

Marsden and Gault  
on Collisions at Sea

Professional  
[www.pbookshop.com](http://www.pbookshop.com)

Sweet & Maxwell

## Preface

This latest edition of *Marine Collision*, the sixteenth, has afforded us a chance to take stock and make some further improvements. The last five years have, once again, been times of momentous development in the legal nature of the law relating to collision. We have also seen some notable changes in the rules for pleading in collision claims. We have also seen some notable changes in the rules for pleading in collision claims and other modifications to Admiralty Court procedure, which we have taken full account of in this new edition. The effect of Brexit on jurisdiction questions arising out of collisions at sea is now clear since the definitive rejection by the EU of the UK's application to accede to the Lugano Convention. The law of damages, one of the most important issues in marine practice, continues to develop, and we have recognised this fact in updating the text.

We have also taken advantage of this comparative full to continue with our efforts to modernise *Marine Collision*. We have continued the process started in the last edition of removing references and language that are outdated and make the coverage more pertinent to the very safety-conscious times we live in and to the increasingly extensive demands of regulatory authorities. In addition, we have taken account of the fact that collisions at sea are now a robustly transnational form of legal business, and continued to give the necessary emphasis to issues such as jurisdiction and governing law that might once have been considered somewhat peripheral.

English maritime law does not exist in a vacuum, or for that matter in a self-contained English bubble. Where necessary, we have taken care to incorporate references to developments elsewhere in the law of tort. We are also very aware that within the Commonwealth there is a great deal of commonality between rules of maritime law; we have taken the opportunity to refer to other common-law authority in this connection much more liberally than in the past. As always, the enterprise would not have been possible without the hard work of the editorial team, the Sweet & Maxwell editorial team, to whom we extend our heartfelt thanks. Mistakes, of course, remain ours.

We have endeavoured to state the law as it stands on 31 May 2025, though we have endeavoured to enter a number of later developments where the opportunity has arisen.

John Kimbell

Andrew Totten

## Summary of Contents

- Chapter 1. Introduction
- Chapter 2. Liability in Personam and in Rem
- Chapter 3. Claimants
- Chapter 4. Defendants
- Chapter 5. Liability for Negligence: Tort and Contract
- Chapter 6. Fault in Navigation (I): a Historical Overview
- Chapter 7. Fault in Navigation (II): The Collision Regulations 1972, a Commentary
- The Collision Regulations Annotated
- Chapter 8. Special Liability Regimes
- Chapter 9. Pollution Liabilities
- Chapter 10. Apportionment of Liability
- Chapter 11. Causation
- Chapter 12. Damages
- Chapter 13. Limitation of Liability
- Chapter 14. Jurisdiction of the English Courts in Collision Cases
- Chapter 15. The Applicable Law
- Chapter 16. Practice and Procedure
- Chapter 17. Time-Bars and Limitation
- Chapter 18. Costs
- Chapter 19. Criminal Liability
- Chapter 20. Maritime Investigations and Inquiries

### Appendices

- Appendix A. United Nations Convention on the law of the sea (UNCLOS): International Maritime Organizations (IMO)
- Appendix B. The Merchant Shipping (Distress Signals and Prevention of Collisions) Regulations 1996
- Appendix C. ASG Wordings
- Appendix D. Vessel Traffic Services (VTS)

Appendix E. Interaction Between Vessels and Their Environment  
 Appendix F. Ships' Routeing  
 Appendix G. Ship Manoeuvring  
 Appendix H. Navigational Charts and Data  
 Appendix I. Automatic Radar Plotting Aids (ARPA)  
 Appendix J. Positioning, Navigation, and Timing (PNT)  
 Appendix K. Automatic Identification Systems (AIS)  
 Appendix L. RADAR Captain N. Cockcroft  
 Appendix M. Bridge Navigation Watch Alarm Systems (BNWAS)  
 Appendix N. Velocity Sensors—The Compass (Direction), the Log (SPEED)  
 Appendix O. The Automatic Pilot  
 Appendix P. Voyage Data Recorders  
 Appendix Q. Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS)

**Table of Cases**

**Index**

**Table of Contents**

**Chapter 1. Introduction**

§ 1:1 Scope  
 § 1:2 The position of the Admiralty Court  
 § 1:3 The principles of law applicable  
 § 1:4 Definitions  
 § 1:5 Type of property involved in collisions at sea: ships and other craft  
 § 1:6 Definition of a "ship"  
 § 1:7 —Merchant Shipping Act 1995  
 § 1:8 —Collision Regulations  
 § 1:9 —Admiralty jurisdiction  
 § 1:10 —Rules of court  
 § 1:11 —Insurance  
 § 1:12 —General  
 § 1:13 Definition of "collision"  
 § 1:14 —The Merchant Shipping Act 1995  
 § 1:15 —The Collision Regulations  
 § 1:16 —Admiralty jurisdiction  
 § 1:17 —Rules of court  
 § 1:18 —Charters and carriage of goods by sea  
 § 1:19 —Insurance  
 § 1:20 The sea  
 § 1:21 Non-ships: hovercraft and aircraft

**Chapter 2. Liability in Personam and in Rem**

§ 2:1 Generally  
 § 2:2 Liability in personam  
 § 2:3 Liability in rem—The action in rem generally  
 § 2:4 —Liability of the ship  
 § 2:5 —Nature of claims in rem  
 § 2:6 —Procedure  
 § 2:7 —Jurisdiction  
 § 2:8 —Foreign government ships  
 § 2:9 —Liability of Crown vessel  
 § 2:10 —The maritime lien for damage caused by collision  
 § 2:11 —Circumstances in which it arises  
 § 2:12 —Personal injury and wrongful death  
 § 2:13 —Cargo claims  
 § 2:14 —Damage to pier or harbour works, and other port authority claims

- § 2:15 —Position where no liability in personam
- § 2:16 —Which ships can be arrested?
- § 2:17 —Priority of the damage lien
- § 2:18 —Effect of winding up or insolvency
- § 2:19 —Discharge of the lien
- § 2:20 —Mergar and claims in personam
- § 2:21 —Loss by passage of time
- § 2:22 —Loss by judicial sale
- § 2:23 —Statutory liability in rem where no maritime lien
- § 2:24 —Claims in rem and other procedures

**Chapter 3. Claimants**

- § 3:1 General rule
- § 3:2 Shipowners
- § 3:3 Charterers
- § 3:4 Mortgagees
- § 3:5 Cargo owners and owners of other property on board
- § 3:6 Crew, passengers and others on board
- § 3:7 Tug owners and others in contractual relation with shipowners
- § 3:8 Shore-based claimants
- § 3:9 —Liability in negligence
- § 3:10 —Liability in nuisance
- § 3:11 Fixed installations at sea
- § 3:12 Insurers

**Chapter 4. Defendants**

**I. Introduction**

- § 4:1 Generally

**II. Liability of the Owner for Negligence of Those in Control of Vessel**

- § 4:2 Liability of the owner for the default of himself or his employees
- § 4:3 —Vicarious liability
- § 4:4 —Scope of employment
- § 4:5 —Deliberate wrongdoing
- § 4:6 Owner's liability where ship under charter
- § 4:7 —Time and voyage charters
- § 4:8 —Bareboat charters
- § 4:9 Owner's liability for independent contractors

**III. Miscellaneous Cases of Owners' Liability**

- § 4:10 Liability for damage done by a ship ashore, sunk or abandoned
- § 4:11 Blockage of harbours, waterways, etc.
- § 4:12 Owner strictly liable by statute for damage to pier, etc.

**IV. Liability of Persons on Vessel Other Than Owners**

- § 4:13 Liability of the bareboat charterer
- § 4:14 Liability of the actual wrongdoer on board the vessel
- § 4:15 Liability of the master personally
- § 4:16 Owner held liable can recover over against employee
- § 4:17 Personal liability of a pilot

**V. Liability of Harbour Authorities and Similar Organisations**

- § 4:18 Liability for directions given to vessels
- § 4:19 Negligent failure to keep ports safe and remove wrecks or obstructions
  - § 4:20 —Occupiers' liability
  - § 4:21 —Non-occupiers' liability
- § 4:22 Liability of harbour, etc. authority: qualification by contract
- § 4:23 Liability of harbour authorities for default of pilots

**VI. Shipbuilders, Ship-Repairers and Others**

- § 4:24 Shipbuilders
- § 4:25 Ship repairers
- § 4:26 Component manufacturers
- § 4:27 Liability of shipbuilders and component manufacturers under the Consumer Protection Act 1987

**VII. Ship Managers, Crewing Agencies, Etc**

- § 4:28 Generally

**VIII. Salvors**

- § 4:29 Generally

**IX. Classification Societies, Transport Authorities, Etc.**

- § 4:30 Generally

**X. Insurers**

- § 4:31 Introduction

- § 4:32 Collision coverage—Collision as an insured peril
- § 4:33 —Collision liability
- § 4:34 —The sistership clause
- § 4:35 Direct claims against liability insurers
- § 4:36 —Statutory exceptions
- § 4:37 —The Third Parties (Rights against Insurers) Act 2010

**Chapter 5. Liability for Negligence: Tort and Contract**

**I. Introduction**

- § 5:1 Generally

**II. General Principles of Negligence Liability**

- § 5:2 Ordinary tort law prima facie applies to collisions at sea
- § 5:3 Special rules applicable to collision actions
- § 5:4 The ambit of negligence law as it affects collisions

**III. Negligence Liability: Effect of Statutory and Other Legislative Standards**

- § 5:5 Breach of statutory duty
- § 5:6 Breach of the Collision Regulations
- § 5:7 Statute may indicate standard of care in negligence

**IV. What Amounts to Negligence**

- § 5:8 Generally
- § 5:9 Duty of care
- § 5:10 —Pure economic loss arising from damage to another's property
- § 5:11 —Failure to act by public authorities
- § 5:12 —Liability of peripheral actors
- § 5:13 Breach of duty
- § 5:14 —Inevitable accident
- § 5:15 —Agony of collision and similar cases
- § 5:16 —Necessity
- § 5:17 —Necessity and the Collision Regulations
- § 5:18 —Statutory or other legal authority
- § 5:19 Negligence a question of fact
- § 5:20 Loss or damage—Negligence not actionable without damage

**V. Standard of Care**

**A. Standard of Care in Navigation**

- § 5:21 Generally
- B. Effect of the Collision Regulations and Other Rules or Warnings**
  - 1. Generally
- § 5:22 Introduction
  - 2. Examples of the Requirements of Good Seamanship
- § 5:23 Scope
- § 5:24 Sufficiency of the crew
- § 5:25 Pilot's duty to inform
- § 5:26 Anchoring—Keeping clear of a ship at anchor and taking precautions in anchorage and pilotage areas
  - Ship at anchor or bringing up foul berth
  - Coming to anchor and turning
  - Precautions to be taken when at anchor
  - Slipping to avoid a collision
  - Bringing up in a fairway or improper place
- § 5:27
- § 5:28
- § 5:29
- § 5:30
- § 5:31
- § 5:32 Coming out of and entering dock
- § 5:33 Extra care required in passing over fishing grounds
- § 5:34 Eddy tide
- § 5:35 Vessel or towed object of peculiar construction, or otherwise dangerous to others
- § 5:36 Dumb barges
- § 5:37 Special precautions when vessel being launched
- § 5:38 Radar and electronic aids
- § 5:39 Small vessels not required by law to keep out of the way of larger vessels
- § 5:40 Narrow channels

**VI. Standard of Care in Ship Management**

- § 5:41 General duty of shipowners as regards management
- § 5:42 Breach of management duty by shipowners
- § 5:43 Termination of the management duty: disposal or abandonment

**VII. Establishing Breach of Duty—The Burden of Proof**

- § 5:44 Generally
- § 5:45 Prima facie evidence of negligence—proof by inference
- § 5:46 Res ipsa loquitur

