

LLOYD'S LIST LAW REPORTS

Editor :

H. P. HENLEY

of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

Assistant Editor :

E. S. MATHERS

of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

1957

Volume 1

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY LLOYD'S
AT LLOYD'S, LONDON, ENGLAND

1957

CASES CITED

	PAGE
Agra Bank, <i>In re. Ex parte</i> Tondeur	(1867) L.R. 5 Eq. 160 174
Aldridge v. Johnson	(1857) 7 E. & B. 885 240
Alexander v. Steinhardt, Walker & Co.	[1903] 2 K.B. 208 258
Allchin (Inspector of Taxes) v. Coulthard	[1943] A.C. 607 503
Alvion Steamship Corporation Panama v. Gaiban Lobo Trading Company, S.A. of Havana	[1955] 1 Q.B. 430; [1954] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 309; [1955] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 9 ... 312
Amis, Swain & Co. v. Nippon Yusen Kabushiki Kaisha	(1919) 1 Ll.L.Rep. 51 283
Anglo-Russian Merchant Traders, Ltd., and John Batt & Co. (London), Ltd., <i>In re</i>	[1917] 2 K.B. 679 25
Annot Lyle, The	(1886) 11 P.D. 114 135
Arlidge, <i>Ex parte. Rex v. Local Government Board</i>	[1914] 1 K.B. 160; [1915] A.C. 120 ... 455
Arnhold Karberg & Co. v. Blythe, Green, Jourdain & Co.	[1916] 1 K.B. 495 240
Arpad, The	[1934] P. 189; (1934) 49 Ll.L.Rep. 313 ... 240
Athenae, The	(1922) 11 Ll.L.Rep. 6 511
Atkinson and Others (Assignees of Sleddon) v. Bell and Others	(1828) 8 B. & C. 277 240
Balfour v. Barty-King and Another	[1956] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 646 522
Bank Line, Ltd. v. Capel & Co.	[1919] A.C. 435 174
Barnard and Others v. National Dock Labour Board and Another	[1953] 2 Q.B. 18; [1953] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 371 455
Bennetts & Co. v. Brown	[1908] 1 K.B. 490 312
Biddell Brothers v. E. Clemens Horst Company	[1911] 1 K.B. 934; [1912] A.C. 18 ... 240
Bolton and Others v. Stone	[1951] A.C. 850 522, 531
Bonnington Castings, Ltd. v. Wardlaw	[1956] A.C. 613 289
Bothnia, The	(1860) Lush. 52 135
Braithwaite v. Foreign Hardwood Company ...	[1905] 2 K.B. 543 174
Brankelow Steamship Company v. Lamport & Holt	[1897] 1 Q.B. 570 312
Brandt & Co. v. H. N. Morris & Co., Ltd. ...	[1917] 2 K.B. 784 517
Brauer & Co. (Great Britain), Ltd. v. James Clark (Brush Materials), Ltd.	[1952] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 147 25
Bristol Corporation v. John Aird & Co.	[1913] A.C. 241 511
British & Beningtons, Ltd. v. North-Western Cachar Tea Company, Ltd. <i>See</i> North-Western Cachar Tea Company, Ltd. v. British & Beningtons, Ltd.	
Browne and Another v. Hare and Another ...	(1858) 3 H. & N. 484; (1859) 4 H. & N. 822 240
Buccinum, The	(1936) 55 Ll.L.Rep. 205 57
Bugge v. Taylor	[1941] K.B. 198 412
Burnett Steamship Company, Ltd. v. Danube and Black Sea Shipping Agencies	[1933] 2 K.B. 438; (1933) 46 Ll.L.Rep. 231 312
Cammell Laird & Co., Ltd. v. Manganese Bronze and Brass Company, Ltd.	[1934] A.C. 402; (1934) 48 Ll.L.Rep. 209 203
Cap Blanco, The	[1913] P. 130 511
Carmichael and Another v. Cockburn & Co., Ltd.	[1956] S.L.T. 241 289
Castellain v. Preston and Others	(1883) 11 Q.B.D. 380 258
Chandris v. Isbrandtsen-Moller Company, Inc. ...	[1951] 1 K.B. 240; (1950) 83 Ll.L.Rep. 385 174
Chattaway v. T. F. Maltby, Ltd.	[1954] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 424 103
Clipsham v. Vertue and Another	(1843) 5 Q.B. 265 174
Colley v. Overseas Exporters	[1921] 3 K.B. 302 240
Comptoir d'Achat et de Vente de Boerenbond Belge, S.A. v. Luis de Ridder, Limitada	[1949] A.C. 293; (1949) 82 Ll.L.Rep. 270 517
Crookall v. Vickers-Armstrong, Ltd.	[1955] 1 W.L.R. 659 289

CASES CITED—*continued*.

