

Presented:

Admiralty and Maritime Law Conference

October 18, 2013
Houston, TX

**RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN ADMIRALTY AND
MARITIME LAW AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL AND
IN THE FIFTH AND ELEVENTH CIRCUITS**

David W. Robertson
W. Page Keeton Chair in Tort Law
University Distinguished Teaching Professor
University of Texas
727 East Dean Keeton Street, Austin, Texas 78705
512/232-1339; Fax 512/858-1045
drobertson@law.utexas.edu

Michael F. Sturley
Fannie Coplin Regents Chair in Law
University of Texas
727 East Dean Keeton Street, Austin, Texas 78705
512/232-1350; Fax 512/471-6988
msturley@law.utexas.edu

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME LAW AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL AND IN THE FIFTH AND ELEVENTH CIRCUITS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENTS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL	2
A. Federal Rules Amendments	2
B. Editorial Corrections to the Rotterdam Rules	3
C. Maximum Compensation Rate Under the LHWCA	3
D. Proposed Rules for Ocean Transportation Intermediaries	3
III. THE WORK OF THE SUPREME COURT	4
A. Vessel Status	4
Lozman v. City of Riviera Beach	
B. Selected Nonmaritime Decisions	5
1. <i>Alien Tort Statute</i>	5
Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Petroleum Co.	
2. <i>Federal Tort Claims Act</i>	6
Millbrook v. United States	
Levin v. United States	
3. <i>Clean Water Act (CWA)</i>	7
Los Angeles County Flood Control District v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.	
4. <i>Takings Clause</i>	8
Arkansas Game and Fish Commission v. United States	
C. Grant of Certiorari	8
Atlantic Marine Construction Co. v. United States District Court for the Western District of Texas	
IV. SELECTED DECISIONS FROM AROUND THE COUNTRY	9
A. Admiralty Jurisdiction: Effects of the <i>Lozman</i> Approach to Vessel Status	9
Fireman's Fund Insurance Co. v. Great American Insurance Co.	
Catlin (Syndicate 2003) at Lloyd's v. San Juan Towing & Marine Services, Inc.	
Sea Village Marina, LLC v. 1980 Carlcraft Houseboat	
Armstrong v. Manhattan Yacht Club, Inc.	

B. Removal of Maritime Cases from State to Federal Court	12
Speranza v. Leonard	
C. Assessing Admiralty Jurisdiction in Declaratory Actions: The “Mirror Image” Approach	12
Garanti Finansal Kiralama A.S. v. Aqua Marine & Trading Inc.	
D. Admiralty Jurisdiction Miscellany	14
Thorpe v. TJM Ocean Isle Partners LLC	
Hickham v. Segars	
Village of Bald Head Island v. United States Army Corps of Engineers	
El v. Americredit Financial Services, Inc.	
E. Supplemental Rule B	16
1. <i>Subject Matter Jurisdiction, Personal Jurisdiction, Pleading Requirements</i>	16
Vitol, S.A. v. Primerose Shipping Co. Ltd.	
2. <i>Choice of Law</i>	18
Blue Whale Corp. v. Grand China Shipping Development Co.	
F. Seaman Status	20
Dize v. Ass’n of Maryland Pilots	
G. The Rights of Seamen	20
1. <i>Must A Seaman Suing a Nonemployer Vessel For Unseaworthiness Establish Crew Member Status Aboard that Vessel?</i>	20
Walters v. Dann Marine Towing, LC.	
2. <i>Unseaworthiness Actions by “Sieracki Seamen”</i>	21
Janes v. Alaska Railbelt Marine, LLC	
3. <i>Maintenance, Cure, and Unearned Wages: Overtime Pay</i>	21
Padilla v. Maersk Line, Ltd.	
4. <i>Punitive Damages</i>	22
H. Federal Maritime Tort and Contract Law	23
1. <i>Punitive Damages</i>	23
Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Minton	
Rowe v. Hornblower Fleet	
Hicks v. Vane Line Bunkering, Inc.	
McRight v. Maersk Line, Ltd.	

