

LLOYD'S LAW REPORTS

Editor :

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

Consulting Editor :

G. M. HALL
of the Middle Temple, Barrister

1979

Volume 1

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

© LLOYD'S OF LONDON PRESS LTD. 1979

LLOYD'S LAW REPORTS

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED

	PAGE
Alderslade v. Hendon Laundry___ <i>Considered</i> .	[1945] K.B. 189 406
Aldora, The___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1975] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 617 410 455
Alexandra I, The___ <i>Considered</i> .	[1972] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 399 341
Andrea Ursula, The___ <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1971] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 145 327
Anticosti Shipping Co. v. Viateur St. Amand___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1959] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 352 595
Ardennes, The___ <i>Distinguished</i> .	(1950) 84 Ll.L. Rep. 340. 595
Aries, The___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1977] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 334 126
Automatic Tube Co. Pty. Ltd. v. Adelaide Steamship (Operations) Ltd. ___ <i>Considered</i> .	[1966] W.A.R. 103 298
Black Diamond S.S. Corporation v. Robert Stewart & Sons___ <i>Applied</i> .	336 U.S. 386 (1949). 431
Borrowman Phillips & Co. v. Free & Hollis___ <i>Considered</i> .	(1878) 4 Q.B.D. 500 592
Bray Keith Pty Ltd. v. Gilchrest Watt & Sanderson Pty. Ltd.___ <i>Applied</i> .	Unreported 298
Brede, The___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 333 126
Bremer Handelsgesellschaft m.b.H. v. Vanden Avenne-Izegem P.V.B.A.___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1978] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 109' 221, 279 554
Brimnes, The___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1972] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 465 367
Canada S.S. Lines Ltd. v. The King___ <i>Considered and applied</i> .	[1952] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 1 406
Canadian Transport, The___ <i>Distinguished</i> .	(1932) 43 Ll.L. Rep. 409 1
Cargo ex Argos___ <i>Applied</i> .	(1873) L.R. 5 P.C. 134 167
Carmichael v. Caledonian Railway Co.___ <i>Applied</i> .	(1868) 6 M. 671 515
Cockerton v. Naviera Aznar S.A.___ <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1960] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 450 257
Compania Merabello, In re___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1973] Ch. 75. 190
Conservators of River Thames v. Walton-upon-Thames U.D.C.___ <i>Considered</i> .	(1906) L.T. 555 153
Conway v. Wade___ <i>Considered</i> .	[1909] A.C. 506. 26
Cookson v. Knowles___ <i>Disapproved</i> .	[1977] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 412 519
Cordova Land Co. Ltd. v. Victor Brothers Inc.___ <i>Distinguished</i> .	[1966] 1 W.L.R. 793 331
Dagmar, The___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1968] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 563 545
Davies v. Powell Duffryn Associated Collieries Ltd.___ <i>Considered</i> .	[1942] A.C. 601. 519
Deacon v. Transport Regulation Board___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1958] V.L.R. 458 89
Department of Trade & Industry v. St. Christopher Motorists Association___ <i>Considered</i> .	[1974] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 17 499
Dias Compania Naviera S.A. v. Louis Dreyfus Corporation___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1978] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 315 459
Eagle, The___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1977] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 70 257
Eastern City, The___ <i>Applied</i> .	[1957] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 153 545
Eurymedon, The___ <i>Considered</i> .	[1974] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 534 298

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED—*continued*

PAGE

Falconbridge Nickel Mines Ltd. et al. v. Chimo Shipping Ltd. et al.____ <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 469	595
Farrell v. Federated Employers' Insurance Association Ltd.____ <i>Applied.</i>	[1970] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 170	557
Federal Commerce & Navigation Co. Ltd. v. Molena Alpha Inc.____ <i>Considered.</i>	[1978] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 132	445
Gilbert Ash (Northern) Ltd. v. Modern Engineering (Bristol) Ltd.____ <i>Considered.</i>	[1974] A.C. 689.	557
Gould v. Curtis____ <i>Considered.</i>	[1913] 3 K.B. 84	499
Great Northern Railway Co. v. Swaffield____ <i>Applied.</i>	(1874) 9 L.R. Ex. 132	167
Hain Steamship Co. Ltd. v. Board of Trade____ <i>Considered.</i>	(1928) 31 Ll.L. Rep. 171	395
Hardwick Game Farm Ltd. v. S.A.P.P.A.____ <i>Considered.</i>	[1968] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 547	341
Harris v. Brights Asphalt Contractors Ltd.____ <i>Overruled.</i>	[1953] 1 Q.B. 617	519
Hassel, The____ <i>Considered.</i>	[1959] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 82	37
Heffron v. Imperial Parking Co.____ <i>Considered.</i>	[1974] 3 O.R. (2d) 722	595
Hong Kong Fir Shipping Co. Ltd. v. Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd.____ <i>Applied.</i>	[1961] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 478	279
Hunt and Winterbotham Ltd. v. British Road Services Ltd.____ <i>Considered.</i>	[1961] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 422	11
Hyundai Shipbuilding and Heavy Industries Co. Ltd. v. Pournaras____ <i>Applied.</i>	[1978] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 502	130
<i>Industry, The</i> ____ <i>Applied.</i>	(1835) 3 Hag. Adm. 203	455
Jones v. European and General Express Co. Ltd.____ <i>Applied.</i>	(1920) 4 Ll.L. Rep. 127	175
Kahler v. Midland Bank Ltd.____ <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1950] A.C. 24.	167
Kitson Trucking (A. R.) Ltd. v. Rivtow Straits Ltd. & Renner____ <i>Applied.</i>	[1975] 4 W.W.E. 1	595
Knutsford (S.S.) Ltd. v. Tillmans & Co.____ <i>Applied.</i>	[1908] A.C. 406.	212
Lee Heng v. Port Swettenham Authority____ <i>Applied.</i>	[1971] 2 M.L.J. 27.	11
Levison et al. v. Patent Steam Carpet Cleaning Co. Ltd.____ <i>Considered.</i>	[1977] 3 All E.R. 498.	595
Loch Tulla, The____ <i>Considered.</i>	(1950) 84 Ll.L. Rep. 62	37
<i>Maasdam, The</i> ____ <i>Considered.</i>	(1893) 7 Asp. Mar. Law Cas. 400.	37
<i>Maude, The</i> ____ <i>Considered.</i>	(1876) 3 Asp. Mar. Law Cas. 338.	37
McCutcheon v. David MacBrayne Ltd.____ <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1964] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 16	595
Midland Silicones Ltd. v. Scrutton____ <i>Considered.</i>	[1961] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 365	298
Miliangos v. George Frank Textiles Ltd.____ <i>Applied.</i>	[1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 201	123
Morris v. C. W. Martin and Sons Ltd.____ <i>Distinguished.</i>	[1965] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 63	167
Morris v. C. W. Martin and Sons Ltd.____ <i>Applied.</i>	[1965] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 63	11
Morris v. C. W. Martin and Sons Ltd.____ <i>Considered.</i>	[1965] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 63	19

