

LLOYD'S LAW REPORTS

Editor:

G. M. HALL

of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

Consulting Editor:

E. S. MATHERS

of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

1973

Volume 1

PUBLISHED AND PRINTED BY LLOYD'S OF LONDON PRESS LTD.,
LLOYD'S, LIME STREET, LONDON EC3M 7HA
© LLOYD'S OF LONDON PRESS LTD. 1973

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED

	PAGE
Aikman v. Conway — <i>Considered</i> (1837) 3 M. & W. 71 143	
Applegate v. Moss — <i>Applied</i> [1971] 1 Q.B. 406 189	
Bilbee v. Hasse & Co. — <i>Applied</i> "The Times" Jan. 16 (1890) ... 153	
Bremer Oeltransport G.m.b.H. v. Drury — <i>Applied</i> . 133 [1933] 1 K.B. 753; (1933) 45 Ll.L.Rep. ... 21	
Bright v. Attorney-General — <i>Considered</i> ... [1971] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 68 524	
Canada Steamship Lines Ltd. v. The King — <i>Considered</i> . Rep. 1 [1952] A.C. 192; [1952] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 1 ... 10	
Case of Market Overt — <i>Applied</i> (1596) 5 Co. Rep. 83b. 518	
Castrique v. Bernabo — <i>Considered</i> (1844) 6 Q.B. 498 143	
Chittenden v. Doe and Another — <i>Applied</i> ... [1970] 1 W.L.R. 1618 56	
Compagnie d'Armement Maritime S.A. v. Compagnie Tunisienne de Navigation S.A. — <i>Distinguished</i> . Rep. 99 [1971] A.C. 572; [1970] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 99 ... 296	
Cumming & Co. Ltd. v. Hassell — <i>Considered</i> (1920) 28 C.L.R. 508 209	
Dawnays v. Minter — <i>Distinguished</i> [1971] 1 W.L.R. 1205; [1971] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 192 369	
Decro-Wall International S.A. v. Practitioners in Marketing Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> [1971] 1 W.L.R. 361 453	
Dreyfus (Louis) & Co. v. Lauro — <i>Considered</i> . (1938) 60 Ll.L.Rep. 94 349	
Duffield v. British Railways — <i>Distinguished</i> . [1967] C.L.Y. sect. 1134 572	
Efpolia Shipping Corporation Ltd. v. Canadian Transport Co. Ltd. (The <i>Pantanassa</i>) — <i>Considered</i> . Eleftheria — <i>Applied</i> [1958] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 449 349	
Eleftheria, The — <i>Applied</i> [1970] P. 94; [1969] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 237 129	
Eleftheria, The — <i>Applied</i> [1970] P. 94; [1969] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 237 453	
Faulkner v. Cooper — <i>Applied</i> (1899) 4 Com. Cas. 213 153	
Fehmarn, The — <i>Applied</i> [1957] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 511; [1957] 1 W.L.R. 815; (C.A.) [1957] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 551; [1958] 1 W.L.R. 159 453	
Focke & Co. Ltd. v. Thomas Robinson, Sons & Co. Ltd. — <i>Followed</i> . (1935) 52 Ll.L.Rep. 334 289	
Ford v. Cotesworth — <i>Applied</i> (1868) L.R. 4 Q.B. 127 482	
Greenhill v. Federal Insurance Co. Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> . 383 [1927] 1 K.B. 65; (1926) 24 Ll.L.Rep. 383 169	

