



# 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

1974

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. 1974

## CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED

	PAGE
Adler v. Dickson (No. 2) — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1955] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 315 ... 133
Allen v. McAlpine (Sir Alfred) & Sons Limited — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1968] 2 Q.B. 229 ... 32
Aluminios Pozuelo Ltd. v. S.S. <i>Navigator</i> — <i>Applied</i> . ...	(1968) 407 F.2d. 152 ... 599
Apex (Trinidad) Oilfields Ltd. v. Lunham & Moore Shipping Ltd., — <i>Considered</i> . ...	[1962] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 203 ... 106
Aquascutum of London Inc. v. S.S. <i>American Champion</i> — <i>Considered</i> . ...	[1970] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 338 ... 601
Barker (George) Transport Ltd. v. Eynon — <i>Distinguished</i> . ...	[1973] 1 W.L.R. 1461; [1974] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 65 ... 456
Basse & Selve v. Bank of Australasia — <i>Applied</i> . ...	(1904) 90 L.T. 618 ... 56
Booth S.S. Co. v. Meir & Oelhaf Co., — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1959] A.M.C. 1974 ... 122
<i>Bold Buccleugh</i> , The — <i>Considered</i> ...	(1851) Moo. P.C. 267 ... 40
Brightman & Co. v. Bunge y Born Limitada Sociedad — <i>Considered</i> . ...	[1924] 2 K.B. 619 ... 350
Canada Steamship Lines Ltd. v. The King — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1952] A.C. 192; [1952] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 1 ... 443
<i>Cap Bon</i> , The — <i>Considered</i> . ...	[1967] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 543 ... 378
Chambers v. Goldthorpe — <i>Overruled</i> . ...	[1901] 1 K.B. 624 ... 318
<i>Colarado</i> , The — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1923] P. 102 ... 174
Dexters Ltd. v. Hill Crest Oil Co. (Bradford) Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1926] 1 K.B. 348 ... 263
Donoghue v. Stevenson — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1932] A.C. 562 ... 246
Duckett v. Williams — <i>Applied</i> ...	(1834) 2 Crompt. & M. ... 147
<i>Emilie Millon</i> , The — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1905] 2 K.B. 817 ... 456
<i>Everosa</i> , The — <i>Considered</i> . ...	(1937) 20 F. Supp. 8 ... 40
Felthouse v. Bindley — <i>Considered</i> . ...	(1862) 11 C.B.N.S. ... 133
Gillespie Bros. & Co. Ltd. v. Roy Bowles Transport Ltd. and Rennie Hogg Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1972] 3 W.L.R. 1003; [1973] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 10 ... 443
Glassmann v. Hyder — <i>Considered</i> . ...	(1968) 296 N.Y.S.2d. 783 ... 601
Government of Ceylon v. Chandris — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1965] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 204 ... 263
Gray & Co. v. Christie & Co. — <i>Applied</i> . ...	(1889) 5 T.L.R. 577 ... 86
Halesowen Presswork & Assemblies Ltd. v. Westminster Bank Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1972] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 101; [1972] 2 W.L.R. 455 ... 429
Haniel (Franz) A.G. v. Sabre Shipping Corporation — <i>Applied</i> . ...	[1962] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 531 ... 263

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED—*continued*

PAGE

Harris v. Quine — <i>Distinguished.</i> ... ..	(1869) L.R. 4 Q.B. 653 ... ..	573
Hogarth (Hugh) and Owners of <i>Westfalia</i> v. Miller (Alexander) Brother & Co. — <i>Considered.</i>	[1891] A.C. 48 ... ..	311
Johnston (J. A.) Co. Ltd. v. The Ship <i>Tindefjell</i> and Sealion Navigation S.A. and Concordia Line A/S (The <i>Tindefjell</i> ), — <i>Applied.</i>	[1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 253 ... ..	106
Keever, In re, — <i>Distinguished.</i> ... ..	[1967] 1 Ch. 182; [1966] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 475 ... ..	65
Keevil & Keevil v. Boag — <i>Considered.</i> ... ..	(1940) 67 Ll.L.Rep. 263 ... ..	369
Key City, The — <i>Considered.</i> ... ..	(1871) 81 U.S. Rep. (14 Wallace) 653 ... ..	40
Leather's Best Inc. v. S.S. <i>Mormaclynx</i> , — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1971] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 476; (1971) 451 F. 2d 800 ... ..	119, 122
<i>Loch Trool</i> , The — <i>Applied.</i> ... ..	(1907) 150 Fed. Rep. 429 ... ..	241
London and Cheshire Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Laplagrene Property Co. Ltd. — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1971] Ch. 499 ... ..	272
MacGregor, The — <i>Applied</i> ... ..	[1943] A.C. 197; (1942) 74 Ll.L.Rep. 82 ... ..	489
Marquis v. The Ship <i>Astoria</i> — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1931] Ex C.R. 195 ... ..	174
Matheos (S.S.) v. Louis Dreyfus & Co. — <i>Considered.</i>	[1925] A.C. 654 ... ..	350
Morris v. C. W. Martin & Sons Ltd. — <i>Applied</i> ... ..	[1966] 1 Q.B. 716; [1965] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 63 ... ..	133
Motor Districtors v. Olaf Pedersen's Rederi A.S. — <i>Applied.</i>	(1956) 239 F.2d. 463 ... ..	588
Nutt v. Bourdieu — <i>Applied</i> ... ..	(1786) 1 Term Rep. 323 ... ..	179
Oldendorf & Co. v. Tradax Export S.A. (The <i>Johanna Oldendorff</i> ) — <i>Applied.</i> ... ..	[1973] 3 W.L.R. 382; [1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 285 ... ..	350
Pannell v. United States Lines Co. — <i>Considered.</i>	(1959) 263 F.2d. 497 ... ..	599
Parker (William C.) v. Ham (F. J.) & Sons Limited — <i>Applied.</i>	[1972] 1 W.L.R. 1583 ... ..	32
Parker (William C.) v. F. J. Ham & Sons Ltd. — <i>Considered.</i>	[1972] 3 All E.R. 1051 ... ..	128
Paxton v. Allsopp — <i>Considered.</i> ... ..	[1971] 1 W.L.R. 1310 ... ..	365
<i>Point Breeze</i> , The — <i>Applied.</i> ... ..	[1928] P. 135 ... ..	40
Poseidon Schiffahrt G.m.b.H. v. M/S <i>Netuno</i> — <i>Applied.</i>	(1973) 474 F.2d. 203 ... ..	588
Prudential Insurance Co. v. Inland Revenue Comrs. — <i>Applied.</i>	[1904] 2 K.B. 658 ... ..	17
Rawlinson v. Babcock & Wilcox Ltd. — <i>Followed.</i>	[1967] 1 W.L.R. 481 ... ..	475
Reardon Smith Line Ltd. v. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries & Food — <i>Applied.</i>	[1963] A.C. 69; [1963] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 12 ... ..	350
Revici v. Prentice Hall Incorporated — <i>Considered.</i>	[1969] 1 W.L.R. 157 ... ..	365
Royal Typewriter Co. (Division of Litton Business Systems) Inc. v. Kulmerland — <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 428 (1972) 346 F. Supp 1019; [1972] A.M.C. 1995 ... ..	119
Royal Typewriter Co. (Division of Litton Business Systems) Inc. v. Kulmerland — <i>Applied.</i>	[1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 428 ... ..	122

