentions of Jaynes disregarded his arguments against the validity of the jurisdiction. But although the jurisdiction was upheld, the decision was ultimately reversed and Jaynes’s convictions were wiped.