

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Griffin v. Ste. Michelle Wine Estates, LTD, et al
Docket No. 47703

Mary Clare Griffin purchased a bottle of Italian wine in Idaho, which broke when she attempted to open it, causing substantial injuries to her hand. Griffin brought a products liability suit against Zignago Vetro S.P.A. (Zignago), the Italian manufacturer of the wine bottle; Marchesi Antinori SRL (Antinori), the Italian wine company that purchased the bottle from Zignago, filled it with wine, and exported it to the United States; Chateau Sainte Michelle Wine Estates, Ltd. (Ste. Michelle), the United States importer; S & C Importers and Distributors, Inc. (S&C), the Idaho distributor who purchased the bottle from Ste. Michelle; and, Albertson's LLC (Albertson's), the retailer that sold the bottle to Griffin.

Zignago successfully moved the district court to dismiss Griffin's complaint based on a lack of personal jurisdiction. Griffin appealed the district court's decision, asking this Court to apply the personal jurisdiction framework established by the United States Supreme Court in *World Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson*, 444 U.S. 286 (1980). Zignago asserted that the district court did not err by applying the stricter test that the United States Supreme Court offered in *Asahi Metal Indus. Co. v. Superior Court of California, Solano Cnty.*, 480 U.S. 102 (1987) (plurality). Griffin also appealed the district court's order granting summary judgment to Antinori and Ste. Michelle on the grounds that Griffin failed to meet her burden to show a *prima facie* case for a products liability claim. Additionally, Griffin appealed several adverse discovery rulings.

On appeal to the Idaho Supreme Court, the Court reversed the district court's decision to grant Zignago's motion to dismiss because it applied *Asahi* instead of *World Wide Volkswagen*. Applying *World Wide Volkswagen* to Griffin's case, the Court held that Zignago placed the wine bottle into the stream of commerce with the knowledge that it would end up in Idaho, and it would not violate Zignago's constitutional due process rights for an Idaho court to exercise jurisdiction over Zignago. Furthermore, the Idaho Supreme Court affirmed the district court's decision to grant Antinori and Ste. Michelle's motion for summary judgment as Griffin failed to meet her burden on her products liability claim. Otherwise, the Idaho Supreme Court affirmed the district court's other discovery rulings.

This summary constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court, but has been prepared by court staff for the convenience of the public.