

PRESENTED AT

The University of Texas School of Law 25th Annual Admiralty and Maritime Law Conference

August 26, 2016 South Texas College of Law, Houston, Texas

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

David W. Robertson
William Powers, Jr. and Kim L. Heilbrun Chair in Tort Law
University Distinguished Teaching Professor
University of Texas at Austin

Michael F. Sturley
Fannie Coplin Regents Chair in Law
University of Texas at Austin

Author Contact Information: David W. Robertson University of Texas School of Law drobertson@law.utexas.edu 512.232.1339

Michael F. Sturley University of Texas School of Law msturley@law.utexas.edu 512.232.1350

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

<u>I.</u>	Introduction
<u>II.</u>	MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENTS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL
A.	Federal Rules Amendments
	Maximum Compensation Rate Under the LHWCA
<u>III.</u>	THE WORK OF THE SUPREME COURT
A.	Selected Nonmaritime Decisions
	Franchise Tax Board of California v. Hyatt
B.	Denials of Certiorari
	Ludlow v. BP, PLC
	Eason v. Huntington Ingalls Industries, Inc.
<u>IV.</u>	SELECTED DECISIONS FROM AROUND THE COUNTRY
A.	Admiralty Jurisdiction in Tort
	1. Problems with the PDMC and SRTMA Requirements
	In re Germain
	Ficarra v. Germain
	In re Christopher Columbus, LLC
	2. Problems with the L-or-AEA Requirements
	Blake Marine Group v. CarVal Investors LLC
	3. Removal into Admiralty
	Brown v. Porter
B.	Admiralty Jurisdiction in Contract
	Fireman's Fund Insurance Co. v. Great American Insurance Co.
	Galilea, LLC. v. AGCS Marine Insurance Co.
C.	The Rights of Seamen
	1. Releases of Liability
	In re New York City Asbestos Litigation

Re	cen	t Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law	page ii
	2.	Removal of Jones Act Claims	15
		Leloff v. Georgia-Pacific Consumer Products, Ltd.	
D.	Ge	eneral Maritime Tort Law	16
	1.	Products Liability	16
		McIndoe v. Huntington Ingalls Inc.	
	2.	Punitive Damages	18
		Hausman v. Holland America Line-USA	
E.	Ca	urriage of Goods	19
	1.	The Cargo Claimant's <i>Prima Facie</i> Case	19
		Affiliated FM Insurance Co. v. M/V Maersk Visby	
	2.	The COGSA Package Limitation	20
		Vilorio v. Sallaum Lines	
	3.	Forum Selection Clauses in Bills of Lading	21
		Idaho Pacific Corp. v. Binex Line Corp.	
F.	Ma	arine Insurance	22
	1.	Utmost Good Faith (Uberrimae Fidei)	22
		Fireman's Fund Insurance Co. v. Great American Insurance Co.	
	2.	All-Risk Policies	23
		AGCS Marine Insurance Co. v. World Fuel Services, Inc.	
	3.	Conditions of Coverage	24
		Brawner Builders, Inc. v. Northern Assurance Co. of America	
G.	Lo	ongshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA)	24
		SSA Terminals v. Carrion	
		Shirrod v. Director, OWCP	
H.	Co	ollison	26
		In re Frescati Shipping Co.	
		In re Buccina	
		Buccina v. Grimsby	

I.	Maritime Liens	2
	In re World Imports Ltd.	
	O'Rourke Marine Services L.P., L.L.P. v. M/V COSCO Haifa	
	Bunker Holdings Ltd. v. M/V YM Success (IMO 9294800)	
	Billybey Marina Services, LLC v. Affairs Afloat, Inc.	
	City of Newport Beach v. M/Y Bad Habit	
J.	Limitation of Liability Act	
	In re Henry Marine Service, Inc.	
<u>V.</u>	THE WORK OF THE FEDERAL COURTS IN THE FIFTH AND ELEVENTH CIRCUITS	<i>′</i>
A.	Admiralty Jurisdiction	
	1. Admiralty Jurisdiction in Tort	
	Petrobras America, Inc. v. Vicinay Cadenas, S.A.	
	Newell v. Carnival Cruise Lines	
	2. Removal into Admiralty	
	Harrison v. Crowley Maritime Corp.	
	Darville v. Tidewater Marine Service, Inc.	
B.	Vessel Status Cases	
	Gold v. Helix Energy Solutions Group, Inc.	
C.	The Federal vs. State Law Consequences of Admiralty Jurisdiction	
	Petrobras America, Inc. v. Vicinay Cadenas, S.A.	
D.	The Rights of Seamen	
	1. Seaman Status	
	a. The substantial-in-duration requirement and the <i>Bertrand</i> exception	
	Lebrun v. Baker Hughes, Inc.	
	b. "Vessel in navigation" is synonymous with "vessel"?	
	Gold v. Helix Energy Solutions Group, Inc.	
	c. The substantial-in-nature requirement	
	Starks v. Advantage Staffing	
	d. The Michael Tracy principle	
	Cepeda v. Orion Marine Construction, Inc.	