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED—*continued*

PAGE

Halesowen Presswork & Assemblies Ltd. v. Westminster Bank Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> .	[1972] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 101; [1972] 2 W.L.R. 455	414
Halifax Overseas Freighters v. Rasno Export; Techno-Prominport; and Polskie Linie Oceaniczne (The <i>Pine Hill</i>) — <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1958] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 146	129
Harbuts "Plasticine" Ltd. v. Wayne Tank and Pump Co. Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> .	[1970] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 15	345
Himmerland, The — <i>Considered</i>	[1965] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 353	392
Hogarth v. Miller — <i>Considered</i>	[1891] A.C. 48	28
Hollebone and Others v. Midhurst and Fernhurst Builders Ltd. and Eastman & White of Midhurst Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> .	[1968] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 38	345
Hubbard v. Vosper — <i>Applied</i>	[1972] 2 Q.B. 84	453
Ian Stach Ltd. v. Baker Bosley Ltd. — <i>Applied</i>	[1958] 2 Q.B. 130	209
Kennedy v. Thomas — <i>Considered</i>	[1894] 2 Q.B. 759	143
Ladd v. Marshall — <i>Applied</i>	[1954] 1 W.L.R. 1489	561
Lesley Shipping Co. v. Walstead (The <i>Raithwaite</i>) — <i>Considered</i> .	[1921] 3 K.B. 420	28
Lucock v. Mildren and Chamberlain — <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1962] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 852	572
Macgregor, The — <i>Applied</i>	[1943] A.C. 197; (1942) 74 Ll.L.Rep. 82	329
Magee v. Peninne Insurance Co. — <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1969] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 378	325
Mann, MacNeal and Steeves Ltd. v. Capital and Countries Insurance Co. Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> .	[1921] 2 K.B. 300; (1920) 5 Ll.L.Rep. 424	169
Modern Transport Co. Ltd. v. Ternstrom & Roos — <i>Applied</i> .	(1924) 19 Ll.L.Rep. 345	209
Mulholland v. Mitchell — <i>Considered</i>	[1971] A.C. 666	561
Muller Bros Ltd. v. G.M. Power Plant Co. Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> .	(unreported) May 8, 1963	209
National Dock Labour Board v. John Bland & Co. Ltd. and Others — <i>Applied</i> .	[1972] A.C. 222; [1971] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 20	101
National Dock Labour Board v. John Bland & Co. Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> .	[1972] A.C. 222; [1971] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 20	183
Norman, The	[1960] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 1	373
O'Connell v. Jackson — <i>Applied</i>	[1972] 1 Q.B. 270; [1971] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 354	439
Oliver v. Ashman — <i>Applied</i>	[1962] 2 Q.B. 210	561
Peter Benoit, The — <i>Applied</i>	(1915) 13 Asp. M.L.C. 203	329
Pollard, <i>In re</i> — <i>Distinguished</i>	(1902) T.L.R. 717	162
Regenstein, The — <i>Distinguished</i>	[1970] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 1	221
St. Helens Colliery Co. Ltd. v. Hewitson — <i>Applied</i> .	[1924] A.C. 59	313
Sea and Land Securities Ltd. v. William Dickinson & Co. Ltd. (The <i>Alresford</i>) — <i>Considered</i> .	[1942] 2 K.B. 65; (1942) 72 Ll.L.Rep. 159	28
Strathcona (Lord) Steamship Co. v. Dominion Coal Co. — <i>Considered</i> .	[1926] A.C. 109	482

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED—*continued*

PAGE

Taunton-Collins v. Cromie and Others — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1964] 1 W.L.R. 633	129
Tynedale Steam Shipping Co. Ltd. v. Anglo-Soviet Shipping Co. Ltd. — <i>Considered.</i>	(1936) 54 L.L.Rep. 341; (1936) 41 Com. Cas. 206	28
Volute, The — <i>Applied</i>	[1922] 1 A.C. 129; (1921) 9 L.L.Rep. 71	329
Warner Bros. Pictures Inc. v. Nelson — <i>Applied.</i>	[1937] 1 K.B. 209	453
Wickman Machine Tool Sales Ltd. v. L. Schuler A.G. — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1972] 1 W.L.R. 840	532
World Harmony — <i>Applied</i>	[1967] P. 341; [1965] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 244	202
Yorkshire Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Nisbet Shipping Co. Ltd. — <i>Considered.</i>	[1962] 2 Q.B. 330; [1961] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 479	549

STATUTES CONSIDERED

	PAGE
UNITED KINGDOM—	
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT, 1956	202
ARBITRATION ACT, 1950	
Sect. 4	369
Sect. 4 (1)	129
Sect. 21	296
Sect. 27	509
BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1914	
Sect. 31	414
BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT, 1882	
Sect. 45	143
Sect. 48	143
Sect. 49	143
Sect. 55	143
BRITISH TRANSPORT DOCKS ACT, 1964	
Sect. 28	101
COMPANIES ACT, 1948	
Sect. 302	414
DOCK WORKERS (REGULATION OF EMPLOYMENT) ACT, 1946	
Sect. 6	183
FACTORIES ACT, 1961	
Sect. 29 (1)	580
FINANCE ACT, 1949	
Sect. 1	216
Sect. 28 (2)	216
FINANCE ACT, 1972	286
HIGHWAYS ACT, 1959	
Sect. 44	524
LAW REFORM (CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE) ACT, 1945	
Sect. 1 (1)	439
LAW REFORM (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1971	
Sect. 4 (1)	591
LIMITATION ACT, 1939	189
LIMITATION ACT, 1963	
Sect. 1	199
MARINE INSURANCE ACT, 1906	
Sect. 31 (1), (2)	233
MARITIME CONVENTIONS ACT, 1911	
Sect. 8	56, 202
MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894	
Sect. 503	394
SALE OF GOODS ACT, 1893	
Sect. 22 (1)	518
UNITED STATES—	
CARRIAGE OF GOODS BY SEA ACT, (46 U.S. CODE)	
Sect. 1300	88
Sect. 1303 (6)	46
Sect. 1304 (3)	363
Sect. 1304 (5)	267, 318
JONES ACT, (46 U.S. CODE)	
Sect. 688	88

CONTENTS

NOTE:—These Reports should be cited as
“[1973] 1 Lloyd's Rep.”

