

LLOYD'S LAW REPORTS

Editor:

Miss M. M. D'SOUZA, LL.B.
of the Middle Temple, Barrister

Consulting Editor:

G. M. HALL
of the Middle Temple, Barrister

1977

Volume 1

PUBLISHED BY LLOYD'S OF LONDON PRESS LTD. (LEGAL PUBLISHING DEPARTMENT), 16/17 BRIDE LANE, LONDON, EC4Y 8EB. PRINTED BY LLOYD'S OF LONDON PRINTING SERVICES LTD., LLOYD'S, LIME STREET, LONDON, EC3M 7HA.



LLOYD'S OF LONDON PRESS LTD. 1977.

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED

	PAGE
<i>Agios Giorgis</i> , The — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 192 268
<i>Agios Giorgis</i> , The — <i>Considered and applied.</i>	[1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 192 268
<i>Alan</i> (W. J.) & Co. v. <i>El Nasr Export & Import Co.</i> — <i>Applied.</i>	[1972] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 313 133
<i>Andrea Ursula</i> , The — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1971] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 145 536
<i>Astro Vencedor Compania Naviera S.A. v. Mabanft G.m.b.H.</i> — <i>Considered.</i>	[1971] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 502 630
<i>Atlantic Star</i> , The — <i>Considered and applied.</i>	[1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 197 124
<i>Australia and New Zealand Bank v. Colonial & Eagle Wharf</i> — <i>Applied.</i>	[1960] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 241 244
<i>Baccus S.R.L. v. Servicio Nacional del Trigo</i> — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1956] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 448 581
<i>Banshee</i> , The — <i>Considered and applied.</i>	(1887) 6 Asp.Mar.Law Cas. 221 384
<i>Bradburn v. Great Western Railway Co.</i> — <i>Applied.</i>	(1874) L.R. 10 Ex. 1 368
<i>Brede</i> , The — <i>Upheld.</i>	[1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 333 334
<i>Brimnes</i> , The — <i>Applied.</i>	[1974] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 241 315
<i>Canadian Transport</i> , The — <i>Considered and applied.</i>	(1932) 43 U.S. Rep. 409. 39
<i>Cap Bon</i> , The — <i>Considered.</i>	[1967] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 543 283
<i>Coco v. A. N. Clark (Engineers) Ltd.</i> — <i>Applied.</i>	[1969] R.P.C. 41 505
<i>Darrah</i> , The — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 359 217
<i>Di Fernando v. Simon Smits</i> — <i>Applied.</i>	[1920] 3 K.B. 409 39
<i>Dione</i> , The — <i>Applied.</i>	[1975] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 115 368
<i>Dungate v. Dungate</i> — <i>Considered.</i>	[1965] 1 W.L.R. 1447 653
<i>Emanuel v. Symon</i> — <i>Considered.</i>	[1908] 1 K.B. 302 607
<i>European Grain & Shipping Co. Ltd. v. Rayner</i> — <i>Applied.</i>	[1970] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 239 133
<i>Eurymedon</i> , The — <i>Applied.</i>	[1974] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 534 445
<i>Evje</i> , The — <i>Considered.</i>	[1974] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 57 630
<i>Federal Commerce & Navigation Co. Ltd. v. Tradax Export S.A.</i> — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1977] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 217 618
<i>Flynn v. Flynn</i> — <i>Considered.</i>	[1969] 2 Ch. 403 653
<i>Georgios C</i> , The — <i>Overruled.</i>	[1971] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 7 315
<i>Golden Trader</i> , The — <i>Considered.</i>	[1974] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 378 283
<i>Good v. Parry</i> — <i>Considered.</i>	[1963] 2 Q.B. 418 653
<i>Great Western Railway Co. In re</i> — <i>Considered.</i>	[1905] 2 K.B. 532 564
<i>Great Western Railway Co. v. Royal Norwegian Government</i> — <i>Applied.</i>	[1945] 1 All E.R. 324. 662
<i>Harbutts "Plasticine" Ltd. v. Wayne Tank & Pump Co. Ltd.</i> — <i>Applied.</i>	[1970] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 15 645
<i>Hartford Fire Insurance Co. v. Pacific Far East Lines</i> — <i>Applied.</i>	[1974] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 359 93
<i>Hedley Byrne & Co. Ltd. v. Heller & Partners Ltd.</i> — <i>Considered.</i>	[1963] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 485 67
<i>Horabin v. British Overseas Airways Corporation</i> — <i>Considered.</i>	[1952] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 450 564
<i>Ismail v. Polish Ocean Lines</i> — <i>Considered.</i>	[1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 489 630
<i>Johanna Oldendorff</i> , The — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 285 217
<i>Juan Ysmael & Co. Inc. v. Government of the Republic of Indonesia</i> — <i>Applied.</i>	[1954] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 175 536

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED—*continued*.

