

abide the judgment of the court, or has given bond payable to the clerk of the court in such amount and with such surety as the court or judge may deem proper, conditioned upon the compliance by the plaintiff with the future order or judgment of the court with respect to the subject matter of the controversy.

(b) Such an action may be entertained although the titles or claims of the conflicting claimants do not have a common origin, or are not identical, but are adverse to and independent of one another.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 931; Pub. L. 109-2, §4(b)(1), Feb. 18, 2005, 119 Stat. 12.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §41(26) (Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, §24, par. 26, as added Jan. 20, 1936, ch. 13, §1, 49 Stat. 1096).

Words “civil action” were substituted for “suits in equity”; word “plaintiff” was substituted for “complainant”; and word “judgment” was substituted for “decree,” in order to make the language of this section conform with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The words “duly verified” following “in the nature of interpleader,” near the beginning of the section, were omitted. Under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure pleadings are no longer required to be verified or accompanied by affidavit unless specially required by statute. Although verification was specially required by section 41(26) of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., the need therefor is not apparent.

Provisions of section 41(26)(b) of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., relating to venue are the basis of section 1397 of this title. (See, also, reviser’s note under said section.)

Subsections (c) and (d) of said section 41(26) relating to issuance of injunctions constitute section 2361 of this title. (See reviser’s note under said section.)

Subsection (e) of such section 41(26), relating to defense in nature of interpleader and joinder of additional parties, was omitted as unnecessary, such matters being governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Changes were made in phraseology.

#### Editorial Notes

##### AMENDMENTS

2005—Subsec. (a)(1). Pub. L. 109-2 inserted “subsection (a) or (d) of” before “section 1332”.

#### Statutory Notes and Related Subsidiaries

##### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2005 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 109-2 applicable to any civil action commenced on or after Feb. 18, 2005, see section 9 of Pub. L. 109-2, set out as a note under section 1332 of this title.

#### § 1336. Surface Transportation Board’s orders

(a) Except as otherwise provided by Act of Congress, the district courts shall have jurisdiction of any civil action to enforce, in whole or in part, any order of the Surface Transportation Board, and to enjoin or suspend, in whole or in part, any order of the Surface Transportation Board for the payment of money or the collection of fines, penalties, and forfeitures.

(b) When a district court or the United States Court of Federal Claims refers a question or issue to the Surface Transportation Board for determination, the court which referred the question or issue shall have exclusive jurisdiction of a civil action to enforce, enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend, in whole or in part, any

order of the Surface Transportation Board arising out of such referral.

(c) Any action brought under subsection (b) of this section shall be filed within 90 days from the date that the order of the Surface Transportation Board becomes final.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 931; Pub. L. 88-513, §1, Aug. 30, 1964, 78 Stat. 695; Pub. L. 93-584, §1, Jan. 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1917; Pub. L. 97-164, title I, §128, Apr. 2, 1982, 96 Stat. 39; Pub. L. 102-572, title IX, §902(b)(1), Oct. 29, 1992, 106 Stat. 4516; Pub. L. 104-88, title III, §305(a)(1), (2), Dec. 29, 1995, 109 Stat. 944.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §41(27), (28) (Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, §§24(27), (28), 207, 36 Stat. 1091, 1148; Oct. 22, 1913, ch. 32, 38 Stat. 219).

Words “Except as otherwise provided by enactment of Congress” were inserted because of certain similar cases of which the courts of appeals are given jurisdiction. (See, for example, section 21 of title 15, U.S.C., 1940 ed., Commerce and Trade.)

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

Changes were made in phraseology.

#### Editorial Notes

##### AMENDMENTS

1995—Pub. L. 104-88 substituted “Surface Transportation Board’s” for “Interstate Commerce Commission’s” in section catchline and “Surface Transportation Board” for “Interstate Commerce Commission” wherever appearing in text.

1992—Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 102-572 substituted “United States Court of Federal Claims” for “United States Claims Court”.

1982—Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 97-164 substituted “United States Claims Court” for “Court of Claims”.

1975—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 93-584 substituted provisions that the district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions to enforce, in whole or in part, orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to enjoin or suspend, in whole or in part, any order of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the payment of money or the collection of fines, penalties, and forfeitures, for provisions that the district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions to enforce, enjoin, set aside, annul or suspend, in whole or in part, any order of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

1964—Pub. L. 88-513 designated existing provisions as subsec. (a) and added subsecs. (b) and (c).