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED—*continued*

PAGE

Nestle Co. Ltd. v. E. Biggins & Co. Ltd. — <i>Considered.</i>	[1958] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 398	279
Offshore International S.A. v. Banco Central S.A. and Another— <i>Applied.</i>	[1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 402	279
Oliver v. Ashman— <i>Overruled.</i>	[1962] 2 Q.B. 210	519
Original Blouse Co. Ltd. v. Bruck Mills Ltd.— <i>Applied.</i>	(1963) 42 D.L.R. (2d) 174	335
Owen (Edward) Engineering Ltd. v. Barclays Bank International Ltd. and Another— <i>Considered.</i>	[1978] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 166.	267, 445
Phillips v. London & South West Railway Co.— <i>Applied.</i>	(1879) 4 Q.B.D. 407	519
Pope v. D. Murphy & Son Ltd.— <i>Applied.</i>	[1961] 1 Q.B. 222	519
Priam, The— <i>Applied.</i>	(1948) 81 Ll.L. Rep. 1	395
Prudential Insurance Co. v. Commissioners of Inland Revenue— <i>Applied and considered.</i>	[1904] 2 K.B. 658.	499
Pyrene v. Scindia Navigation Co.— <i>Applied.</i>	[1954] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 321	595
Rasool v. West Midlands Passenger Transport Executive— <i>Applied.</i>	[1974] 3 All E.R. 638	17
Riddell v. Lanarkshire and Ayrshire Railway Co.— <i>Applied.</i>	(1904) 6 F. 432.	515
Shiloh Spinners Ltd. v. Harding— <i>Considered.</i>	[1973] A.C. 691	557
Skelton v. Collins— <i>Applied.</i>	(1966) 115 C.L.R. 94	519
Smith v. U.M.B. Chrysler (Scotland) Ltd.— <i>Considered.</i>	[1978] S.L.T. 21	406
Societe Franco-Tunisienne D'Armement v. Sidermar S.p.A.— <i>Applied.</i>	[1960] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 594	167
Starside Properties Ltd. v. Mustapha — <i>Considered.</i>	[1974] 1 W.L.R. 816	557
Stilk v. Meyrick— <i>Considered.</i>	(1809) 2 Camp. 317	89
Stork, The— <i>Applied.</i>	[1955] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 349	545
Suisse Atlantique Societe d'Armement Maritime S.A. v. Rotterdamsche Kolen Centrale — <i>Considered.</i>	[1966] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 529	595
Sze Hai Tong Bank Ltd. v. Rambler Cycle Co. Ltd.— <i>Considered.</i>	[1959] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 114	298
Sztejn v. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation — <i>Distinguished.</i>	(1941) 31 N.Y.S. 2nd. 631	267
Thai-Europe Tapioca Services Ltd. v. Government of Pakistan Directorate of Agricultural Supplies— <i>Considered and applied.</i>	[1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 1	481
Trendtex Trading Corporation v. Central Bank of Nigeria— <i>Considered and not followed.</i>	[1977] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 581	481

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED—*continued*

PAGE

Ulster-Swift Ltd. and Pigs Marketing Board (Northern Ireland) v. Taunton Meat Haulage Ltd. and Fransen Transport N.V.____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1977] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 346	175
Union of India v. Compania Naviera Aeolus S.A.____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1962] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 175	459
Universal Cargo Carriers Corporation v. Citati____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1957] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 191	212
Ward v. Byham____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1956] 1 W.L.R. 496	89
Williams v. Williams____ <i>Considered</i> .	[1957] 1 W.L.R. 148	89
York Products Pty. Ltd. v. Gilchrest Watt & Sanderson Pty. Ltd.____ <i>Applied</i> .	[1968] N.S.W.R. 551	298

STATUTES CONSIDERED

	PAGE
MALAYSIA—	
PORT AUTHORITIES ACT, 1963	
s. 29	11
SINGAPORE—	
HIGH COURT (ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION), ACT	
s. 4 (4)	327
UNITED KINGDOM—	
ARBITRATION ACT, 1950	
s. 4	244
ARBITRATION ACT, 1975	
s. 1 (1)	244
s. 7	244
BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT, 1882	
s. 3	100, 548
s. 11	100, 548
s. 18	100
CAPITAL ALLOWANCES ACT, 1968	
s. 33 (7)	395
CARRIAGE BY ROAD ACT, 1965	175
CIVIL EVIDENCE ACT, 1968	
s. 8 (1)	17
COMPANIES ACT, 1948	
s. 399	190
INSURANCE COMPANIES ACT, 1974	
Part II	499
MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894	
s. 503	509
PORT OF LONDON ACT, 1968	
s. 120	133
STATUTE OF FRAUDS AMENDMENT ACT, 1828	335
THIRD PARTIES (RIGHTS AGAINST INSURERS) ACT, 1930	
s. 1	190, 557
TRADE UNION AND LABOUR RELATIONS ACT, 1974	
s. 12	26
s. 13	26
s. 17	26
s. 28	26
s. 29	26
TRADE UNION AND LABOUR RELATIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1976	
s. 3	26
WAR RISKS INSURANCE ACT, 1939	
s. 1 (2)	395