**VIII. Liability in Contract**

- § 5:47 Introduction

- § 5:48 Cargo owners and passengers
- § 5:49 Claims by crew
- § 5:50 Liability of owners of a berth or port authority for an unsafe berth or port
- § 5:51 Liability of the operator to the owners of a berth or port authority
- § 5:52 Liabilities arising out of towage

**Chapter 6. Fault in Navigation (I): a Historical Overview**

**I. Introduction**

- § 6:1 Generally

**II. History of the Collision Regulations**

- § 6:2 General

**III. Period I—Rules Before 1840**

- § 6:3 Generally
- § 6:4 Leeward vessel becomes stand-on vessel
- § 6:5 Port tack rule not recognised

**IV. Period II—1840 to 1846**

- § 6:6 Generally

**V. Period III—1846 to 1851**

- § 6:7 Early penalties for infringements

**VI. Period IV—1851 to 1863**

- § 6:8 Penalties for infringements enlarged

**VII. Period V—1863 to 1873**

- § 6:9 Statutory presumptions of fault
- § 6:10 Failure to stand by
- § 6:11 Failure to exchange particulars

**VIII. Period VI—1873 to 1911**

- § 6:12 Amendments to the statutory presumptions of fault
- § 6:13 The regulation infringed had to be one material to the case
- § 6:14 A regulation was not infringed until there was an opportunity of complying with it

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 6:15 Penalty strictly enforced if infringement proved
- § 6:16 Penalty inapplicable in special circumstances
- § 6:17 Breaking down of fog-horn
- § 6:18 Ships' lights: reasonable compliance with the regulations sufficient
- § 6:19 Whether the presumption of fault applied where the collision was from the first inevitable
- § 6:20 Whether presumption applied where the infringement was in the agony of the collision
- § 6:21 Whether presumption applied where previous negligence rendered departure from the regulations necessary
- § 6:22 The presumption of fault in relation to local rules
- § 6:23 Failure to stand by presumption of fault continued
- § 6:24 Foreign ships application of presumption of fault
- § 6:25 Later legislation

**IX. Period VII—1911 to the Collision Regulations 1972**

- § 6:26 Generally
- § 6:27 Effect of the Maritime Conventions Act 1911
- § 6:28 The obligation to observe the regulations
- § 6:29 The IMO Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea
- § 6:30 The Merchant Shipping Act 1979
- § 6:31 The Merchant Shipping Act 1995
- § 6:32 Enactment of the Collision Regulations

**Chapter 7. Fault in Navigation (II): The Collision Regulations 1972, a Commentary**

- § 7:1 Introduction
- § 7:2 Structure
- § 7:3 Application—Time and date of application
- § 7:4 —By statutory instrument
- § 7:5 —As a matter of good seamanship
- § 7:6 —By private international law
- § 7:7 Interpretation of the Collision Regulations
- § 7:8 —Uniform construction desirable
- § 7:9 —Literal or purposive interpretation
- § 7:10 —Reasonable commercial interpretation
- § 7:11 —Cases decided under predecessors of the Collision Regulations
- § 7:12 Consequences of infringement of the Collision Regulations
- § 7:13 When regulations are inapplicable, seamanship is the test of negligence

THE COLLISION REGULATIONS ANNOTATED

Part A General

Rule 1 Application

- § MSR1:1 Rule 1(a)
- § MSR1:2 Application of regulations to UK ships
- § MSR1:3 Application to Crown ships
- § MSR1:4 Application to foreign ships
- § MSR1:5 Application to aircraft and hovercraft
- § MSR1:6 Rule 1(b)
- § MSR1:7 Rule 1(c)
- § MSR1:8 Rule 1(d)
- § MSR1:9 Rule 1(e)

Rule 2 Responsibility

- § MSR2:1 Rule 2(a)
- § MSR2:2 Compliance with notices to mariners
- § MSR2:3 Rule 2(b)
- § MSR2:4 Breach of the regulations
- § MSR2:5 Duty to keep out of the way of warship formations, convoys and submerged submarines, and in relation to firing practice and exercise areas
- § MSR2:6 If the rules cannot be complied with, or cannot, if complied with, prevent collision, the general prudential rule does not apply
- § MSR2:7 A ship is not bound to take a step dangerous to herself
- § MSR2:8 Wartime cases
- § MSR2:9 Necessity of departure from the rules must be proved
- § MSR2:10 Cases where departure from the regulations held not justifiable
- § MSR2:11 Neither ship may depart from the rules on the chance of the other obeying them

Rule 3 General definitions

- § MSR3:1 Rule 3(a)
- § MSR3:2 "Hovercraft"
- § MSR3:3 "MODUs"
- § MSR3:4 Rule 3(b)
- § MSR3:5 Rule 3(c)
- § MSR3:6 Rule 3(d)
- § MSR3:7 Rule 3(e)
- § MSR3:8 Rule 3(f)
- § MSR3:9 Rule 3(g)
- § MSR3:10 Rule 3(h)
- § MSR3:11 Rule 3(i)
- § MSR3:12 Rule 3(j)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § MSR3:13 Rule 3(k)
- § MSR3:14 Rule 3(l)
- § MSR3:15 Rule 3(m)

Part B Steering and Sailing Rules

Section I Conduct of vessels in any condition of visibility

Rule 4 Application

- § MSR4:1 Rule 4

Rule 5 Look-out

- § MSR5:1 Rule 5
- § MSR5:2 Consequences of improper look-out
- § MSR5:3 What is required depends on the circumstances
- § MSR5:4 Anchor watch
- § MSR5:5 Look-out astern
- § MSR5:6 Look-out during towing operations
- § MSR5:7 Look-out in confined waters and in traffic separation schemes
- § MSR5:8 Unattended barges and craft
- § MSR5:9 Improper use of VHF radio
- § MSR5:10 Improper use of automatic pilot

Rule 6 Safe speed

- § MSR6:1 Rule 6
- § MSR6:2 Relationship with Rule 19
- § MSR6:3 Safe speed as good seamanship
- § MSR6:4 Safe speed to be judged on the basis of the circumstances in each case
- § MSR6:5 Cases where speed held to be unsafe when vessels in sight of one another
- § MSR6:6 Cases where speed held to be unsafe in restricted visibility
- § MSR6:7 Cases where speed held to be safe
- § MSR6:8 Being underway in fog unnecessarily

Rule 7 Risk of collision

- § MSR7:1 Rule 7(a)
- § MSR7:2 Rule 7(b)
- § MSR7:3 Head-up mode
- § MSR7:4 Long-range scanning
- § MSR7:5 Plotting
- § MSR7:6 ARPA
- § MSR7:7 Shore-based radar
- § MSR7:8 Rule 7(c)
- § MSR7:9 Rule 7(d)(i) and (ii)

Rule 8 Action to avoid collision

- § MSR8:1 Rule 8(a)
- § MSR8:2 Rule 8(b)
- § MSR8:3 Rule 8(c)

§ MSR8:4 Rule 8(d)  
 § MSR8:5 Rule 8(e)  
 § MSR8:6 Rule 8(f)(i) to (iii)  
 Rule 9 Narrow channels  
 § MSR9:1 Rule 9(a)  
 § MSR9:2 "Narrow channel"  
 § MSR9:3 "Fairway"  
 § MSR9:4 "Keep"  
 § MSR9:5 "Safe and practicable"  
 § MSR9:6 Rule 9(b)  
 § MSR9:7 Rule 9(c)  
 § MSR9:8 Rule 9(d)  
 § MSR9:9 Rule 9(e)  
 § MSR9:10 Rule 9(f)  
 § MSR9:11 Rule 9(g)  
 § MSR9:12 Relationship with other rules  
 § MSR9:13 Does Rule 9 apply where local rules are in force?  
 Rule 10 Traffic separation schemes  
 § MSR10:1 Rule 10  
 § MSR10:2 Rule 10(b)  
 § MSR10:3 "General direction"  
 § MSR10:4 "Proceed"  
 § MSR10:5 Rule 10(c)  
 § MSR10:6 Rule 10(d)  
 § MSR10:7 Rule 10(e)  
 § MSR10:8 Rule 10(f)  
 § MSR10:9 Rule 10(g)  
 § MSR10:10 Rule 10(h)  
 § MSR10:11 Rule 10(i)  
 § MSR10:12 Rule 10(j)  
 § MSR10:13 Rule 10(k)  
 § MSR10:14 Rule 10(l)  
 Section II Conduct of Vessels in Sight of One Another  
 Rule 11 Application  
 § MSR11:1 Rule 11  
 Rule 12 Sailing vessels  
 § MSR12:1 Rule 12  
 Rule 13 Overtaking  
 § MSR13:1 Rule 13  
 § MSR13:2 When the rule applies  
 § MSR13:3 Relationship with other rules  
 § MSR13:4 Interaction  
 § MSR13:5 Rule 13(b)  
 § MSR13:6 Rule 13(c)

§ MSR13:7 Rule 13(d)  
 Rule 14 Head-on situation  
 § MSR14:1 Rule 14  
 Rule 15 Crossing situation  
 § MSR15:1 Rule 15  
 § MSR15:2 "Course"  
 § MSR15:3 Rule applies until the ships are past  
 § MSR15:4 Vessels leaving dock or near dock and getting underway  
 § MSR15:5 Conflicting duties  
 § MSR15:6 One vessel creating a crossing situation  
 § MSR15:7 Crossing ahead of the other vessel  
 Rule 16 Action by give-way vessel  
 § MSR16:1 Rule 16  
 Rule 17 Action by stand-on vessel  
 § MSR17:1 Rule 17  
 § MSR17:2 Duty to "keep her course and speed"  
 § MSR17:3 Whistle signals  
 § MSR17:4 Rule 17(b)  
 § MSR17:5 Rule 17(c) and (d)  
 Rule 18 Responsibilities between vessels  
 § MSR18:1 Rule 18  
 § MSR18:2 General  
 § MSR18:3 A vessel not under command  
 § MSR18:4 A vessel restricted in her ability to manoeuvre  
 § MSR18:5 A vessel engaged in fishing  
 § MSR18:6 A sailing vessel  
 § MSR18:7 Cases illustrating the precedence of a sailing vessel over a power-driven vessel  
 § MSR18:8 Rule 18(d)  
 § MSR18:9 Rule 18(e)  
 § MSR18:10 Rule 18(f)  
 Section III Conduct of Vessels in Restricted Visibility  
 Rule 19 Conduct of vessels in restricted visibility  
 § MSR19:1 Rule 19(a)  
 § MSR19:2 Rule 19(b)  
 § MSR19:3 Excessive speed is negligence  
 § MSR19:4 Rule 19(c)  
 § MSR19:5 Rule 19(d)  
 § MSR19:6 Rule 19(e)  
 § MSR19:7 "Except where it has been determined that risk of collision does not exist"  
 § MSR19:8 Whistle heard abaft the beam  
 § MSR19:9 Whistle heard a long way off  
 § MSR19:10 Whistle signal reported

- § MSR19:11 "Reduce her speed to the minimum at which she can be kept on course"
- § MSR19:12 "Alteration of helm in fog"
- § MSR19:13 "Navigate with extreme caution"

Part C Lights and Shapes

Rule 20 Application

- § MSR20:1 Rule 20
- § MSR20:2 Loss and obscuration of lights
- § MSR20:3 Consequences of not displaying regulation lights
- § MSR20:4 Misleading or embarrassing lights
- § MSR20:5 Shapes

Rule 21 Definitions

- § MSR21:1 Rule 21(a)
- § MSR21:2 Rule 21(b)
- § MSR21:3 Rule 21(c)
- § MSR21:4 Rule 21(d)
- § MSR21:5 Rule 21(e)
- § MSR21:6 Rule 21(f)

Rule 22 Visibility of lights

- § MSR22:1 Rule 22(a)
- § MSR22:2 Rule 22(b)
- § MSR22:3 Rule 22(c)
- § MSR22:4 Rule 22(d)

