

## Summary

The main focus of the thesis is the issue of determining jurisdiction in matters of tort, delict or quasi-delict with regard to the internet. The author finds that the general rules of determining jurisdiction are suitable for use even in disputes arising with connection to the internet. However, strict application of the aforementioned rules would lead to undesirable results. Therefore it is necessary to construe the general rules in such a way that takes into account the unique characteristics of the internet environment. Given the fact that courts are mainly responsible for the interpretation and application of the general rules, significant decisions of European and American courts are thoroughly analyzed. Even though the main focus of the thesis are the decisions of the courts, recent findings of jurisprudence and recommendations of the international bodies are taken into account as well.

In the opening chapters, the unique characteristics of the internet and basic rules for determining the special jurisdiction are presented. Although the issue of determining jurisdiction in contracts is also mentioned in chapter 3, this topic exceeds the scope of this work and is discussed mainly in connection with the “targeting” criterion, which is also significant for out of contract issues. Chapters 4 and 5 provide detailed breakdown of the European and American courts decisions on the issue of special jurisdiction. In chapter 6, the currently used methodological approaches are reviewed and possible adjustments are proposed.

The author finds the “minimal contacts” doctrine, employed by American courts, to be perfectly suitable, because the jurisdiction of the court is possible only in cases which have a special connection between the court and the state. On the other side, the criteria of the “effects test” and “center of interests” are criticized. The author finds these criteria inappropriate for the online environment, for they can often lead to unpredictable and random results. The author emphasizes the importance of the “targeting” approach, as this approach significantly increases the legal certainty of the parties. The author concludes that a certain form of targeting criteria will be required in the future. The rejection of targeting criteria would result in extremely broad jurisdiction of the courts, which would make it impossible to predict the court competent to hear the case. Given that the foreseeability of the jurisdiction is one of the main purposes of the rules determining the competent court, such conclusion is clearly undesirable.