PAGE

Dampskibsselskabet Botnia A/S v. C. P. Bell & Co.	[1932] 2 K.B. 569; (1931) 41 Ll.L.Rep. 160	312
Davidson v. Gwynne	(1810) 12 East 381	174
Davies v. Mann	(1842) 10 M. & W. 546	108
Ebbs v. James Whitson & Co., Ltd.	[1952] 2 Q.B. 877	289
Elliott v. Pybus	(1834) 10 Bing. 512	240
Embricos v. Reid & Co.	[1914] 3 K.B. 45	174
Esso Petroleum Company, Ltd., and Another v. Southport Corporation	[1955] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 655; [1955] 3 All E.R. 864	135
Etablissements Chainbaux S.A.R.L. v. Harbor-master, Ltd.	[1955] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 303	174
Flatman v. J. Fry & Co., Ltd.	[1957] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 73	497
Forslind v. Bechely-Crundall	[1922] Sess. Cas. (H.L.) 173	174
France v. Gaudet and Others	(1871) L.R. 6 Q.B. 199	240
Freeman v. Taylor	(1831) 8 Bing. 124	174
Geipel and Others v. Smith and Another	(1872) L.R. 7 Q.B. 404	174
Giertsen and Others v. Turnbull & Co.	[1908] Sess. Cas. 1101	271
Grace & Co., Ltd. v. General Steam Navigation Company, Ltd.	[1950] 2 K.B. 383; (1949) 83 Ll.L.Rep. 297	174
Grant v. Australian Knitting Mills, Ltd., and Others	[1936] A.C. 85	203
Grant & Co. v. Coverdale, Todd & Co.	(1884) 9 App. Cas. 470	174
Gregson v. Hick Hargreaves & Co., Ltd.	[1955] 1 W.L.R. 1252	289
Grieve, Son, & Co. v. König & Co.	(1880) 7 Sess. Cas. (4th Series) 521	283
Hamilton & Co. v. Mackie and Sons	(1889) 5 T.L.R. 677	79
Harding v. Price	[1948] 1 All E.R. 283	289
Hardy & Co., Inc. v. A. V. Pound & Co., Ltd.	[1956] A.C. 588; [1956] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 255	25, 517
Havelock v. Geddes and Others	(1809) 10 East 555	174
Hemsworth v. Hemsworth	[1946] K.B. 431	503
Heyman and Another v. Darwins, Ltd.	[1942] A.C. 356; (1942) 72 Ll.L.Rep. 65	174
Hochster v. De la Tour	(1853) 2 E. & B. 678	174
Hopkins, <i>Ex parte</i>	(1891) 61 L.J. (Q.B.) 240	455
<i>Hornet</i> , The	[1892] P. 361	135
Hudson's Bay Company v. Domingo Mumburu Sociedad Anonima	(1922) 10 Ll.L.Rep. 476	174
Imperial Smelting Corporation, Ltd. v. Joseph Constantine Steamship Line, Ltd.	[1940] 1 K.B. 812; (1940) 66 Ll.L.Rep. 147; (H.L.) [1942] A.C. 154; (1941) 70 Ll.L.Rep. 1	79
Inverkip Steamship Company, Ltd. v. Bunge & Co.	[1917] 2 K.B. 193	174
Ireland and Others v. Livingston	(1872) L.R. 5 H.L. 395	240
<i>Joannis Vatis</i> (No. 2), The	[1922] P. 213; (1922) 10 Ll.L.Rep. 756	503
Johnson v. Johnson	[1916] P. 205	503
Keys v. Harwood	(1846) 2 C.B. 905	174
King v. Victoria Insurance Company, Ltd.	[1896] A.C. 250	258
Langton v. Higgins	(1859) 4 H. & N. 402	240
Law & Bonar, Ltd. v. British American Tobacco Company, Ltd.	[1916] 2 K.B. 605	240
Leeds Shipping Company, Ltd. v. Duncan, Fox & Co., Ltd.	(1932) 42 Ll.L.Rep. 123; (1932) 37 Com. Cas. 213	271
Leeson v. General Council of Medical Education and Registration	(1889) 43 Ch.D. 366	455
Local Government Board v. Arlidge	[1914] 1 K.B. 160; [1915] A.C. 120	455
Lubovsky v. Snelling	[1944] K.B. 44; (1943) 77 Ll.L.Rep. 57	396

CASES CITED—continued.

	PAGE
MacAndrew and Others v. Chapple and Another	(1866) L.R. 1 C.P. 643 ... 174
Maclean v. The Workers' Union	[1929] 1 Ch. 602 ... 455
Maritime National Fish, Ltd. v. Ocean Trawlers, Ltd.	[1935] A.C. 524; (1935) 51 Ll.L.Rep. 299 ... 174
Merchant Prince, The	[1892] P. 179 ... 135
Mersey Docks and Harbour Board v. Coggins & Griffith (Liverpool), Ltd., and Another	[1947] A.C. 1; (1946) 79 Ll.L.Rep. 569 ... 57
Minister of Food v. Reardon Smith Line, Ltd.	[1951] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 265 ... 79, 271
Minister of Materials v. Wold Steamship Company, Ltd.	[1952] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 485 ... 271
Mirabita v. Imperial Ottoman Bank	(1878) 3 Ex.D. 164 ... 240
Moore v. R. Fox & Sons	[1956] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 129 ... 135
Morton v. William Dixon, Ltd.	[1909] Sess. Cas. 807 ... 531
Mucklow and Others (Assignees of Royland) v. Mangles	(1808) 1 Taunt. 318 ... 240
Musgrove v. Pandelis	[1919] 2 K.B. 43 ... 522
Nelson Line (Liverpool), Ltd. v. James Nelson & Sons, Ltd.	[1908] A.C. 16 ... 271
Nichols v. Hall	(1873) L.R. 8 C.P. 322 ... 289
Nicolene, Ltd. v. Simmonds	[1953] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 189 ... 271
North River Freighters, Ltd. v. President of India	[1955] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 668 ... 174
North-Western Cachar Tea Company, Ltd. v. British & Beningtons, Ltd.	(1921) 8 Ll.L.Rep. 219; (C.A.) (1921) 10 Ll.L.Rep. 381; (H.L.) [1923] A.C. 48; (1922) 13 Ll.L.Rep. 67 ... 174
Northumbria, The	(1868) L.R. 3 A. & E. 6 ... 503
Paris v. Stepney Borough Council	[1951] A.C. 367; (1950) 84 Ll.L.Rep. 525 ... 103
Partabmull Rameshwar v. K. C. Sethia (1944), Ltd.	[1951] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 89 ... 25
Payzu, Ltd. v. Saunders	[1919] 2 K.B. 581 ... 240
Petrofina, S.A., of Brussels v. Compagnia Italiana Trasporto Olii Minerali, of Genoa	(1937) 57 Ll.L.Rep. 247 ... 79, 271
Phoenix Bessemer Steel Company, <i>In re. Ex parte</i> Carnforth Hematite Iron Company	(1876) 4 Ch.D. 108 ... 174
Pignataro v. Gilroy	[1919] 1 K.B. 459 ... 240
Pladda, The	(1876) 2 P.D. 34 ... 135
Polartank, The	(1948) 82 Ll.L.Rep. 108 ... 57
Pound & Co., Ltd. v. M. W. Hardy & Co., Inc.	[1956] A.C. 588; [1956] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 255 ... 517
Public Trustee v. Elder	[1926] Ch. 266 ... 416
Pyrene Company, Ltd. v. Scindia Navigation Company, Ltd.	[1954] 2 Q.B. 402; [1954] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 321 ... 517
Racecourse Betting Control Board v. Secretary for Air	[1944] Ch. 114 ... 511
Randal v. Cockran	(1748) 1 Ves. Sen. 98 ... 258
Read v. J. Lyons & Co., Ltd.	[1947] A.C. 156; (1946) 80 Ll.L.Rep. 1 ... 522
Renton & Co., Ltd. v. Palmyra Trading Corporation	[1956] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 379 ... 79
<i>Rex v. Local Government Board. Ex parte</i> Arlidge	[1914] 1 K.B. 160; [1915] A.C. 120 ... 455
Riches v. Westminster Bank, Ltd.	[1947] A.C. 390 ... 503
Rohde and Others v. Thwaites	(1827) 6 B. & C. 388 ... 240
Rylands v. Fletcher	(1868) L.R. 3 H.L. 330 ... 522
Sachs v. Miklos and Others	[1948] 2 K.B. 23 ... 240
Savona, The	[1900] P. 252 ... 174
Scott v. London and St. Katherine Docks Company	(1865) 3 H. & C. 596 ... 135
Sea Spray, The	[1907] P. 133 ... 151
Sherras v. De Rutzen	[1895] 1 Q.B. 918 ... 289
Sochacki v. Sas and Another	[1947] 1 All E.R. 344 ... 522
Socrates and the <i>Champion</i> , The	[1923] P. 76; (1923) 14 Ll.L.Rep. 91 ... 57