2. <i>Government Contractor Defense (and Federal Officer Removal Act)</i>	24
Ruppel v. CBS Corporation	
I. Carriage of Goods	26
1. <i>Carriers' Actions Against Cargo Interests</i>	26
Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha, Ltd. v. Plano Molding Co.	
Chem One, Ltd. v. M/V Rickmers Genoa	
2. <i>One-Year Time-for-Suit Provision</i>	27
Clevo Co. v. Hecny Transportation, Inc.	
3. <i>Forum Selection Clauses in Bills of Lading</i>	28
Good v. Nippon Yusen Kaisha	
Great American Insurance Company of New York v. Nippon Yusen Kaisha	
AIG Mexico Seguros Interamericana, S.A. de C.V. v. M/V Zapoteca	
Pacific Asian Enterprises v. Cross Chartering NV	
J. Marine Insurance	29
Weeks Marine, Inc. v. American Steamship Owners Mutual Protection & Indemnity Association, Inc. (February 1)	
Weeks Marine, Inc. v. American Steamship Owners Mutual Protection & Indemnity Association, Inc. (February 8)	
K. Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA)	30
1. <i>Negligence Actions Against Vessels Under LHWCA § 5(b)</i>	30
Bunn v. Oldendorff Carriers GMBH & Co., KG,	
2. <i>The Intoxication and Suicide Defenses to LHWCA Compensation Claims</i>	31
Schwirse v. Director, OWCP	
Kealoha v. Director, OWCP	
3. <i>Judicial Review in Defense Base Act Cases</i>	34
Truczinas v. Director, OWCP	
4. <i>Nuts and Bolts of Workers' Compensation Law</i>	35
Marine Repair Air Services Inc. v. Fifer	
Homeport Ins. Services v. Lundy	
Pettitt v. Sause Brothers	
L. Collision	36
In re Frescati Shipping Co.	

M. Salvage	37
Williamson v. Recovery Ltd. Partnership	
N. Procedure	39
1. <i>Appellate Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(3)</i>	39
Williamson v. Recovery Ltd. Partnership	
2. <i>Forum Non Conveniens</i>	40
Frederiksson v. HR Textron, Inc.	
3. <i>Procedural Issues in Limitation of Liability Proceedings</i>	41
In re American River Transportation Co.	
3. <i>Arbitration</i>	43
Garanti Finansal Kiralama A.S. v. Aqua Marine & Trading Inc.	
O. Miscellaneous Cases	43
Angelex Ltd. v. United States	
<u>V. THE WORK OF THE FEDERAL COURTS IN THE FIFTH AND ELEVENTH CIRCUITS</u>	45
A. Admiralty Jurisdiction	45
1. <i>Effects of the Lozman Approach to Vessel Status</i>	45
Lemelle v. St. Charles Gaming Co.	
McBride v. Estis Well Service, LLC	
Perio v. Titan Maritime, LLC	
Dune Energy, Inc. v. FROGCO Amphibious Equipment, LLC	
Mooney v. W & T Offshore, Inc.	
Warrior Energy Services Corp. v. ATP Titan	
Nassri v. Inland Dredging Co.	
Barker v. Hercules Offshore, Inc.	
2. <i>Applications of the Grubart Test for Admiralty Jurisdiction in Tort Cases</i>	50
Barker v. Hercules Offshore, Inc.	
3. <i>Criteria for Designating a Body of Water As “Navigable” for Admiralty/Maritime Purposes</i>	51
Aqua Log, Inc. v. Lost & Abandoned Pre-Cut Logs & Rafts of Logs	
4. <i>Removal Into Admiralty</i>	52
Barker v. Hercules Offshore, Inc.	
Ryan v. Hercules Offshore, Inc.	
Wells v. Abe’s Boat Rentals Inc.	

Perio v. Titan Maritime, LLC	
B. The Rights of Seamen	54
1. <i>Seaman Status</i>	54
Duet v. American Commercial Lines LLC	
Clark v. American Marine & Salvage, LLC	
Grab v. Boh Brothers Construction Co.	
Cushwa v. Ross	
Smith v. Tetra Applied Technologies, LLC	
2. <i>The McCorpen Defense to Maintenance and Cure</i>	57
Boudreaux v. Transocean Deepwater, Inc.	
Lett v. Omega Protein, Inc.	
Fricke v. John W. Stone Oil Distributor, LLC	
3. <i>Restitution of Maintenance and Cure Overpayments</i>	58
Boudreaux v. Transocean Deepwater, Inc.	
4. <i>Two Different “Course and Scope of Employment” Requirements</i>	58
Ebanks v. United States	
5. <i>Punitive Damages</i>	59
McBride v. Estis Well Service, L.L.C.	
Snyder v. L & M Botruc Rental, Inc.	
Todd v. Canal Barge Co.	
Ainsworth v. Caillou Island Towing Co.	
Bloodsaw v. Diamond Offshore Management Co.	
In re International Marine, L.L.C.	
C. Federal Maritime Tort Law	61
1. <i>Punitive Damages</i>	61
Callahan v. Gulf Logistics, L.L.C.	
Operaciones Tecnicas Marinas S.A.S. v. Diversified Marine Services, LLC	
McWilliams v. Exxon Mobil Corp.	
2. <i>Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress</i>	63
Barker v. Hercules Offshore, Inc.	
3. <i>Two Aspects of Economic Loss Doctrine</i>	65
Bertucci Contracting Co. v. Steele	