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED—*continued*

PAGE

Samuel (P.) & Co. Ltd. v. Dumas — <i>Considered.</i>	[1924] A.C. 431 ... ..	593
<i>Saxton, In re</i> — <i>Applied.</i> ... ..	[1962] 1 W.L.R. 968 ... ..	197
Sayers v. Harlow Urban District Council — <i>Applied.</i>	[1958] 1 W.L.R. 623 ... ..	508
Smyth (Ross T.) & Co. Ltd. v. Lindsay (W.N.) Ltd. — <i>Considered.</i>	[1953] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 378 ... ..	499
<i>Southern Cross, The</i> — <i>Considered.</i> ... ..	[1940] A.M.C. 59 ... ..	482
Sparenborg v. Edinburgh Life Assurance Co. — <i>Applied.</i> ... ..	[1912] 1 K.B. 195 ... ..	147
Spooner (A. N.) & Son v. Connecticut Fire Insce. Co. — <i>Considered.</i>	(1963) 314 F.2d. 753 ... ..	590
Standard Electrica S.A. v. Hamburg Sud-amerikanische, — <i>Applied.</i> ... ..	[1967] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 193; [1967] A.M.C. 881 ... ..	122
Steele v. Robert George (1937) Ltd. — <i>Applied</i>	[1942] A.C. 497 ... ..	165
Street v. Royal Exchange Assurance — <i>Distinguished.</i>	(1914) 19 Com. Cas. 339 ... ..	590
Suisse Atlantique Societe D'Armement Maritime S.A. v. N.V. Rotter-damsche Kolen Centrale — <i>Applied.</i>	[1967] 1 A.C. 361; [1966] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 529 ... ..	185
The Ship <i>Strandhill</i> v. Walter W. Hodder Co. — <i>Applied.</i> ... ..	[1926] S.C.R. 680 ... ..	174
Thompson v. Weems — <i>Applied.</i> ... ..	(1884) 9 App. Cas. 671 ... ..	147
Timber Shipping Co. S.A. v. London & Overseas Freighters Ltd. — <i>Applied.</i> ... ..	[1972] A.C.1.; [1971] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 523 ... ..	86
<i>Tojo Maru, The</i> — <i>Applied.</i> ... ..	[1972] A.C. 242; [1971] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 341 ... ..	557
Tropical Marine Products v. Birmingham Fire Insurance Co. — <i>Applied.</i>	(1957) 247 F.2d. 116 ... ..	593
Tynedale Steam Shipping Co. Ltd. v. Anglo-Soviet Shipping Co. Ltd. — <i>Considered.</i>	(1936) 54 Ll.L.Rep. 341 ... ..	311
Voller v. Dairy Produce Packers Ltd. — <i>Followed.</i>	[1962] 1 W.L.R. 960 ... ..	475
Watson S.S. Co. v. Merryweather & Co. — <i>Applied.</i>	(1913) 18 Com. Cas. 294 ... ..	86
Wigle v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. — <i>Considered.</i>	(1959) 177 F. Supp. 932 ... ..	593
Wiltshire Iron Co. v. Great Western Railway, — <i>Considered.</i>	(1871) L.R. 6 Q.B. 776 ... ..	65
Worrall v. Reich — <i>Applied.</i> ... ..	[1955] 1 Q.B. 296 ... ..	197

## STATUTES CONSIDERED

	PAGE
UNITED KINGDOM—	
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT, 1956 ... ..	40
ARBITRATION ACT, 1950	
Sect. 4 (1), (2) ... ..	378
Sect. 12 (6) (f) ... ..	378
Sect. 28 ... ..	378
BILLS OF LADING ACT, 1855	
Sect. 1 ... ..	185
CARRIAGE OF GOODS BY ROAD ACT, 1965	
SCHEDULE	
Art. 23 ... ..	203
Art. 25 ... ..	203
Art. 27 ... ..	203
Art. 32 ... ..	203
CARRIAGE OF GOODS BY SEA ACT, 1924	
SCHEDULE	
Art. III, r. 6 ... ..	534
Art. IV, r. 5 ... ..	534
COAST PROTECTION ACT, 1949	
Sect. 34 ... ..	140
COMPANIES ACT, 1948	
Sect. 95 (1) ... ..	274
Sect. 302 ... ..	229
DOCKS AND HARBOURS ACT, 1966	
Sect. 51 ... ..	267
FATAL ACCIDENTS ACTS, 1846-1959 ... ..	475
FOREIGN JUDGMENTS (RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT) ACT, 1933	
Sect. 8 (1) ... ..	573
HARWICH HARBOUR ACT, 1863	
Sect. 17 ... ..	140
HARWICH HARBOUR ACT, 1865	
Sect. 26 ... ..	140
INSURANCE COMPANIES ACT, 1958 ... ..	17
LAW REFORM (CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE) ACT, 1945 ... ..	508
LAW REFORM (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1934 ... ..	475
MANCHESTER CORPORATION ACT, 1965	
Sect. 35 ... ..	456
OIL IN NAVIGABLE WATERS ACT, 1955	
Sect. 1 (1) ... ..	8, 520
OIL IN NAVIGABLE WATERS ACT, 1963 ... ..	8
SALE OF GOODS ACT, 1893	
Sect. 51 (3) ... ..	263
AUSTRALIA—	
GEELONG HARBOR TRUST ACT, 1928	
Sect. 110 ... ..	344
CANADA—	
CANADA RAILWAY ACT (R.S.C. 1952 C. 234)	
Sect. 353 (2) ... ..	106
CARRIAGE OF GOODS BY WATER ACT (R.S.C. 1970 Cap C. 15)	
SCHEDULE	
Art. III, r. 2 ... ..	482
Art. IV, r. 2 (m), (n) ... ..	482
UNITED STATES—	
CARRIAGE OF GOODS BY SEA ACT, 1936 (46 U.S. Code) ... ..	185
Sect. 1300 ... ..	287
Sect. 1304 (5) ... ..	119, 359, 599
NEW YORK INSURANCE LAW	
Sect. 59 (a) 2a (1), (4) ... ..	601