	COURT	PAGE
Aaby's Rederi A/S v. The Union of India (<i>The Evje</i>) ...	[C.A.]	509
African Continental Bank Ltd.:—Compania Sudamericana de Fletes S.A. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	21
Agip S.p.A. C/O S.N.A.M. S.p.A.:— <i>Yoho Maru</i> (Owners) v.	[Q.B.]	409
Agro Company of Canada Ltd. v. Richmond Shipping Ltd. (<i>The Simonburn</i>)	[C.A.]	392
Al Ahleia Insurance Co. S.A.K.:—River Thames Insurance Co. Ltd. v.	[C.A.]	2
Algrey Contractors Ltd. v. Tenth Moat Housing Society Ltd.	[Q.B.]	369
Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers (Engineering Section):—Goad, <i>In re</i>	[N.I.R. Ct.]	162
American Airlines Inc. v. Hope; Banque Sabbag S.A.L. v. Hope	[C.A.]	233
Arterial Caravans Ltd. v. Yorkshire Insurance Co. Ltd. ...	[Q.B.]	169
<i>Atlantic Sunbeam</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	482
Banque Sabbag S.A.L. v. Hope	[C.A.]	233
Bermondsey Cold Stores Ltd.:—National Dock Labour Board v.	[Q.B. (Div. Ct.)]	183
Bertola S.A. and Another:—Evans Marshall & Co. Ltd. v. ...	[C.A.]	453
<i>Bovenkerk</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	63
Bowen v. Mills & Knight Ltd.	[Q.B.]	580
Bowles Transport Ltd.:—Gillespie Bros. & Co. Ltd. v.	[C.A.]	10
Boyd & Co. Ltd. v. Louis Louca	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	209
British Eagle International Air Lines v. Compagnie Nationale Air France	[Ch.]	414
British Steel Corporation:—National Dock Labour Board v.	[H.L.]	101
Bulk Oil (Zug) A.G. v. Trans-Asiatic Oil Ltd. S.A.	[Q.B.]	129
Bureau Veritas:—Great American Insurance Company and Others v.	[U.S. Ct.]	273
Caltex Oil (Australia) Pty. Ltd. v. Howard Smith Industries Pty. Ltd. (<i>The Howard Smith</i>)	[Aust. Ct.]	544
Canadian Pacific (Bermuda) Ltd. v. Canadian Transport Co. Ltd. (<i>The H. R. MacMillan</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	27

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Canadian Transport Co. Ltd.:—Canadian Pacific (Bermuda) Ltd. v. ...	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	27
<i>Carebeka I</i> , The ...	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	396
Cart and Another:—McCann v. ...	[C.A.]	561
Cavendish Woodhouse Ltd. and Comerford:—Elleanor v. ...	[C.A.]	313
Clasen:—D. I. Henry Ltd. ...	[C.A.]	159
Cocks and Another:—Reid v. ...	[C.A.]	518
Comerford and Another:—Elleanor v. ...	[C.A.]	313
Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis and Cocks:—Reid v. ...	[C.A.]	518
Commissioners of Inland Revenue:—Trustees Executors & Agency Co. Ltd. and Others v. ...	[Ch.]	216
Compagnie Nationale Air France:—British Eagle International Air Lines v. ...	[Ch.]	414
Compania Sudamericana de Fletes S.A. v. African Continental Bank Ltd. (The <i>Rosarino</i>) ...	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	21
<i>Conoco Arrow</i> , The ...	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	86
Continental Grain Co.:—Alfred C. Toepfer v. ...	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	289
Du Pont de Nemours & Co. Inc. and Another v. S.S. <i>Mormacvega</i> and Another ...	[U.S. Ct.]	267
International S.A. and E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co. Inc. v. S.S. <i>Mormacvega</i> etc. and Moore-McCormack Lines Inc. (The <i>Mormacvega</i>) ...	[U.S. Ct.]	267
Duncan:—Martindale v. ...	[C.A.]	558
Durable Wharfrage Co. Ltd.:—J. Lowenstein & Co. Ltd. and Another v. ...	[M. & C.L. Ct.]	221
Eaglehill Ltd. v. J. Needham (Builders) Ltd. ...	[H.L.]	143
Eckman and Others v. Midland Bank Ltd. and Hill Samuel & Co. Ltd. ...	[N.I.R. Ct.]	162
Elleanor v. Cavendish Woodhouse Ltd. and Comerford ...	[C.A.]	313
Elmbridge Insurances:—Vehicle & General Insurance Co. Ltd. v. ...	[M. & C.L. Ct.]	325
Elwells Engineers Ltd.:—Roberts v. ...	[C.A.]	153
<i>England</i> , The (Owners) and Others:—Rederij Erven H. Groen and Groen v. ...	[C.A.]	373
Embassy of Pakistan:—Hellenic Lines Ltd. v. ...	[U.S. Ct.]	363
English Industrial Estates Corporation v. George Wimpey & Co. Ltd. ...	[C.A.]	118
Evans Marshall & Co. Ltd. v. Bertola S.A. and Independent Sherry Importers Ltd. ...	[C.A.]	453
<i>Evje</i> , The ...	[C.A.]	509
Export Credits Guarantee Department:—L. Lucas Ltd. and Another v. ...	[C.A.]	549