Smith Maritime, Inc. v. L/B Kaitlyn Eymard	
D. Carriage of Goods	66
1. <i>The Applicability of the Carmack Amendment After Regal-Beloit</i>	66
Norfolk Southern Railway Co. v. Sun Chemical Corp.	
2. <i>Negligent Third Parties and Himalaya Clauses</i>	67
Norfolk Southern Railway Co. v. Sun Chemical Corp.	
3. <i>Forum Selection Clauses in Bills of Lading</i>	68
Haratio Shipping Co., Ltd. v. Oceaneering International, Inc.	
E. Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act	68
1. <i>Removal of OCSLA/Admiralty Cases</i>	68
Barker v. Hercules Offshore, Inc.	
F. Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA)	69
1. <i>A Major Shift Re The Act's Coverage</i>	69
New Orleans Depot Services, Inc. v. Director, OWCP	
G. Collision	72
Mike Hooks Dredging Co. v. Marquette Transportation Gulf-Inland, L.L.C.	
H. Salvage	73
Lay v. Hixson	
I. Procedure	73
1. <i>Forum Non Conveniens</i>	73
Giglio Sub S.N.C. v. Carnival Corp.	

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME LAW AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL AND IN THE FIFTH AND ELEVENTH CIRCUITS

David W. Robertson
W. Page Keeton Chair in Tort Law
University Distinguished Teaching Professor
University of Texas
727 East Dean Keeton Street, Austin, Texas 78705
512/232-1339; Fax 512/858-1045
drobotson@law.utexas.edu

Michael F. Sturley
Fannie Coplin Regents Chair in Law
University of Texas
727 East Dean Keeton Street, Austin, Texas 78705
512/232-1350; Fax 512/471-6988
msturley@law.utexas.edu

October 1, 2013

I. INTRODUCTION

This is the thirteenth article in a series of annual reports on U.S. admiralty and maritime law and practice.¹ In these articles we try to call attention to the principal na-

¹ The preceding twelve articles are David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 37 TUL. MAR. L.J. 401 (2013) [hereinafter *2012 Recent Developments*]; David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 36 TUL. MAR. L.J. 425 (2012) [hereinafter *2011 Recent Developments*]; David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 35 TUL. MAR. L.J. 493 (2011) [hereinafter *2010 Recent Developments*]; David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 34 TUL. MAR. L.J. 443 (2010) [hereinafter *2009 Recent Developments*]; David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 33 TUL. MAR. L.J. 381 (2009) [hereinafter *2008 Recent Developments*]; David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 32 TUL. MAR. L.J. 493 (2008) [hereinafter *2007 Recent Developments*]; David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 31 TUL. MAR. L.J. 463 (2007) [hereinafter *2006 Recent*

tional-level developments that bear on the work of admiralty judges, lawyers, and scholars, and we look more closely at the relevant work of the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits. We do not warrant full coverage, although with respect to the Fifth and Eleventh Circuit Courts of Appeals, we try to be fairly thorough.²

II. MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENTS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

A. Federal Rules Amendments

Amendments to the federal rules of civil and appellate procedure are expected to go into effect on December 1, 2013. Amendments to civil rules 37 and 45 relate to subpoena practice. Amendments to appellate rules 28 and 28, dealing with briefing requirements, consolidate the dual requirements of a “statement of the case” and a “statement of facts” into one requirement of a “concise statement of the case.”³

Developments]; David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 30 TUL. MAR. L.J. 195 (2006) [hereinafter 2005 *Recent Developments*]; David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 29 TUL. MAR. L.J. 369 (2005) [hereinafter 2004 *Recent Developments*]; David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 16 U.S.F. MAR. L.J. 147 (2004) [hereinafter 2003 *Recent Developments*]; David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 27 TUL. MAR. L.J. 495 (2003) [hereinafter 2002 *Recent Developments*]; David W. Robertson & Michael F. Sturley, *Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits*, 26 TUL. MAR. L.J. 193 (2001) [hereinafter 2001 *Recent Developments*].

² We make no attempt to be thorough respecting district court decisions, although we have included some for their information value. “A decision by a federal district judge is not binding precedent in either a different judicial district, the same judicial district, or even upon the same judge in a different case.” 18 MOORE’S FEDERAL PRACTICE § 134.02[1][d], p. 138-24.1 (3d ed. 2007). *See also* American Electric Power Co. v. Connecticut, 131 S. Ct. 2527, 2540 (2011) (“[F]ederal district judges, sitting as sole adjudicators, lack authority to render precedential decisions binding other judges, even members of the same court.”).

³ *See* 81 U.S.L.W. 1521 (Apr. 23, 2013). Other amendments to the appellate rules address appeals from the Tax Court. There are also amendments to the bankruptcy, criminal procedure, and evidence rules.