PAGE

<i>Kozara, The</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 1	39
<i>Krajina v. Tass Agency (of Moscow)</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1949] 2 All E.R. 274.	581
<i>Kraut v. Albany Fabrics Ltd.</i> _____ <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 350	618
<i>Kraut v. Albany Fabrics Ltd.</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 350	39
<i>Laconia, The</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 395	397
<i>Lloyd v. Grace Smith & Co.</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1912] A.C. 716.	564
<i>London Explorer, The</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1971] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 523	368
<i>Maritime Bulk Carriers v. Garnac Grain Co.</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	1975 A.M.C. 1826.	217
<i>Mellenger v. New Brunswick Development Corporation</i> _____ <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1971] 1 W.L.R. 604	581
<i>Miliangos v. George Frank (Textiles) Ltd.</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 201	51, 618
<i>Miliangos v. George Frank (Textiles) Ltd.</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 201	39
<i>Ministry of Housing and Local Government v. Sharp</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1970] 2 Q.B. 223	67
<i>Morris v. C. W. Martin & Sons</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1965] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 63	564
<i>Mutual Life Citizens Assurance Co. Ltd. v. Evatt</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1970] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 441	67
<i>Nea Agrex S.A. v. Baltic Shipping Co. Ltd. (The Agios Lazaros)</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 47	653
<i>Nord-Deutsche et al v. The Queen et al</i> _____ <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1971] S.C.R. 849	195
<i>Nowy Sacz, The</i> _____ <i>Considered and applied</i> .	[1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 682	384
<i>Oliver v. Davis</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1949] 2 K.B. 727	431
<i>Panchaud Freres S.A. v. Etablissements General Grain Co.</i> _____ <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1970] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 53	499
<i>Philippine Admiral, The</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 234	536
<i>Philippine Admiral, The</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 234	581
<i>Porto Alexandre, The</i> _____ <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1920] P. 30.	536
<i>Russell v. Pellegrini</i> _____ <i>Distinguished</i> .	(1856) 6 E. & B. 1020.	463
<i>Russian Bank For Foreign Trade v. Excess Insurance Co. Ltd.</i> _____ <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1918] 2 K.B. 123	457
<i>Satterthwaite (A.M.) & Co. Ltd. v. New Zealand Shipping Co. Ltd. (The Eurymedon)</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1974] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 534	665
<i>Seager v. Copydex Ltd.</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1976] 1 W.L.R. 923	505
<i>Seyfang v. G. D. Searle & Co. and Another</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1973] 1 Q.B. 148	418
<i>Sze Hai Tong Bank Ltd. v. Rambler Cycle Co. Ltd.</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1959] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 114	445
<i>Talbot v. Von Boris</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1941] 1 K.B. 854	431
<i>Tankexpress S.A. v. Compagnie Financière Belges des Petroles S.A.</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	(1948) 82 Ll.L.Rep. 43	315
<i>Tennants (Lancashire) Ltd. v. Wilson & Co. Ltd.</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1917] A.C. 495.	133
<i>Thai-Europe Tapioca Service Ltd. v. Government of Pakistan Directorate of Agricultural Supplies</i> _____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 1	581
<i>Total Oil Great Britain Ltd. v. Marbonanza Compania Naviera S.A.</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	(1975) unreported	404
<i>Tradax Export S.A. v. Andre & Cie. S.A.</i> _____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 416	133
<i>Tradax Export S.A. v. Andre & Cie. S.A.</i> _____ <i>Considered and applied</i> .	[1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 416	278

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED—*continued*

PAGE

Trendtex Trading Corporation v. Central Bank of Nigeria ____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1977] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 581	536
Trinder Anderson & Co. v. Thames Mersey Marine Insurance Co. ____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1898] 2 Q.B. 114	61
Ulster Swift Ltd. and Another v. Taunton Meat Haulage Ltd. ____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1975] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 502	411
Waterhouse v. Reid ____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1938] 1 K.B. 743	404
Workington Harbours & Docks Board v. Towerfield (Owners) ____ <i>Applied</i> .	(1950) 84 Ll.L.Rep. 233	195

STATUTES CONSIDERED

	PAGE
CANADA—	
FEDERAL COURT ACT (R.S.C. 1970 2nd. Supp. C. 10)	
s. 22 (2)	180, 303
s. 43 (1)	180
s. 44	180
MARINE INSURANCE ACT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA (R.S.B.C. 1960 C. 231)	
s. 4	206
s. 19	206
s. 20	206
s. 35	206
s. 43	206
PILOTAGE ACT (R.S.C. 1970-71-72 C. 52)	
s. 31	195
SHIPPING ACT	
s. 647	310
UNITED KINGDOM—	
ARBITRATION ACT, 1950	
s. 4	463
s. 22	29
s. 23	29
ARBITRATION ACT, 1975	
s. 1 (1)	463
BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT, 1882	
s. 27	431
s. 54 (1)	51
s. 57	51
s. 72 (4)	51
BRITISH NATIONALITY ACT, 1948	
s. 1	105
CARRIAGE OF GOODS BY ROAD ACT, 1965	
s. 1	234
Sched.	346, 411
arts. 23 (1), (2), (4)	234
CRIMINAL LAW ACT, 1967	105
CUSTOMS AND EXCISE ACT, 1952	
s. 85	234

STATUTES CONSIDERED—*continued*

	PAGE
UNITED KINGDOM— <i>continued</i>	
MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894	105
MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS, 1894 to 1974	17
MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD ACT, 1954	
s. 3 (3)	17
OFFENCES AT SEA ACT, 1799	105
SALE OF GOODS ACT, 1893	
s. 14 (2) (1)	645
s. 55 (4), (5), (7), (8)	645
s. 62 (1) (1A), (6)	645
SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (CONSOLIDATION) ACT, 1925	22
THEFT ACT, 1968	105
UNITED STATES—	
ARBITRATION ACT (9 U.S.C.)	
ss. 201-208	673
CARRIAGE OF GOODS BY SEA (46 U.S.C.)	
s. 183	310
s. 1304 (5)	93
EXPORT REGULATION ACT, 1969 (50 U.S.C.)	
ss. 2401-2413	673

CONTENTS

NOTE:— These Reports should be cited as
 “[1977] 1 Lloyd’s Rep.”