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Federated Employers Insurance Association Ltd.:—Grunther Industrial Developments Ltd. v.	[C.A.]	394
<i>Filipinas I</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	349
<i>Francesco Nullo</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	72
Freightex Ltd.:—Somerset International Finance Co. Ltd. v.	[C.A.]	227
General Metal Utilisation Co. and Another:—Durable Wharfage Co. Ltd. v.	[M. & C.L. Ct.]	221
Gillespie Bros. & Co. Ltd. v. Roy Bowles Transport Ltd. Rennie Hogg Ltd. (Third Party)	[C.A.]	10
Goad v. Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers (Engineering Section), <i>In re</i> , Eckman and Others v. Midland Bank Ltd. and Hill Samuel & Co. Ltd.	[N.I.R. Ct.]	162
Great American Insurance Company and Others v. Bureau Veritas (The <i>Tradeways II</i>)	[U.S. Ct.]	273
Groen and Groen v. The <i>England</i> (Owners) and Others ...	[C.A.]	373
Grunther Industrial Developments Ltd. v. Federated Employers Insurance Association Ltd.	[C.A.]	394
<i>H. R. MacMillan</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	27
<i>Hagen</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	257
Halfdan Greig & Co. A/S v. Sterling Coal and Navigation Corporation and A.C. Neleman's Handel-entransportonderneming (The <i>Lysland</i>)	[C.A.]	296
Hambidge v. Harrison	[C.A.]	572
Hamburg-Amerika Linie and Another:—Royal Typewriter Co. Division Litton Business Systems Inc. v.	[U.S. Ct.]	318
Hapag-Lloyd A.G. (Sued as Hamburg-Amerika Linie v. Pioneer Terminal Corporation, International Terminal Operating Co. Inc. and Sullivan Security Services Inc.) (The <i>Kulmerland</i>)	[U.S. Ct.]	318
Harris v. Harris	[C.A.]	445
Harrison:—Hambidge v.	[C.A.]	572
Harrisons of Thurnscoe Ltd.:—Hole & Son (Sayers Common) Ltd. v.	[Q.B.]	345
Hellenic Lines Ltd. v. Embassy of Pakistan	[U.S. Ct.]	363
Henry Ltd. v. Wilhelm G. Clasen	[C.A.]	159

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Hill Samuel & Co. Ltd. and Another:—Eckman and Others v.	[N.I.R. Ct.]	162
Hole & Son (Sayers Common) Ltd. v. Harrisons of Thurnscoe Ltd.	[Q.B.]	345
<i>Homer, The</i>	[C.A.]	501
Hope:—American Airlines Inc. and Banque Sabbag S.A.L. v.	[C.A.]	233
Howard Smith Industries Pty. Ltd.:—Caltex Oil (Australia) Pty. Ltd. v.	[Aust. Ct.]	544
<i>Howard Smith, The</i>	[Aust. Ct.]	544
Howell v. West Midlands Passenger Transport Executive ...	[C.A.]	199
Independent Sherry Importers and Another:—Evans Marshall & Co. Ltd.	[C.A.]	453
International Terminal Operating Co. Inc. and Others:— Hamburg-Amerika Linie v.	[U.S. Ct.]	318
<i>Jan Laurenz, The</i>	[C.A.]	329
— (No. 2), <i>The</i>	[C.A.]	1
— <i>The</i> (Owners):— <i>Saint William, The</i> (Owners) v.	[C.A.]	1
King v. Victor Parsons & Co. and Thompson	[C.A.]	189
<i>Kulmerland, The</i>	[U.S. Ct.]	318
— and Another:—Royal Typewriters Co. Division Litton Business Systems Inc. v.	[U.S. Ct.]	318
Lamet Trading Ltd. and Another v. Export Credits Guarantee Department	[C.A.]	549
Louis Louca:—David T. Boyd & Co. Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	209
Lowenstein & Co. Ltd. and General Metal Utilisation Co. Ltd. v. Durable Wharfage Co. Ltd. (Thames & General Lighterage Co. Ltd. Third Party)	[M. & C.L. Ct.]	221
Lucas Ltd. and Lamet Trading Ltd. v. Export Credits Guarantee Department	[C.A.]	549
<i>Lysland, The</i>	[C.A.]	296
<i>Maid of Kent, The</i>	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	49
<i>Manchester Courage, The</i>	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	386
<i>Marine Sulphur Queen, The</i>	[U.S. Ct.]	88

