

November 30, 2010



## Trust & Estate Litigation

Case law relating to trusts and estates is constantly evolving. To keep you updated, this newsletter reports on new decisions of note. I hope you and your clients find it helpful.

Here's the latest from the Massachusetts courts:

In *Ajemian v. Yahoo! Inc.*, Case No. 09E-0079-GC1 (Nov. 10, 2010), the Norfolk County Probate and Family Court (Casey, J.) addressed the question of whether the administrators of an estate could access the decedent's e-mail account with Yahoo, including all of the decedent's e-mails. Yahoo filed a motion to dismiss the administrator's complaint in equity, arguing, *inter alia*, (1) that the forum selection clause in the "Terms of Service" contract between the decedent and Yahoo requires the action to be brought in California, (2) that the one-year limitations period set forth in the contract had expired, and (3) that the administrators had failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted because the private e-mails in the decedent's Yahoo account are not property of the decedent's estate.

The Court granted Yahoo's motion to dismiss based on the forum selection clause. The Court explained that these clauses are to be enforced in Massachusetts if (1) doing so is fair and reasonable, (2) the contract was not affected by fraud, undue influence or a disparate bargaining position, and (3) enforcement would not contravene a strong public policy of Massachusetts. Regarding online contracts in particular, the Court explained that courts elsewhere have applied traditional principles of contract law and determined whether the plaintiff had both reasonable notice of the online contract and manifested assent to its terms. Here, the Court rejected the administrators' argument that forcing them to travel to California to litigate would be oppressive. Mere inconvenience and additional expense are not enough, especially where it may be assumed that the contracting party had received consideration for this inconvenience and expense. Moreover, the Court found it significant that the administrators' legal remedies would not be reduced in California, because both Massachusetts and California consider the same principles

If you have a T&E litigation question or issue you'd like to discuss, I'd like to hear from you. Please e-mail or call me. Also, please feel free to forward this to others who might be interested.

**Mark E. Swirbalus**

Attorney at Law  
Probate Controversies

**Day Pitney LLP**

One International Place  
Boston MA 02110

t (617) 345 4753

f (617) 206 9359

c (617) 763 9912

[meswirbalus@daypitney.com](mailto:meswirbalus@daypitney.com)

[www.daypitney.com](http://www.daypitney.com)

Mark is a partner in the Boston office of Day Pitney LLP and a trial lawyer in the firm's Probate Controversies Practice Group. To learn more about Mark and his practice, [click here](#).

in measuring fairness and reasonableness. The fact that the decedent may not have actually read the Yahoo contract was of “no consequence,” because the decedent was free to find another no-cost e-mail provider.

Given the enforceability of the forum selection clause, the Court held that the California court should determine when the one-year limitations period in the contract began running and whether it had expired. The Court likewise held that the “seminal issue” of whether the decedent’s e-mail accounts are property of his estate or Yahoo should also be resolved by the California court.

---

This communication is provided for educational and informational purposes only and is not intended and should not be construed as legal advice. This communication may be deemed advertising under applicable state laws. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

If you have any questions regarding this communication, please contact Day Pitney LLP at 7 Times Square, New York, NY 10036, T: 212 297 5800.

© 2010, Day Pitney LLP | One International Place | Boston | MA | 02110