	COURT	PAGE
<i>Aegis Spirit</i> , The	[U.S. Ct.]	93
Aegnoussiotis Shipping Corporation of Monrovia v. A/S Kristian Jebsens Rederi of Bergen (<i>The Aegnoussiotis</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	268
<i>Aegnoussiotis</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	268
Allard S.A.R.L. (Third Party) and Laurent Transport Co. Ltd.:—Muller Batavier Ltd. v.	[Q.B.]	411
Amercoat Europa N.V. and Rust:—Global Tankers Inc. v.	[Q.B.]	61
Anderson v. Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society Ltd.	[C.A.]	253
Antares Shipping Corp. v. Delmar Shipping Ltd. and Portland Shipping Co. Inc. (<i>The Capricorn</i>)	[Can. Ct.]	180
Antco Shipping Co. Ltd. v. Sidermar S.p.A.	[U.S. Ct.]	673
Antco Shipping Co. Ltd. and New England Petroleum Corporation:—Sidermar S.p.A. v.	[U.S. Ct.]	673
<i>Apj Akash</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	653
<i>Aragon</i> , The	[C.A.]	343
Argy Trading Development Co. Ltd. v. Lapid Developments Ltd.	[Q.B.]	67
<i>Aries</i> , The	[H.L.]	334
Aries Tanker Corporation v. Total Transport Ltd. (<i>The Aries</i>)	[H.L.]	334
Arta Shipping Co. Ltd. v. Thai-Europe Tapioca Service Ltd. (<i>The Johnny</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	257
Atkinson and Others v. J.C.L. Marine Ltd.	[Q.B.]	645
Attica Sea Carriers Corporation of Liberia:—Mardort Peach & Co. Ltd. v.	[H.L.]	315
<i>Auriga</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	384
Babco Forwarding & Shipping (U.K.) Ltd.:—Buchanan & Co. Ltd. v.	[C.A.]	234
Baiden (F.W.):—Kuehne & Nagel Inc. v.	[U.S. Ct.]	90
Barclays Bank International Ltd. v. Levin Bros. (Bradford) Ltd.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	51
Berg (V.) & Son Ltd. v. Vanden Avenne-Izegem P.V.B.A.	[C.A.]	499
<i>Berwyn</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	17
Bremer Handelsgesellschaft m.b.H. v. Vanden Avenne-Izegem P.V.B.A.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	133
Buchanan & Co. Ltd. v. Babco Forwarding & Shipping (U.K.) Ltd.	[C.A.]	234
Bunge S.A. v. Kruse	[C.A.]	492
Canadian Overseas Shipping Ltd. and Ceres Stevedoring Co. Ltd.:—Eisen und Metall A.G. v.	[Can. Ct.]	665
Canaria Armadora S.A.:—Mareva Navigation Co. Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	368

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
<i>Capricorn</i> , The	[Can. Ct.]	180
<i>Captain Diamantis</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	362
Central Bank of Nigeria:—Trendtex Trading Corporation v. ...	[C.A.]	581
Ceres Stevedoring Co. Ltd. and Canadian Overseas Shipping Ltd.:—Eisen und Metall A.G. v.	[Can. Ct.]	665
<i>Christos</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	109
City of Munich (No. 2):—Lively Ltd. and Another v. ...	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	420
City of Munich (No. 1):—Lively Ltd. and Control Nominees Ltd. v.	[Q.B.]	418
Commercial Union Assurance Co. Ltd. v. Hayden	[C.A.]	1
Compagnie Continentale (France) S.A.:—Hill Court Shipping Co. S.A. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	29
Company of Proprietors of Selby Bridge v. Mackenzie (The <i>John William</i>)	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	129
Control Nominees Ltd. and Lively Ltd. v. City of Munich (No. 1)	[Q.B.]	418
Cory Bros. Shipping Ltd. (Third Party) and Port of London Authority:—Knapp v.	[Q.B.]	662
Delmar Shipping Ltd. and Portland Shipping Co. Inc.:— Antares Shipping Corp. v.	[Can. Ct.]	180
<i>Despina R</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	618
<i>Diane</i> , The	[Q.B.]	61
<i>Dias</i> , The	[C.A.]	485
Dias Compania Naviera S.A. v. Louis Dreyfus Corporation (The <i>Dias</i>)	[C.A.]	485
Distos Compania Naviera S.A.:—Ibrahim Shanker & Co. v. ...	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	404
Dreyfus (Louis) Corporation:—Dias Compania Naviera S.A. v.	[C.A.]	485
Dunford & Elliott Ltd. v. Johnson & Firth Brown Ltd. ...	[C.A.]	505
Eisen und Metall A.G. v. Ceres Stevedoring Co. Ltd. and Canadian Overseas Shipping Ltd.	[Can. Ct.]	665
<i>Ercole</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	516
<i>Estrella</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	525
Faghirzadeh v. Rudolf Wolff (S.A.) (Pty.) Ltd.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	630
Federal Commerce and Navigation Co. Ltd. v. Tradax Export S.A. (The <i>Maratha Envoy</i>)	[C.A.]	217
<i>Folias</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	39
Fransen Transport N.V. and Taunton Meat Haulage Ltd.:— Ulster Swift Ltd. and Pigs Marketing Board (Northern Ireland) v.	[C.A.]	346
Global Tankers Inc. v. Amercoat Europa N.V. and Rust (The <i>Diane</i>)	[Q.B.]	61
Government of Sri Lanka:—Surrendra Overseas Ltd. v. ...	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	653
Govindaswamy Chettiar & Sons:—Port Sudan Cotton Co. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	166
<i>Halcyon Skies</i> , The (No. 2)	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	22
Hasan v. Willson	[Q.B.]	431
Hayden:—Commercial Union Assurance Co. Ltd. v. ...	[C.A.]	1