CONTENTS—continued

	COURT	PAGE
Marmara Transport A.S. v. Mobil Tankers S.A. (<i>The Mersin</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	532
Martindale v. Duncan	[C.A.]	558
McCann v. Sheppard and Cart	[C.A.]	561
	[N.I.R.]	
<i>Mersin</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	532
Midland Bank Ltd. and Another:—Eckman and Others v.	[N.I.R. Ct.]	162
Mills & Knight Ltd.:—Bowen v.	[Q.B.]	580
Mobil Tankers S.A.:—Marmara Transport A.S. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	532
Moore-McCormack Lines Inc. and Another:—Du Pont de Nemours International S.A. and Another v.	[U.S. Ct.]	267
<i>Mormacvega</i> , The	[U.S. Ct.]	267
———— S.S. and Another:—Du Pont de Nemours International S.A. and Another v.	[U.S. Ct.]	267
<i>Natalie</i> , The	[Ch.]	216
	[Q.B.]	
National Dock Labour Board v. Bermondsey Cold Stores Ltd.	(Div. Ct.)]	183
———— v. British Steel Corporation	[H.L.]	101
National Packaging Corporation v. Nippon Yusen Kaisha (N.Y.K. Line)	[U.S. Ct.]	46
Needham (Builders) Ltd.:—Eaglehill Ltd. v.	[H.L.]	143
Neleman's Handel-entransportonderneming and Another:—Halfdan Greig & Co. A/S v.	[C.A.]	296
Nippon Yusen Kaisha (N.Y.K. Line):—National Packaging Corporation	[U.S. Ct.]	46
<i>Owenbawn</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	56
Pagnan & Fratelli v. N.G.J. Schouten N.V. (<i>The Filipinas I</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	349
Parsons & Co. and Another:—King v.	[C.A.]	189
Pasternack v. Poulton	[Q.B.]	439
Pioneer Terminal Corporation and Others:—Hamburg-Amerika Linie v.	[U.S. Ct.]	318
Poulton:—Pasternack v.	[Q.B.]	439
Practice Direction	[Supreme Court Taxing Office]	286
————	[Ch.]	372
————	[Ch.]	451
————	[Ch.]	451
————		548
Practice Note	[Ch.]	182

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
President of India :—Sunbeam Shipping Co. Ltd.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	482
—————:—Venore Transportation Co. v.	[U.S. Ct.]	494
<i>Preveze</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm.)]	202
Price:—Thompson v.	[Q.B.]	591
 Reid v. Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis and Cocks Rennie Hogg Ltd. (Third Party). <i>See</i> Gillespie Bros. & Co. Ltd. v. Roy Bowles Ltd.	[C.A.]	518
Richmond Shipping Ltd.:—Agro Company of Canada v. ...	[C.A.]	392
Rider v. Rider and Another	[C.A.]	524
— and Another:—Rider v.	[C.A.]	524
River Thames Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Al Ahleia Insurance Co. S.A.K.	[C.A.]	2
Roberts v. Elwells Engineers Ltd.	[C.A.]	153
<i>Rosarino</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	21
Royal Typewriter Co. Division Litton Business Systems Inc. v. m.v. <i>Kulmerland</i> and Hamburg-Amerika Linie ...	[U.S. Ct.]	318
 <i>Saint William</i> , The (Owners) v. <i>Jan Laurenz</i> (Owners) (The <i>Jan Laurenz</i> (No. 2))	[C.A.]	1
Schouten N.V.:—R. Pagnan & Fratelli v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	349
<i>Simonburn</i> , The	[C.A.]	392
Somerset International Finance Co. Ltd. v. Freightex Ltd.	[C.A.]	227
Sterling Coal and Navigation Corporation and Another:— Halfdan Greig & Co. A/S v.	[C.A.]	296
Sullivan Security Services and Others:—Hamburg-Amerika Linie v.	[U.S. Ct.]	318
Sunbeam Shipping Co. Ltd. v. President of India (The <i>Atlantic Sunbeam</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	482
 Tenth Moat Housing Society Ltd:—Algrey Contractors Ltd. v.	[Q.B.]	369
Thames & General Lighterage Co. Ltd. (Third Party). <i>See</i> Lowenstein & Co. Ltd. v. Durable Wharfage Co. Ltd.		
Thompson v. Price	[Q.B.]	591
Thompson and Another:—King v.	[C.A.]	189
Toepfer v. Continental Grain Co.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	289
<i>Toni</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	79
<i>Tradeways II</i> , The	[U.S. Ct.]	273
Trans-Asiatic Oil Ltd. S.A.:—Bulk Oil (Zug) A.G.	[Q.B.]	129
<i>Trecarrell</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	402
Trustees Executors & Agency Co. Ltd. and Others v. Com- missioners of Inland Revenue (The <i>Natalie</i>)	[Ch.]	216