# CONTENTS

---

**NOTE:—These Reports should be cited as  
“[1974] 1 Lloyd’s Rep.”**

	COURT	PAGE
Adamson:— Fairline Shipping Corporation v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	133
Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. & Others:— Pan American World Airways Inc. v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	207
Agroexport State Enterprise for Foreign Trade v. Compagnie Europeene de Cereales ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	499
<i>Alex</i> , The ... ..	[Can. Ct.]	106
Alkmeon Naviera S.A. v. The vessel <i>Marina L.</i> ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	588
Alkmeon Naviera S.A. and Others:— Peoples Insurance Co. of China v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	588
<i>Alletta</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	40
Alma Shipping Corp. of Monrovia v. Mantovani (The <i>Dione</i> )	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	86
Altema Compania Maritima S.A. & the ship <i>Ioannis Daskalelis</i> :— Todd Shipyards Corp. v. (The <i>Ioannis Daskalelis</i> ) ... ..	[Can. Ct.]	174
American Export Isbrandtsen Lines Inc.:— Rosenbruch v. (The <i>Container Forwarder</i> ) ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	119
Apple and Others:— De Meza and Another v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	508
Aronsen (Oscar L) Inc. v. Compton and Others (The <i>Megara</i> ) ...	[U.S. Ct.]	590
Avec Audio-Visual Equipment Ltd.:— Wilson v. ... ..	[C.A.]	81
Banque de L’Indochine:— Gian Singh & Co. Ltd. v. ... ..	[Sing. Ct.]	56
Barchard & Son Ltd.:— National Dock Labour Board ... ..	[C.A.]	267
Barker (Transport) Ltd. v. Eynon ... ..	[C.A.]	65
<i>Berkshire</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	185
<i>Bischofstein</i> , The ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	122
Black-Clawson International Ltd. v. Papierwerke Waldhof-Aschaffenburg A.G. ... ..	[C.A.]	573
British Eagle International Airlines Ltd. v. Compagnie Nationale Air France ... ..	[C.A.]	429
British India Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. and Another:— Carter v. <i>Briton</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B.]	419
Brixham Bunkering and Devon Marine Ltd. v. County Borough of Torbay ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	339
Brooks:— Payton v.... ..	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	22
Bux v. Slough Metal Ltd. ... ..	[C.A.]	241
Canadian Pacific (Bermuda) Ltd. v. Canadian Transport Co. Ltd. (The <i>H.R. Macmillan</i> ) ... ..	[C.A.]	311
Canadian Pacific Railway Co.:— Lufty Ltd. v. (The <i>Alex</i> ) ...	[Can. Ct.]	106

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Canadian Transport Co. Ltd.:— Canadian Pacific (Bermuda) Ltd. ... ..	[C.A.]	311
Carter v. British India Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. and France (William) Fenwick & Co. Ltd. ... ..	[Q.B.]	419
Carter v. Port of London Authority ... ..	[Q.B.]	583
Causton v. Mann Egerton (Johnsons) Ltd. ... ..	[C.A.]	197
Channel Airways Ltd. v. The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Citizens of the City of Manchester ... ..	[Q.B.]	456
Clarke Ltd. and Pickwick Foods Ltd. v. Redburn Wharves Ltd. ... ..	[Q.B.]	52
Commercial Trading Co. Inc. v. Hartford Fire Insurance Co. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	179
Compagnie Nationale Air France:— British Eagle International Airlines Ltd. ... ..	[C.A.]	429
Compton and Others:— Oscar L. Aronsen Inc. v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	590
Compagnie Europeene de Cereales:— Agroexport State Enterprise for Foreign Trade v. ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	499
Continental Grain Co.:— Alfred C. Toepfer ... ..	[C.A.]	11
<i>Continental Shipper</i> , The ... ..	[Can. Ct.]	482
<i>Continental Shipper</i> (Owners) and Others:— Nissan Automobile Co. (Canada) Ltd. v. ... ..	[Can. Ct.]	482
<i>Container Forwarder</i> , The ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	119
County Borough of Torbay:— Brixham Bunkering and Devon Marine Ltd. v. ... ..	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	22
Cummins Sales & Service Inc. v. Institute of London Underwriters and Others and Deutsche Dampfschiffahrt Gesellschaft Hansa (The <i>Goldenfels</i> ) ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	292
De Meza and Stuart v. Apple, Van Straten, Shena and Stone ... ..	[Q.B.]	508
Department of Trade and Industry:— Federal Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. v. ... ..	[C.A.]	8
Department of Trade and Industry:— Federal Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. v. ... ..	[H.L.]	520
Department of Trade and Industry v. St. Christopher Motorists' Association Ltd. ... ..	[Ch.]	17
Deutsche Dampfschiffahrt Gesellschaft Hansa and Others:— Cummins Sales & Service Inc. v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	292
Devon Marine Ltd. and Another v. County Borough of Torbay	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	22
<i>Dione</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	86
Donner:— Kirkbride v. ... ..	[M. & C.L. Ct.]	549
Du Pont de Nemours International S.A. and E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co. Inc. v. S.S. <i>Mormacvega</i> etc. and Moore-McMormack Lines Inc. (The <i>Mormacvega</i> ) ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	296
East Suffolk County Council and Others:— Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	140
E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co. Inc. and Another v. S.S. <i>Mormacvega</i> and Another ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	296
Elmarina Inc. and Others:— Peoples Insurance Co. of China v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	588
<i>Erich Schroeder</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	192
<i>Eurymedon</i> , The ... ..	[P.C.]	534
Eynon:— George Barker Transport Ltd. v. ... ..	[C.A.]	65



CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Fairline Shipping Corp. v. Adamson ... ..	[Q.B.]	133
Falmouth Docks and Engineering Co. v. Fowey Harbour Commissioners (The <i>Briton</i> ) ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	339
Federal Commerce and Navigation Co. Ltd. and Others:— Nissan Automobile Co. (Canada) Ltd. v. ... ..	[Can. Ct.]	482
Federal Pacific Lakes Line and Others:— Nissan Automobile Co. (Canada) Ltd. v. ... ..	[Can. Ct.]	482
Federal Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. v. Department of Trade and Industry (The <i>Huntingdon</i> ) ... ..	[C.A.]	8
Federal Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. v. Department of Trade and Industry (The <i>Huntingdon</i> ) ... ..	[H.L.]	520
Ferrymasters Ltd. & Another:— William Tatton & Co. Ltd. v. Figueiredo Navegacas S.A. v. Reederei Richard Schroeder K.G. (The <i>Erich Schroeder</i> ) ... ..	[Q.B.]	203
Fowey Harbour Commissioners:— Falmouth Docks & Engineering Co. v. ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	192
France (William) Fenwick & Co. Ltd. and Another:— Carter v. ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	339
	[Q.B.]	419
Geelong Harbor Trust Commissioners v. Gibbs Bright & Co. (The <i>Octavian</i> ) ... ..	[P.C.]	344
Gibbs Bright & Co.:— Geelong Harbor Trust Commissioners v. <i>Goldenfels</i> , The ... ..	[P.C.]	344
	[U.S. Ct.]	292
<i>Golden Trader</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	378
Goukeket & Co. N.V. and Another:— Mitsui & Co. Ltd. v. ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	386
<i>Green Lion</i> , The ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	593
<i>H.R. Macmillan</i> , The ... ..	[C.A.]	311
<i>Hadjtsakos</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	564
Hair and Skin Trading Co. Ltd. v. Norman Airfreight Carriers Ltd. and World Transport Agencies ... ..	[Q.B.]	443
Harland & Wolff Ltd. v. Lakeport Navigation Co. Panama S.A. ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	301
Hartford Fire Insurance Co.:— Commercial Trading Co. Inc. v. Hartford Fire Insurance Co. v. Pacific Far East Line Inc. (The <i>Pacific Bear</i> ) ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	179
		359
Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board v. Secretary of State for the Environment, East Suffolk County Council & Stour River Estate ... ..	[Q.B.]	140
<i>Hawthorn</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	282
Hay and Another v. Hughes ... ..	[Fam. Div.]	475
Helvetia Swiss Fire Insurance Co. Ltd. and Another:— Ringers' Dutchocs Inc. v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	601
Holland America Line and Another:— Van Breems v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	599
Hoverlloyd Ltd.:— Nosedá v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	448
Hughes:— Hay and Another v. ... ..	[Fam. Div.]	475
<i>Huntingdon</i> , The ... ..	[C.A.]	8
<i>Huntingdon</i> , The ... ..	[H.L.]	520
<i>Ile Aux Moines</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	263
Institute of London Underwriters and Others:— Cummins Sales & Services Inc. v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	292

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
International Terminal Operating Co. Inc. and Another:— Van Breems ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	599
<i>Ioannis Daskalelis</i> , The ... ..	[Can. Ct.]	174
Kerr v. National Carriers Ltd. ... ..	[C.A.]	365
Kirkbride v. Donner ... ..	[M. & C.L. Ct.]	549
Kumar v. Life Insurance Corp. of India ... ..	[Q.B.]	147
Lakeport Navigation Co. Panama S.A.:— Harland & Wolff Ltd. v. ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	301
Lefka Naviera S.A. and Others:— Peoples Insurance Co. of China v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	588
Life Insurance Corp. of India:— Kumar v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	147
London Country Buses and Another:— Persson v. ... ..	[C.A.]	415
The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Citizens of the City of Manchester:— Channel Airways Ltd. v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	456
Lloyds Bank Ltd.:— McNerny v. ... ..	[C.A.]	246
Lufty Ltd. v. Canadian Pacific Railway Co. ( <i>The Alex</i> ) ... ..	[Can. Ct.]	106
<i>Maid of Kent</i> , The ... ..	[C.A.]	434
Mann Egerton (Johnsons) Ltd.:— Causton v. ... ..	[C.A.]	197
Mantovani:— Alma Shipping Corp. of Monrovia v. ( <i>The Dione</i> )	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	86
<i>Marina L.</i> , The ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	588
<i>Marina L.</i> , The:— Alkmeon Naviera S.A. v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	588
<i>Marina L.</i> and Others:— Peoples Insurance Co. of China v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	588
Marpro Industrial Ltd. and Another:— Mitsui & Co. Ltd. v. ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	386
McAlpine & Sons Ltd.:— Sweeney v. ... ..	[C.A.]	128
McNerny v. Lloyds Bank Ltd. ... ..	[C.A.]	246
<i>Megara</i> , The ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	590
Mitsui & Co. Ltd. v. Marpro Industrial Ltd. and Goukeket & Co. N.V. ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	386
<i>Mollymawk</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	32
Moore-McMormack Lines Inc. and Others:—Du Pont de Nemours International S.A. and Another v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	296
Moran and Another:— Regina v. ... ..	[C.A.]	8
Morgan v. T. Wallis Ltd. ... ..	[Q.B.]	165
<i>Mormacvega</i> , The ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	296
Motor Insurers' Bureau and Another:— Persson v. ... ..	[C.A.]	415
National Carriers Ltd.:— Kerr v. ... ..	[C.A.]	365
National Dock Labour Board v. W. S. Barchard & Son Ltd. ... ..	[C.A.]	267
New Zealand Shipping Company Limited v. A. M. Satterthwaite & Company Limited ( <i>The Eurymedon</i> ) ... ..	[P.C.]	534
Nissan Automobile Co. (Canada) Ltd. v. Owners of the vessel <i>Continental Shipper</i> , United Steamship Corporation, Federal Commerce and Navigation Co. Ltd. and Federal Pacific Lakes Line ( <i>The Continental Shipper</i> ) ... ..	[Can. Ct.]	482
Norddeutscher Lloyd & Others:— Sperry Rand Corporation v. ( <i>The Bischofstein</i> ) ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	122