C O N T E N T S

**NOTE:—These Reports should be cited as
“[1979] 1 Lloyd’s Rep.”**

	COURT	PAGE
<i>Aghios Nicolaos, The</i>	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	475
<i>Allobrogia, The</i>	[Ch. (Comp. Ct.)]	190
Allobrogia Steamship Corporation, Re (<i>The Allobrogia</i>)	[Ch. (Comp. Ct.)]	190
Amalgamated Investment (Europe) B.V.:—Brown Shipley & Co. Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	488
<i>American Accord, The</i>	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	267
American Marine Underwriters Inc. and Calvert Fire Insurance Co. v. Posgate and Others	[U.S. Ct.]	439
<i>Assios, The</i>	[C.A.]	313
<i>Atlantic Baron, The</i>	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	89
<i>Avance, The</i>	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	143
A/S Awilco v. Fulvia S.p.A. Di Navigazione (<i>The Chikuma</i>) ...	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	367
 Banco Continental S.A., Royal Bank of Canada and Vitrorefuerzos S.A.:—United City Merchants (Investments) Ltd. and Glass Fibres and Equipments Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	267
Bank of London and Montreal Ltd.:—Diamond v.	[C.A.]	335
<i>Bellami, The</i>	[C.A.]	123
<i>Ben Gairn, The</i>	[Sc. Ct.]	410
<i>Benfri, The</i>	[H.L.]	201
Bjorn Jensen & Co. v. Lysaght (Australia) Ltd. (<i>The Gamma</i>) ..	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	494
Blue Horizon Shipping Co. S.A. v. E.D. & F. Man Ltd. (<i>The Aghios Nicolaos</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	475
Brandt's Ltd. and Piermay Shipping Co. S.A. v. Chester	[C.A.]	17
Brandt's Ltd. and Piermay Shipping Co. S.A. v. Chester	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	55
Bremer Handelsgesellschaft m.b.H. v. C. Mackprang Jr.	[C.A.]	221
British Rail Engineering:—Pickett v.	[H.L.]	519
Brown Shipley & Co. Ltd. v. Amalgamated Investment (Europe) B.V.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	488
Bruce's Stores (Aberdeen) Ltd. v. Richard Irvin and Sons Ltd. (<i>The Ben Gairn</i>)	[Sc. Ct.]	410
Bunge G.m.b.H. v. Alfred C. Toepfer	[C.A.]	554
Bunge S.A. v. Kruse	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	279
 Calvert Fire Insurance Co. and American Marine Underwriters Inc. v. Posgate and Others	[U.S. Ct.]	439
<i>Camilla M, The</i>	[C.A.]	26
Canadian Marine Underwriters Ltd., American Marine Underwriters Inc., Calvert Fire Insurance Co. and C.N.A. Assurance Co. Inc.:—China Union Lines Ltd. and Another v.	[U.S. Ct.]	439
Captain v. Far Eastern Steamship Co.	[Can. Ct.]	595

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Central Bank of Nigeria:—Etablissement Esefka International Anstalt v.	[C.A.]	445
Chester:—Piermay Shipping Co. S.A. and Brandt's Ltd. v. . . .	[C.A.]	17
Chester:—Piermay Shipping Co. S.A. and Brandt's Ltd. v. . . .	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	55
<i>Chikuma</i> , The.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	367
China-Pacific S.A. v. The Food Corporation of India (The <i>Winson</i>).	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	167
China Union Lines Ltd. and Another v. American Marine Underwriters Inc., Calvert Fire Insurance Co., Canadian Marine Underwriters Ltd. and C.N.A. Assurance Co. Inc. .	[U.S. Ct.]	439
Chinecrest Ltd.:—James & Co. Scheepvaart En Handelsmij B.V. v.	[C.A.]	126
Collarbone, Slater and Laughton:—Star Sea Transport Corporation v.	[C.A.]	26
C.N.A. Assurance Co. Inc., American Marine Underwriters Inc., Calvert Fire Insurance Co. and Canadian Marine Underwriters Ltd.:—China Union Lines Ltd. and Another v.	[U.S. Ct.]	439
Costain-Blankevoort (U.K.) Dredging Co. Ltd. v. Davenport (The <i>Nassau Bay</i>).	[Ch. D.]	395
C.V.G. Siderurgica Del Orinoco S.A. v. London Steamship Owners Mutual Insurance Association Ltd. (The <i>Vainqueur José</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	557
Daly v. General Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. (The <i>Dragon</i>)	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	257
Davenport:—Costain Blankevoort (U.K.) Dredging Co. Ltd. v. .	[Ch. D.]	395
Davidson v. Guardian Royal Exchange Assurance	[Sc. Ct.]	406
Debenhams (Central Buying) Ltd.:—Korea Exchange Bank v. . .	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	100
Debenhams (Central Buying) Ltd.:—Korea Exchange Bank v. . .	[C.A.]	548
Department of Trade (The):—The Medical Defence Union Ltd. v.	[Ch. D.]	499
<i>Despina R.</i> , The	[H.L.]	1
<i>Devotion II</i> , The	[Sc. Ct.]	509
<i>Devotion II</i> , The (No. 2)	[Sc. Ct.]	515
Diamond v. Bank of London and Montreal Ltd.	[C.A.]	335
<i>Doric Chariot</i> , The	[C.A.]	123
Doric Shipping Corporation S.A.:—Negocios Del Mar S.A. v. . .	[C.A.]	331
<i>Dragon</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	257
Empresa Maritima Del Estado S.A.:—Islander Shipping Enterprises S.A. v.	[C.A.]	545
Equitorial Shipping Co. Ltd. and Equitorial Lines Ltd.:—Fraser v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	103
<i>Ercole</i> , The	[C.A.]	539
European Grain & Shipping Ltd.:—Promos S.A. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	375
Etablissement Esefka International Anstalt v. Central Bank of Nigeria.	[C.A.]	445
Excess Insurance Co. Ltd. and Miles, Smith, Anderson and Game Ltd.:—Woolcott v.	[C.A.]	231
Far Eastern Steamship Co.:—Captain v.	[Can. Ct.]	595
Federal Commerce and Navigation Ltd. v. Molena Alpha Inc.; Same v. Molena Beta Inc.; Same v. Molena Gamma Inc. (The <i>Nanfri</i> , <i>Benfri</i> and <i>Lorfri</i>)	[H.L.]	201
<i>Folias</i> , The	[H.L.]	1

