

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 931; Pub. L. 91-577, title III, §143(b), Dec. 24, 1970, 84 Stat. 1559; Pub. L. 100-702, title X, §1020(a)(4), Nov. 19, 1988, 102 Stat. 4671; Pub. L. 105-304, title V, §503(b)(1), (2)(A), Oct. 28, 1998, 112 Stat. 2917; Pub. L. 106-113, div. B, §1000(a)(9) [title III, §3009(1)], Nov. 29, 1999, 113 Stat. 1536, 1501A-551.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §§41(7) and 371(5) (Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, §§24, par. 7, 256, par. 5, 36 Stat. 1092, 1160).

Section consolidates section 41(7) with section 371 (5) of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., with necessary changes in phraseology.

Words “of any civil action” were substituted for “all suits at law or in equity” and “cases” to conform section to Rule 2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Word “patents” was substituted for “patent-right” in said section 371 (Fifth) of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed.

Similar provisions respecting suits cognizable in district courts, including those of territories and possessions. (See section 34 of title 17, U.S.C., 1940 ed., Copyrights.)

Subsection (b) is added and is intended to avoid “piecemeal” litigation to enforce common-law and statutory copyright, patent, and trade-mark rights by specifically permitting such enforcement in a single civil action in the district court. While this is the rule under Federal decisions, this section would enact it as statutory authority. The problem is discussed at length in *Hurn v. Oursler* (1933, 53 S.Ct. 586, 289 U.S. 238, 77 L.Ed. 1148) and in *Musher Foundation v. Alba Trading Co.* (C.C.A. 1942, 127 F.2d 9) (majority and dissenting opinions).

AMENDMENTS

1999—Pub. L. 106-113 substituted “trademarks” for “trade-marks” in section catchline and subsec. (a) and substituted “trademark” for “trade-mark” in subsec. (b).

1998—Pub. L. 105-304, §503(b)(2)(A), inserted “designs,” after “mask works,” in section catchline.

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 105-304, §503(b)(1), inserted “, and to exclusive rights in designs under chapter 13 of title 17,” after “title 17”.

1988—Pub. L. 100-702, §1020(a)(4)(B), amended section catchline generally, inserting “mask works,” after “copyrights,”.

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 100-702, §1020(a)(4)(A), added subsec. (c).

1970—Pub. L. 91-577 inserted references to “plant variety protection” in section catchline and in subsecs. (a) and (b).

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1970 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 91-577 effective Dec. 24, 1970, see section 141 of Pub. L. 91-577, set out as an Effective Date note under section 2321 of Title 7, Agriculture.

§ 1339. Postal matters

The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to the postal service.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 932.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §41(6) (Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, §24, par. 6, 36 Stat. 1092).

Changes were made in phraseology.

§ 1340. Internal revenue; customs duties

The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action arising under any Act of Congress providing for internal revenue, or

revenue from imports or tonnage except matters within the jurisdiction of the Court of International Trade.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 932; Pub. L. 96-417, title V, §501(21), Oct. 10, 1980, 94 Stat. 1742.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §41(5) (Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, §24, par. 5, 36 Stat. 1092; Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 488, §1, 45 Stat. 1475).

Words “Customs Court” were substituted for “Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.” Section 41(5) of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., is based on the Judicial Code of 1911. At that time the only court, other than the district courts, having jurisdiction of customs cases, was the Court of Customs Appeals which became the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in 1929. The Customs Court was created in 1926 as a court of original jurisdiction over customs cases. (See reviser’s note preceding section 251 of this title.)

Words “any civil action” were substituted for “all cases” in view of Rule 2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Changes were made in phraseology.

AMENDMENTS

1980—Pub. L. 96-417 redesignated the Customs Court as the Court of International Trade.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1980 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 96-417 effective Nov. 1, 1980, and applicable with respect to civil actions pending on or commenced on or after such date, see section 701(a) of Pub. L. 96-417, set out as a note under section 251 of this title.

§ 1341. Taxes by States

The district courts shall not enjoin, suspend or restrain the assessment, levy or collection of any tax under State law where a plain, speedy and efficient remedy may be had in the courts of such State.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 932.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §41(1) (Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, §24, par. 1, 36 Stat. 1091; May 14, 1934, ch. 283, §1, 48 Stat. 775; Aug. 21, 1937, ch. 726, §1, 50 Stat. 738; Apr. 20, 1940, ch. 117, 54 Stat. 143).

This section restates the last sentence of section 41(1) of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed.

Other provisions of section 41(1) of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., are incorporated in sections 1331, 1332, 1342, 1345, 1354, and 1359 of this title.

Words “at law or in equity” before “in the courts of such State” were omitted as unnecessary.

Words “civil action” were substituted for “suit” in view of Rule 2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Words “under State law” were substituted for “imposed by or pursuant to the laws of any State” for the same reason.

§ 1342. Rate orders of State agencies

The district courts shall not enjoin, suspend or restrain the operation of, or compliance with, any order affecting rates chargeable by a public utility and made by a State administrative agency or a rate-making body of a State political subdivision, where:

(1) Jurisdiction is based solely on diversity of citizenship or repugnance of the order to the Federal Constitution; and,

(2) The order does not interfere with interstate commerce; and,