CASES CITED—*continued*.

	PAGE
Stafford Allen & Sons, Ltd. v. Pacific Steam Navigation Company	[1956] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 495 ... 271
Stanton v. Richardson	(1872) L.R. 7 C.P. 421 ... 174
Stearns v. Village Main Reef Gold Mining Company, Ltd.	(1905) 10 Com. Cas. 89 ... 258
Stock v. Inglis	(1884) 12 Q.B.D. 564; (1885) 10 App. Cas. 263 ... 240
Tarrabochia v. Hickie	(1856) 1 H. & N. 183 ... 174
Taylor v. Taylor	[1938] 1 K.B. 320 ... 503
Temple Steamship Company, Ltd. v. V/O. Soviracht	(1943) 76 Ll.L.Rep. 35 ... 174
Themistocles (Owners) v. Compagnie Intercontinentale de l'Hyperphosphate, of Tangier	(1948) 82 Ll.L.Rep. 232 ... 312
Thomas & Co., Ltd. v. Portsea Steamship Company, Ltd.	[1912] A.C. 1 ... 79
Thorpe v. Fasey	[1949] Ch. 649 ... 174
Thurogood v. Van den Berghs & Jurgens, Ltd.	[1951] 2 K.B. 537 ... 522
Tynedale Steam Shipping Company, Ltd. v. Anglo-Soviet Shipping Company, Ltd.	(1936) 54 Ll.L.Rep. 341 ... 271
United British Steamship Company, Ltd. v. Minister of Food	[1951] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 111 ... 312
Vergottis v. William Cory & Son, Ltd.	[1926] 2 K.B. 344; (1926) 25 Ll.L.Rep. 64 ... 174
Vine v. National Dock Labour Board	[1956] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 567 ... 455
Wait and Another v. Baker	(1848) 2 Ex. 1 ... 240
Way v. Latilla	[1937] 3 All E.R. 759 ... 127
Western Belle, The	(1906) 95 L.T. 364 ... 135
Wilkins v. Bromhead and Hutton	(1844) 6 M. & G. 963 ... 240
William Lindsay, The	(1873) L.R. 5 P.C. 338 ... 135
Wimble, Sons & Co. v. Rosenberg & Sons	[1913] 3 K.B. 743 ... 240
Woolfall & Rimmer, Ltd. v. Moyle and Another	(1941) 71 Ll.L.Rep. 15 ... 121
Zadok, The	(1883) 9 P.D. 114 ... 335

STATUTES CONSIDERED.

	PAGE
UNITED KINGDOM—	
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT, 1956.	
Sect. 1 (1) (g)	511
Sect. 1 (1) (h)	283
Sect. 3 (4)	283
ARBITRATION ACT, 1950.	
Sect. 1	1
FACTORIES ACT, 1937.	
Sect. 47 (1)	289
INCOME TAX ACT, 1952.	
Sect. 169	503
Sect. 170	503
MARITIME CONVENTIONS ACT, 1911.	
Sect. 8	267, 396
MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.	
Sect. 503	69
ROAD AND RAIL TRAFFIC ACT, 1933.	
Sect. 1	16
Sect. 2 (4)	16
ROAD TRAFFIC ACT, 1930.	
Sect. 4 (1)	412
Sect. 121 (1)	412
<hr/>	
AUSTRALIA—	
FEDERAL NAVIGATION ACT, 1912-1953.	
Sect. 396	267
SALE OF GOODS ACT, 1923 (N.S.W.).	
Sect. 19	203
<hr/>	
UNITED STATES—	
CARRIAGE OF GOODS BY SEA ACT, 1936.	
Sect. 1 (e)	40
Sect. 2	79, 271
Sect. 3	40, 79, 271
Sect. 4	40, 79, 271
Sect. 5	79, 271
Sect. 13	79, 271