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Union of India:—E. B. Aaby's Rederi A/S v.	[C.A.]	509
Vehicle & General Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Elmbridge Insurances	[M. & C.L. Ct.]	325
<i>Venore</i> , The	[U.S. Ct.]	494
Venore Transportation Co. v. President of India (The <i>Venore</i>)	[U.S. Ct.]	494
West Midlands Passenger Transport Executive:—Howell v. Wimpey & Co. Ltd.:—English Industrial Estates Corporation v.	[C.A.]	199
	[C.A.]	118
<i>Yoho Maru</i> (Owners) v. Agip S.p.A. C/O S.N.A.M. S.p.A.	[Q.B.]	409
Yorkshire Insurance Co. Ltd.:—Arterial Caravans Ltd. v.	[Q.B.]	169

LLOYD'S LAW REPORTS

Editor: G. M. HALL

of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

Consulting Editor: E. S. MATHERS

of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

[1973] VOL. 1]

The "Jan Laurenz" (No. 2)

PART 1

COURT OF APPEAL

Friday, June 23, 1972

THE "SAINT WILLIAM" (OWNERS) v.
"JAN LAURENZ" (OWNERS)

(THE "JAN LAURENZ" (NO. 2))

Before Lord DENNING, M.R.,
and Lord Justice CAIRNS

**Admiralty practice — Appointment of assessor
with experience in handling vessels under
1000 tons.**

This was a motion by the plaintiff owners of the motor vessel *Saint William* for the appointment of an assessor to sit with the Court in a pending appeal by the plaintiffs from a decision of Mr. Justice Brandon, sitting with a Nautical Assessor, on Feb. 3, 1972 ([1972] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 404). Mr. Justice Brandon held that they were equally to blame with the owners of the motor vessel *Jan Laurenz* for damages and costs arising out of a collision between the two vessels in the Manchester Ship Canal on Mar. 22, 1968. The defendants had denied negligence and counterclaimed damages against the plaintiffs.

Mr. I. Ward and Mr. D. F. R. Cox (instructed by Messrs. Alsop, Stevens, Batesons & Co.) for the appellant plaintiffs; Mr. Michael Thomas and Mr. S. A. G. L. Gault (instructed by Messrs. Ince & Co.) for the respondent defendants.

JUDGMENT

Lord DENNING, M.R.: This is an unusual application. An Admiralty case has recently been tried by Mr. Justice Brandon. It arose out of a collision between the motor vessel

Saint William and the motor vessel *Jan Laurenz* — one of them being of 781 tons and the other about one-third of the tonnage both well under 1000 tons. The collision occurred in the Manchester Ship Canal. At the hearing of the case the Nautical Assessor was one of the Elder Brethren. Now, on the appeal to this Court, Mr. Ward, who appears for the owner of the *Saint William*, applies that this Court should be assisted by an assessor, a certificated master, who has experience in piloting vessels in the Manchester Ship Canal of a similar size. Most of the Elder Brethren, who are retired masters, have been in command of the big ships across the ocean. Few of them, I imagine, would have much experience of the small coastal vessels or vessels under 1000 tons. In these circumstances it does seem appropriate that the Court should have the assistance of an assessor who has experience of these small vessels. We are told by the Admiralty Marshal that quite recently the Admiralty Registrar, in a case arising out of a collision between coastal vessels, made an order for an officer having experience in handling vessels of less than 1000 tons to be appointed to advise. So here we think that in this case it would be desirable. An order should be made that this Court should be assisted by one officer experienced in the handling of vessels of less than 1000 tons in narrow waters. We do not need two assessors. It is not a case which would warrant great expense. We certainly do not think that any officer should be excluded because he knows the Manchester Ship Canal. Indeed nearly all of those available would be expected to have a knowledge of it to a greater or less extent. Nor will we make an order that he *must* have had experience in piloting vessels in the Manchester Ship Canal. We expect that most of those available would have had some experience of it. If there is no one of the Elder Brethren who has that experience,

it may well be that one of the officers on the Home Office list for Wreck Inquiries might be available at a suitable time. If the Admiralty Marshal cannot find one available at a suitable time, then he would be quite ready to ask the parties to submit names from whom one can be selected. So we grant the application to this extent: the assessor for this Court is to be an officer experienced in the handling of vessels of less than 1000 tons in narrow waters.

Lord Justice CAIRNS: I agree.

Mr. WARD: My Lord, in the motion I also ask for the costs of this application. There is provision to agree this sort of thing beforehand. It was not agreed and I therefore ask for the costs.

Lord DENNING, M.R.: Mr. Thomas, what do you say about the costs?