Rule 23 Power-driven vessels underway

- § MSR23:1 Rule 23(a)
- § MSR23:2 Rule 23(b)
- § MSR23:3 Rule 23(c)
- § MSR23:4 Rule 23(d)

Rule 24 Towing and pushing

- § MSR24:1 Rule 24(a)
- § MSR24:2 Rule 24(b)
- § MSR24:3 Rule 24(c)
- § MSR24:4 Rule 24(d)
- § MSR24:5 Rule 24(e)
- § MSR24:6 Rule 24(f)
- § MSR24:7 Rule 24(g)
- § MSR24:8 Rule 24(h)
- § MSR24:9 Rule 24(i)

Rule 25 Sailing vessels underway and vessels under oars

- § MSR25:1 Rule 25(a)
- § MSR25:2 Rule 25(b)
- § MSR25:3 Rule 25(c)
- § MSR25:4 Rule 25(d)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § MSR25:5 Rule 25(e)
- Rule 26 Fishing vessels
  - § MSR26:1 Rule 26(a)
  - § MSR26:2 Rule 26(b)
  - § MSR26:3 Rule 26(c)
  - § MSR26:4 Rule 26(d)
  - § MSR26:5 Rule 26(e)
- Rule 27 Vessels not under command or restricted in their ability to manoeuvre
  - § MSR27:1 Rule 27(a)
  - § MSR27:2 Rule 27(b)
  - § MSR27:3 Rule 27(c)
  - § MSR27:4 Rule 27(d)
  - § MSR27:5 Rule 27(e)
  - § MSR27:6 Rule 27(f)
  - § MSR27:7 Rule 27(g)
  - § MSR27:8 Rule 27(h)
- Rule 28 Vessels constrained by their draught
  - § MSR28:1 Rule 28
- Rule 29 Pilot vessels
  - § MSR29:1 Rule 29
- Rule 30 Anchored vessels and vessels aground
  - § MSR30:1 Rule 30(a)
  - § MSR30:2 Riding light must not be obscured
  - § MSR30:3 Riding light must be shown promptly
  - § MSR30:4 Sheering about when at anchor
  - § MSR30:5 Rule 30(b)
  - § MSR30:6 Rule 30(c)
  - § MSR30:7 Rule 30(d)
  - § MSR30:8 Rule 30(e)
  - § MSR30:9 Rule 30(f)
- Rule 31 Seaplanes
  - § MSR31:1 Rule 31
- Part D Sound and Light Signals
- Rule 32 Definitions
  - § MSR32:1 Rule 32(a)
  - § MSR32:2 Rule 32(b)
  - § MSR32:3 Rule 32(c)
  - § MSR32:4 Rule 32(d)
- Rule 33 Equipment for sound signals
  - § MSR33:1 Rule 33(a)
  - § MSR33:2 Rule 33(b)

Rule 34 Manoeuvring and warning signals

- § MSR34:1 Rule 34
- § MSR34:2 "In sight"
- § MSR34:3 "When manoeuvring"
- § MSR34:4 "Authorised or required"
- § MSR34:5 Misleading signals

Rule 35 Sounds signals in restricted visibility

- § MSR35:1 Rule 35
- § MSR35:2 Vessels not required to sound signals in restricted visibility
- § MSR35:3 Signals not heard
- § MSR35:4 Towing signals

Rule 36 Signals to attract attention

- § MSR36:1 Rule 36

Rule 37 Distress signals

- § MSR37:1 Rule 37

Part E Exemptions

Rule 38 Exemptions

- § MSR38:1 Rule 38

Annex I

Positioning and technical details of lights and shapes

- 1 Definition
  - § MSR AI:1 Annex I paragraph 1
- 2 Vertical positioning and spacing of lights
  - § MSR AI:2 Annex I paragraph 2
- 3 Horizontal positioning and spacing of lights
  - § MSR AI:3 Annex I paragraph 3
- 4 Details of location of direction indicating lights for fishing vessels, dredgers and vessels engaged in underwater operations
  - § MSR AI:4 Annex I paragraph 4
- 5 Screens for sidelights
  - § MSR AI:5 Annex I paragraph 5
- 6 Shapes
  - § MSR AI:6 Annex I paragraph 6
- 7 Colour specification of lights
  - § MSR AI:7 Annex I paragraph 7
- 8 Intensity of lights
  - § MSR AI:8 Annex I paragraph 8
- 9 Horizontal sectors
  - § MSR AI:9 Annex I paragraph 9
- 10 Vertical sectors
  - § MSR AI:10 Annex I paragraph 10

- 11 Intensity of non-electric lights
  - § MSR AI:11 Annex I paragraph 11
- 12 Manoeuvring light
  - § MSR AI:12 Annex I paragraph 12
- 13 High speed craft
  - § MSR AI:13 Annex I paragraph 13
- 14 Approval
  - § MSR AI:14 Annex I paragraph 14

Annex II

Additional signals for fishing vessels fishing in close proximity

- 1 General
  - § MSR AII:1 Annex II paragraph 1
- 2 Signals for trawlers
  - § MSR AII:2 Annex II paragraph 2
- 3 Signals for purse seiners
  - § MSR AII:3 Annex II paragraph 3

Annex III

Technical details of sound signal appliances

- 1 Whistles
  - § MSR AIII:1 Annex III paragraph 1
- 2 Bell or gong
  - § MSR AIII:2 Annex III paragraph 2
- 3 Approval
  - § MSR AIII:3 Annex III paragraph 3

Annex IV

Distress Signals

- 1
- 2
- 3
  - § MSR AIV:1 Annex IV paragraph 1
  - § MSR AIV:2 Annex IV paragraph 2
  - § MSR AIV:3 Annex IV paragraph 3

Chapter 8. Special Liability Regimes

- § 8:1 Generally
- § 8:2 Cargo claims
- § 8:3 —Bills of lading

§ 8:4 —Charterparties  
 § 8:5 —Division of loss as it affects cargo claims  
 § 8:6 Passengers and crew  
 § 8:7 —Liability of the carrying ship  
 § 8:8 —The Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977 and the Consumer Rights Act 2015  
 § 8:9 —Crew agreements  
 § 8:10 —Liability to passengers  
 § 8:11 Harbour installations: strict liability under the Harbours, Piers and Docks Clauses Act 1847  
 § 8:12 Nuclear risks  
 § 8:13 Wreck raising powers  
 § 8:14 Wreck raising powers deriving from domestic provisions: the Merchant Shipping Act 1995, the Harbours, Docks and Piers Clauses Act 1847, and local Acts  
 § 8:15 Wreck raising powers—The Nairobi Wreck Removal Convention  
 § 8:16 Non-orthodox craft involved in collisions at sea  
 § 8:17 Non-orthodox craft—Insubstantial craft, such as lightweight jetskis  
 § 8:18 —Aircraft  
 § 8:19 —Hovercraft

**Chapter 9. Pollution Liabilities**

§ 9:1 Background  
 § 9:2 Oil pollution from tankers and similar vessels: the CLC 1992 and the Funds  
 § 9:3 The CLC 1992 and the Funds—Oil pollution and bunker pollution  
 § 9:4 —The Civil Liability Conventions (CLC 1969 and CLC 1992)  
 § 9:5 —Applicability  
 § 9:6 —Oil  
 § 9:7 —Incident  
 § 9:8 —Territorial scope and jurisdictional issues  
 § 9:9 —Persons liable: owners  
 § 9:10 —Persons liable: others  
 § 9:11 —Strict liability  
 § 9:12 —Exclusion and qualification of strict liability  
 § 9:13 —Damages  
 § 9:14 —Limitation of liability  
 § 9:15 —Limitation amounts and units of account  
 § 9:16 —The establishment of a limitation fund  
 § 9:17 —Distribution of the limitation fund  
 § 9:18 —Compulsory insurance  
 § 9:19 —Procedure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 9:20 —The 1992 Fund Convention and the Supplementary Protocol 2003  
 § 9:21 Pollution from bunkers: the Bunkers Convention 2001  
 § 9:22 The Bunkers Convention 2001—"Shipowners" and "registered owners"  
 § 9:23 —Scope of application  
 § 9:24 —The scheme of liability  
 § 9:25 —Limitation  
 § 9:26 —Insurance  
 § 9:27 —Procedure  
 § 9:28 Liability for oil pollution from other ships  
 § 9:29 Oil pollution from ships and voluntary schemes: the former TOVALOP and CRISTAL  
 § 9:30 Oil pollution from ships and voluntary schemes: STOPIA 2006  
 § 9:31 Oil pollution from ships and voluntary schemes: TOPIA 2006  
 § 9:32 Oil pollution from fixed installations and voluntary agreements: OPOL  
 § 9:33 Special regimes for non-oil pollution: the prospective Hazardous and Noxious Substances Convention 1996 and 2010 (HNS)  
 § 9:34 The prospective Hazardous and Noxious Substances Convention 1996 and 2010 (HNS)—Definitions  
 § 9:35 —Scope of application  
 § 9:36 —Scheme of liability  
 § 9:37 —Insurance  
 § 9:38 —The HNS Fund  
 § 9:39 Liability for pollution at common law  
 § 9:40 —Trespass  
 § 9:41 —Public nuisance  
 § 9:42 —Private nuisance  
 § 9:43 —Negligence  
 § 9:44 —Rylands v Fletcher  
 § 9:45 —Limitation  
 § 9:46 Collisions, pollution and EU law  
 § 9:47 —Jurisdiction in pollution claims

**Chapter 10. Apportionment of Liability**

§ 10:1 Historical introduction  
 § 10:2 The Collision Convention 1910  
 § 10:3 The modern statutory basis for dividing loss according to degree of fault  
 § 10:4 The duty to apportion  
 § 10:5 —Scope of the Act—vessels used in navigation  
 § 10:6 —Cases in which the Act applies  
 § 10:7 —Liability in proportion to fault

- § 10:8 Impermissible "unit" approach
- § 10:9 Impermissible unit approach—The proviso
- § 10:10 The division of loss rule where Merchant Shipping Act 1995 ss.187–189 do not apply
- § 10:11 Appeals on the apportionment
- § 10:12 Claims in respect of death and personal injury
- § 10:13 Effect of the rule of division of loss on cargo-owners
- § 10:14 —The rights of cargo-owners in cases of collision between ships of the same owner
- § 10:15 The rule of division of loss in the case of limitation of liability
- § 10:16 Different heads of damage
- § 10:17 Right of the assured under the collision clause
- § 10:18 Contributions between joint-tortfeasors
- § 10:19 The rule of division of loss and general average

**Chapter 11. Causation**

**I. Introduction**

- § 11:1 Generally

**II. Causation in General**

- § 11:2 General rule: no liability unless damage would not have been suffered but for breach of duty
- § 11:3 Connection between breach of duty and loss must not be entirely fortuitous
- § 11:4 Causation by material contribution
- § 11:5 Damage to vessel already damaged
- § 11:6 A special case: causation, subsequent damage and the effect of hindsight
- § 11:7 Causation, subsequent damage and the effect of hindsight—Claims for repair costs or diminution in value
- § 11:8 —Claims for detention damages

**III. Causation and the Effect of Intervening Events**

- § 11:9 The doctrine of novus actus interveniens
- § 11:10 What amounts to novus actus interveniens?
- § 11:11 Novus actus interveniens: failure by claimant to take reasonable steps
- § 11:12 Novus actus interveniens—The effect of an unreasonable act by the claimant
- § 11:13 —Failure of those on board to exhibit ordinary skill and courage in standing by her
- § 11:14 —Failure to take assistance where necessary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 11:15 —Unjustifiable abandonment
- § 11:16 —Failure to repair injury received in the collision
- § 11:17 —Miscellaneous cases
- § 11:18 —The role of foreseeability
- § 11:19 —Reasonable act not novus actus
- § 11:20 —Disregard of some intervening events while effects of defendant's negligence continuing
- § 11:21 —Relationship with apportionment of liability
- § 11:22 —Act of third party as novus actus interveniens
- § 11:23 —Natural events