CONTENTS

**NOTE:—These Reports should be cited as
“[1957] 1 Lloyd’s Rep.”**

	PAGE
Adamastos Shipping Company, Ltd.:—Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Company, Ltd. v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	79
... .. [C.A.]	271
Admiralty:—Clarke v. — [Q.B.]	331
Alexander v. Glenbroome, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	157
Alexander, Ltd. v. Glenbroome, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	157
Allan v. Leo Lines, Ltd. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	127
American International Underwriters, Ltd., and Another:— Republic of China and Others v. — [U.S. Dist. Ct.]	428
Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Company, Ltd. v. Adamastos Shipping Company, Ltd. v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	79
... .. [C.A.]	271
Azuero, S.A. <i>See</i> Compania Naviera Azuero, S.A.	
Barge <i>T-429</i> , The — [Sup. Ct. (Trinidad and Tobago)]	135
Barnes v. Port of London Authority — [Q.B.]	486
Benbow v. New Zealand Shipping Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	95
Bethlehem Steel Company and Another:—Krawill Machinery Corporation v. — [U.S. Ct.]	40
Braithwaite & Sons (Engineers), Ltd.:—J. Doltis, Ltd. v. — [Q.B.]	522
British Oil & Cake Mills, Ltd., and Others:—Compania Naviera Azuero, S.A. v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	312
British Transport Commission:— <i>Norseman</i> (Owners) v. — [Adm.]	503
... ..:—Wilcock v. — [Q.B.]	360
Brown, Jenkinson & Co., Ltd. v. Percy Dalton (London), Ltd. — [M. & C.L. Ct.]	31
Burns, Philp & Co., Ltd. v. Nelson & Robertson Proprietary, Ltd. — [High Ct. of Aust.]	267
Card:—Gravatt v. — [Q.B.]	19
Carpenter v. W. Lusty & Sons, Ltd. — [Q.B. (Div. Ct.)]	16
Cassidy Seed Company, Ltd. v. Osuustukkukauppa I.L. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	25
<i>Cedartree</i> , The — [Adm.]	51
China (Republic of), China Merchants Steam Navigation Company, Ltd., and United States of America v. National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and American International Underwriters, Ltd. — [U.S. Dist. Ct.]	428

CONTENTS—*continued.*

	PAGE
China Merchants Steam Navigation Company, Ltd., and Others v. National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and Another — [U.S. Dist. Ct.]	428
Citati :—Universal Cargo Carriers Corporation v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	174
Clarke v. Admiralty — [Q.B.]	331
Collins v. Palm Line, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	374
Compania Argentina de Navegacion Dodero and Another :— Richards v. — [Q.B.]	367
Compania Naviera Azuero, S.A. v. British Oil & Cake Mills, Ltd., and Others — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	312
Cunard Steam-Ship Company, Ltd. :—Wiseman v. — [Q.B.] ...	356
Cunningham, Ltd. v. Lucas — [Q.B.]	416
 Dalton (London), Ltd. :—Brown, Jenkinson & Co., Ltd. v. — [M. & C.L. Ct.]	31
Davids Proprietary, Ltd. v. George Wills & Co., Ltd. — [High Ct. of Aust.]	203
Denny v. Walter Wilson & Son, Ltd. — [M. & C.L. Ct.] ...	497
Doltis, Ltd. v. Isaac Braithwaite & Sons (Engineers), Ltd. — [Q.B.]	522
Driscoll v. H. Lange, Bell & Co., Ltd. — [Q.B.]	377
<i>Durango</i> , The — [Adm.]	230
 English Exporters (London), Ltd. :—N.V. Handel My. J. Smits Import-Export v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	517
<i>Ericbank</i> and the <i>M.S.C. Panther</i> , The — [Adm.]	57
 Federspiel & Co., S.A. v. Charles Twigg & Co., Ltd., and Another — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	240
<i>Fehmarn</i> , The — [Adm.]	511
<i>Fireside</i> , The — [Adm.]	6
Flatman v. J. Fry & Co., Ltd. — [Q.B.]	73
Flota Argentina de Navegacion de Ultramar and Another :— Richards v. — [Q.B.]	367
Ford & Co., Ltd., and Others :—Compania Naviera Azuero, S.A. v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	312
Frota Nacional de Petroleiros v. Skibsaktieselskapet Thorsholm — [C.A.]	1
Fry & Co., Ltd. :—Flatman v. — [Q.B.]	73
 Gee Stevedoring Company, Ltd. :—Sargent v. — [Q.B.]	357
Glenbroome, Ltd. :—Alec Alexander, Ltd. v. — [Q.B.]	157
— :—Alexander v. — [Q.B.]	157
Govindram Brothers, Ltd. <i>See</i> Newman Industries, Ltd. v. Indo- British Industries, Ltd.	
Gradley v. Port of London Authority — [Q.B.]	370
Gravatt v. Card — [Q.B.]	19
Griffin v. Port of London Authority — [Q.B.]	238

CONTENTS—continued.