Mr. THOMAS: My friend has not had a complete victory in the motion, but a halfway house has been reached. May I ask that the costs be costs in the appeal?

Lord DENNING, M.R.: Costs costs in the appeal.

COURT OF APPEAL

Oct. 23, 24, 25, 1972

RIVER THAMES INSURANCE CO. LTD.
v. AL AHLEIA INSURANCE CO., S.A.K.

Before Lord DENNING, M.R., Lord Justice
MEGAW and Mr. Justice BRABIN

Insurance — Reinsurance treaty — Confirmation and agreement of underwriting accounts — Whether initialling of accounts by reinsurer's agent sufficient — Whether equitable set-off applicable — Alleged miscalculation of portfolio transfer — Whether dispute which should go to arbitration.

Practice — Order 14 proceedings — Reinsurance treaty — Action for amount due on underwriting accounts — Whether initialling of confirmation and agreement of underwriting accounts by reinsurer's agent sufficient — Alleged miscalculation of portfolio transfer — Whether dispute which should go to arbitration — Whether equitable set-off applicable.

In 1963, the plaintiffs and the defendants entered into a reinsurance treaty whereby the plaintiff reassured agreed to cede and the defendant reinsurers agreed to accept a 5 per cent. quota share of all and every insurance and reinsurance accepted by the reassured after Jan. 1, 1963, through the underwriting agency of B.W. & Co.

Article VI of the treaty provided:

The accounts for each year's underwriting shall be kept separately in the usual way of keeping underwriting accounts.

As soon as may be practicable after the close of each Quarter the "Reassured" shall prepare and submit to the "Reinsurers" through [B.W. & Co.] a Statement of Account showing the "Reinsurers" proportions of all premiums, returns of premiums, claims and refunds, reinsurance premiums and reinsurance recoveries as aforesaid, expenses and disbursements in connection with the subject matter of this Agreement, but any errors or omissions in any such account may be corrected upon discovery.

The accounts shall be confirmed by the "Reinsurers" within one month after they have been rendered and the balance on either side shall become payable six months from the date the accounts are agreed.

Article X of the treaty provided:

Whereas the "Reinsurers" desire to be relieved of liability in respect of each year of account at the end of the third year, it

is hereby understood and agreed, for the purposes of this treaty, that a portfolio transfer into the second year of the following year of account shall be effected by Messrs. Bland, Welch and Company Limited charging the "Reinsurers" with their share of the amount considered by the "Reassured" to be sufficient to liquidate all known and unknown outstanding liability for the Underwriting Account in question. At the same time the outstanding premium reserve for the underwriting Account in question shall be released to the "Reinsurers".

On Aug. 5, 1968, the defendants told B.W. & Co. to address future correspondence to the defendants' London agents. Certain accounts were rendered on Sept. 25, 1969, (showing a balance due from the defendants) and were returned by the defendants' agents on Mar. 9, 1970, initialled by them and with a letter saying:

With reference to your letters . . . regarding settlement and confirmation of balances on this treaty, as you are aware the question of settlement of all outstanding balances due between yourselves and [defendants] is at present the subject of separate correspondence. However, pending agreement of those matters we confirm that the balances of £13,170.17.0d., U.S. \$161090.98 and C. \$1728.70 have been entered in our books.

The account was not paid and on May 16, 1972, the plaintiffs issued a writ against the defendants for the balance due and commenced Order 14 proceedings for summary judgment.

MOCATTA, J. gave judgment for the plaintiffs for £78,781.97 (which the defendants paid into a joint account) and the defendants appealed:

—*Held*, by C.A. (Lord DENNING, M.R., MEGAW, L.J., and BRABIN, J.), (1) that the letter of Mar. 9, 1970, together with the initialling of the accounts by the agents was a confirmation of the accounts such as to satisfy art. VI and that the reinsurers became liable to pay the accounts so confirmed and agreed (see p. 6, cols. 1 and 2; p. 7, col. 1; p. 8, col. 2);

(2) that, under art. X, the reinsured was to fix the amount for the portfolio transfer, and, in the absence of fraud or bad faith, once the account was confirmed and agreed that amount was binding on the reinsurers; that, therefore, there was no arguable issue of fact or law; and the plaintiffs were entitled to summary judgment (see p. 7, col. 2; p. 8, col. 2).

Appeal dismissed.

This was an appeal by Al Ahleia Insurance Co., S.A.K., of Kuwait, from a judgment of Mr. Justice Mocatta in the Queen's Bench

Division (Commercial Court) on July 19, awarding River Thames Insurance Co. Ltd., of Fenchurch Street, London, £78,781.97 and £13,241.84 interest under a treaty of re-insurance between the parties.