**IV. Causation: The Burden of Proof**

- § 11:24 Generally
- § 11:25 Onus of proof with respect to novus actus interveniens
- § 11:26 Causation and the Collision Regulations
- § 11:27 Causation: loss of a chance

**Chapter 12. Damages**

**I. The Basic Principle: Restitutio in Integrum**

- § 12:1 Generally
- § 12:2 The net loss principle
- § 12:3 The collateral source rule and the effect of insurance

**II. Qualifications of the Principle of Restitutio in Integrum**

- § 12:4 Generally
- § 12:5 Problems of the duty of care
- § 12:6 Remoteness of damage
- § 12:7 —Claimant to be foreseeable
- § 12:8 —Need for foreseeable type of damage
- § 12:9 —Means of occurrence unforeseeable
- § 12:10 —Position where extent of loss unforeseeable
- § 12:11 —The burden of proof
- § 12:12 —Duty to mitigate loss
- § 12:13 —Effect of steps taken to mitigate loss

**III. Particular Situations: Total Loss of Vessel**

- § 12:14 Value of ship recoverable
- § 12:15 Prima facie market value
- § 12:16 Where no market for ship
- § 12:17 Ship of special value to owner
- § 12:18 At what date value taken

- § 12:19 At what place value taken
- § 12:20 Consequential losses
- § 12:21 Consequential loss: loss of freight
- § 12:22 Consequential loss: loss of fishing
- § 12:23 Consequential loss: agency

**IV. Particular Situations: Constructive Total Loss of Vessel**

- § 12:24 Value of ship
- § 12:25 Position regarding the wreck
- § 12:26 Expenses of raising
- § 12:27 Consequential losses

**V. Particular Situations: Damage to Vessel**

**A. Different Heads of Damage: Repairs, Consequential Losses and Loss of Use**

- § 12:28 Generally
- § 12:29 Diminution in value, presumptively set at repair cost, recoverable as of right
- § 12:30 Repairs and diminution in value—Repair costs greater than diminution in value
- § 12:31 —Repairs which will not be carried out or paid for
- § 12:32 —Repair costs as consequential losses
- § 12:33 Repair costs: general points—Choice of repair location
- § 12:34 —Timing of repairs
- § 12:35 —How much is recoverable?
- § 12:36 —Dry-docking expenses
- § 12:37 —Ship to be made as good as before
- § 12:38 —Betterment
- § 12:39 —Repairs using claimant's own facilities
- § 12:40 Consequential losses
- § 12:41 —Repair costs as consequential losses
- § 12:42 —Expenses of raising, etc.
- § 12:43 —Salvage awards
- § 12:44 —Towage charges
- § 12:45 —Average charges
- § 12:46 —Agency
- § 12:47 —Miscellaneous
- § 12:48 Detention and loss of use
- § 12:49 —General damages for loss of use: public vessels
- § 12:50 —General damages for loss of use—Vessels used for pleasure
- § 12:51 — —Vessels used in commerce
- § 12:52 — —Actual loss of use to be shown
- § 12:53 —Loss of use: special damages

- § 12:54 —Claims for lost profits
- § 12:55 —Loss of charter freight or hire
- § 12:56 —Loss of future charter already agreed
- § 12:57 —Loss of future hypothetical charters
- § 12:58 —Loss of other engagements
- § 12:59 —Claims for lost profits in the absence of charter or other engagement
- § 12:60 —Damages not allowed for loss of charter and also for detention
- § 12:61 —Assessment of net profits
- § 12:62 —Ship hired as replacement for damaged chartered ship
- § 12:63 —Sister-ship substituted for damaged vessel
- § 12:64 —Reserve ship
- § 12:65 —Vessels used for own trade
- § 12:66 —Fishing vessels
- § 12:67 —Prospective detention
- § 12:68 —Who is liable for what detention?
- § 12:69 —Time allowable for detention

**VI. Loss of, Damage to, or Delay of, Goods Through Collision**

- § 12:70 General principles
- § 12:71 Loss or damage to goods: title to sue
- § 12:72 Goods owner may be able to sue, even if he personally suffers no loss
- § 12:73 Rights of carrying ship
- § 12:74 Goods lost in collision: market value, or cost plus merchant's profit
- § 12:75 Goods not lost but damaged
- § 12:76 Goods delayed but neither lost nor damaged
- § 12:77 Deterioration of goods caused by delay
- § 12:78 Fishing gear lost or damaged
- § 12:79 Crew's or passengers' lost effects

**VII. Damages for Loss of Life and Personal Injury**

- § 12:80 Loss of life and personal injury

**VIII. Currency of the Award of Damages**

- § 12:81 Currency of award of damages
- § 12:82 Currency of personal injury damages
- § 12:83 Foreign currency—cross-claims
- § 12:84 Foreign currency—limitation of liability
- § 12:85 Damages in foreign currency: procedural and other matters

**IX. Interest on Collision Damages**

- § 12:86 Interest on damages

§ 12:87 Interest where limitation fund constituted

**Chapter 13. Limitation of Liability**

§ 13:1 Generally

§ 13:2 Implementation of the LLMC 1976

§ 13:3 Structures to which limitation applies

§ 13:4 Persons entitled to limit liability

§ 13:5 —Owners

§ 13:6 —Charterers

§ 13:7 —Managers

§ 13:8 —Operators

§ 13:9 —Salvors

§ 13:10 —Others

§ 13:11 Claims for which limitation is available

§ 13:12 —Loss of life and personal injury

§ 13:13 —Loss of or damage to property

§ 13:14 —Loss resulting from delay

§ 13:15 —Other loss

§ 13:16 —Raising, removal, destruction, or rendering harmless of a ship

§ 13:17 —Removal, destruction or the rendering harmless of cargo

§ 13:18 —Persons other than the person liable

§ 13:19 Claims specifically excepted from limitation under the LLMC 1976

§ 13:20 —Claims for salvage

§ 13:21 —Oil pollution damage

§ 13:22 —Nuclear damage and international conventions or national legislation

§ 13:23 —Nuclear damage and shipowners

§ 13:24 —Claims by servants of the shipowner or salvor

§ 13:25 Exclusion of the right to limit by contract

§ 13:26 Loss of the right to limit liability—History

§ 13:27 —Breaking limitation: the LLMC

§ 13:28 The limitation fund and the limitation amounts

§ 13:29 Passengers

§ 13:30 Aggregation of claims

§ 13:31 Limitation actions

§ 13:32 Staying actions in favour of jurisdictions applying other systems of limitation

§ 13:33 Limitation of liability without constitution of a limitation fund

§ 13:34 Limitation, currency conversion and timing

§ 13:35 Costs of limitation

§ 13:36 Constitution of the fund

§ 13:37 Distribution of the fund

§ 13:38 Bars to other actions

§ 13:39 Governing law

§ 13:40 Scope of application of the LLMC

§ 13:41 Special cases of limitation—Loss or damage by fire, etc.

§ 13:42 —Docks, etc.

§ 13:43 —Pilots

**Chapter 14. Jurisdiction of the English Courts in Collision Cases**

§ 14:1 Generally

§ 14:2 The significance of jurisdiction

§ 14:3 The European dimension: before and after 1 January 2021

§ 14:4 Geographical jurisdiction of the English courts

§ 14:5 Jurisdiction of the English courts in personam—Jurisdiction is based on service of process on the defendant, but subject to qualifications

§ 14:6 —The extent of the jurisdiction of England and Wales: internal waters, the territorial sea and beyond

§ 14:7 —Extent of the territorial area on land

§ 14:8 —Extent of the territorial area at sea

§ 14:9 —Beyond the territorial sea

§ 14:10 —Jurisdiction based on presence within the jurisdiction

§ 14:11 —English-registered companies

§ 14:12 —Service out of the jurisdiction (1): the “gateways”

§ 14:13 — —Contract claims

§ 14:14 — —Tort claims

§ 14:15 — —Miscellaneous other causes of action

§ 14:16 — —Miscellaneous other cases not dependent on the cause of action

§ 14:17 —Service out in collision cases (2): specific restrictions on collision jurisdiction in personam

§ 14:18 —Jurisdiction in personam arising from proceedings in rem

§ 14:19 —Limitation proceedings: a separate jurisdiction regime

§ 14:20 Jurisdiction of the English courts in rem

§ 14:21 Matters relating to jurisdiction both in personam and in rem—Submission to jurisdiction

§ 14:22 —Agreement to English jurisdiction

§ 14:23 —Declining jurisdiction—Agreed exclusive jurisdiction elsewhere

§ 14:24 — —Arbitration agreed

§ 14:25 — —Forum non conveniens

§ 14:26 — —Forum non conveniens as a reason to stay an action properly brought

§ 14:27 — —Forum non conveniens and service out of the jurisdiction

§ 14:28 — —Proceedings abroad

- § 14:29 —Anti-suit injunctions
- § 14:30 ——Suit in breach of an exclusive English jurisdiction agreement
- § 14:31 ——Suit otherwise oppressive
- § 14:32 ——Forum non conveniens and anti-suit relief

**Chapter 15. The Applicable Law**

- § 15:1 Introduction
- § 15:2 —“English Admiralty law”
- § 15:3 —“Foreign law”
- § 15:4 Collisions on the high seas
- § 15:5 —Liability as between two vessels
- § 15:6 —Liability within the same vessel
- § 15:7 ——Contract claims
- § 15:8 ——Tort claims
- § 15:9 ——Mandatory regimes
- § 15:10 —Liability where vessel collides with fixed structure on the high seas
- § 15:11 Collisions in foreign territorial waters—Liability as between two vessels in territorial waters
- § 15:12 —Collision between vessel and fixed structure
- § 15:13 —Foreign territorial waters: events entirely within one vessel—Passengers and crew against carrying vessel
- § 15:14 ——Cargo against carrying vessel
- § 15:15 Collisions in English territorial waters
- § 15:16 The application of foreign law: substance and procedure
- § 15:17 —“The basis and extent of liability, including the determination of persons who may be held liable for acts performed by them” (Rome II art.15(a))
- § 15:18 —“The grounds for exemption from liability, any limitation of liability and any division of liability” (Rome II art.15(b))
- § 15:19 —“The existence, the nature and the assessment of damage or the remedy claimed” (Rome II art.15(c))
- § 15:20 —“Within the limits of powers conferred on the court by its procedural law, the measures which a court may take to prevent or terminate injury or damage or to ensure the provision of compensation” (Rome II art.15(d))
- § 15:21 —“Persons entitled to compensation for damage sustained personally” (Rome II art.15(f))
- § 15:22 —“Liability for the acts of another person” (Rome II art.15(g))
- § 15:23 —“The manner in which an obligation may be extinguished and rules of prescription and limitation, including rules relating to the commencement, interruption and suspension of a period of prescription or limitation” (Rome II art.15(h))
- § 15:24 —The burden of proof (Rome II art.22)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 15:25 “Overriding mandatory provisions” and the effect of conventions on particular areas of law—“Overriding mandatory provisions”
- § 15:26 —Areas of law affected by international conventions
- § 15:27 —Matters governed by the Collision Convention 1910
- § 15:28 ——Fault liability and the burden of proof
- § 15:29 ——Division of liability and contribution
- § 15:30 ——Collision time-bar
- § 15:31 —Matters governed by the Limitation Convention 1976
- § 15:32 —Matters governed by the Civil Liability Convention 1992 and other pollution conventions
- § 15:33 —Liability in rem and the Arrest Convention 1952
- § 15:34 —Carriage of passengers and the Athens Convention 1974