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Haydon:—Trollope & Colls Ltd. v.	[C.A.]	244
Hill Court Shipping Co. S.A. v. Compagnie Continentale (France) S.A. (The <i>Yperagia</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	29
Holland Bulk Transport B.V.:—Mammoth Bulk Carriers Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	362
<i>I Congreso Del Partido</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	536
Ibrahim Shanker Co. v. Distos Compania Naviera S.A. (The <i>Siskina</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	404
Intermare Transport G.m.b.H. v. Tradax Export S.A. (The <i>Oakwood</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	263
Irish Shipping Ltd. v. The Queen (The <i>Irish Stardust</i>) ...	[Can. Ct.]	195
<i>Irish Stardust</i> , The	[Can. Ct.]	195
Jade Enterprises Ltd.:—Tropwood A.G. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	397
James Yachts Ltd. v. Thames & Mersey Marine Insurance Co. Ltd. and Others	[Can. Ct.]	206
<i>John W. Hill</i> , The	[U.S. Ct.]	213
<i>John William</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	129
<i>Johnny</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	257
Johnson & Firth Brown Ltd.:—Dunford & Elliott Ltd. v. Johnson Matthey (Pty.) Ltd., Rustenburg Platinum Mines Ltd. and Matthey Bishop Inc. v. South African Air- ways and Pan American World Airways Inc.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	564
Joint Cargo Services Pty. Ltd. and Another:—Salmond & Spraggon (Australia) Pty. Ltd. v.	[Aust. Ct.]	445
Kammgarn Spinnerei G.m.b.H.:—Nova (Jersey) Knit Ltd. v. Knapp v. Port of London Authority and Cory Bros. Shipping Ltd. (Third Party)	[H.L.]	463
Kristian (A/S) Jebsens Rederi of Bergen:—Aegnoussiotis Shipping Corporation of Monrovia v.	[Q.B.]	662
Kruse:—Bunge S.A. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	268
Kuehne & Nagel Inc. v. F. W. Baiden	[C.A.]	492
	[U.S. Ct.]	90
<i>Laconia</i> , The	[H.L.]	315
Laing (John) (Management) Ltd. and Oceanus Mutual Underwriting Association (Bermuda) Ltd.:—Marazura Navegacion S.A. and Others v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	283
Lapid Developments Ltd.:—Argy Trading Developments Ltd. v.	[Q.B.]	67
Laurent Transport Co. Ltd. and Allard S.A.R.L. (Third Party):—Muller Batavier Ltd. v.	[Q.B.]	411
Levin Bros. (Bradford) Ltd.:—Barclays Bank International Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	51
Lively Ltd. and Another v. City of Munich (No. 2) ...	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	420
Lively Ltd. and Control Nominees Ltd. v. City of Munich (No. 1)	[Q.B.]	418
London Steam-ship Owners' Mutual Insurance Association Ltd.:—Wells Fargo Bank International Corporation v. ...	[U.S. Ct.]	213