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Norman Airfreight Carriers Ltd. and Another:— Hair and Skin Trading Co. Ltd. v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	443
Nosedá v. Hoverlloyd Ltd. ... ..	[Q.B.]	448
<i>Octavian</i> , The ... ..	[P.C.]	344
<i>Oldekerk</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	95
<i>Pacific Bear</i> , The ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	359
Pacific Far East Line Inc.:— Hartford Fire Insurance Co. v. ...	[U.S. Ct.]	359
Pagnan & Fratelli:— Panchaud Freres S.A. v. ... ..	[C.A.]	394
Panama Canal Company:— Sommer Corporation v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	287
Pan American World Airways Inc. v. The Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. & Others ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	207
Panchaud Freres S.A. v. R. Pagnan & Fratelli ... ..	[C.A.]	394
Papierwerke Waldhof-Aschaffenburg A.G.:— Black-Clawson International Ltd. v. ... ..	[C.A.]	573
Payton v. Brooks ... ..	[C.A.]	241
Peoples Insurance Co. of China v. The vessel <i>Theokeetor</i> , The vessel <i>Marina L.</i> , Alkmeon Naviera S.A., Elmarina Inc. and Lefka Naviera S.A. (The <i>Marina L.</i> ) ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	588
Persson v. London Country Buses and Motor Insurers' Bureau	[C.A.]	415
Phillips:— Stenhouse Australia Ltd. v. ... ..	[P.C.]	1
Pickwick Foods Ltd. and Another v. Redburn Wharves Ltd. ...	[Q.B.]	52
Pilgrim Shipping Co. Ltd. v. State Trading Corporation of India Ltd. (The <i>Hadjitsakos</i> ) ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	564
Port of London Authority:— Carter v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	583
Practice Direction ... ..	[Ch.]	425
Practice Direction ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	239
Practice Direction ... ..	[Ch.]	184
Practice Direction ... ..	[Ch.]	132
Practice Direction ... ..	[H.L.]	62
<i>Prinses Margriet</i> , The ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	599
Probatina Shipping Co. Ltd. v. Sun Insurance Office Ltd. (The <i>Sageorge</i> ) ... ..	[C.A.]	369
<i>Prometheus</i> , The ... ..	[C.A.]	554
<i>Prometheus</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	350
Redburn Wharves Ltd.:— F. & C. Clarke Ltd. and Pickwick Foods Ltd. v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	52
Reederei Richard Schroeder K.G.:— Figueiredo Navegacas S.A. (The <i>Erich Schroeder</i> ) ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	192
Regina v. The Federal Steam Nav. Co. and Derek Ernest Moran (The <i>Huntingdon</i> ) ... ..	[C.A.]	8
Ringers' Dutchocs Inc. v. Steamship <i>S.L. 180</i> , Her engines, boilers etc., Sea-Land Service Inc. and Helvetia Swiss Fire Insurance Co. Ltd. (The <i>S.L. 180</i> ) ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	601
Rosenbruch v. American Export Isbrandtsen Lines Inc. (The <i>Container Forwarder</i> ) ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	119

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
<i>St. Blane</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	557
<i>St. Christopher Motorists' Association Ltd.</i> :— Department of Trade and Industry v. ... ..	[Ch.]	17
<i>Sabine</i> , The ... ..	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	465
<i>Sageorge</i> , The ... ..	[C.A.]	369
<i>Satterthwaite &amp; Company Limited</i> :— The New Zealand Shipping Company Limited v. ... ..	[P.C.]	534
<i>S.L. 180</i> , The ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	601
<i>S.L. 180</i> , The:— <i>Ringers' Dutchocs Inc. v.</i> ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	601
<i>Sea-Land Service Inc. and Another</i> :— <i>Ringers' Dutchocs Inc. v. Secretary of State for the Environment, East Suffolk County Council &amp; Stour River Estate</i> :— Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	601
<i>Shena and Others</i> :— <i>De Meza and Another v.</i> ... ..	[Q.B.]	140
<i>Singh &amp; Co. Ltd. v. Banque de L'Indochine</i> ... ..	[Q.B.]	508
<i>Slough Metal Ltd.</i> :— <i>Bux v.</i> ... ..	[Sing. Ct.]	56
<i>Societe Commerciale de Cereales et Financiere S.A. of Zurich</i> :— <i>Venizelos A.N.E. of Athens v.</i> ... ..	[C.A.]	155
<i>Societe Maritime Nationale of Paris</i> :— <i>Vanda Compania Limitada of Costa Rica v.</i> ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	350
<i>Sipowicz v. Wimble and Others (The Green Lion)</i> ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	263
<i>Sommer Corporation v. Panama Canal Company</i> ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	593
<i>Sperry Rand Corporation v. Norddeutscher Lloyd and Others (The Bischofstein)</i> ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	287
<i>State Trading Corporation of India Ltd.</i> :— <i>Pilgrim Shipping Co. Ltd. v.</i> ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	122
<i>Stenhouse Australia Ltd. v. Phillips</i> ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	564
<i>Stone and Others</i> :— <i>De Meza and Another v.</i> ... ..	[P.C.]	1
<i>Stour River Estate and Others</i> :— Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	508
<i>Stuart and Another v. Apple, Van Straten, Shena and Stone</i> ... ..	[Q.B.]	140
<i>Sun Insurance Office Ltd.</i> :— <i>Probatina Shipping Co. Ltd. v.</i> ... ..	[Q.B.]	508
<i>Sutcliffe v. Thackrah and Others</i> ... ..	[C.A.]	369
<i>Sweeney v. Sir Robert McAlpine &amp; Sons Ltd.</i> ... ..	[H.L.]	318
	[C.A.]	128
<i>Tatton &amp; Co. Ltd. v. Ferrymasters Ltd. &amp; Another</i> ... ..	[Q.B.]	203
<i>Thackrah and Others</i> :— <i>Sutcliffe v.</i> ... ..	[H.L.]	318
<i>Theokeetor</i> , The and Others:— <i>Peoples Insurance Co. of China v.</i> ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	588
<i>Todd Shipyards Corp. v. Altema Compania Maritima S.A. &amp; the ship Ioannis Daskalelis (The Ioannis Daskalelis)</i> ... ..	[Can. Ct.]	174
<i>Toepfer v. Continental Grain Co.</i> ... ..	[C.A.]	11
<i>Toni</i> , The ... ..	[C.A.]	489
<i>United Steamship Corporation and Others</i> :— <i>Nissan Automobile Co. (Canada) Ltd. v.</i> ... ..	[Can. Ct.]	482
<i>Van Breems v. International Terminal Operating Co. Inc. and Holland America Line (The Prinses Margriet)</i> ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	599
<i>Van Straten and Others</i> :— <i>De Meza and Another v.</i> ... ..	[Q.B.]	508