**Chapter 16. Practice and Procedure**

- § 16:1 Introduction
- § 16:2 —Stage 1: Jurisdiction and security
- § 16:3 —Stage 2: Apportionment of liability
- § 16:4 —Stage 3: Assessment of damages
- § 16:5 —Stage 4: Enforcement
- § 16:6 Limitation
- § 16:7 Compulsory commencement in the Admiralty Court
- § 16:8 Definition of ‘collision claim’
- § 16:9 Transfer to the county court
- § 16:10 Other potential claims
- § 16:11 —Hull claims
- § 16:12 —Cargo claims
- § 16:13 —Claims for loss of life or personal injuries
- § 16:14 —Claims in respect of salvage or general average
- § 16:15 —Pollution claims
- § 16:16 —Limitation claims
- § 16:17 Co-ordination of the various claims
- § 16:18 —Counterclaims
- § 16:19 —Stay of the original claim pending provision of security
- § 16:20 —Multiple parties
- § 16:21 —Consolidation
- § 16:22 —Cargo claims and claims for death and personal injuries are usually deferred until after the hull claims
- § 16:23 The practice in liability claims
- § 16:24 —Issue of the claim form
- § 16:25 —Particulars of claim
- § 16:26 —Sister ship claims
- § 16:27 —Issue of claim form by electronic filing
- § 16:28 —Initial case management

§ 16:29 —Service of the claim form

§ 16:30 —Acknowledgment of issue or service of the claim form

§ 16:31 —Arrest of the vessel

§ 16:32 —The application for an arrest

§ 16:33 —Caution against arrest

§ 16:34 —The declaration

§ 16:35 —Execution of the warrant of arrest

§ 16:36 —A caution against release

§ 16:37 —Property under arrest

§ 16:38 —Wrongful arrest

§ 16:39 —Arrest of the wrong ship

§ 16:40 —Release of the vessel

§ 16:41 —Security

§ 16:42 —Survey, appraisalment or sale of the vessel pendente lite

§ 16:43 —Discharge of security

§ 16:44 —Freezing injunctions

§ 16:45 —Pleadings

§ 16:46 —Collision statements of case

§ 16:47 —Part 1 of the collision statement of case

§ 16:48 —Part 2 of the collision statement of case

§ 16:49 —Further statements of case

§ 16:50 —Judgment in default of filing a collision statement of case

§ 16:51 —A view

§ 16:52 —Requests for information

§ 16:53 —Disclosure of electronic track data (including pre-action disclosure)

§ 16:54 —Disclosure of documents (other than electronic track data)

§ 16:55 —The hearing of a case management conference

§ 16:56 —Preparation for the case management conference

§ 16:57 — —Disclosure report

§ 16:58 — —Costs budgets

§ 16:59 — —Case management conference documents

§ 16:60 —The hearing of a case management conference

§ 16:61 —Split trial of liability and apportionment and quantum

§ 16:62 —Costs management

§ 16:63 —Pleadings

§ 16:64 —Disclosure

§ 16:65 —Witness statements

§ 16:66 —Expert evidence

§ 16:67 —No expert evidence on seamanship and navigation

§ 16:68 —Application for permission to call expert evidence other than in relation to navigation and seamanship

§ 16:69 —Matters on which expert evidence is commonly adduced

§ 16:70 —Interpretations of traces from course recorders

§ 16:71 —Speed and angle of blow

§ 16:72 —Authenticity of documents

§ 16:73 —Interaction

§ 16:74 —Navigation and seamanship

§ 16:75 —The role of nautical assessors

§ 16:76 —Practice in relation to nautical assessors

§ 16:77 —Plotting

§ 16:78 —Photographs

§ 16:79 —Evidence on commission

§ 16:80 —Evidence by video link or other remote means

§ 16:81 —Conducting part of the trial abroad

§ 16:82 —Date and place of trial

§ 16:83 —Progress monitoring

§ 16:84 —Hearsay notices

§ 16:85 —Preparations for the trial

§ 16:86 —Trial of liability and apportionment

§ 16:87 —The court

§ 16:88 —The oral opening statements

§ 16:89 —Evidence

§ 16:90 —Admissions

§ 16:91 —Documentary evidence

§ 16:92 —Bell books

§ 16:93 —Scrap logs

§ 16:94 —Notebooks

§ 16:95 —Fair logs

§ 16:96 —Passage plans

§ 16:97 —Working charts

§ 16:98 —AIS recordings

§ 16:99 —Electronic charts

§ 16:100 —Voyage data recorder

§ 16:101 —Course record

§ 16:102 —Engine data logger printout

§ 16:103 —Protests

§ 16:104 —Other statutory provisions for admitting documentary evidence

§ 16:105 —Real evidence

§ 16:106 —Oral factual evidence

§ 16:107 —Expert evidence

§ 16:108 —Documentary expert evidence

§ 16:109 —Oral expert evidence

§ 16:110 —Closing submissions

§ 16:111 —Judgment

§ 16:112 —Limitation

§ 16:113 —Limitation as a defence or counterclaim

§ 16:114 —The nature of the right to limit

§ 16:115 —Procedure in a limitation claim  
 § 16:116 —Jurisdiction  
 § 16:117 —Admission of liability  
 § 16:118 —The first stage of a limitation action  
 § 16:119 —The limitation fund  
 § 16:120 —Constituting a limitation fund by providing security  
 § 16:121 —The second stage of a limitation action  
 § 16:122 Assessment of damages  
 § 16:123 —Damages are usually assessed by the Admiralty Registrar assisted, if necessary, by merchants  
 § 16:124 —Procedure on a reference  
 § 16:125 Execution  
 § 16:126 Appeals  
 § 16:127 —Assessors  
 § 16:128 —New head of blame  
 § 16:129 —Apportionment  
 § 16:130 —The Admiralty Registrar

**Chapter 17. Time-Bars and Limitation**

**I. Introduction**

§ 17:1 Generally

**II. Inter-Vessel Claims Arising Out of Collisions, Etc: Merchant Shipping Act 1995 s.190**

§ 17:2 Time-bar under the Merchant Shipping Act 1995 s.190  
 § 17:3 Time-bar under the Merchant Shipping Act 1995 s.190: qualifications  
 § 17:4 Time-bar under the Merchant Shipping Act 1995 s.190: discretionary extension under s.190(5)  
 § 17:5 —Good reason  
 § 17:6 —Discretion  
 § 17:7 Time-bar under the Merchant Shipping Act 1995 s.190: extension available as of right under s.190(6)  
 § 17:8 Time-bar under the Merchant Shipping Act 1995 s.190: claimants under disability and cases of fraud or concealment  
 § 17:9 Time-bar under the Merchant Shipping Act 1995 s.190: extension of the validity of a claim form

**III. Crew Claims**

§ 17:10 Crew injuries

**IV. Passenger Claims**

§ 17:11 Injury to passengers

**V. Cargo Claims**

§ 17:12 Generally

**VI. Maritime Liens: Loss by Passage of Time**

§ 17:13 Generally

§ 17:14 The application of laches

**Chapter 18. Costs**

§ 18:1 Costs management  
 § 18:2 Costs budgets  
 § 18:3 The statutory power to award costs  
 § 18:4 Non parties  
 § 18:5 The Crown  
 § 18:6 The exercise of the power to award costs in the Admiralty Court  
 § 18:7 The general rule in collision cases  
 § 18:8 Basis of assessment  
 § 18:9 Gathering evidence  
 § 18:10 Arrest of wrong ship  
 § 18:11 Costs of excessive security  
 § 18:12 Examples of costs orders in a collision claims  
 § 18:13 Offers to settle a collision claim  
 § 18:14 Costs of two defendants  
 § 18:15 Admissions  
 § 18:16 Actions by cargo owners  
 § 18:17 Personal injury  
 § 18:18 Costs of a reference  
 § 18:19 Limitation actions  
 § 18:20 Costs of appeal  
 § 18:21 Interest on costs  
 § 18:22 Security for costs

**Chapter 19. Criminal Liability**

§ 19:1 Generally  
 § 19:2 Criminal damage to ships, etc.  
 § 19:3 Offences in connection with lighthouses, buoys, beacons, etc.  
 § 19:4 Conduct endangering ships, structures or individuals  
 § 19:5 Failure to obey Collision Regulations  
 § 19:6 Rules of Good Seamanship  
 § 19:7 Duties to assist ships  
 § 19:8 Safety on ships  
 § 19:9 Unsafe ships  
 § 19:10 Documents and reports relating to collisions

- § 19:11 Enquiries
- § 19:12 Pollution
- § 19:13 Pilotage
- § 19:14 Jurisdiction and procedure

**Chapter 20. Maritime Investigations and Inquiries**

- § 20:1 Introduction
- § 20:2 Shipping inquiries
- § 20:3 Marine accident investigations
- § 20:4 —Legal framework
- § 20:5 —Operation
- § 20:6 —Admissibility of MAIB reports in civil proceedings
- § 20:7 Formal investigations
- § 20:8 —The court
- § 20:9 —The powers of the wreck commissioner
- § 20:10 —The duties of the wreck commissioner
- § 20:11 —Re-hearings
- § 20:12 —The hearing of a formal investigation
- § 20:13 —Preparation
- § 20:14 —Parties
- § 20:15 —Evidence
- § 20:16 —Procedure
- § 20:17 —Appeals
- § 20:18 —Effect on civil litigation
- § 20:19 Disciplinary inquiries involving officers
- § 20:20 —Unfitness
- § 20:21 —Serious negligence
- § 20:22 —Failing to give information or assistance
- § 20:23 —The court
- § 20:24 —Powers
- § 20:25 —Duties
- § 20:26 —Procedure
- § 20:27 —Re-hearings or appeals
- § 20:28 —Disciplinary powers involving other seamen
- § 20:29 —Powers to obtain evidence
- § 20:30 —Restoration of certificates
- § 20:31 Death or injury inquiries

**Appendices**

- Appendix A. United Nations Convention on the law of the sea (UNCLOS): International Maritime Organizations (IMO)
- Appendix B. The Merchant Shipping (Distress Signals and Prevention of Collisions) Regulations 1996

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- Appendix C. ASG Wordings
- Appendix D. Vessel Traffic Services (VTS)
- Appendix E. Interaction Between Vessels and Their Environment
- Appendix F. Ships' Routeing
- Appendix G. Ship Manoeuvring
- Appendix H. Navigational Charts and Data
- Appendix I. Automatic Radar Plotting Aids (ARPA)
- Appendix J. Positioning, Navigation, and Timing (PNT)
- Appendix K. Automatic Identification Systems (AIS)
- Appendix L. RADAR Captain N. Cockcroft
- Appendix M. Bridge Navigation Watch Alarm Systems (BNWAS)
- Appendix N. Velocity Sensors—The Compass (Direction), the Log (SPEED)
- Appendix O. The Automatic Pilot
- Appendix P. Voyage Data Recorders
- Appendix Q. Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS)

**Table of Cases**

**Index**

where more than one vessel was at fault has varied over this period. Secondly, the duty for ships in collision to stand by and exchange particulars after the collision has evolved in parallel to the evolution of the Collision Regulations.<sup>10</sup>

### III. PERIOD I—RULES BEFORE 1840

#### § 6:3 Generally

Many years before the rule of the road at sea was regulated by Act of Parliament, the practice of seamen had established rules to enable approaching ships to keep clear of each other. These rules, which are the foundation of those now in force, were well established by custom, and formed part of the general maritime law recognised and enforced by the Admiralty Court.