CONTENTS—continued

	COURT	PAGE
Mackenzie:—The Company of Proprietors of Selby Bridge v.	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	129
<i>Maheno</i> , The	[N.Z. Ct.]	81
Mammoth Bulk Carriers Ltd. v. Holland Bulk Transport B.V. (<i>The Captain Diamantis</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	362
<i>Maratha Envoy</i> , The	[C.A.]	217
Marazura Navegacion S.A. and Others v. Oceanus Mutual Underwriting Association (Bermuda) Ltd. and John Laing (Management) Ltd.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	283
Mardorf Peach & Co. Ltd. v. Attica Sea Carriers Corporation of Liberia (<i>The Laconia</i>)	[H.L.]	315
<i>Mareva A.S.</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	368
<i>Mareva</i> Navigation Co. Ltd. v. Canaria Armadora S.A. (<i>The Mareva A.S.</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	368
Marine (J.C.L.) Ltd.:—Atkinson and Others v.	[Q.B.]	645
Marine (J.C.L.) Ltd.:—Rasbora Ltd. v.	[Q.B.]	645
Matthey Bishop Inc., Rustenburg Platinum Mines Ltd. and Johnson Matthey (Pty.) Ltd. v. South African Airways and Pan American World Airways Inc.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	564
<i>Maurice Desgagnes</i> , The	[Can. Ct.]	290
Mauthner (Fritz):—Warinco A.G. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	277
Muller Batavier Ltd. v. Laurent Transport Co. Ltd. and Allard S.A.R.L. (Third Party)	[Q.B.]	411
Nacional Hispanica Aseguradora S.A.:—Naviera De Canarias S.A. v.	[H.L.]	457
<i>Narada</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	256
Naviera De Canarias S.A. v. Nacional Hispanica Aseguradora S.A. (<i>The Playa de Las Nieves</i>)	[H.L.]	457
New England Petroleum Corporation and Antco Shipping Co. Ltd.:—Sidermar S.p.A. v.	[U.S. Ct.]	673
<i>New York Star</i> , The	[Aust. Ct.]	445
Ney Shipping Ltd.:—N. & J. Vlassopoulos Ltd. v.	[C.A.]	478
Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society Ltd.:—Anderson v. Nova (Jersey) Knit Ltd. v. Kammgarn Spinnerei G.m.b.H.	[C.A.]	253
	[H.L.]	463
<i>Oakwood</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	263
Oceanus Mutual Underwriting Association (Bermuda) Ltd. and John Laing (Management) Ltd.:—Marazura Navegacion S.A. and Others v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	283
Oteri v. The Queen	[P.C.]	105
Pagnan (R) & Fratelli:—Segovia Compagnia Naviera S.A. v. Pan American World Airways Inc. and South African Airways:—Rustenburg Platinum Mines Ltd., Johnson Matthey (Pty.) Ltd. and Matthey Bishop Inc. v.	[C.A.]	343
Perry and Others v. Zissis and Others	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	564
Pigs Marketing Board (Northern Ireland) and Ulster-Swift Ltd. v. Taunton Meat Haulage and Fransen Transport N.V.	[C.A.]	607
Pillgrem v. Cliff Richardson Boats Ltd. and Richardson and Switzerland General Insurance Co.	[C.A.]	346
	[Can. Ct.]	297

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
<i>Playa de Las Nieves</i> , The	[H.L.]	457
Port of London Authority and Cory Bros. Shipping Ltd. (Third Party):—Knapp v.	[Q.B.]	662
Port Sudan Cotton Co. v. Govindaswamy Chettiar & Sons Portland Shipping Co. Inc. and Delmar Shipping Ltd.:— Antares Shipping Corp. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)] [Can. Ct.]	166 180
Queen:—Irish Shipping Ltd. v.	[Can. Ct.]	195
Queen:—Oteri v.	[P.C.]	105
Rasbora Ltd. v. J.C.L. Marine Ltd.	[Q.B.]	645
Richardson (Cliff) Boats Ltd., Richardson and Switzerland General Insurance Co.:—Pillgrem v.	[Can. Ct.]	297
Rust and Amercoat Europa N.V.:—Global Tankers Inc. v. Rustenburg Platinum Mines Ltd., Johnson Matthey (Pty.) Ltd. and Matthey Bishop Inc. v. South African Air- ways and Pan American World Airways Inc.	[Q.B.] [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	61 564
Salmond & Spraggon (Australia) Pty. Ltd. v. Joint Cargo Services Pty. Ltd. and Another (The <i>New York Star</i>)	[Aust. Ct.]	445
<i>Santa Carina</i> , The	[C.A.]	478
<i>Santa Maria</i> , The	[Can. Ct.]	303
<i>Schipol</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	114
Segovia Compagnia Naviera S.A. v. R. Pagnan & Fratelli (The <i>Aragon</i>)	[C.A.]	343
Services Europe-Atlantique Sud (Seas) v. Stockholms Rederiaktiebolag SVEA (The <i>Folias</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	39
Sidermar S.p.A.:—Antco Shipping Co. Ltd. v.	[U.S. Ct.]	673
Sidermar S.p.A. v. Antco Shipping Co. Ltd. and New England Petroleum Corporation	[U.S. Ct.]	673
<i>Siskina</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	404
South African Airways and Pan American World Airways Inc.:—Rustenburg Platinum Mines Ltd., Johnson Matthey (Pty.) Ltd. and Matthey Bishop Inc. v. ...	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	564
<i>Steelton</i> , The	[U.S. Ct.]	310
Stockholms Rederiaktiebolag SVEA:—Services Europe- Atlantique Sud (Seas) v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	39
Surrendra Overseas Ltd. v. The Government of Sri Lanka (The <i>Apj Akash</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	653
Switzerland General Insurance Co., Richardson and Cliff Richardson Boats Ltd.:—Pillgrem v.	[Can. Ct.]	297
Taunton Meat Haulage Ltd. and Fransen Transport N.V.:— Ulster Swift Ltd. and Pigs Marketing Board (Northern Ireland) v.	[C.A.]	346
Thai-Europe Tapioca Service Ltd.:—Arta Shipping Co. Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	257
Thames & Mersey Marine Insurance Co. Ltd. and Others:— James Yachts Ltd. v.	[Can. Ct.]	206
<i>Tillie Lykes</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	124
Total Transport Ltd.:—Aries Tanker Corporation v. ...	[H.L.]	334
Tradax Export S.A.:—Federal Commerce and Navigation Co. Ltd. v.	[C.A.]	217
Tradax Export S.A.:—Intermare Transport G.m.b.H. v. ...	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	263