	PAGE
Harland & Wolff, Ltd.:—Lyon v. — [Q.B.]	493
Hartley, Ltd. v. Provincial Insurance Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	121
Herd & Co., Inc., and Another:—Krawill Machinery Corporation v. — [U.S. Ct.]	40
Highway Ironfounders (West Bromwich), Ltd.:—Richards v. — [Q.B.]	289
Hodder & Stone, Ltd., and Others:—Compania Naviera Azuero, S.A. v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	312
Hovey, Ltd.:—Smith v. — [Q.B.]	372
Huntsman, The — [Adm.]	404
Indo-British Industries, Ltd.:—Newman Industries, Ltd. v. — [C.A.]	211
Indus, The — [Adm.]	335
Kennedy v. Lamport & Holt Line, Ltd. (Proprietors of Thames Stevedoring Company) — [Q.B.]	425
King & Co. (London), Ltd.:—Parsons v. — [Q.B.]	123
Krawill Machinery Corporation v. Robert C. Herd & Co., Inc., and Another — [U.S. Ct.]	40
Lamport & Holt Line, Ltd.:—Kennedy v. — [Q.B.]	425
— and Another:—Shanley v. — [L'pool Assizes]	144
— [C.A.]	391
Lange, Bell & Co., Ltd.:—Driscoll v. — [Q.B.]	377
Leo Lines, Ltd.:—Allan v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	127
Lissekerk, The — [Adm.]	349
Lloyd's Underwriters:—Williams v. — [Q.B.]	118
London & Rochester Trading Company, Ltd.:—Wheeler v. — [Q.B.]	69
Lucas:—J. & J. Cunningham, Ltd. v. — [Q.B.]	416
Lusty & Sons, Ltd.:—Carpenter v. — [Q.B. (Div. Ct.)]	16
Lyon v. Harland & Wolff, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	493
M.S.C. Panther and the Ericbank, The — [Adm.]	57
Middleditch v. Union-Castle Mail Steamship Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	531
Miller, Gibb & Co., Ltd. (In liquidation), <i>In re</i> — [Ch.]	258
Moran and Another v. National Dock Labour Board — [C.A.]	455
N.V. Handel My. J. Smits Import-Export v. English Exporters (London), Ltd. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	517
National Dock Labour Board:—Norman and Another v. — [C.A.]	455
National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and Another:—Republic of China and Others v. — [U.S. Dist. Ct.]	428
Nelson & Robertson Proprietary, Ltd.:—Burns, Philp & Co., Ltd. v. — [High Ct. of Aust.]	267

CONTENTS—continued.

	PAGE
New Zealand Shipping Company, Ltd.:—Benbow v. — [Q.B.]	95
Newcastle-on-Tyne Corporation:—Walton v. — [Q.B. (Div. Ct.)]	412
Newman Industries, Ltd. v. Indo-British Industries, Ltd. (Govindram Brothers, Ltd., Third Parties) — [C.A.]	211
Nicolson v. Shaw Savill & Albion Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	162
Norman and Moran v. National Dock Labour Board — [C.A.]	455
Norseman, The — [Adm.]	503
Norseman (Owners) v. British Transport Commission — [Adm.]	503
<i>Olympic Rock</i> , The — [Adm.]	221
Osuustukkukauppa I.L.:—Peter Cassidy Seed Company, Ltd. v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	25
<i>Ousel</i> , The — [Adm.]	151
<i>Pallas</i> , The — [Adm.]	475
Palm Line, Ltd.:—Collins v. — [Q.B.]	374
<i>Panther</i> and the <i>Erichbank</i> , The — [Adm.]	57
Parsons v. A. W. King & Co. (London), Ltd. — [Q.B.]	123
Patience and Another:—Carlos Federspiel & Co., S.A. v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	240
Paul, Ltd., and Others:—Compania Naviera Azuero, S.A. v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	312
Pedro Citati. See Universal Cargo Carriers Corporation v. Pedro Citati.	
Port of London Authority:—Barnes v. — [Q.B.]	486
—:—Gradley v. — [Q.B.]	370
—:—Griffin v. — [Q.B.]	238
—:—Vincent v. — [C.A.]	103
—:—Warren v. — [Q.B.]	23
Provincial Insurance Company, Ltd.:—R. S. Hartley, Ltd. v. — [Q.B.]	121
Richards v. Highway Ironfounders (West Bromwich), Ltd. — [Q.B.]	289
— v. W. F. White & Co. and Flota Argentina de Navegacion de Ultramar, Cia. Argentina de Navegacion Dodero — [Q.B.]	367
<i>Riverton</i> , The — [Adm.]	108
Royal Mail Lines, Ltd.:—Thompson v. — [Q.B.]	99
Royte (England), Ltd.:—World Transport Agency, Ltd. v. — [Q.B.]	381
<i>St. Elefterio</i> (Owners):—Schwarz & Co. (Grain), Ltd. v. — [Adm.]	283
Sargent v. Gee Stevedoring Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	357
<i>Sauria</i> and the <i>Trent</i> , The — [C.A.]	396
Schwarz & Co. (Grain), Ltd. v. <i>St. Elefterio</i> (Owners) — [Adm.]	283

CONTENTS—*continued.*

	PAGE
Shanley v. West Coast Stevedoring Company and Lamport & Holt Line, Ltd. — [L'pool Assizes]	144
[C.A.]	391
Shaw Savill & Albion Company, Ltd. :—Nicolson v. — [Q.B.] ...	162
Skibsaktieselskapet Thorsholm :—Frota Nacional de Petroleiros v. — [C.A.]	1
Smith v. L. J. Hovey, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	372
<i>T-429</i> , The — [Sup. Ct. (Trinidad and Tobago)]	135
Thames Stevedoring Company :—Kennedy v. — [Q.B.]	425
Thompson v. Royal Mail Lines, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	99
Thorsholm. <i>See</i> Frota Nacional de Petroleiros v. Skibsaktiesels- kapet Thorsholm.	
<i>Trent</i> and the <i>Sauria</i> , The — [C.A.]	396
Twigg & Co., Ltd., and Another :—Carlos Federspiel & Co., S.A. v. — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	240
Union-Castle Mail Steamship Company, Ltd. :—Middleditch v. — [Q.B.]	531
United States of America and Others v. National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and Another — [U.S. Dist. Ct.]	428
Universal Cargo Carriers Corporation v. Pedro Citati — [Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	174
Vincent v. Port of London Authority — [C.A.]	103
Walton v. Newcastle-on-Tyne Corporation — [Q.B. (Div. Ct)]	412
Warren v. Port of London Authority — [Q.B.]	23
West Coast Stevedoring Company and Another :—Shanley v. — [L'pool Assizes]	144
[C.A.]	391
Wheeler v. London & Rochester Trading Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	69
White & Co., and Another :—Richards v. — [Q.B.]	367
Wilcock v. British Transport Commission — [Q.B.]	360
Williams v. Lloyd's Underwriters — [Q.B.]	118
Wills & Co., Ltd. :—Davids Proprietary, Ltd. v. — [High Ct. of Aust.]	203
Wilson & Son, Ltd. :—Denny v. — [M. & C.L. Ct.]	497
Wiseman v. Cunard Steam-Ship Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	356
World Transport Agency, Ltd. v. Royte (England), Ltd. — [Q.B.]	381

LLOYD'S LIST LAW REPORTS

Editor : H. P. HENLEY

Of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

Assistant Editor : E. S. MATHERS

Of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

[1957] VOL. 1]

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 1957.