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Food Corporation of India (The):—China-Pacific S.A. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	167
Fraser v. Equitorial Shipping Co. Ltd. and Equitorial Lines Ltd. (The <i>Ijaola</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	103
Fulvia S.p.A. Di Navigazione:—A/S Awilco v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	367
Galvez (Vincente Belloch) and MAT (Britannia Express) Ltd. and Mateu and Mateu S.A.:—Moto Vespa S.A. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	175
<i>Gamma</i> , The.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	494
Garnac Grain Co. Inc.:—Unitramp v.	[C.A.]	212
General Steam Navigation Co. Ltd.:—Daly v.	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	257
Gertreide Import Gesellschaft m.b.H. v. Itoh & Co. (America) Inc.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	592
<i>Gimi</i> , The.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	153
Glass Fibres and Equipments Ltd. and United City Merchants (Investments) Ltd. v. Royal Bank of Canada Vitrorefuerzos S.A. and Banco Continental S.A.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	267
<i>Glenfalloch</i> , The.	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	247
Golar Gas Transport Inc. v. The Liquefied Gas Shipping Co. Ltd. and Others; Golar Gas Carriers Inc. v. Same; Golar Gas Tankers Inc. v. Same (The <i>Hilli</i> , <i>Khannur</i> and <i>Gimi</i>) . .	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	153
Golar Gas Transport Inc.:—The Liquefied Gas Shipping Co. Ltd. v.; Golar Gas Carriers Inc.:—Same v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	153
Government of Uganda (The):—The Uganda Co. (Holdings) Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	481
Guardian Royal Exchange Assurance:—Davidson v.	[Sc. Ct.]	406
<i>Hellenic Glory</i> , The.	[U.S. Ct.]	424
<i>Hermine</i> , The.	[C.A.]	212
<i>Hilli</i> , <i>Khannur</i> and <i>Gimi</i>	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	153
Huron Liberian Co.:—Saronic Shipping Co. Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	341
Hyundai Construction Co. Ltd. and Hyundai Shipbuilding and Heavy Industries Co. Ltd.:—North Ocean Shipping Co. Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	89
Hyundai Heavy Industries Co. v. Papadopoulos and Others. . . .	[C.A.]	130
<i>Ijaola</i> , The.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	103
Irvin (Richard) and Sons Ltd.:—Bruce's Stores (Aberdeen) Ltd. v.	[Sc. Ct.]	410
Islander Shipping Enterprises S.A. v. Empresa Maritima Del Estado S.A. (The <i>Khian Sea</i>)	[C.A.]	545
Itoh & Co. (America) Inc.:—Gertreide Import Gesellschaft m.b.H.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	592
James & Co. Scheepvaart En Handelsmij B.V. v. Chinecrest Ltd. Johnson Matthey (Pty.) Ltd., Rustenburg Platinum Mines Ltd. and Matthey Bishop Inc. v. South African Airways and Pan American World Airways Inc.	[C.A.]	126
	[C.A.]	19
<i>Khannur</i> , The.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	153
<i>Khian Sea</i> , The.	[C.A.]	545
Koch Marine Inc.:—Pole Star Compania Naviera S.A. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	581
Kompass Schiffahrtskontor G.m.b.H.:—Whitehall Shipping Co. Ltd.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	589
Korea Exchange Bank v. Debenhams (Central Buying) Ltd. . . .	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	100
Korea Exchange Bank v. Debenhams (Central Buying) Ltd. . . .	[C.A.]	548

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Kruse v. Bunge	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	279
<i>Kylix and Rustringen, The</i>	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	133
Laughton, Slater and Collarbone:—Star Sea Transport Corporation v.	[C.A.]	26
Liquefied Gas Shipping Co. Ltd. (The) v. Golar Gas Transport Inc.; Same v. Golar Gas Carriers Inc. (The <i>Hilli, Khannur and Gimi</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	153
Liquefied Gas Shipping Co. Ltd. (The) and Others:—Golar Gas Transport Inc. v.; Same:—Golar Gas Carriers Inc. v.; Same:—Golar Gas Tankers Inc. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	153
London Steamship Owners' Mutual Insurance Association Ltd.:—C.V.G. Siderurgicia Del Orinoco v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	557
<i>Lorfri, The</i>	[H.L.]	201
Lysaght (Australia) Ltd.:—Bjorn Jensen & Co. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	494
Mackprang (C.) Jr.:—Bremer Handelsgesellschaft m.b.H.	[C.A.]	221
Man (E.D. & F.) Ltd.:—Blue Horizon Shipping Co. S.A. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	475
<i>Maritsa, The</i>	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	581
Marperfecta Compania Naviera v. The President of India (The <i>Doric Chariot</i>)	[C.A.]	123
MAT (Britannia Express) Ltd. and Mateu and Mateu S.A. and Vincente Belloch Galvez:—Moto Vespa S.A. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	175
Mateu and Mateu and Vincente Belloch Galvez:—Moto Vespa S.A. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	175
Matthey Bishop Inc., Rustenburg Platinum Mines Ltd. and Johnson Matthey (Pty.) Ltd. v. South African Airways and Pan American World Airways Inc.	[C.A.]	19
Medical Defence Union Ltd. (The) v. The Department of Trade .	[Ch.D.]	499
<i>Michael, The</i>	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	55
Miles, Smith, Anderson and Game Ltd. and Excess Insurance Co. Ltd.:—Woolcott v.	[C.A.]	231
Molena Alpha Inc.:—Federal Commerce and Navigation Ltd. v. .	[H.L.]	201
Molena Beta Inc.:—Federal Commerce and Navigation Ltd. v. .	[H.L.]	201
Molena Gamma Inc.:—Federal Commerce and Navigation Ltd. v.	[H.L.]	201
Monrovia Tramp Shipping Co. v. The President of India (The <i>Pearl Merchant</i>)	[C.A.]	123
Moto Vespa S.A. v. MAT (Britannia Express) Ltd. and Mateu and Mateu S.A. and Vincente Belloch Galvez; Same v. Mateu and Mateu S.A. and Vincente Belloch Galvez	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	175
<i>Nanfri, Benfri and Lorfri, The</i>	[H.L.]	201
<i>Nassau Bay, The</i>	[Ch. D.]	395
Negocios Del Mar S.A. v. Doric Shipping Corporation S.A. (The <i>Assios</i>)	[C.A.]	331
<i>New York Star, The</i>	[Aust. Ct.]	298
Nippon Yusen Kaisha v. Societe Anonyme Marocaine De L'Industrie du Raffinage (The <i>Tsukuba Maru</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	459
North Ocean Shipping Co. Ltd. v. Hyundai Construction Co. Ltd. and Hyundai Shipbuilding and Heavy Industries Co. Ltd. (The <i>Atlantic Baron</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	89
O'Keefe v. John Stewart & Co. Shipping Ltd. (The <i>Yewkyle</i>) . . .	[Q.B.]	182