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Trendtex Trading Corporation v. Central Bank of Nigeria ...	[C.A.]	581
Trollope & Colls Ltd. v. Haydon	[C.A.]	244
Tropwood A.G. v. Jade Enterprises Ltd. (<i>The Tropwind</i>) ...	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	397
<i>Tropwind</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	397
Ulster-Swift Ltd. and Pigs Marketing Board (Northern Ireland) v. Taunton Meat Haulage Ltd. and Fransen Transport N.V.	[C.A.]	346
Vanden Avenne-Izegem P.V.B.A.:—Bremer Handelsgesell- schaft m.b.H. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	133
Vanden Avenne-Izegem P.V.B.A.:—V. Berg & Son Ltd. v. Vlassopoulos (N. & J.) Ltd. v. Ney Shipping Ltd., (<i>The</i> <i>Santa Carina</i>)	[C.A.]	499
Warinco A.G. v. Fritz Mauthner	[C.A.]	478
Wells Fargo Bank International Corporation v. London Steam-ship Owners' Mutual Insurance Association Ltd. (<i>The John W. Hill</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	277
Willson:—Hasan v.	[U.S. Ct.]	213
Wolff (Rudolf) (S.A.) (Pty.) Ltd.:—Faghirzadeh v.	[Q.B.]	431
	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	630
<i>Yperagia</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	29
Zissis and Others:—Perry and Others v.	[C.A.]	607

LLOYD'S LAW REPORTS

Editor : Miss M. M. D'SOUZA, LL.B., Barrister

Consulting Editor : G. M. HALL, Barrister

[1977] Vol. 1]

Commercial Union v. Hayden

PART 1

COURT OF APPEAL

July 26, 27 and 28, 1976

COMMERCIAL UNION ASSURANCE
CO. LTD. v.
HAYDEN

Before Lord Justice CAIRNS,
Lord Justice STEPHENSON and
Lord Justice LAWTON

Insurance (Public Liability) — Double insurance — Contribution — Public liability policies effected with insurance company and with Lloyd's underwriters — Policies concurrent — No pro rata average contribution — Settlement by insurance company of assured's claim under policy — Claim for contribution from Lloyd's underwriters made by insurance company — Whether "maximum liability" approach or "independent liability" approach applicable.

C. effected a public liability policy with the plaintiff insurance company with a limit of £100,000 in respect of any one accident. A policy which contained a public liability section was also issued by the defendant, a representative Lloyd's underwriter, the sum insured being £10,000. Each policy contained a clause stating that if at the time of any claim arising from it there should be any other insurance covering the same risk, the insurers would not be liable for more than a rateable proportion of it. Neither policy contained a pro rata average condition. P. suffered an injury on C.'s premises. His claim of £4425.45 was settled by the plaintiffs who claimed a contribution from the defendant on the "independent liability" approach i.e. on the basis that the contribution should be calculated in accordance with what would have been the respective liabilities of the insurers towards C. if each had been the sole insurer. They contended that since the claim would have been met by either insurer in full, they were entitled to a contribution of one half of C.'s claim i.e. £2212.72.

The defendant, however, maintained that the "maximum liability" approach should be adopted i.e. the contribution should be calculated in proportion to the limits of the respective policies i.e. the proportion of 10 to 1. On this basis he was liable only for 1/11th of C.'s claim i.e. £402.31.

—Held, by Q.B. (DONALDSON, J.), that the "maximum liability" approach should be adopted.

Judgment for the plaintiffs.

On appeal by the plaintiffs:

—Held, by C.A. (CAIRNS, STEPHENSON and LAWTON, L.J.J.), that (1) there was no authority binding on the Court and there were no decided cases which indicated a clear preference for one basis over the other (see p. 12, col. 1; p. 14, col. 2);

(2) the issue was one of construction and was equally capable of bearing either suggested meaning (see p. 12, col. 1); but the more likely meaning to be intended by reasonable business men was the independent liability basis which was more realistic in its results (see p. 12, col. 2; p. 13, col. 1; p. 15, col. 1);

(3) the obvious purpose of having a limit of liability was to protect the insurers from the effect of exceptionally large claims and it appeared artificial to use the limits under the policies to adjust liability in respect of claims which were within the limits of either policy (see p. 12, col. 1);

(4) where there were two insurers with differing upper limits for claims the inference was that they were both accepting the same level of risk up to the lower of the limits and a "rateable satisfaction" would be an equal division of liability up to the lower limits (see p. 16, col. 2).

Appeal allowed. *Leave to appeal to House of Lords granted.*

The following cases were referred to in the judgments:

* American Surety Co. of New York v. Wrightson, (1910) 16 Com. Cas. 37;

[1977] VOL. 1]

Commercial Union v. Hayden

- Citizens Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Firemen's Fund Insurance Co., (1964) 234 Fed. Supp. 931;
- Dering v. Winchelsea, (1787) 1 Cox Eq. Cas. 318;
- Ellesmere Brewery Co. v. Cooper, [1896] 1 Q.B. 75;
- Godin v. The London Assurance Corporation, (1758) 1 Wm. Bl., 103; (1758) 1 Burr. 489;
- Home Insurance Co. v. Baltimore Warehouse Co., (1896) 93 U.S. 527;
- Industrial Indemnity Co. v. Continental Casualty Co., (1967) 375 Fed. Rep. (2nd) 183;
- Newby v. Reed, (1763) 1 Wm. Bl. 417;
- North British and Mercantile Insurance Co. v. London, Liverpool and Globe Insurance Co., (1877) 5 Ch. D. 569;
- Oregon Automobile Insurance Co. v. United States Fidelity and Guarantee Co. (1952) 195 Fed. Rep. (2nd) 958;
- Pendlebury v. Walker, (1841) 4Y & C. Ex. 424;
- Scottish Heritable Securities Association v. Northern Insurance Co., (1883) 11 Sess. Cas. R. 287;
- Sickness and Accident Insurance Association v. General Accident Assurance Corp., (1892) Sess. Cas. R. 977.