[PART 1

COURT OF APPEAL.

Friday, Feb. 1, 1957.

FROTA NACIONAL DE PETROLEIROS v. SKIBSAKTIESELSKAPET THORS- HOLM.

Before Lord Justice DENNING, Lord
Justice ROMER and Lord Justice
PARKER.

Arbitration—Stay of proceedings—Dispute under charter-party—"Differences . . . shall be put to arbitration in the City of London"—Notice of cancellation by owners—Action for damages commenced by charterers in U.S.—Exceptions filed by owners in U.S.—Arbitrator appointed by owners in London—Charterers notified—Motion by charterers to restrain owners from continuing with arbitration—Power of Court to revoke arbitrator's authority—Arbitration Act, 1950, Sect. 1.

Time charter for five years of Norwegian motor vessel *Thorsoy* by Brazilian charterers, providing (*inter alia*):

40. . . . In the event of a war involving Norway or Brazil, or involving any two or more of the following powers: Great Britain or United States of America or Russia or France, both the owner and the charterer have the right to cancel this charter . . .

49. Any and all differences and disputes of whatsoever nature arising out of this charter shall be put to arbitration in the City of London pursuant to the laws relating to arbitration there in force, before a board of three persons, consisting of one arbitrator to be appointed by the owner, one by the charterer, and one by the two so chosen. The decision of any two of the three on any point or points shall be final. . . .

Notice of cancellation given by owners following naval and military operations in Suez Canal area—Proceedings *in rem* and *in personam* commenced by charterers in United States—Ship arrested, but afterwards released upon owners providing security—Preliminary objections immediately filed by owners, it being submitted that dispute should go to arbitration in London—Arbitration proceedings accordingly commenced by owners in London, arbitrator being appointed—Charterers notified of appointment—Motion brought by charterers claiming (1) an interim injunction restraining owners from proceeding with arbitration, pending outcome of U.S. proceedings; (2) that authority of owners' arbitrator should be revoked—Risk of conflict of jurisdiction—Power of Court to revoke authority of arbitrator—Arbitration Act, 1950, Sect. 1.

—*Held*, by C.A., that the charter-party provided that disputes should be resolved by arbitration in London and that no good reason had been shown why the Court should intervene to stay arbitration proceedings which had properly been commenced in London; *further*, that there was no power in the Court to revoke the authority of an arbitrator against the will of the party appointing him—Decision of GLYN-JONES, J., refusing charterers' motion, upheld.

Per DENNING, L.J. (at p. 5): It is said that there may be different decisions by the Courts of the United States and by the arbitrators in the City of London. I am not oppressed by the difficulties which are set before us, because the Courts of the United States view arbitration proceedings with the same respect as do these Courts, and view a contract to go to arbitration in the same light.

This was an interlocutory appeal by plaintiffs, Frota Nacional de Petroleiros, of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, charterers of the motor vessel *Thorsoy*, for leave to appeal

[1957] Vol. 1] *Frota Nacional de Petroleiros v. Skibsaktieselskapet Thorsholm.*

[C.A.]

against the refusal of Mr. Justice Glyn-Jones, in Chambers, to grant them an interim injunction restraining defendants, Skibsaktieselskapet Thorsholm, of Sandefjord, owners of the vessel, from proceeding with, or taking any further step in, an arbitration begun in London by defendants pending the hearing of an action commenced by plaintiffs in the United States.

The charter-party, which was in "Standime" form, was dated Dec. 17, 1953, and was for five years from the date of delivery, which was in August, 1954. It provided (*inter alia*):

35. This charter shall, so far as possible, be governed by the laws of the flag of the vessel, except in cases of general average, which shall be settled according to York/Antwerp Rules 1950 and as to the matters not therein provided for, according to the usages and customs of the port of London. . . .

40. . . . In the event of a war involving Norway or Brazil, or involving any two or more of the following powers: Great Britain or United States of America or Russia or France, both the owner and the charterer have the right to cancel this charter, in which case the vessel to be redelivered to the owner at the port of destination, or if prevented from reaching such port, at the nearest open and safe port, at owner's option, after discharge of any cargo on board. Either party to give in writing three weeks' notice of their intention to cancel this charter.

In the event of cancellation by owner, the charterer shall have the first right to re-charter the vessel for the balance outstanding of the charter period or part of such period at rate to be mutually agreed.

49. Any and all differences and disputes of whatsoever nature arising out of this charter shall be put to arbitration in the City of London pursuant to the laws relating to arbitration there in force, before a board of three persons, consisting of one arbitrator to be appointed by the owner, one by the charterer, and one by the two so chosen. The decision of any two of the three on any point or points shall be final. Either party hereto may call for such arbitration by service upon any officer of the other, wherever he may be found, of a written notice specifying the name and address of the arbitrator chosen by the first

moving party and a brief description of the disputes or differences which such party desires to put to arbitration. If the other party shall not, by notice served upon an officer of the first moving party within twenty days of the service of such first notice, appoint its arbitrator to arbitrate the dispute or differences specified, then the first moving party shall have the right without further notice to appoint a second arbitrator, who shall be a disinterested person, with precisely the same force and effect as if said second arbitrator has been appointed by the other party. In the event that the two arbitrators fail to appoint a third arbitrator within twenty days of the appointment of the second arbitrator, either arbitrator may apply to a Judge of any Court of maritime jurisdiction in the city above mentioned for the appointment of a third arbitrator, and the appointment of such arbitrator by such Judge on such application shall have precisely the same force and effect as if such arbitrator had been appointed by the two arbitrators. Until such time as the arbitrators finally close the hearings either party shall have the right by written notice served on the arbitrators and on an officer of the other party to specify further disputes or differences under this charter for hearing and determination. Awards made in pursuance to this clause may include costs, including a reasonable allowance for attorney's fees, and judgment may be entered upon any award made hereunder in any Court having jurisdiction in the premises.