The grounds for the appeal were :

" 1. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the principles applied by the Court of Appeal in *Dawnay v. Minter and Trollope & Colls Ltd.* (1971) 1 WLR 1205 and *Frederick Mark Ltd. v. Schield* (1972) 1 Lloyd's Rep 9 in relation to an architect's interim certificate and similar principles applied by the Commercial Judge in Chambers in two unreported cases in relation to charterparties should be applied to the Reinsurance Treaty between the Plaintiffs and the Defendants.

" 2. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the question of whether or not the principles referred to in 1 hereof should be applied to the said Treaty was not in itself a triable issue.

" 3. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that this is not a case where there is reasonable ground for an enquiry or account in order to ascertain the amount recoverable and in not applying the principle applied by the House of Lords in *Wallingford v. Mutual Society* (1880) 5 App. Cas 685 and by the Court of Appeal in *Contract Discount Corporation Ltd. v. Furlong* (1948) 1 AER 274.

" 4. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that on the true construction of Articles III, V, VI and XII of the said treaty the Defendants are bound to pay a confirmed account in full notwithstanding that they have reasonable ground for believing that the said account is based on mistakes of fact in the compilation thereof.

" 5. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the construction of the treaty as set out in 4 hereof is not a triable issue and in holding that it was not a difference between the parties which ought to be referred to arbitration in accordance with the said treaty.

" 6. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in construing the word 'confirm' in Article VI of the said treaty to be equivalent to the word 'agree' in all respects material to this case.

" 7. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the construction of Art. VI of the said treaty as set out in 6 hereof is not a triable issue and in holding

that it was not a difference between the parties which ought to be referred to arbitration in accordance with the said treaty.

" 8. That the learned Judge ought not to have attempted to construe the correspondence in Exhibit KHAS 1 exhibited to the Affidavit of Mr. Saunders sworn on 19th July 1972 because the said correspondence was patently an incomplete selection.

" 9. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in construing the letter of 9th March 1970¹ included in the said Exhibit KHAS 1 as a confirmation of the Plaintiffs' accounts in a sense equivalent to an agreement thereto by the Defendants and in construing the letter of 29th April 1970 as leaving no doubt of the correctness of his aforesaid construction of the letter of 9th March 1970.

"10. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the construction of the said letter of 9th March 1970 and the said letter of 29th April 1970 and the construction of the whole of the said correspondence are not triable issues and in holding that the construction of the said letters was not a difference between the parties which ought to be referred to arbitration in accordance with the said treaty.

" 11. That there was no evidence on which the learned Judge could find that the Defendants had agreed to or admitted the Plaintiffs' said accounts.

" 12. That the judgment was against the weight of the evidence in that the learned Judge found that the Defendants had agreed to or admitted the Plaintiffs' said accounts.

" 13. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the Defendants' contention that they did not agree to or admit the Plaintiffs' said accounts is not a triable issue and in holding that the said issue was not a difference between the parties which ought to be referred to arbitration in accordance with the said treaty.

" 14. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the Defendants' contention that the Plaintiffs have not fulfilled their obligation under Article V to produce receipts and vouchers is not a triable issue and a difference between the parties which ought to be referred to arbitration in accordance with the said treaty.

" 15. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the Defendants' contention that certain claims have been allocated to the incorrect year of account

(some examples of which are given in Exhibit FH3 to the affidavit of Mr. Harmans sworn on 18th July 1972) is not a triable issue and a difference between the parties which ought to be referred to arbitration in accordance with the said treaty.

" 16. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the Defendants' contention that certain facultative reinsurance recoveries were not credited to the Defendants is not a triable issue and a difference between the parties which ought to be referred to arbitration in accordance with the said treaty.

" 17. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the Defendants' contention that the Plaintiffs had not refunded to the Defendants the amounts due under the letter of credit scheme is not a triable issue and a difference between the parties which ought to be referred to arbitration in accordance with the said treaty.

" 18. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the Defendants' contention that the Plaintiffs have overstated the Defendants' share of claims outstanding on 31st December 1968 by £33,417 is not a triable issue and a difference between the parties which ought to be referred to arbitration in accordance with the said treaty.

" 19. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that the Defendants' contention that the Plaintiffs have miscalculated the portfolio transfer is not a triable issue and a difference between the parties which ought to be referred to arbitration in accordance with the said treaty.

" 20. That there was no evidence on which the learned Judge could find that the Defendants had dilly-dallied for long periods of time.

" 21. That the learned Judge wrongly exercised his discretion not to stay these proceedings by acting on an erroneous principle and under a misapprehension of the relevant facts.

" 22. That the learned Judge misdirected himself in holding that there was no triable issue between the parties or other reason for which there ought to be a trial."

By their respondents' notice the respondents contended that Mr. Justice Mocatta's orders should be affirmed on grounds additional to those relied on by the learned Judge, namely that (as argued before the learned Judge but not referred to in his

¹ See p. 6, col. 2, *post*.