#### Statutory Notes and Related Subsidiaries

##### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1995 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 104-88 effective Jan. 1, 1996, see section 2 of Pub. L. 104-88, set out as an Effective Date note under section 1301 of Title 49, Transportation.

##### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1992 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 102-572 effective Oct. 29, 1992, see section 911 of Pub. L. 102-572, set out as a note under section 171 of this title.

##### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1982 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 97-164 effective Oct. 1, 1982, see section 402 of Pub. L. 97-164, set out as a note under section 171 of this title.

##### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1975 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 93-584 not applicable to actions commenced on or before last day of first month

beginning after Jan. 2, 1975, and actions to enjoin or suspend orders of Interstate Commerce Commission which are pending when this amendment becomes effective shall not be affected thereby, but shall proceed to final disposition under the law existing on the date they were commenced, see section 10 of Pub. L. 93-584, set out as a note under section 2321 of this title.

**§ 1337. Commerce and antitrust regulations; amount in controversy, costs**

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action or proceeding arising under any Act of Congress regulating commerce or protecting trade and commerce against restraints and monopolies: *Provided, however,* That the district courts shall have original jurisdiction of an action brought under section 11706 or 14706 of title 49, only if the matter in controversy for each receipt or bill of lading exceeds \$10,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

(b) Except when express provision therefor is otherwise made in a statute of the United States, where a plaintiff who files the case under section 11706 or 14706 of title 49, originally in the Federal courts is finally adjudged to be entitled to recover less than the sum or value of \$10,000, computed without regard to any setoff or counterclaim to which the defendant may be adjudged to be entitled, and exclusive of any interest and costs, the district court may deny costs to the plaintiff and, in addition, may impose costs on the plaintiff.

(c) The district courts shall not have jurisdiction under this section of any matter within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Court of International Trade under chapter 95 of this title.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 931; Pub. L. 95-486, §9(a), Oct. 20, 1978, 92 Stat. 1633; Pub. L. 96-417, title V, §505, Oct. 10, 1980, 94 Stat. 1743; Pub. L. 97-449, §5(f), Jan. 12, 1983, 96 Stat. 2442; Pub. L. 104-88, title III, §305(a)(3), Dec. 29, 1995, 109 Stat. 944.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §41(8), (23) (Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, §24, pars. 8, 23, 36 Stat. 1092, 1093; Oct. 22, 1913, ch. 32, 38 Stat. 219).

Words "civil action" were substituted for "suits", in view of Rule 2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Changes were made in phraseology.

**Editorial Notes**

AMENDMENTS

1995—Subsecs. (a), (b). Pub. L. 104-88 substituted "11706 or 14706" for "11707".

1983—Pub. L. 97-449 substituted "section 11707 of title 49" for "section 20(11) of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 20(11)) or section 219 of part II of such Act (49 U.S.C. 319)" wherever appearing.

1980—Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 96-417 added subsec. (c).

1978—Pub. L. 95-486 designated existing provisions as subsec. (a), inserted proviso giving the district courts original jurisdiction of actions brought under sections 20(11) and 219 of the Interstate Commerce Act when the amounts in controversy for each receipt exceed \$10,000, exclusive of interests and costs, and added subsec. (b).

**Statutory Notes and Related Subsidiaries**

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1995 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 104-88 effective Jan. 1, 1996, see section 2 of Pub. L. 104-88, set out as an Effective

Date note under section 1301 of Title 49, Transportation.

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.

**§ 1338. Patents, plant variety protection, copyrights, mask works, designs, trademarks, and unfair competition**

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, copyrights and trademarks. No State court shall have jurisdiction over any claim for relief arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, or copyrights. For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

(b) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action asserting a claim of unfair competition when joined with a substantial and related claim under the copyright, patent, plant variety protection or trademark laws.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) apply to exclusive rights in mask works under chapter 9 of title 17, and to exclusive rights in designs under chapter 13 of title 17, to the same extent as such subsections apply to copyrights.

(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; Pub. L. 112-29, §19(a), Sept. 16, 2011, 125 Stat. 331.)

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).