On Nov. 5, 1956, owing to naval and military operations in the Suez Canal area, defendants gave notice of cancellation, but plaintiffs denied that any circumstances had arisen which entitled defendants to cancel. Defendants offered the vessel to plaintiffs for re-charter under Clause 40 and to arbitrate their right to cancel, but the ensuing discussions were unsuccessful, and on Dec. 3, defendants withdrew their vessel from the services of plaintiff charterers. On Dec. 15, plaintiffs commenced an action *in rem* and *in personam* against the *Thorsoy* and defendants in the U.S. District Court and the ship was arrested; but she was released on defendants putting up security for 500,000 dols. Defendants immediately filed preliminary objections to these proceedings, contending that the U.S. District

Court had no jurisdiction (or mere discretionary jurisdiction) to determine the dispute, as the charter-party, by Clause 49, provided that any disputes arising under the charter-party should go to arbitration in London. The U.S. District Court fixed a day (which plaintiffs said was Feb. 11, 1957) for determination of the issue raised by defendants. On Jan. 5, defendants wrote to plaintiffs calling for arbitration in London to determine defendants' right to cancel under Clause 40, and they informed plaintiffs that they (defendants) had appointed Mr. J. Chesterman as their arbitrator and also requested plaintiffs to advise defendants of the name of plaintiffs' arbitrator.

On Jan. 31, 1957 (by writ issued on Jan. 30) plaintiffs applied for an interim injunction to restrain defendants from proceeding with the arbitration commenced by defendants, pending the final outcome of the proceedings commenced in the United States. They also asked that the authority of Mr. Chesterman as arbitrator should be revoked. Plaintiffs' application was rejected by Mr. Justice Glyn-Jones, and by co-operation between the parties an appeal was enabled to be brought to the Court of Appeal on the following day, as Feb. 2 was the last day on which plaintiffs could appoint an arbitrator:

Mr. A. A. Mocatta, Q.C., and Mr. H. V. Brandon (instructed by Messrs. Coward, Chance & Co.) appeared for appellant plaintiffs; Mr. Ashton Roskill, Q.C., and Mr. Basil Eckersley (instructed by Messrs. Ince & Co.) represented respondent defendants.

Mr. MOCATTA said that if as a result of the preliminary proceedings in the United States defendants' objections were overruled, plaintiffs' action in that Court would proceed and the issues between the parties under the charter-party would be determined, and in such proceedings the security provided by defendants would be available to meet plaintiffs' claim. In that event plaintiffs would have a good cause of action on the merits for a permanent injunction as claimed on the writ on the grounds (1) that the questions involved under Clause 40 and the application thereto of Norwegian law were more fit for determination by a Court of law than by arbitration; (2) that it would be undesirable for parallel proceedings, with potentially different results, to take place in two countries; (3) that proceedings in the District Court were started by plaintiffs

prior to the institution of arbitration proceedings by defendants; (4) that if the arbitration proceeded in this country notwithstanding the dismissal of defendants' objections by the District Court, that decision would in effect be rendered nugatory; and (5) that there was security to meet plaintiffs' claim in the American proceedings, whereas there would be no security available to meet any counterclaim advanced by plaintiffs at the arbitration.

Lord Justice ROMER: I do not understand why you delayed so long issuing your writ. You got defendants' letter claiming arbitration on Jan. 14, and you did not issue your writ until the 30th.

Mr. MOCATTA said that the letter was received in Brazil and discussion then had to take place with plaintiffs' United States lawyers.

Lord Justice ROMER: But you had nearly three weeks from the 14th in which to appoint your arbitrator.

Mr. MOCATTA (continuing) said that the two tribunals might quite well arrive at different conclusions, which would be most embarrassing to all concerned. On the question of the revocation of the authority of Mr. Chesterman, Counsel submitted that the Court had power to do that under Sect. 1 of the Arbitration Act, 1950*; and if the Court did revoke that authority, it still left the arbitration clause in being and of full force and effect, and it did not deprive either party of proceeding with their arbitration in due course.

Mr. ROSKILL said that nothing which plaintiffs had put forward suggested that the arbitration proceedings proposed to be held in England were vexatious or an abuse of any process, and in Counsel's view Mr. Justice Glyn-Jones, in refusing plaintiffs' application, had quite rightly exercised his discretion in the light of the facts put forward. As regards plaintiffs' claim that the arbitrator's authority should be revoked, Counsel agreed that that power obtained where a sole arbitrator was appointed with power to adjudicate upon differences which arose, but that was not this case at all. Mr. Chesterman had no authority at all to adjudicate upon the matters in dispute. The facts here were that plaintiffs had signed a charter-party with an arbitration clause. There was a

* "1. The authority of an arbitrator or umpire appointed by or by virtue of an arbitration agreement shall, unless a contrary intention is expressed in the agreement, be irrevocable except by leave of the High Court or a judge thereof."

dispute, on their own showing, which arose in November, 1956, or at the very latest by December, when the vessel was withdrawn. During the intervening period time was taken up negotiating under the War Clauses in the charter-party, which gave an option to plaintiffs to re-charter the vessel in the event of war. They could have appointed their arbitrator from the date of withdrawal early in December. As these negotiations were going on it might have been premature; but they failed to appoint an arbitrator, and they now applied to the Court at the very last minute. They had had indulgence shown to them by the Courts and by the defendants, who had accepted short notice of everything and service of all proceedings in England so as to enable plaintiffs to bring this matter before their Lordships before Feb. 2. Had defendants been so minded, they could have made it impossible for plaintiffs to argue their case.

JUDGMENT.