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Vanda Compania Limitada of Costa Rica v. Societe Maritime Nationale of Paris ( <i>The Ile Aux Moines</i> ) ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	263
Venizelos A.N.E. of Athens v. Societe Commerciale de Cereales et Financiere S.A. of Zurich ( <i>The Prometheus</i> ) ... ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	350
Venizelos A.N.E. of Athens v. Societe Commerciale De Cereales et Financiere S.A. ( <i>The Prometheus</i> ) ... ..	[C.A.]	554
Wallis Ltd.:— Morgan v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	165
Wallis & Simmonds (Builders) Ltd., <i>Re</i> . ... ..	[Ch.]	272
Wilson v. Avec Audio-Visual Equipment Ltd. ... ..	[C.A.]	81
Wimble and Others:— Sipowicz v. ... ..	[U.S. Ct.]	593
World Transport Agencies and Another:— Hair and Skin Trading Co. Ltd. v. ... ..	[Q.B.]	443

# 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

[1974] VOL. 1]

Stenhouse Australia Ltd. v. Phillips

PART 1

## PRIVY COUNCIL

July 9, 10, 11, 1973

### STENHOUSE AUSTRALIA LTD. v. PHILLIPS

Before Lord REID,  
Lord MORRIS OF BORTH-Y-GEST,  
Lord WILBERFORCE,  
Lord SIMON OF GLAISDALE and  
Sir GARFIELD BARWICK

Master and servant — Restraint of trade — Period of restraint — Reasonableness — Restraint for five years after termination of employment — Insurance brokers — Prohibition on employee soliciting former employer's clients — "Clients" narrowly defined — Test for determining whether period reasonable — Question to be determined by Judge — Determination by Judge after informing himself of all relevant circumstances.

Trade — Restraint of trade — Master and servant — Clause not expressed to be in restraint of trade — Provision for payment of money — Duty of Court to have regard to likely effect of provision — Provision clearly operating in restraint of trade — Provision to be treated as being in restraint of trade.

A company, which had its office in Sydney, was the holding company in a group of companies ("the group"). Through its subsidiaries the company carried on the business of insurance broking in Australia. In 1964 the employee entered into an employment agreement with one of the subsidiaries. The agreement was expressed to last until the employee was 60 years old and thereafter from year to year. Under the agreement the employee covenanted for a period of five years after the determination of his services, within 25 miles of Sydney, not to engage in the business of insurance broking nor to solicit the custom of any person who during the continuation of the agreement would have been a customer of any company in the group, and (b) not, for a similar period, to be concerned in the business of an insurance broker in any town in Australia in which any company of the group, at the

termination of the contract, had a recognized place of business nor in any place in Australia to solicit the custom of any person who during the continuance of the agreement should have been a customer of any company in the group.

In 1966 the agreement was novated so that the company became the employing party. The employee's main activities were concerned with reinsurance business for the group, but they also involved direct dealings or negotiations with a limited number of clients with a view to the placing of insurance business in the group. In May, 1971 the employee gave notice of his intention to resign but the company refused to accept the notice. On July 9, 1971 the employee left the company's employment and set up a company which commenced business in the first half of 1972 in competition with the company. Meanwhile negotiations had been going on between the employee and the company with regard to the termination of his employment.

On Mar. 23, 1972 an agreement was executed which recited the earlier employment agreement and provided by cl. 1 for the termination of the employee's employment. By cl. 4 the employee covenanted that he would not for a period of five years from July 9, 1971 without the company's prior consent directly or indirectly solicit insurance business from any client as defined. Clause 5 provided that if, within the five year period, any client of the company placed insurance business, whether or not of a type currently transacted by the company for such client, through the agency of the employee or any agency other than that of one of the companies in the group, so that the employee, or any person, firm or corporation with which he was in any way connected, received or became entitled to receive directly or indirectly any financial benefit from the placing of such business then the employee was to pay or procure the payment to the company of one-half of the gross commission paid by the insurance company without any allowance for any rebate made to the client. The sums payable under cl. 5 would continue to be payable for a period of five years after such insurance business was first placed. By cl. 6 the employee covenanted that except in the circumstances provided in cl. 5 he would not for a period of three years from July 9, 1971, without the company's prior consent, act as insurance broker for any client as defined. For the purposes of cll. 4, 5 and 6, "client" was defined by cl. 8 as

any person, firm or corporation who on July 9, 1971 or in the preceding month was a client of the company or any of its associated companies with whom in the course of his employment with the company the employee had had dealings or negotiations, or prospective clients whose insurance business had, through the employee's services or agency, been the subject of negotiations within the 12 month period preceding July 9, 1971, but excluded prospective clients whose business was acquired by, or who became a subsidiary of, any person, firm or corporation which on or after July 9, 1971 was or became a client of the employee or person, corporation or firm by whom he was employed or for whom he was acting as agent, and furthermore excluded any insurance company.