2.	Seaman Status Under the FLSA	
	Halle v. Galliano Marine Service	
	Johnson v. Canal Barge Co.	
3.	Maintenance and Cure	
	a. McCorpen	
	Chapman v. Spartan Offshore Drilling	
	LeBlanc v. LA Carriers	
	Copeland v. Offshore Marine Contractors, Inc.	
	b. Recoupment of undeserved maintenance-and-cure payments	
	Boudreaux v. Transocean Deepwater, Inc.	
	c. Punitive damages and attorney's fees	
	Weeks Marine, Inc. v. Watson	
	Stermer v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.	
	d. Procedure in maintenance and cure cases	
	Robb v. Jantran, Inc.	
4.	Jones Act and Unseaworthiness Litigation	
	a. The primary duty doctrine	
	Orion Marine Constr., Inc. v. De Leon	
	Soudelier v. PBC Management, Inc.	
	b. FELA decisions from the Texas Supreme Court	
	Union Pacific R. Co. v. Nami	
	BNSF Railway Co. v. Phillips	
	c. Nonpecuniary Damages	
	Lewis v. Noble Drilling Services, Inc.	
5.	Ramifications of the Collateral Benefits Rule in Seamen's Litigation	
	Howard v. Offshore Liftboats, LLC	
6.	Property Damage and Indemnity Claims by Jones Act Employers Against Their Injured Employees	
	Thompson v. Yellow Fin Marine Services, LLC	
7.	Punitive Damages in Seamen's Tort Actions	
	Collins v. A.B.C. Marine Towing, L.L.C.	

M/V

Savoie v. Huntington Ingalls, Inc.

Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law page			page vii
M.	Mi	iscellaneous Cases	87
	1.	Pollution	87
		United States v. Fafalios	
	2.	Wong's Influence	88
		Trinity Marine Products, Inc. v. United States	
	3.	Drugs	89
		United States v. Iguaran	
N.	Po	ostscript on the B.P. Oil Spill Litigation	90
		In re Deepwater Horizon	
		In re Deepwater Horizon: Lake Eugenie Land & Develop- ment, Inc. v. BP Exploration & Production, Inc.	
		In re Deepwater Horizon: Seacor Holdings, Inc. v. Mason	

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

David W. Robertson
William Powers, Jr. and Kim L. Heilbrun 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

August 1, 2016

I. Introduction

This is the sixteenth paper in a series of annual reports on U.S. admiralty and maritime law and practice.¹ In these papers we try to call attention to the principal

¹ The preceding fifteen papers 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, 40 Tul. MAR. L.J. 343 (2016) [hereinafter 2015 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, 39 Tul. Mar. L.J. 471 (2015) [hereinafter 2014 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, 38 Tul. Mar. L.J. 419 (2014) [hereinafter 2013 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, 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.

national-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 Appellate and Civil Procedure will go into effect on December 1, 2016, unless Congress acts on them prior to that date. The affected rules include Civil Rules 50, 52, and 59 and Appellate Rule 4.

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 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*, 564 U.S. 410, 428 (2011) ("[F]ederal district judges, sitting as sole adjudicators, lack authority to render precedential decisions binding other judges, even members of the same court.").





Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the <u>UT Law CLE eLibrary (utcle.org/elibrary)</u>

Title search: Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the 25^{th} Annual Admiralty and Maritime Law Conference session "Recent Developments in Admiralty and Maritime Law at the National Level and in the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits"