# 29TH ANNUAL DAVID W. ROBERTSON ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME LAW CONFERENCE

OCTOBER 16, 2020 HOUSTON, TEXAS

## Judicial Perspective: Discussion of Maritime Decisions and Practice

Honorable Lee H. Rosenthal Chief Judge United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas

> Kenneth G. Engerrand President

> > Brown Sims, P.C. 1177 West Loop South Tenth Floor Houston, Texas 77027 713.629-1580 kengerrand@brownsims.com

### **Table of Contents**

- 1 Case v. Omega Natchiq, Inc., No. H-08-835 (S.D. Tex. July 10, 2008).
- 2 Mendez v. Anadarko Petroleum Corp., No. H-10-1755 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 9, 2010).
- 3 *Mendez v. Anadarko Petroleum Corp.,*No. H-10-1755 (S.D. Tex. Dec. 20, 2010), *aff'd*, 466 F. App'x 316 (5th Cir. Mar. 26, 2012).
- 4 Wells v. Abe's Boat Rentals, Inc., No. H-13-1112 (S.D. Tex. June 18, 2013).
- 5 Butler v. Ensco Intercontinental GmbH, No. H-16-578 (S.D. Tex. Feb. 7, 2017).
- 6 Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co. v. Larrisquitu, Nos. H-06-3489, H-06-3669, H-06-4040 (S.D. Tex. Aug. 15, 2007).

## Tab 1

Case v. Omega Natchiq, Inc., No. H-08-835 (S.D. Tex. July 10, 2008).

#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

DAVID W. CASE,

Plaintiff,

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. H-08-0835

OMEGA NATCHIQ, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

S

Defendants.

#### MEMORANDUM AND OPINION

This case arises out of an injury that David W. Case sustained while on board the Rowan Midland, an offshore structure moored in the Gulf of Mexico. Case sued his employer, Omega Natchiq, Inc. ("Omega"), and the Rowan Midland's then-owners, Rowandrill, Inc. and the Rowan Companies, Inc. (together, "Rowan"), and the charterer and subsequent owner, ATP Oil & Gas Corporation ("ATP"). Case asserted Jones Act claims for negligence against Omega and ATP and for unseaworthiness against Rowan and ATP. Case sued in state court. The defendants timely removed on the basis of federal-question jurisdiction under the Outercontinental Shelf Lands Act ("OCSLA"), 43 U.S.C. § 1333 *et seq.* (Docket Entry No. 1). Case has moved to remand on the basis that he properly pleaded a Jones Act cause of action, making the case nonremovable. (Docket Entry No. 13). The defendants have responded by arguing that as a matter of law, Case is not a seaman and that federal removal jurisdiction is proper. (Docket Entry No. 15).



Also available as part of the eCourse Judicial Perspective: Discussion of Maritime Decisions and Practice

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the  $29^{\text{th}}$  Annual David W. Robertson Admiralty and Maritime Law Conference session "Judicial Perspective: Discussion of Maritime Decisions and Practice"