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Pan American World Airways Inc. and South African Airways:—Rustenburg Platinum Mines Ltd., Johnson Matthey (Pty.) Ltd. and Matthey Bishop Inc. v.	[C.A.]	19
Papadopoulos and Others:—Hyundai Heavy Industries Co.	[C.A.]	130
<i>Pearl Merchant</i> , The	[C.A.]	123
<i>Permina 3001</i> , The	[Sing. Ct.]	327
Pickfords Removals Ltd.:—Willcock v.	[C.A.]	244
Piermay Shipping Co. S.A. and Brandt's Ltd. v. Chester	[C.A.]	17
Piermay Shipping Co. S.A. and Brandt's Ltd. v. Chester (The <i>Michael</i>)	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	55
Pickett v. British Rail Engineering	[H.L.]	519
Pleaurama Ltd. v. Sun Alliance and London Insurance Ltd.	[Q.B.]	389
Pole Star Compania Naviera S.A. v. Koch Marine Inc. (The <i>Maritsa</i>).	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	581
Port Jackson Stevedoring Pty. Ltd.:—Salmond Spraggon (Australia) Pty. Ltd. v.	[Aust. Ct.]	298
Port Swettenham Authority v. Wu & Co. (M) Sdn. Bhd. (The <i>Sansei Maru</i>)	[P.C.]	11
Posgate and Others:—American Marine Underwriters Inc. and Calvert Fire Insurance Co. v.	[U.S. Ct.]	439
President of India:—George Veflings Rederi A/S v.	[C.A.]	123
President (The) of India:—Marperfecta Compania Naviera v.	[C.A.]	123
President (The) of India:—Monrovia Tramp Shipping Co. v.	[C.A.]	123
Promos S.A. v. European Grain & Shipping Ltd.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	375
<i>Rilland</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	455
Royal Bank of Canada, Vitrorefuerzos S.A. and Banco Continental S.A.:—United City Merchants (Investments) Ltd. and Glass Fibres and Equipments Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	267
Rustenburg Platinum Mines Ltd., Johnson Matthey (Pty.) Ltd. and Matthey Bishop Inc. v. South African Airways and Pan American World Airways Inc.	[C.A.]	19
<i>Rustringen</i> , The	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	133
Salmond Spraggon (Australia) Pty. Ltd. v. Port Jackson Stevedoring Pty. Ltd. (The <i>New York Star</i>)	[Aust. Ct.]	298
Samor S.p.A.:—Warinco A.G. v.	[C.A.]	450
<i>Sansei Maru</i> , The	[P.C.]	11
Saronic Shipping Co. Ltd. v. Huron Liberian Co.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	341
Services Europe Atlantique Sud (SEAS) v. Stockholms Rederiaktiebolag SVEA (The <i>Folias</i>)	[H.L.]	1
Slater, Laughton and Collarbone:—Star Sea Transport Corporation v.	[C.A.]	26
Societe Anonyme Marocaine de L'Industrie du Raffinage:—Nippon Yusen Kaisha v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	459
South African Airways and Pan American World Airways Inc.:—Rustenburg Platinum Mines Ltd., Johnson Matthey (Pty.) Ltd. and Matthey Bishop Inc. v.	[C.A.]	19
<i>Stainless Patriot</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	589
Star Sea Transport Corporation v. Slater, Laughton and Collarbone (The <i>Camilla M</i>)	[C.A.]	26
<i>Steelton</i> , The (No. 2).	[U.S. Ct.]	431
Stewart (John) & Co. Shipping Ltd.:—O'Keefe v.	[Q.B.]	182
Stockholms Rederiaktiebolag SVEA:—Services Europe Atlantique Sud (SEAS)	[H.L.]	1
Sun Alliance and London Insurance Ltd.:—Pleaurama Ltd. v.	[Q.B.]	389

CONTENTS—*continued*

	COURT	PAGE
Toeffer (Alfred):—Bunge G.m.b.H. v.	[C.A.]	554
<i>Tsukuba Maru</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	459
Uganda Co. (Holdings) Ltd. v. The Government of Uganda . . .	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	481
<i>Unique Mariner</i> , The (No. 2).	[Q.B. (Adm. Ct.)]	37
United City Merchants (Investments) Ltd. and Glass Fibres and Equipments Ltd. v. Royal Bank of Canada, Vitrorefuerzos S.A. and Banco Continental S.A. (<i>The American Accord</i>) .	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	267
Unitramp v. Garnac Grain Co. Inc. (<i>The Hermine</i>).	[C.A.]	212
<i>Vainqueur José</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	557
Veflings (George) Rederi A/S v. The President of India (<i>The Bellami</i>).	[C.A.]	123
Vitrorefuerzos S.A., Royal Bank of Canada and Banco Continental S.A.:—United City Merchants (Investments) Ltd. and Glass Fibres Equipments Ltd. v.	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	267
Warinco A.G. v. Samor S.p.A.	[C.A.]	450
Whitehall Shipping Co. Ltd. v. Kompass Schiffahrtsskontor G.m.b.H. (<i>The Stainless Patriot</i>).	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	589
Willcock v. Pickford Removals Ltd.	[C.A.]	244
<i>Winson</i> , The	[Q.B. (Com. Ct.)]	167
Woolcott v. Excess Insurance Co. Ltd. and Miles, Smith, Anderson and Game Ltd.	[C.A.]	231
Wu and Co. (M) Sdn. Bhd.:—Port Swettenham Authority v. . . .	[P.C.]	11
<i>Yewkyle</i> , The	[Q.B.]	182

LLOYD'S LAW REPORTS

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

Consulting Editor: G. M. HALL, Barrister

[1979] VOL. 1

The "Despina R." and "Folias"

PART 1

HOUSE OF LORDS

July 17, 18, 19 and 20, 1978

THE "DESPINA R.",

SERVICES EUROPE ATLANTIQUE SUD
(SEAS)

v.