Lord Justice DENNING: The plaintiffs in this matter are a Brazilian concern who took a long term charter of a Norwegian vessel, the *Thorsoy*. The defendants are the Norwegian company who owned that vessel. The charter-party was for five years from August, 1954, so that if it went its full term it would not expire until August, 1959. In that charter-party there was a clause which said that in the event of a war involving Norway or Brazil, or involving any two or more of the following powers—Great Britain, the United States, Russia, France—both the owners and the charterers have the right to cancel the charter, either party to give in writing three weeks' notice of their intention to cancel the charter. There was in the charter-party an arbitration clause which provided for arbitration in London. I will read it a little later.

On Nov. 5, 1956, when things were happening in the Suez Canal area, the owners of the ship gave notice of cancellation of the charter-party—their contention presumably being that there was a war involving Great Britain and France. That was denied by the charterers; but none the less, in pursuance of their notice of cancellation, the owners withdrew the vessel from the services of the charterers on Dec. 3, 1956. I need hardly say, in view of the increase in freight rates, that they have utilized this vessel (it was an oil tanker) at a rate of freight greatly in excess of that provided in the charter.

In these circumstances, on Dec. 15, 1956, the charterers brought proceedings in the District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, claiming damages. The ship was then at Philadelphia. The charterers brought those proceedings *in rem* against the ship, which was only released by the authorities on 500,000 dols. being put up as security. When the charterers took those proceedings the owners promptly took exception to them. They objected to the jurisdiction of the Court of the United States because they said that there was an arbitration clause in the charter-party under which the matter had to go to arbitration. No ruling has yet been given by the United States Court on that matter. Meanwhile, the owners have taken steps to go to arbitration in London under the arbitration clause. The object of the present application is this: The charterers want to restrain the owners from taking those arbitration proceedings; and that is the question we have to determine.

This is the arbitration clause, agreed upon by both parties, the Brazilian charterers and the Norwegian owners:

49. Any and all differences and disputes of whatsoever nature arising out of this charter shall be put to arbitration in the City of London pursuant to the laws relating to arbitration there in force, before a board of three persons, consisting of one arbitrator to be appointed by the owner, one by the charterer, and one by the two so chosen. The decision of any two of the three on any point or points shall be final. Either party hereto may call for such arbitration by service upon any officer of the other, wherever he may be found, of a written notice specifying the name and address of the arbitrator chosen by the first moving party and a brief description of the disputes or differences which such party desires to put to arbitration. If the other party shall not, by notice served upon an officer of the first moving party within twenty days of the service of such first notice, appoint its arbitrator to arbitrate the dispute or differences specified, then the first moving party shall have the right without further notice to appoint a second arbitrator, who shall be a disinterested person, with precisely the same force and effect as if said second arbitrator has been appointed by the other party. In the event that the two arbitrators fail to appoint a third arbitrator within twenty days of the appointment of the second

arbitrator, either arbitrator may apply to a Judge of any Court of maritime jurisdiction in the city above mentioned for the appointment of a third arbitrator, and the appointment of such arbitrator by such Judge on such application shall have precisely the same force and effect as if such arbitrator had been appointed by the two arbitrators. . . .

I need not read more of that clause, because what has happened in this case is that the owners have called for arbitration in the City of London, in accordance with that clause, and they have stated that they have appointed Mr. Chesterman in London as their arbitrator. They have asked the charterers to appoint their arbitrator; and that the charterers have not yet done. The charterers have got, under the clause which I have read, twenty days in which to do it, and the time is going to be up to-morrow.

The parties have been very co-operative in this matter and have brought these proceedings speedily before the Court so as to have this matter determined, and we are in a position to determine it here and now. The question is whether this Court should restrain the owners from proceeding to arbitration in the City of London, and also whether it should revoke the appointment of Mr. Chesterman as arbitrator. The argument put forward in support of that application is mainly this: Proceedings are now pending in the Courts of the United States: security is lodged in that Court. Is there not a danger of there being a conflict of jurisdiction in the two Courts in the two countries if, while proceedings are pending in the United States, the arbitration proceedings are to go on in the City of London? It is said that there may be different decisions by the Courts of the United States and by the arbitrators in the City of London. I am not oppressed by the difficulties which are set before us, because the Courts of the United States view arbitration proceedings with the same respect as do these Courts, and view a contract to go to arbitration in the same light.

The Courts of the United States have not pronounced upon this document at all at the moment. It seems to me that here is a contract between the parties—a contract whereby they have provided that all their differences and disputes are to be put to arbitration in the City of London. That is a contract which binds them still; and I have heard of no reason in the course of

this case why there should not be arbitration in the City of London according to their contract. I do not pause to consider whether the question of war or no war is a question of fact or a question of law. Suffice it to say that the parties have agreed that all their differences are to be put to arbitration in the City of London. I can see no reason why this Court should intervene to hamper that contract or to say that the owners are not at liberty to proceed to the arbitration in the City of London when both parties have agreed that they should be. I can see no equity or any reason whatever for this Court to intervene to prevent this arbitration going forward in accordance with the terms of the contract. I do not fear that there will be any conflict of jurisdiction. The Courts of both these countries, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, can be trusted to see that in the end there is no conflict.

The other question was whether we should revoke the appointment of the arbitrator under Sect. 1 of the Arbitration Act, 1950. Suffice it to say that this arbitrator, Mr. Chesterman, has been appointed by one party, and I see nothing in Sect. 1 of this Act which enables the Court to revoke his appointment. It could in a proper case give leave for the party to revoke it; but I see no ground for saying that the Court has power to revoke it against the will of the party who appointed the arbitrator. I am dealing, of course, only with the case where the provision is for an arbitrator to be appointed by each of the two parties who in their turn appoint an umpire.

For these reasons, it seems to me that the Judge below was quite right in the decision to which he came, and I would dismiss the appeal.

Lord Justice ROMER: I agree, and there is nothing that I wish to add.

Lord Justice PARKER: I also agree.

Mr. ROSKILL: My Lords, the appeal will be dismissed with costs?

Lord Justice DENNING: Yes.