The company brought proceedings seeking, *inter alia*, a declaration as to the validity of cl. 4, 5 and 6 of the agreement.

—Held, by P.C. (Lord REID, Lord MORRIS OF BORTH-Y-GEST, Lord WILBERFORCE, Lord SIMON OF GLAISDALE and Sir GARFIELD BARWICK), that (i) cl. 4, although in restraint of trade, was reasonable and necessary for the protection of the company's business for the following reasons—

(a) the prohibition on soliciting was narrow restraint which left open a wide field of unrestrained competitive activity by the employee (see p. 5, col. 2);

(b) the covenant extended only to a comparatively small number of clients with whom the respondent had dealt directly, and expressly excluded any insurance company, an exception of great importance to the respondent as the greater part of his work had been in the field of re-insurance (see p. 5, col. 2);

(c) the period of five years was effectively one for less than 4½ years since it was expressed to run from July, 1971; to determine whether that period was reasonable the question to be asked was what was a reasonable time during which the employer was entitled to protection against solicitation of clients with whom the employee had had contact and influence during employment and who were not bound to the employer by contract or by stability of association; that question could not advantageously form the subject of direct evidence but was to be determined by the Judge after informing himself as fully as he could of the facts and circumstances of the employer's business, the nature of the employer's interest to be protected and the likely effect on it of solicitation; in all the circumstances the period specified in the agreement was not unreasonable (see p. 5, cols. 1 and 2; p. 6, col. 1);

(ii) Although on the face of it cl. 5 was not a restraint at all but a provision for the payment of money, the question whether it operated in restraint of trade was to be determined not by the form of the stipulation, but by its effect in practice. The provisions of the clause were such as to be likely to cause the employee to refuse business which he would otherwise take. The clause therefore clearly operated in restraint of trade, particularly when read in conjunction with cl. 6 since, read together, the two clauses amounted to a restriction, as stated in cl. 6, against acting as

insurance broker for clients unless payment was made in accordance with cl. 5. Once it was accepted that cl. 5 operated in restraint of trade it followed from the severity, as regards the employee, of the clause, that it operated unreasonably. Furthermore the existence of the restraint in cl. 4 diminished the need for others, or at least increased the burden of proving that they were reasonably required. It followed that cl. 5 and 6, which had to be read together, were unenforceable (see p. 6, cols. 1 and 2).

(iii) Clause 4 was, however, in no way dependent on cl. 5 and 6 and was therefore enforceable (see p. 6, col. 2).

Appeal allowed in part.

The following cases were referred to in the judgment.

Attwood v. Lamont, (C.A.) [1920] 3 K.B. 571.

Esso Petroleum Co. Ltd. v. Harper's Garage (Stourport) Ltd., [1967] 1 All E.R. 699, [1968] A.C. 269.

Hudson (Howard F.) Pty. Ltd. v. Ronayne, [1972] A.L.R. 357.

Leatham (Henry) & Sons Ltd. v. Johnstone-White, (C.A.) [1907] 1 Ch. 322.

By a summons dated July 3, 1972, the appellant, Stenhouse Australia Ltd., commenced a suit in the Equity Division of the Supreme Court of New South Wales against the respondent, Marshall William Davidson Phillips, claiming, *inter alia*, injunctions restraining the respondent from acting in breach of a contract made between the parties on Mar. 23, 1972 and a declaration that the provisions of cl. 4, 5 and 6 of the contract were valid and enforceable. On Oct. 26, 1972 Mr. Justice Mahoney dismissed the suit and on Dec. 15, 1972 granted the appellant leave to appeal to the Privy Council.

James P. H. Mackay Q.C., J. A. D. Hope (both of the Scottish Bar) and J. R. T. Wood (of the New South Wales Bar) (instructed by Messrs. Wilkinson, Kimbers and Staddon) for the appellant; A. J. L. Lloyd, Q.C. and B. A. Beaumont (of the New South Wales Bar) (instructed by Messrs. Linklaters and Paines) for the respondent.

The facts are set out in the judgment of Lord Wilberforce.

Tuesday, Oct. 2, 1973

#### JUDGMENT

Lord WILBERFORCE: This appeal from the Supreme Court of New South Wales involves the question whether certain provisions in an agreement under seal dated Mar. 23, 1972 between the appellant and the respondent are

or are not unenforceable as being in restraint of trade. Before stating the provisions in question, it is necessary, for later discussion, to refer to some previous history concerning the relations of the appellant and the respondent.

The appellant is a company having an office in Sydney with a considerable business in the field of insurance. It carries on business itself as an insurance broker and also has a number of wholly owned subsidiaries through which it carries on the business of insurance broking in the States of Australia. It will be convenient to refer to the appellant and its subsidiaries as "the Stenhouse group".

On Dec. 11, 1964 the respondent entered into an employment agreement with one of the companies in the Stenhouse group, namely, Stenhouse Scott North Australia Ltd. The agreement was expressed to continue until the respondent should attain the age of 60 years and thereafter, subject to certain conditions, from year to year until determined by six months' notice on either side. It contained, *inter alia*, two covenants on the part of the respondent. The first was a covenant not, for five years after the determination of his services, within 25 miles from the General Post Office, Sydney, to engage in the business of insurance broking, nor to solicit the custom of any person who during the continuance of the agreement should have been a customer of any company in the Stenhouse group. The second was a covenant not, for a similar period, to be concerned in the business of an insurance broker in any town in Australia in which any company of the Stenhouse group should, at the date of termination of the agreement, have a recognized place of business, nor in any place within Australia to solicit the custom of any person who during the continuance of the agreement should have been a customer of any company in the Stenhouse group.

By an agreement dated Sept. 6, 1966 the 1964 agreement was novated so that the appellant for all purposes, was substituted as the employing party, for Stenhouse Scott North Australia Ltd. as from its date of signature, i.e., Dec. 11, 1964. The respondent continued to serve the appellant company under the terms of these agreements; he was managing director of Stenhouse Scott North Australia Ltd. and also of Stenhouse Re-Insurance Pty. Ltd., another member of the Stenhouse group. His main activities were concerned with reinsurance business for the Stenhouse group but they also involved direct dealings or negotiations with a limited number of clients with a view to the placing of insurance business with companies of the Stenhouse group. In particular he had negotiations with a substantial industrial

concern called Boral Ltd. and its subsidiary and associated companies. There was evidence that between Jan. 1, 1970 and June 30, 1972 the Stenhouse group acted as insurance broker of some classes of insurance for the Boral group.