STOCKHOLMS REDERIAKTIEBOLAG
SVEA

(THE "FOLIAS")

Before Lord WILBERFORCE, Lord DIPLOCK,
Lord SALMON, Lord RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN
and Lord KEITH OF KINKEL

Practice — Foreign currency — Judgments and arbitration awards — Whether Judges and arbitrators entitled to give judgments and awards in foreign currency in cases of tort and breaches of contract.

In the first appeal, *The Despina R.*, in April, 1974, a collision took place off Shanghai between two Greek ships, the *Eleftherotria*, owned by the plaintiffs, and the *Despina R.*, owned by the defendants, as a result of which the plaintiffs started an action against the defendants alleging negligence of the defendants, their servants or agents. The action was settled, the parties agreeing that the defendants were 85 per cent. to blame, the defendants' counterclaim be dismissed, and that the defendants would pay 85 per cent. of the loss to the plaintiffs. Expenses for repairs, &c., were incurred in Chinese renmimbi or yuan (R.M.B.); Japanese yen and U.S. dollars. On the question whether, where plaintiffs suffered damage or sustained loss in a currency other than sterling, they were entitled to recover damages expressed in that other currency:

Held, by Q.B. (Adm. Ct.) (BRANDON, J.), that (1) where a plaintiff suffered damage in

consequence of a tort, the first matter which the Court was concerned with was the valuation of that damage; and the effect of the *Miliangos* case was that the Court was relieved of the obligation to convert into sterling the amount of damages arrived at in the initial valuation in the foreign currency in which the expenditure or loss was immediately and directly incurred;

(2) the currency of expenditure or loss solution (i.e., awarding damages in respect of any item of expenditure or loss in whatever currency, sterling or foreign it was directly or immediately incurred) was to be preferred; and a requirement that a plaintiff should receive restitution in integrum was in most cases more likely to be satisfied, so far as that was possible, by awarding damages in that currency rather than converting that currency into sterling at the date of incurrence;

(3) the currency of expenditure and loss solution would be adopted and judgment would be given in accordance with that solution following the *Miliangos* form of order for payment of a certain sum in foreign currency or its sterling equivalent at the date of payment.

On appeal by the defendants, the owners of *Despina R.* and the plaintiffs, the owners of *Eleftherotria*:

Held, by C.A. (STEPHENSON, ORR and CUMMING-BRUCE, L.JJ.), that (1) an English Court was free to choose the plaintiff's currency solution if it worked better justice than the solution of the currency of expenditure and loss.

(2) the solution of the plaintiff's currency reduced the risk of changes in currency values by subjecting the plaintiff to changes in the internal value of his own currency only and not to changes in the rate of exchange between his own currency and the currency in which damages were awarded; and further support for the plaintiff's currency could be derived from the general principle that a tortfeasor took his victim as he found him, currency strong or weak;

(3) there was nothing in the facts of this case to prevent the application of the plaintiff's currency solution and U.S. dollars was the appropriate foreign currency for the plaintiffs' claim;

(4) the plaintiffs were therefore entitled to be awarded as damages the amount of reasonable expenditure and loss expressed in U.S. dollars or the sterling equivalent of such amounts at the date

[1979] VOL. 1]

The "Despina R." and "Folias"

of payment; and that when the expenditure and loss suffered by the plaintiffs were directly and immediately incurred in any other currency other than U.S. dollars, the sums representing such expenditure and loss should be converted into U.S. dollars at the date when the expenditure or loss was incurred.

Appeal allowed.

On appeal by the defendants, the owners of *Despina R.*:

Held, by H.L. (Lord WILBERFORCE, Lord DIPLOCK, Lord SALMON, Lord RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN and Lord KEITH OF KINKEL), that (1) there was no doubt that, given the ability of an English Court (and of arbitrators sitting in this country) to give judgments or to make an award in a foreign currency, to give a judgment in the currency in which the loss was sustained produced a juster result than one which fixed the plaintiff with a sum in sterling taken at the date of the breach or loss (*see p. 5, cols. 1 and 2; p. 9, col. 2*);

(2) the decision in *The Canadian Transport*, did not preclude a decision in favour of the plaintiff's currency or the currency of the loss once the possibility of giving judgments in a foreign currency existed (*see p. 5, col. 2*);

The Canadian Transport, (1932) 43 Ll.L. Rep. 409 distinguished.

(3) a plaintiff who normally conducted his business through a particular currency and who, when other currencies were involved used his own currency to obtain those currencies, could reasonably say that the loss he sustained was to be measured, not by the immediate currency in which the loss first emerged but by the amount of his own currency, which in the normal course of operations he had used to obtain those currencies (*see p. 5, col. 2; p. 6, col. 1; p. 10, col. 1*); this was the currency in which his loss was felt and was the currency which it was reasonably foreseeable he would have to spend (*see p. 6, cols. 1 and 2; p. 7, col. 1*); and the normal principles of restitution in integrum and that of reasonable foreseeability of the damage sustained, which governed the assessment of damage in tort applied (*see p. 5, col. 2*).

Appeal dismissed.