This was an appeal by the plaintiffs, Commercial Union Assurance Co. Ltd. from the decision of Mr. Justice Donaldson given in favour of the defendant, Mr. Nicholas Charles Hayden, a representative Lloyd's underwriter and holding in effect that the maximum liability basis applied to the question of how liability between the plaintiffs and defendant should be apportioned where both of them had insured against the same risk and there was a clause in each policy providing that in such circumstances the insurer shall not be liable for more than its rateable proportion of any claim.

Mr. Justice DONALDSON delivered the following reserved judgment on July 28, 1975: On May 26, 1971, Mr. Frederick Parsons sustained an injury on the premises of Messrs. George Cartwright. He put forward a claim for damages which was settled for £4425.45p. including costs. Messrs. Cartwright had prudently taken the

precaution of insuring against such a liability. Indeed, whether by accident or by design, they had two insurance policies which applied. The first was with Lloyd's and was in their common form public liability policy with a limit of £10,000 any one accident. The second was with the Commercial Union. This took the form of their "Compact" policy which really consists of a selection of standard policies made up to suit the needs of the assured. Cartwrights chose the fire, money and public liability sections. I am only concerned with the latter, which was limited to £100,000.

Each policy contained a rateable proportion clause and it is the meaning of those clauses and the rights of the insurers inter se which have given rise to this action. As, on any view, Cartwrights could recover the whole of their loss from the two insurers taken together, Lloyd's and the Commercial Union, acting in accordance with the best traditions of the London Market, have made sure that Cartwrights are not troubled with this matter. By agreement, the Commercial Union met the claim in full, without prejudice to their right to claim contribution from Lloyd's. Lloyd's say that that contribution should be calculated in proportion to the limits of the respective policies, i.e., 10:1. Accordingly they admit liability for, and have paid the Commercial Union, 1/11th of Cartwrights' claim or £402.31. This I will call the "maximum liability" approach. The Commercial Union, for their part say that the contribution should be calculated in accordance with what would have been the respective liabilities of the insurers to Cartwrights if each had been the sole insurer on the risk. As the claim would, on that hypothesis, have been met by either insurer in full, the Commercial Union claim an additional contribution of £1810.41, bringing their recoveries from Lloyd's up to one half of Cartwrights' claim. This I will call the "independent liability" approach.

The sum in dispute is of no great consequence to either party, but the principles involved have only once been considered by an English Court.

The rateable proportion clauses are in the following terms:—

Commercial Union.

If at the time of any claim arising under this Section there shall be any other insurance covering the same risk

or any part thereof the Company shall not be liable for more than its ratable proportion thereof.

Lloyd's.

If any claim covered by this Policy is also covered in whole or in part by any other insurance, the liability of the Underwriters shall be limited to their rateable proportion of such claim.

The minor differences in wording and the ancient and modern versions of spelling are not material and the clauses can be treated as identical. Such clauses undoubtedly have the effect of restricting the right of the assured to look to one insurer only should a claim arise, but the average assured would certainly be surprised to be told it.

It has been said that the object of this clause is to *compel* contribution between insurers (see Bunyon—Law of Fire Insurance, p. 294) and clearly it is right that each should bear their share of the loss, irrespective of whether the assured looks to one or the other or to both for indemnity. But surely in modern times a rateable proportion clause is unnecessary to achieve this result, for there is an equitable right of contribution in all circumstances in which the clause would apply and little difficulty in finding or obtaining payment from co-insurers. This right, incidentally, is different from a subrogation right which does not exist as between insurers in a case of double insurance: see *Austin v. Zurich General Accident and Liability Insurance Co. Ltd.*, (1945) 78 Ll.L.Rep. 185; [1945] 1 K.B. 250; but it appears that, in circumstances different from the present, the clause has another effect, namely, that if the assured has cover with insurer "A" and subsequently, from an abundance of caution or forgetfulness, effects the like cover with insurer "B", insurer "A's" liability is reduced even if the assured can recover nothing from insurer "B" because of a breach of condition or because insurer "B" is insolvent. Bearing in mind that insurer "A" necessarily knows nothing of the cover to be granted later by insurer "B" and that the premium charged by insurer "A" takes no account of the later insurance, I find this suggested result surprising. Suffice it to say that insofar as this proposition rests upon the authority of *Weddell v. Road Transport*, (1931) 41 Ll.L.Rep. 69; [1932] 2 K.B. 563; the facts there were very special in that the assured had, by his own inaction after the loss, defeated the right of

insurer "A" to claim contribution from the insurer "B".