#### § 6:4 Leeward vessel becomes stand-on vessel

In "A Book of Orders for the War both by Sea and Land", written by Thomas Audley at the command of King Henry VIII in about 1530,<sup>1</sup> an article directs that no captain shall take the wind of an admiral except by necessity, and the Earl of Warwick's Sailing Instructions of 1645,<sup>2</sup> and the Duke of York's Sailing Instructions of about 1670 both contain an article to similar effect. The rule that a ship with the wind free must give way to a ship close-hauled appears to have been first recognised by the courts in Lord Erskine's time, "in a case tried at Guildhall before Mr Justice Buller". In 1815, the rule was held to be that:

The law imposes on the vessel having the wind free, the obligation of taking proper measures to get out of the way of a vessel that is close hauled, and of shewing that it has done so, if not, the owners of it are responsible for the loss which ensues.<sup>3</sup>

The rule was justified on the relative convenience of the windward vessel taking avoiding action, as against the leeward vessel losing ground. In 1828, the rule was stated:

The ship which has the wind at large may go either to leeward or to windward but, as a general rule, she ought to expect that the ship which is

<sup>10</sup>Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862 s.33; Merchant Shipping Act 1871 s.9. Merchant Shipping Act 1873 s.16; Merchant Shipping Act 1894 s.422; Merchant Shipping Act 1995 s.92.

#### [Section 6:4]

<sup>1</sup>Harl. MSS. 309, f.10, in Hodges and Hughes, *Select Naval Documents* (Cambridge University Press, 1922).

<sup>2</sup>Ad. Ct. Ree Miscell. bundle 56.

<sup>3</sup>*The Woodrop-Sims* (1815) 2 Dods 83 at [86]–[87].

close-hauled will keep to windward, and therefore she ought to go to leeward, unless it is quite clear that she can go to windward with safety.<sup>4</sup>

In *Jamieson v Drinkald*,<sup>5</sup> expert evidence as to the custom was heard. The judge had "the assistance of two Brethren of the Trinity House, to explain the duties of the masters of both ships"; the custom was evidently recognised by the elder brethren.

#### § 6:5 Port tack rule not recognised

Neither in Audley's "Book of Orders", nor the Earl of Warwick's or the Duke of York's Sailing Instructions, nor in any of the pleadings or sentences of the seventeenth centuries, is there any trace of the "port tack" rule. The earliest reported reference appears in submissions in *The Resolution*<sup>1</sup> decided in 1789. The "rule" that a vessel on the port tack should keep out of the way of another on the starboard tack was said to have been framed by Lord Howe in America seven or eight years previously. However, the Trinity Masters declined to recognise it as a rule of navigation and it was not then a generally recognised custom. The rule was later relied on by the claimant owners of *The Susan* in *The Chester*,<sup>2</sup> but the case was instead decided on the basis: (i) that *The Chester* admitted she had had the wind free, and was accordingly obliged to keep clear of *The Susan* which had been close-hauled; and (ii) that she had kept an improper look-out. Accordingly, it was irrelevant which tack *The Susan* had been on, the material fact was that she had been close-hauled. Although the port tack rule was stated in at least one contemporary instruction book for sailors as being general practice,<sup>3</sup> it is unclear whether the rule was judicially approved before the Trinity House Sailing Regulations of 1840. The cases reported before 1840 where sailing vessels were on opposite tacks all appear to have been decided either on the basis that one vessel had had the wind free, or there had been a negligent look-out; this indicates that the port tack rule had not then been recognised.

<sup>4</sup>*Handaysyde v Wilson* (1828) 3 C. & P. 528.

<sup>5</sup>*Jamieson v Drinkald* (1826) 5 L.J.C.P. (O.S.) 30.

#### [Section 6:5]

<sup>1</sup>*The Resolution*, Mars. Ad. Cas. 332.

<sup>2</sup>*The Chester* (1836) 3 Hagg. 316.

<sup>3</sup>R.H. Dana, *The Seaman's Manual* (Moxton 1841), p.211.

## IV. PERIOD II—1840 TO 1846

## § 6:6 Generally

In 1840 the London Trinity House promulgated regulations<sup>1</sup> setting out recognised rules based on existing practice for sailing vessels and two new rules for steamships. The provisions for steamships were as follows:

When steam vessels on different courses must unavoidably or necessarily cross so near that by continuing their respective courses there would be a risk of coming into collision, each vessel shall put her helm to port,<sup>2</sup> so as always to pass on the larboard side of each other.

A steam vessel passing another in a narrow channel must always leave the vessel she is passing on the larboard hand.

The regulations for sailing ships included the rule that a vessel on the port tack give way to a vessel on starboard, where both were close-hauled. Additionally, a rule stipulated that where two sailing vessels both having the wind free appeared at risk of collision, both would put their helms to port.

These regulations had no statutory authority, nor were they rules of law, but were recognised and enforced by the Admiralty Court.<sup>3</sup> They were authoritative evidence of what seamen ought to do in circumstances in which the regulations were applicable,<sup>4</sup> but the primary rule was to avoid a collision, if it could be done with safety.<sup>5</sup> During this period the result of disregarding the regulations on the rights and liabilities of shipowners depended on principles of law unmodified by legislative enactment.

## V. PERIOD III—1846 TO 1851

## § 6:7 Early penalties for infringements

Section 9 of the Steam Navigation Act 1846 enacted the substance of

## [Section 6:6]

<sup>1</sup>See 1 Wm. Rob. 488 for text.

<sup>2</sup>Old helm orders result: the vessel would go to starboard.

<sup>3</sup>Other bodies, such as port authorities, also made regulations for collisions, e.g. Liverpool, where the locally applicable regulation was a steamship at risk of collision to starboard her helm, the opposite of the Trinity House regulations. This divergent practice was the cause of several casualties. See "Report of Select Committee on Shipwrecks" 1843, House of Commons. However, the Admiralty Court enforced the Trinity House regulations.

<sup>4</sup>*The Duke of Sussex* (1841) 1 Wm. Rob. 274; *The Unity* (1856) Sw. 101; *The Hope* (1840) 1 Wm. Rob. 154; *The Immaganda Sara Clasina* (1850) 7 Not. of Cas. 582, 8 Moo P.C. 85; *The Friends* (1843) 1 Wm. Rob. 484; 4 Moo. P.C. (1844) c.314.

<sup>5</sup>*The Test* (1847) 5 Not. of Cas. 276.

the new Trinity House rules for steamships, with some elaborations. They were made statutory obligations and a penalty was imposed on masters who disobeyed them. In this statute the starboard side of narrow channels rule appears specifically for the first time.

Under the statute the Admiralty Regulations of 1848<sup>1</sup> as to lights were promulgated. Observance of the Admiralty Regulations was enforced by a penalty on masters and by a provision<sup>2</sup> that the owner of a vessel in breach of them in rivers or narrow channels, or in the sea within 20 miles of Great Britain, should not be entitled to recover any damages which might be sustained by such vessel in consequence of any other vessel running foul of her at night. In other respects during this period the rights and liabilities of shipowners remained unaltered if negligence caused damage by collision, liability and a corresponding right to recover arose.

## VI. PERIOD IV—1851 TO 1863

## § 6:8 Penalties for infringements enlarged

By the Steam Navigation Act 1851, the statutory rules for steamships enacted in the Act of 1846 were repealed, but, in substance, re-enacted in different terms, and continued in force until repealed by the Merchant Shipping Repeal Act 1854,<sup>1</sup> and replaced by the rules enacted in the Merchant Shipping Act 1854,<sup>2</sup> under which the port to port rule was applied to all ships, steam and sailing, but the starboard side of narrow channels rule was continued in force for steamships only. In each of these Acts, powers to make regulations were conferred, and under them Admiralty Regulations respecting lights for both steamships and sailing vessels under way were issued in 1852,<sup>3</sup> and 1858,<sup>4</sup> and in the latter year regulations respecting fog signals, lights for pilot vessels and vessels at anchor were added. As in the last period, there appears to have been no direct statutory injunction to obey the regulations. During this period the liabilities of owners for breaches of regulations remained as before, but their rights were curtailed by sections enacted both in the Steam Navigation Act 1851, and the Merchant Shipping Act 1854, to the effect that if a collision was occasioned by the non-observance of any of

## [Section 6:7]

<sup>1</sup>Under powers given in Admiralty Regulations 1848 s.10; *The London Gazette* 11 July 1848, 29 May 1849. These rules ordered masthead and red and green port and starboard lights for steamships, and are substantially similar to those now in force.

<sup>2</sup>Admiralty Regulations 1848 s.12.

## [Section 6:8]

<sup>1</sup>Merchant Shipping Repeal Act 1854 s.3 and Sch.

<sup>2</sup>Merchant Shipping Act 1854 ss.3, 4, 296, 297.

<sup>3</sup>*The London Gazette*, 4 May 1852 S.App. p.i.

<sup>4</sup>*The London Gazette*, 24 February 1858 S.App. p.vi.

the rules as to lights or navigation contained in or made under those Acts, the owner of the ship by which the rule was infringed should recover no damages for injury to his ship, unless it was proved that the departure from the rule was necessary.

Section 28 of the Steam Navigation Act 1851, provided:

If in any case of collision between two or more vessels it appear that such collision was occasioned by the non-observance of either of the foregoing rules with respect to the passing of steamers, or [the rule as to ships' lights made under the powers of the Act] . . . the owner of the vessel by which any such rule has been infringed, shall not be entitled to recover any recompense whatever for any damage sustained by such vessel in such collision, unless it appears to the court before which the case is tried that the circumstances of the case were such as to justify a departure from the rule, [etc.].

Section 298 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1854, provided:

If in any case of collision it appears to the court before which the case is tried that such collision was occasioned by the non-observance of any rule, [etc.] the owner of the ship by which such rule has been infringed shall not be entitled to recover any recompense whatever for any damage sustained by such ship in such collision, unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that the circumstances of the case made a departure from the rule necessary.<sup>5</sup>

The effect of these enactments was to abrogate the Admiralty Court rule, that a wrongdoing vessel should recover half her loss if the other ship was also in fault, in the case of a vessel which had unnecessarily infringed the statutory rules. This effect was probably not appreciated by the legislature.<sup>6</sup> In each case the question had to be tried whether the infringement was negligence contributing to the collision, and if it was so held, the infringing vessel was liable to the other, but could herself recover none of her damage where the other vessel was also to blame.

*Tuff v Warman*<sup>7</sup> was an action at common law, against a Trinity House pilot for negligence in navigating a steam vessel, *The Celt*, which was in collision in the Thames with the plaintiff's sailing barge. It was heard before Willes J and a jury. It was held in this and other cases,<sup>8</sup> upon the construction of these enactments, that though the claimant had infringed the regulations, and by his negligence had brought the ships into danger, yet if the defendant could by reasonable care have avoided the collision, the claimant could recover, as under such circumstances the collision was not "occasioned" by the non-observance of the rule. Where one ship,

<sup>5</sup>*The Juliana* (1857) Sw. 20.

<sup>6</sup>*The Swanland* (1855) 2 Ecc. & Ad. 107 at 110.

<sup>7</sup>*Tuff v Warman* (1857) 2 C.B. (N.S.) 740 on appeal (1858) 5 C.B. (N.S.) 573.

<sup>8</sup>*Morrison v General Steam Navigation Co* (1853) 8 Ex. 733; *The Vivid* (1856) Sw. 88, affirmed 10 Moo. P.C. 472, Cas; *The Aliwal* (1854) 18 Jur. 296; *The Telegraph*, *Valentine v Cleogh* (1854) 1 Sp. 427; *The Juliana* (1857) Sw. 20; *The Fairy* (1855) Sp. 298; *The Wansfell* (1855) 1 Sp. 271.

A, was in fault as a matter of seamanship for not keeping a look-out, and the other, B, was in fault for infringing the statutory rule, it was held that A could recover half her loss under the Admiralty rule of equal division of loss then in force<sup>9</sup> and that B could recover nothing.<sup>10</sup> But it was held that s.298 of the 1854 Act did not prevent the owner of cargo on board a ship infringing the statutory rule from recovering half his loss.<sup>11</sup>

The regulations in the Merchant Shipping Act 1854 did not apply to all collisions involving foreign vessels, and where they did not apply, the Admiralty Court applied the "law of nations" to judge whether there had been negligence in navigation. Hence in 1861, the Privy Council described the rules for sailing ships where the regulations did not apply to be:

... when two vessels are approaching each other nearly on the same course, and both have the wind free, each vessel is bound to port her helm and run to starboard of the other, but when one vessel is close-hauled, the running ship, that is the ship that has the wind free, is bound to make way for the close-hauled ship.<sup>12</sup>

In substance, this statement followed the rules stated in the 1854 Act, and effectively, this allowed a wider application of the Act to situations where statute might not apply.