Per Lord WILBERFORCE (at p. 6): I wish to make it clear that I would not approve of a hard and fast rule that in all cases where a plaintiff suffers a loss or damage in a foreign currency the right currency to take for the purpose of his claim is "the plaintiffs' currency". I should refer to the definition I have used of this expression the currency in which the loss was effectively felt or borne by the plaintiff having regard to the currency in which he generally operates or with which he has the closest connection and emphasise that it does not suggest the use of a personal currency attached like nationality to a plaintiff but a currency which he is able to show is that in which he normally conducts trading operations . . .

In the second appeal, *The Folias*, on July 5, 1971, the owners let their vessel *Folias* to the charterers under a time charter in the New York Produce Exchange form for one round voyage

Mediterranean-East Coast South America. Various clauses in the charter provided for payment in U.S. dollars which was the currency of account. The charter contained a London arbitration clause and the proper law of the charter was English law.

A cargo of onions was shipped from Valencia to Rio de Janeiro and Santos under bills of lading dated July 19, 1971, but on discharge was found to be damaged owing to the failure of the refrigeration machinery. The charterers, whose place of business was Paris, settled the cargo-receivers' claims by exchanging French francs for Brazilian cruzeiros. The owners accepted liability for the claims but the charterers contended that they were entitled to a larger sum since they had suffered a loss due to the subsequent fluctuations of French francs and Brazilian cruzeiros.

The dispute was referred to arbitration, and the arbitrators held that the owners should pay to the charterers the sum of 418,012.17 French frs. but stated their award in the form of a special case, the question of law for decision of the Court being:

Whether upon the facts found and upon the true construction of the charter-party:

(1) the charterers are entitled to an award in French francs;

(2) if the answer to par. 1 above is "No" (a) what currency is to be used for the award, Brazilian Cruzeiros or United States dollars or pounds sterling? (b) what is the appropriate date for rate of exchange purposes?

Held, by Q.B. (Com. Ct.) (ROBERT GOFF, J.), that (1) the arbitrators were not inhibited from making an award in a foreign currency because the claim was one for damages;

(2) since the proper law of the charter was English, damages for its breach had to be calculated in the currency in which the loss was incurred;

(3) the measure of damages was the amount by which the sound arrived value of the goods at the port of discharge exceeded their damaged value at that port and since the charterers' loss was incurred in the currency of the country in which the discharging ports were situated the charterers' loss was incurred in Brazilian cruzeiros;

(4) since the loss was incurred by the charterers in cruzeiros it was irrelevant that the charterers exchanged French francs into cruzeiros to satisfy the cargo-receivers' claim;

(5) there was no express agreement, and no agreement could be implied to the effect that because the parties had agreed upon the U.S. dollar as the currency of the charter, they had agreed that damages for breach of any obligation under the contract should be calculated and paid in U.S. dollars regardless of the currency in which the loss was incurred;

(6) the currency in which the arbitrators should have made their award was Brazilian cruzeiros as the currency in which the loss was incurred and the currency of account of the damages claimed by the charterers and the answers to the question of law were (1) No; (2) (a) Brazilian cruzeiros; (b) Did not arise.

On appeal by the charterers:

Held, by C.A. (Lord DENNING, M.R., ORMROD and GEOFFREY LANE, L.JJ.), that (1) there was no authority which was binding upon the Court; and in each case it would be for the plaintiff to claim his damage in such currency as he thought appropriate the onus being on him not only to prove the quantum of his loss but also the currency in which he claimed to have sustained it.

(2) damages should be awarded to the plaintiff in the currency which most truly expressed his loss; if the expenditure or loss was incurred in a foreign currency, but in order to meet it the plaintiff had to use his own currency in the ordinary course of his business, then the award should be in his own currency.

(3) the currency which most truly expressed the loss of the charterers was French francs not Brazilian cruzeiros since the charterers had to use French francs in order to settle the claim of the cargo-receivers, and they should be compensated for that expenditure in French francs by an award of that sum (at the date on which they paid it) with interest thereafter.

Appeal allowed.

On appeal by the owners:

Held, by H.L. (Lord WILBERFORCE, Lord DIPLOCK, Lord SALMON, Lord RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN and Lord KEITH OF KINKEL), that (1) the effect of the decision in *Miliangos v. George Frank (Textiles) Ltd.*, was that in contractual as in other cases a judgment (and an award) could be given in a currency other than sterling (see p. 7, col. 2);

Miliangos v. George Frank (Textiles) Ltd., [1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 201, applied.

(2) although the proper law of the contract was accepted to be English by virtue of a London arbitration clause, neither the parties to the contract nor the contract itself nor the claims which arose had any connection with sterling so that *prima facie* this would have been a case for giving judgment in foreign currency (see p. 8, col. 2);

(3) the essential question was which was the loss suffered by the charterers, and the loss which they (the charterers) claimed as damages was the discharge of the receivers' claim together with legal and other expenses incurred which they had discharged by providing francs (see p. 8, col. 2; p. 9, col. 1; p. 10, col. 2); until they had provided francs to meet the receivers' claim, they had suffered no loss (see p. 9, col. 1); and it was reasonable for the parties to have contemplated that the charterers being a French corporation and having a place of business in Paris would have to use French francs to purchase other currencies to settle cargo claims arising under the bills of lading (see p. 9, col. 1);

(4) according to the normal principle of *restitutio in integrum*, the charterers' recoverable loss was the sum of French francs which they had paid (see p. 9, col. 1; p. 10, col. 2).

Appeal dismissed.

Per Lord WILBERFORCE (at p. 9): . . . a decision in what currency the loss was borne or felt can be expressed as equivalent to finding which currency

sum appropriately or justly reflects the recoverable loss. This is essentially a matter for arbitrators to determine. A rule that arbitrators may make their award in the currency best suited to achieve an appropriate and just result should be a flexible rule in which account must be taken of the circumstances in which the loss arose, in which the loss was converted into a money sum, and in which it was felt by the plaintiff . . . Awards of arbitrators based upon their appreciation of the circumstances in which the foreign currency came to be provided should not be set aside for, as such, they involve no error in law.