On May 12, 1971 the respondent gave the appellant eight weeks' notice of his intention to resign, but by letter of May 13, 1971 the appellant refused to accept the notice so given. On July 9, 1971 the respondent left the employment of the appellant and set about the constitution of a business in competition. He formed a company, C. E. Heath Insurance Broking (Australia) Pty. Ltd. to carry on business in association with Heath & Co. Ltd. of London. He became a director of the Australia company, which commenced business in the first half of 1972. Between July, 1971 and March, 1972 the respondent negotiated with a Mr. Hargreaves who controlled the placing of insurance for the Boral group, with a view to securing business for the Heath group of companies. This later led to the Boral group effecting certain insurance through C. E. Heath Insurance Broking (Australia) Ptd. Ltd. as brokers.

Meanwhile it would seem that negotiations had been going on between the appellant and the respondent with regard to the termination of the respondent's employment. These led to the execution on Mar. 23, 1972 of the agreement the subject of the present proceedings. This agreement, made between the appellant of the first part and the respondent, described as "Insurance Broker", of the second part, contained recitals concerning the previous agreements of Dec. 11, 1964 and Sept. 6, 1966 ending with the following:

WHEREAS [the respondent] has tendered his resignation as an employee of Stenhouse and has requested Stenhouse to release him from his obligations under the abovementioned Agreements AND WHEREAS Stenhouse has agreed so to release [the respondent] but only on the conditions that he undertakes to be bound by the obligations hereinafter stated.

The agreement then set forth the following substantive provisions: By cl. 1 it was agreed that the respondent's employment should cease with effect from July 9, 1971, and by cl. 2 the appellant as from the same date accepted the respondent's resignation as director of specified companies in the Stenhouse group. Clause 3 contained a covenant against the disclosure of confidential information. Clauses 4, 5 and 6 were as follows:

4. [The respondent] covenants that he will not for a period of five years from the said 9th day of July, 1971 unless with the prior



[1974] VOL. 1]

Stenhouse Australia Ltd. v. Phillips

[Lord WILBERFORCE]

written consent of Stenhouse directly or indirectly as principal servant or agent solicit whether by written or oral communication or otherwise insurance business from any client as hereinafter defined.

5. In the event that any client of Stenhouse shall within a period of five years from the said 9th day of July 1971 (and that whether or not such client is a client of one or more of the Stenhouse companies at the time) place insurance business whether or not business of a type presently transacted by Stenhouse for such client through the agency of [the respondent] or through any agency other than that of one of the Stenhouse companies referred to in Clause 2 of this Agreement so that [the respondent] or any person firm or corporation for whom [the respondent] is a principal or agent or by whom [the respondent] is employed and with whom he is associated or connected in any other way receives or becomes entitled to receive directly or indirectly any financial benefit from the placing of such business then [the respondent] agrees to pay or procure that there shall be paid to Stenhouse a one-half share of the commission received in respect of such transaction and such commission shall be the gross commission (including any allowances) paid by the Insurance Company in respect of such transaction without allowance for any rebate made to the client and after deduction of any procurement fee properly payable in respect of prospective clients as hereinafter defined to any third party for the introduction of such business such procurement fee not to exceed one-third of the total initial commission. The sums payable to Stenhouse pursuant to this clause shall continue to be paid for a period of five years (but only if there is a financial benefit as aforesaid for each year) from the date on which such insurance business is so first placed and shall be paid to Stenhouse concurrently with the settlement of the net premium due to the Insurance Company concerned.

6. [The respondent] covenants that except in the circumstances provided for in Clause 5 hereof he shall not for a period of three years from the said 9th day of July 1971 unless with the prior consent in writing of Stenhouse directly or indirectly as principal servant or agent act as Insurance Broker for any client as hereinafter defined.

Clause 7 was a covenant against enticement of officers or employees of the Stenhouse group. Clause 8 was as follows:

For the purposes of Clauses 4, 5 and 6 of this Agreement the word "client" shall mean

any person firm or corporation who at the said 9th day of July 1971 or in the preceding month was a client of Stenhouse or any of its associated companies with whom in the course of his employment with Stenhouse [the respondent] has had dealings or negotiations and further shall mean a prospective client of Stenhouse or of its associated companies whose insurance business was the subject of negotiation with Stenhouse through the services or agency of [the respondent] either at the said 9th day of July 1971 or within the period of 12 months preceding that date but shall be construed as excluding any person firm or corporation who was a client or prospective client of Stenhouse as aforesaid and whose business is acquired by or who becomes thereafter a subsidiary of any other person firm or corporation which is at the said 9th day of July 1971 or may become during the term of this Agreement a client of [the respondent] or any person firm or corporation by whom he is employed or for whom he is acting as agent, and further shall be construed as excluding any Insurance Company.

By proceedings commenced by summons on July 3, 1972, the appellant sought declarations as to the validity of cl. 4, 5 and 6 of the agreement, and certain injunctions, an account, and damages. On Oct. 26, 1972, Mr. Justice Mahoney sitting in Equity gave judgment dismissing the proceedings for the reasons, briefly, that the clauses in question were unenforceable, or void, as being in restraint of trade.

Their Lordships consider first the provisions of cl. 4. There is no doubt that they are in restraint of trade, so the only question is whether the appellant (as covenantee) can show that they impose no greater restraint than is reasonably necessary for its protection.

The accepted proposition that an employer is not entitled to protection from mere competition by a former employee means that the employee is entitled to use to the full any personal skill or experience even if this has been acquired in the service of his employer: it is this freedom to use to the full a man's improving ability and talents which lies at the root of the policy of the law regarding this type of restraint. Leaving aside the case if misuse of trade secrets or confidential information (which is separately dealt with by cl. 3 of the agreement and which does not arise here), the employer's claim for protection must be based on the identification of some advantage or asset inherent in the business which can properly be regarded as, in a general sense, his property, and which it would be unjust to allow the employee to appropriate for his own