## VII. PERIOD V—1863 TO 1873

### § 6:9 Statutory presumptions of fault

By the Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862,<sup>1</sup> the whole of the existing regulations, including such of the Trinity House Regulations as had not already been superseded, were expressly or impliedly repealed, and one complete code, as amended by the Order in Council,<sup>2</sup> of 9 January 1863,<sup>3</sup> was substituted from 1 June 1863. This enactment placed all the regulations on the same footing and made it a distinct breach of duty to disobey any one of them. This, it is submitted, made a material difference in the legal effect of disobedience to the regulations of 1863 from that which had followed from disobedience to earlier regulations, certainly in the case of the Trinity House Regulations, probably in the case of the Admiralty Regulations as to lights, etc, and possibly even of the rules enacted in previous statutes.

<sup>9</sup>See above.

<sup>10</sup>*The Aurora* (1860) Lush. 327.

<sup>11</sup>*The Milan* (1861) Lush. 388.

<sup>12</sup>*Williams v Gutch "The Chancellor and the Egyptian"* (1861) 15 E.R. 281; XIV Moore 202 at 207.

#### [Section 6:9]

<sup>1</sup>Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862 s.25 and Schs A and C.

<sup>2</sup>*The London Gazette*, 13 January 1863; Lush. App. pp.i and LXX ii.

<sup>3</sup>Made under Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862 s.25.

Section 298 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1854 was repealed, and thereby the Admiralty rule as to the division of damages where both ships were to blame was restored in the case of a vessel guilty of an infringement of the regulations. In lieu of the penalty imposed by that section it was enacted by s.29 of the Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862 that:

If in any case of collision it appears to the court before which the case is tried that such collision was occasioned by the non-observance of any regulation made by or in pursuance of this Act, the ship by which such regulation has been infringed shall be deemed to be in fault, unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that the circumstances of the case made a departure from the rule necessary.<sup>4</sup>

It is desirable in considering the Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862 s.29 and its equivalents in later legislation, to bear in mind the "Proviso to save special cases" contained in art.19 of the regulations of 1863, and the corresponding provisions,<sup>5</sup> which are in approximately similar terms, in subsequent regulations.<sup>6</sup> The terms of art.19 were as follows:

In obeying and construing these rules, due regard must be had to all dangers of navigation: and due regard must also be had to any special circumstances which may exist in any particular case rendering a departure from the above rules necessary in order to avoid immediate danger.

The rights of owners were restored by the Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862 s.29 to what they had been before 1851, but their liabilities were for the first time increased by legislation. How far these liabilities were increased is somewhat uncertain, for the question as to whether the infringement was negligence contributing to the collision had still to be tried, and until that question was decided adversely to the infringer, no presumption of fault arose.<sup>7</sup>

In *The Fenham*<sup>8</sup> a steamer sighted a sailing vessel on a misty evening after sunset, the sailing vessel carried no lights and the steamer was in fault for various reasons for the collision which ensued. At first instance, the sailing ship had been held not to blame, because with ordinary care the steamer might have avoided the collision. However, in the Privy

<sup>4</sup>The wording in this section seems to have been suggested by a passage in the judgment of Cockburn CL in *Tuff v Warman* (1857) 2 C.B. (N.S.) 740 on appeal (1858) 5 C.B. (N.S.) 573. Under this Act the following cases were decided: *The Fenham* (1870) 6 Moo. P.C. (N.S.) 501; L.R. 3 P.C. 212; *The Bougainville and James C. Stevenson* (1873) L.R. 5 P.C. 316; *The Palestine* (1865) 3 W.R. 111; *The Pennsylvania* (1870) 23 L.T. 55.

<sup>5</sup>"Articles" up to 1 January 1954, "rules" in the Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea which came into force on that date and subsequently.

<sup>6</sup>*The Memnon* (1889) 6 Asp. M.C. 488; 62 L.T. 84 at para.5-035 (r.2(b) of the present Collision Regulations).

<sup>7</sup>*The Voorwaarts and the Khedive* (1880) 5 App. Cas. 876 at 892, per Lord Blackburn.

<sup>8</sup>*The Fenham* (1870) 6 Moo. P.C. (N.S.) 501; L.R. 3 P.C. 212.

Council this decision was reversed on the ground that when it was proved that a vessel had not shown proper lights, the onus lay on her to show that the non-compliance with the regulations was not the cause of the collision, and this the sailing vessel had failed to do.

It is not apparent from the reports whether this decision proceeded on the ground that proof of the breach of the statutory duty to exhibit lights cast on the vessel, by which the regulation had been infringed, the onus of proving that the absence of lights had not contributed to the collision, or on the ground that the presumption of fault enacted by the Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862 s.29 caused the onus to shift. It is submitted<sup>9</sup> that the former is the ground of the decision, because the presumption of fault under s.29 only arose after it had been proved that the collision had been occasioned by the infringement. But even if this is so, the decision cannot now be regarded as of authority since *The Aeneas*,<sup>10</sup> in which *The Fenham*<sup>11</sup> was followed, was overruled by the House of Lords in *The Heranger*.<sup>12</sup> It would seem that the application of the doctrine in *Tuff v Warman*<sup>13</sup> as to the construction of the word "occasioned", used in the enactments in force in this and the previous period, prevented s.29 from having the effect which those who framed it wished, and that for this and other reasons, s.17 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1873,<sup>14</sup> which will be considered later,<sup>15</sup> was passed.

#### § 6:10 Failure to stand by

By s.33 of the Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862, "standing by" was made a statutory duty for the first time and a penalty<sup>1</sup> was imposed by the section:

In every case of collision between two ships it shall be the duty of the person in charge of each ship, if and so far as he can do so without danger to his own ship and crew, to render to the other ship, her master, crew, and passengers (if any), such assistance as may be practicable and as may be necessary in order to save them from any danger caused by the collision: In case he fails so to do, and no reasonable excuse for such failure is shown, the collision shall, in the absence of proof to the contrary, be deemed to have been caused by his wrongful act, neglect or default.

<sup>9</sup>With some hesitation in view of what Lord Blackburn said in *Voorwaarts and the Khedive* (1880) 5 App. Cas. 892 at 893.

<sup>10</sup>*The Aeneas* [1935] P. 128.

<sup>11</sup>*The Fenham* (1870) 6 Moo. P.C. (N.S.) 501; L.R. 3 P.C. 212.

<sup>12</sup>*The Heranger* [1939] A.C. 94.

<sup>13</sup>*Tuff v Warman* (1857) 2 C.B. (N.S.) 740, affirmed (1858) 5 C.B. (N.S.) 573.

<sup>14</sup>*The Voorwaarts and the Khedive* (1880) 5 App. Cas. 893, per Lord Blackburn.

<sup>15</sup>See Period VI at §§ 5:15 to 5:26.

#### [Section 6:10]

<sup>1</sup>Provision was also made for cancellation of certificates.

This provision was introduced into the statute by Lord Kingsdown in consequence of a case which came before him in the Privy Council; one ship, after a collision, had sailed away and left the other to perish.<sup>2</sup> Previous to the Act, however, the duty to render assistance, and the temptation to run away in the hope of escaping detection, and the recognised in the Admiralty Court. Defaulting vessels, though free from blame in other respects and successful in the suit, were ordered to pay the costs of the suit.<sup>3</sup>

The "person in charge" intended by the Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862 s.33 was held to be the master, although a compulsory pilot was on board.<sup>4</sup> If the master was below, the duty to stand by lay on the mate or other person in charge of the deck, until the master came on deck. If life or property was still in danger, the duty was then transferred to the master.<sup>5</sup> Where a collision occurred between a ship in tow and a third ship, it was said by Sir R. Phillimore that the law required the tug to stand by the ships in collision.<sup>6</sup> The section was also held to apply in the case of a collision with an open fishing boat.<sup>7</sup> It was held that a tug, whose tow was damaged in collision with a third ship for which the latter was in fault, was not precluded by the section from claiming salvage.<sup>8</sup>

### § 6:11 Failure to exchange particulars

By s.9 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1871, a duty was imposed upon the masters of vessels after collision, of exchanging names of vessels, port of registry or port or place to which each vessel belonged, and ports and places from which and to which each was bound. The same consequences as followed a failure to render assistance were to apply in the event of a breach of this duty.

## VIII. PERIOD VI—1873 TO 1911

### § 6:12 Amendments to the statutory presumptions of fault

During this period the power to make regulations for the prevention of collisions at sea was enacted by s.418(1) of the Merchant Shipping Act

<sup>2</sup>*The Hannibal and the Queen* (1867) L.R. 2 A. & E. 53 at 56; 1868, Hansard's Parl. Debates, 281.

<sup>3</sup>*The Celt* (1837) 3 Hag. Ad. 321.

<sup>4</sup>*The Queen and the Lord John Russell* (1869) L.R. 2 A. & E. 354.

<sup>5</sup>*Ex p. Ferguson and Hutchinson* (1871) L.R. 6 Q.B. 280.

<sup>6</sup>*The Hannibal and the Queen* (1867) L.R. 2 A. & E. 53.

<sup>7</sup>*Ex p. Ferguson and Hutchinson* (1871) L.R. 6 Q.B. 280.

<sup>8</sup>*The Hannibal and the Queen* (1867) L.R. 2 A. & E. 53, approved in *Owners of SS Melanie v Owners of SS San Onofre* [1925] A.C. 246 at 262. Other cases under s.33 are *The Lucia Jantina v The Mexican* (1864) Holt 130; *The Queen of the Orwell* (1863) 7 L.T. 839; *The Eliga and the Orinoco* (1864) Holt Adm. 98.

1894. The obligation to observe all the regulations imposed by s.27 of the Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862 was re-enacted in s.419(1) of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894, and remained the same as in the last period, and the rights of owners were not directly affected by legislation. Section 17 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1873,<sup>1</sup> however, which was in effect re-enacted by s.419(4) of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894, materially altered their liabilities. Section 419(4) was in the following terms:

Where, in a case of collision, it is proved to the court before which the case is tried that any of the collision regulations have been infringed, the ship by which the regulation has been infringed shall be deemed to be in fault, unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that the circumstances of the case made departure from the regulation necessary.

The change in the language of this enactment was made with the following objects: first, to disapply the ratio decidendi in *Tuff v Warman*; secondly, to render it unnecessary to have resort to an artificial rule as to the inference to be drawn from evidence<sup>2</sup>; thirdly, to enable the courts to adjudicate upon collision cases without the necessity of determining upon conflicting evidence the question of fact of whether or not an infringement of a regulation, applicable to the case, and that might possibly have contributed to the collision, did, in fact, contribute to the collision<sup>3</sup> and, lastly, to increase the stringency of the regulations.<sup>4</sup> The statute imposed on a vessel that had infringed a regulation which was prima facie applicable to the case, the burden of showing affirmatively that such infringement was necessary or could not possibly have contributed to the collision.<sup>5</sup> The court had to inquire into the facts in order to ascertain whether the infringement could possibly have contributed to the collision, for it was not sufficient to find that it did not contribute.

This arbitrary rule of law, in force between 1873 and 1911, required

#### [Section 6:12]

<sup>1</sup>A Queen's ship was held in fault under this section in *The Hoching and the Lapwing* (1881) 7 App. Cas. 512 but it is clear that s.419(c) did not apply to HM Ships: *The HMS Sans Pareil* [1900] P. 267. Quaere as to foreign sovereigns: *The Astrakhan* [1910] P. 172.