However, as I have said, on the facts of the present case, if Cartwrights had sued both the insurers, they would have recovered £4425.45 in all and the proportionate liability of the parties would have reflected their equitable right of contribution *inter se*. In other words, the phrase "rateable proportion" in the clause means that proportion which would be borne by any one insurer if the assured had been entitled to look, and had looked, to him alone and that insurer had exercised his right to claim equitable contribution from any other insurers.

In *American Surety Co. of New York v. Wrightson*, (1910) 16 Com. Cas. 37, Lord Sumner (then Mr. Justice Hamilton) after reviewing and dismissing the authorities to which he had been referred, said that insurers' rights to contribution depended "upon natural justice and upon principles of equity". Since neither can operate in a vacuum, I propose to summarize the materials which have been placed before me.

The text books. I have been referred to Bunyon's Law of Fire Insurance (1913), Baker Welford—Law Relating to Accident Insurance (2nd ed., 1932), Welford and Otter Barry—Law Relating to Fire Insurance (4th ed., 1948), MacGillivray on Insurance Law (5th ed., 1961), Ivamy—General Principles of Insurance Law (2nd ed., 1970), Colinvaux—The Law of Insurance (3rd ed. (1970)) and Minion.

From these works, I gather the following information:

- (a) Double insurance with a consequent right to contribution, or the need to apply a rateable contribution clause, can arise in many different circumstances. The principal classes of case appear to be the following:
 - (i) *Concurrent policies insuring property.* Two or more policies apply to the same property or groups of property, each group being insured separately but not necessarily for the same amounts.
 - (ii) *Non-concurrent policies insuring property.* Two or more policies cover the property affected by a peril insured against but also individually cover property which is not insured by both or all of the policies. The sums insured under the policies may be lump sums covering all the

property or may be allocated over specific items. In either case, the sums may differ.

- (iii) *Concurrent and non-concurrent policies insuring liabilities.*
- (iv) *Policies containing "pro rata average" conditions.* These provide that if the subject matter is worth more than the sum insured, i.e., there is under-insurance, the liability of the insurer shall be reduced in proportion to the under insurance. Policies containing these clauses may be either concurrent or non-concurrent.
- (b) The use of the word "rateable" in the standard contribution clauses merely serves to give apparent clarity to a situation which is obscure in the extreme.
- (c) For very many years, the problems have been recognised and differing views expressed as to the correct solution, but meanwhile the British market has resolved the matter domestically by agreement between insurers. So far as property insurance is concerned, the basis has been that:
 - (i) Unless the assured has been guilty of some fault (as in the *Austin* case) and, subject always to the application of any pro rata average conditions, the assured is entitled to be fully indemnified up to the limits of the policies. Accordingly, if a particular method of calculating contribution would give the assured less than a full indemnity, it is modified, the insurers bearing the loss which would otherwise fall on the assured in the like proportion as they bear the remainder of the loss.
 - (ii) Where concurrent policies on property without pro rata average conditions are involved, the practice is to apportion contribution using the maximum liability approach, i.e., to treat each insurer as having underwritten that proportion of the loss which the sum insured by his policy bears to the aggregate of the sums insured by all the policies.
 - (iii) Non-concurrent policies on property without pro rata average conditions seem to be treated in the same way as concurrent policies, but there is a complication where the peril affects more than subject matter and the double

insurance may not be identical for all; e.g., where there is a loss of property "X" and property "Y" and "X" has been insured by "A" and "B" and "Y" by "B" and "C". Here the practice seems to be to start with the largest loss (X) and, having worked out the contribution as if it was the only loss, to do the same calculation in respect of "Y" using the sums insured *less* the contribution due in respect of "X". The same calculation is then done taking "Y" first. Thereafter, a mean of the results is used for the purpose of calculating actual contribution, provided that this gives the assured his fullest entitlement.

- (iv) Other methods of apportionment have been suggested and are discussed in MacGillivray at pars. 1866 and 1867.
- (v) In the case of domestic property, where insurances commonly cover different interests (e.g., that of mortgagor and of mortgagee) insurers, with a cheerful disregard for the decision in *North British and Mercantile Insurance Co. v. London, Liverpool and Globe Insurance Co.*, (1877) 5 Ch.D. 569 treat all the insurances as covering the same interests.
- (vi) Where policies contain a pro rata average clause, contribution is based upon the independent liability approach.
- (d) There appears to be no settled basis for contribution under liability, as contrasted with property, insurances.

The North American Cases. I have been referred to two Canadian cases: *McCausland v. Quebec Fire Insurance Co.*, (1894) 25 Ont.L.R. 330, and *Eacrett v. Gore District Mutual Fire Insurance Co.*, (1903) 60 Ont.L.R. 592, and to four United States cases: *Home Insurance Co. v. Baltimore Warehouse Co.* (1876) 93 U.S.R. S.C. 527, *Oregon Auto Insurance Co. v. United States Fidelity and Guarantee Co.* (1952) 195 Fed. Rep. (2nd) 958, *Citizens' Mutual Automobile Insurance Company v. Firemen's Fund Insurance Co.*, (1964) 234 Fed. Supp. 931, and *Industrial Indemnity Co. v. Continental Casualty Co.*, (1967) 375 Fed. Rep. (2nd) 183. From these cases it appears that the maximum liability approach is adopted universally in North