The following cases were referred to in both appeals:

Canadian Transport, The, (C.A.) (1932) 43 Ll.L. Rep. 409;

Di Ferdinando v. Simon, Smits & Co. Ltd., (C.A.) [1920] 3 K.B. 409;

Federal Commerce and Navigation Co. Ltd. v. Tradax Export S.A., (C.A.) [1977] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 217; [1977] Q.B. 324;

Jugoslavenska Oceanska Plovidba v. Castle Investment Co. Inc. (The Kozara), (C.A.) [1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 1; [1974] Q.B. 292;

Kraut (Jean) A.G. v. Albany Fabrics Ltd., [1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 350; [1977] Q.B. 182;

Miliangos v. George Frank (Textiles) Ltd., (H.L.) [1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 201;

United Railways of Havana and Regla Warehouses Ltd., in re, (H.L.) [1961] A.C. 1007;

Volturno, The, (H.L.) (1921) 8 Ll.L. Rep. 449; [1921] 2 A.C. 544.

These were two appeals brought by shipowners. In the first appeal, the defendant owners of the vessel *Despina R.* appealed against the decision of the Court of Appeal (Stephenson, Orr and Cumming-Bruce, L.JJ.), ([1977] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 319) allowing the appeal of the defendants from the decision of Mr. Justice Brandon ([1977] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 618) given in favour of the plaintiffs the owners of the vessel *Eleftherotria* and holding in effect that the plaintiffs were entitled to be awarded damages in the foreign currency of expenditure or loss. The Court of Appeal held that the plaintiffs were entitled to be awarded damages in the plaintiffs' currency, and the defendants argued that the damages ought to have been awarded in sterling at the rate of exchange prevailing at the date of loss or damage.

[1979] VOL. 1]

The "Despina R." and "Folias"

[Lord WILBERFORCE]

In the second appeal, the owners, Stockholms Rederiaktiebolag SVEA appealed against the decision of the Court of Appeal (Lord Denning, M.R., Ormrod and Geoffrey Lane, L.J.J.) ([1978] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 535), allowing the appeal of the charterers, Services Europe Atlantique Sud (SEAS) from the decision of Mr. Justice Robert Goff ([1977] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 39), given in favour of the owners and holding in effect that the arbitrators' award, that the owners should pay to the charterers the sum of 418,012.17 francs, should have been expressed in Brazilian cruzeiros, as the currency in which the loss was incurred.

Mr. Nicholas A. Phillips, Q.C., and Mr. John Reeder (instructed by Messrs. Holman Fenwick & Willan) for the defendant appellant, the owners of *Despina R.*; Mr. C. S. Staughton, Q.C., Mr. M. N. Howard and Miss Sarah Miller (instructed by Messrs. Hill Dickinson & Co.) for the plaintiff respondent, the owners of *Eleftherotria*.

Mr. A. G. S. Pollock (instructed by Messrs. Holman Fenwick & Willan) for the respondent charterers; Mr. Nicholas Merriman and Mr. Timothy Young (instructed by Messrs. William A. Crump & Son) for the appellant owners.

The further facts are stated in the judgment of Lord Wilberforce.

Judgment was reserved.

Thursday, Oct. 19, 1978

JUDGMENT

Lord WILBERFORCE: My Lords, in *Miliangos v. George Frank (Textiles) Ltd.*, [1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 201; [1976] A.C. 443, this House decided that a plaintiff suing for a debt payable in Swiss francs under a contract governed by Swiss law could claim and recover judgment in this country in Swiss francs. Whether the same, or a similar, rule could be applied to cases where (i) a plaintiff sues for damages in tort, or (ii) a plaintiff sues for damages for breach of contract, were questions expressly left open for later decision. These questions were regulated before *Miliangos* as to tort by the *S.S. Celia (Owners) v. S.S. Volturno (Owners) (The Volturno)*, (1921) 8 Ll.L. Rep. 449; [1921] 2 A.C. 544 and as to contract by *Di Ferdinando v. Simon, Smits & Co. Ltd.*, [1920] 3 K.B. 409, which decided that judgment in an English Court could only be given in sterling converted from any foreign currency as at the date of the wrong. Now these questions are directly raised in the present appeals in each of

which your Lordships have the advantage of judgments of the Court of Appeal and of judgments of high quality at first instance. These enable the House, as it could not have done in *Miliangos*, to consider some of the problems which may exist in the varied cases of torts and breaches of contract.

I. OWNERS OF M.V. "ELEFETHEROTRIA"

v.

OWNERS OF M.V. "DESPINA R."

These are two Greek vessels which collided in April, 1974, off Shanghai. On July 7, 1976, a settlement was arrived at under which it was agreed that the appellants should pay to the respondents 85 per cent. of the loss and damage caused to the respondents by the collision. This is therefore a tort case based upon negligence.

After the collision *Eleftherotria* was taken to Shanghai where temporary repairs were carried out. She then went to Yokohama for permanent repairs, but it turned out that these could not be carried out for some time. She was therefore ordered to Los Angeles, California, U.S.A., for permanent repairs. Expenses were incurred under various headings (particularised in the judgment of Mr. Justice Brandon, [1977] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 618) in foreign currencies, namely, renminbi yuan ("R.M.B."), Japanese yen, U.S. dollars, and as to a small amount in sterling. The owners of the ship are a Liberian company with head office in Piraeus (Greece). She was managed by managing agents with their principal place of business in the state of New York, U.S.A. The bank account used for all payments in and out on behalf of the respondents in respect of the ship was a U.S. dollar account in New York—so all the expenses incurred in the foreign currencies other than U.S. dollars were met by transferring U.S. dollars from this account. The expenses incurred in U.S. dollars were met directly by payment in that currency from New York.

The Judge ordered that the following questions be tried separately, namely: (a) whether, where the plaintiffs have suffered damage or sustained loss in a currency other than sterling, they are entitled to recover damages in respect of such damage or loss expressed in such other currency, (b) if, in such a case, the plaintiffs are only entitled to recover damages expressed in sterling, at what date the conversion into sterling should be made. Under question (a) there are two alternatives. The first is to take the currency in which the expense or loss was immediately sustained. This I shall call "the expenditure currency". The second is to take the currency in which the loss was effectively felt or borne by the plaintiff, having