<sup>2</sup>As in *The Fenham* (1870) 6 Moo. P.C. (N.S.) 501; L.R. 3 P.C. 212. These two reasons for the alteration in the law are given by Lord Blackburn in *The Voorwaarts and the Khedive* (1888) 5 App. Cas. 893.

<sup>3</sup>*The Fanny M. Carvill* (1875) 13 App. Cas. 455; 2 Asp. M.C. 565, in court below *The Fanny M Curvill* (1872-75) L.R. 4 A. & E. 417 at 422 cited by Lord Blackburn in *The Voorwaarts and the Khedive* (1888) 5 App. Cas. 876 at 893, approved and followed by the Privy Council in *The Lapwing* (1881) 7 App. Cas. 512; *The Hibernia* (1874) 2 Asp. M.C. 454; *The Rondane* (1900) Asp. M.C. 106 (a steamship held in fault for not stopping and reversing, though whether the collision would have been avoided by her doing so was conjectural).

<sup>4</sup>*The Voorwaarts and the Khedive* (1888) 5 App. Cas. 876 at 901, per Lord Watson.

<sup>5</sup>*The Anselm* [1907] P. 151; 10 Asp. 438; *The Duke of Buccleuch* (1890) 15 P.D. 86, on appeal [1891] A.C. 310; *The Bellanoch* [1907] A.C. 269; *The Corinthian* [1909] P. 260.

the courts to hold a ship in fault for a collision, although no negligence in the ordinary sense was proved. And it will be seen below that this rule applied, not only where negligence was not proved but where it did not exist, and where those in charge of the ship were, as regards negligence, absolutely free from blame. Evidence directed to show that the infringement did not in fact contribute to the collision was excluded, and consideration of actual negligence was unnecessary.

Where a regulation which was material to the case was proved to have been infringed, as, for example, where one of the lights of the sued ship, which was open to the other ship, was proved to have been insufficient to satisfy the statute,<sup>6</sup> the onus was on the ship carrying the improper light to show, if she could, that the departure from the regulations was necessary,<sup>7</sup> or could not possibly have contributed to the collision.

In *The Englishman*,<sup>8</sup> a trawler had a light at the mast-head, but no side lights, as she ought to have had. She was not seen by anyone on board the other ship before the collision. The latter was held alone in fault upon the ground that there was no look-out, and that therefore the absence of the side lights on the trawler could not possibly have contributed to the collision.

Where a vessel failed to adduce such proof she was within the penalty of the Merchant Shipping Act 1873 s.17.<sup>9</sup> If she alleged the other ship to be also in fault, it lay on her to prove, if she could, that it was not her fault alone that caused the collision.<sup>10</sup>

In *The Love Bird*<sup>11</sup> a vessel which sailed from Dieppe some days before the regulations of 1880 came into force was held in fault for a collision which occurred after the regulations had come into force because she was not sounding and was not provided with a mechanical fog-horn. There was no proof that a mechanical horn could not have been procured at the port from which she sailed.

In *The Calypso and the Mississippi*,<sup>12</sup> however, a foreign ship came into the Mersey without having on board a second riding light, as required by the Mersey Rules. A collision occurred before the master,

<sup>6</sup>*The Duke of Buccleugh* (1890) 15 P.D. 86.

<sup>7</sup>*The Memnon* (1889) 6 Asp. M.C. 488; 62 L.T. 84, see per Lord Herschell at 85, § 5:19.

<sup>8</sup>*The Englishman* (1877) 3 P.D. 18. See also *The Chusan* (1885) 5 Asp. M.C. 476 and *The Argo* (1900) 9 Asp. M.C. 74.

<sup>9</sup>*The Hibernia* (1874) 2 Asp. M.C. 454; *The Arklow, Emery v Chichero* (1883) 9 App. Cas. 136; *The Vera Cruz (No.1)* (1884) 9 P.D. 88; *The Fenham* (1870) 6 Moo. P.C. (N.S.) 501; L.R. 3 P.C. 212 is a similar case under the Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Act 1862 s.29.

<sup>10</sup>*The Arklow* (1883) 9 App. Cas. 136.

<sup>11</sup>*The Love Bird* (1881) 6 P.D. 80.

<sup>12</sup>*The Calypso and the Mississippi* (1878) Ad. Ct. March 7 at 8, 9; cf. *The Chilian* (1881) 4 Asp. M.C. 473 where the use of a mouth fog-horn was excused.

who had gone ashore to get one, had returned to the ship. It was held that the circumstances made a departure from the regulations necessary within the meaning of s.17 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1873.

### § 6:13 The regulation infringed had to be one material to the case

The words of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894 s.419(4): "any of the collision regulations" were not construed literally. It was not an infringement of any regulation that brought the section into operation, but only an infringement of a regulation: "which was in the circumstances applicable".<sup>1</sup>

In *The Fanny M. Carvill*<sup>2</sup> it was held that the *Peru* was not in fault because her screens were seven inches short of the statutory length (three feet), it being clear that her lights were not in fact seen across her bow.

### § 6:14 A regulation was not infringed until there was an opportunity of complying with it

A regulation was not infringed, within the meaning of the statute, if those in charge of the vessel did not in fact know, and could not, with ordinary care, have known, that the regulation had come into operation.<sup>1</sup>

### § 6:15 Penalty strictly enforced if infringement proved

Although the literal interpretation of the statute was departed from in determining what was an infringement of the regulations within its meaning, the penalty was strictly enforced when infringement was proved. In *The Voorwaarts and the Khedive*<sup>1</sup> the House of Lords held that there might be an infringement of the regulations, although those in charge of the ship did all that could be expected of seamen of ordinary skill and nerve, and although they were guilty of no act which at common law, and apart from the statute, would amount to negligence.

In *The Voorwaarts and the Khedive*, steamships of 3,000 and 3,740 tons respectively were approaching each other at night north of Penang Island without risk of collision on nearly opposite and parallel courses,

#### [Section 6:13]

<sup>1</sup>*The Voorwaarts and the Khedive* (1880) 5 App. Cas. 876 at 901, per Lord Watson. See §§ 5:22, 5:23.

<sup>2</sup>*The Fanny M. Curvill* (1872-75) L.R. 4 A. & E. 417; cf. *The Acasta* (1925) 23 Ll. L. Rep. 25.

#### [Section 6:14]

<sup>1</sup>*The Voorwaarts and the Khedive* (1880) 5 App. Cas. 876 at 894, per Lord Blackburn.

#### [Section 6:15]

<sup>1</sup>*The Voorwaarts and the Khedive* (1880) 5 App. Cas. 876.

the green light of each being visible to the other on her starboard bow. At this time both vessels were going at full speed. When the vessels were somewhat less than a mile apart the *Voorwaarts* put her wheel hard-a-starboard and opened her red light to the *Khedive*. This was a wrong manoeuvre and caused risk of collision. Thereupon the captain of the *Khedive*, without easing his engines, put his wheel hard-a-port, and at the same moment gave the order to stand by the engines. One-and-a-half minutes afterwards he put his engines full speed astern. The collision occurred one-and-a-half minutes after this. The engines at the moment of the collision were going full speed astern. They ought to have been stopped and reversed, under the art.16 then in force,<sup>2</sup> as soon as the red light of the *Voorwaarts* appeared, at the moment when the order to put the *Khedive's* wheel hard-a-port was given. The absolutely right manoeuvre was therefore not adopted by the *Khedive*, and it was held by the House of Lords that, the "stop and reverse" rule having been departed from without the necessity provided for by art.19 of the 1863 Regulations, the *Khedive* was in fault under the statute. In the Court of Appeal it had been held that though the captain of the *Khedive* was wrong in not stopping and reversing at the moment when the *Voorwaarts's* red light was seen, yet that his error did not prove him to be deficient in ordinary care, skill or nerve, and that, therefore, the collision not having been caused by negligence of those on board the *Khedive*, the owners of the *Voorwaarts* were alone liable.

In the House of Lords it was held that the *Khedive*, having been within the operation of art.16, and there being no special circumstances (art.19) to justify a departure from the regulations in order to avoid immediate danger, she was by the words of the statute to be deemed in fault, and that the question whether or not her captain had been in fact guilty of negligence was immaterial. The *Voorwaarts*, which by her bad look-out and by putting her wheel to starboard had brought about risk of collision in the first instance, and had kept her engines going at full speed up to the moment of collision, was held in fault both in the Court of Appeal and the House of Lords. In final result, the judgment of the Admiralty Court was restored and the rule of equal division of loss applied.

From this case it seems clear that the House of Lords considered that the purpose of the legislature was to substitute a rigid adherence to the regulations for the discretion which a seaman was, under the previous law, at liberty to exercise and that a justification for the harshness of the new enactment was to be found in the number of collisions which would be avoided if a rigid and almost mechanical adherence to the

<sup>2</sup>"Every steamship when approaching another ship, so as to involve risk of collision shall slacken her speed or, if necessary, stop and reverse."

regulations was substituted for the uncertainty which is inseparable from an application depending upon the discretion of seamen.<sup>3</sup>

### § 6:16 Penalty inapplicable in special circumstances

The facts of *The Voorwaarts* and the *Khedive* did not call for a decision as to the effect of the statute, where the infringement of the regulations was, though unsuccessful as regards averting collision, not only not negligent but the only or the best chance of escaping collision.

In *The Benares*<sup>1</sup> the Court of Appeal was called upon to decide this point. It was held that in such a case *The Voorwaarts* and the *Khedive* did not apply, and that a ship was not to be held in fault under the statute because her captain did not comply with the letter of the regulations, if such non-compliance was the only chance of escaping collision. In such a case the court held that departure from the rules was "necessary in order to avoid immediate danger", within the meaning of art.23 of 1880,<sup>2</sup> and that therefore the penal clause of the statute did not apply.

In *The Benares*,<sup>3</sup> the steamship *Gerarda* observed a green light distant about three-quarters of a mile and bearing about a point on the port bow. Her wheel was put to port, to pass green to green. Very shortly afterwards the unlighted port side of the sailing ship *Benares* was observed. The wheel of the *Gerarda* was put hard-a-port and her engines were kept full speed ahead, but the *Benares* struck the starboard side of the *Gerarda* doing damage. It is clear<sup>4</sup> that the vessels had in fact been approaching port to port, that the green light of the *Benares* could be seen to port, and that she was without a red light. The following passage is from the judgment of Brett MR<sup>5</sup>:

When the *Benares's* green light and the green light alone was seen the *Gerarda* did no wrong by [porting her wheel], for it was impossible as it was then disclosed to her for her to see how immediate was the then danger of collision. The vessels however eventually came so close to each other that the actual position of things was discovered, the port side of the *Benares* without a red light becoming visible to those on the *Gerarda*. Under these

<sup>3</sup>Whether it was desirable or possible by Act of Parliament to fetter the exercise of a seaman's discretion in the throes of a collision has been questioned see *The Memnon* (1889) 59 L.T. at 291; (1889) 6 Asp. M.C. 488, per Lindley LJ.

#### [Section 6:16]

<sup>1</sup>*The Benares* (1883) 9 P.D. 16; 5 Asp. M.C. 171. See below for facts and excerpts from judgments. *The Benares* was followed in *The Sapphire and the Girdleness*, Ad. Ct., 27 February 1884.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. art.19 of the 1863 Regulations (para.5-018).

<sup>3</sup>*The Benares* (1883) 9 P.D. 16 5 Asp. M.C. 171.

<sup>4</sup>*The Benares* (1883) 5 Asp. M.C. 171 at 172.

<sup>5</sup>*The Benares* (1883) 9 P.D. 16 at 17.

circumstances what was the master of the *Gerarda* to do? By article 18<sup>6</sup> if there was nothing else in the circumstances, he ought to have stopped and reversed. But the rules of navigation are contained not in one article, but in all the articles, and article 23<sup>7</sup> is as much to be observed as article 18. The navigation of vessels is to be conducted with a regard to both of them. As I understand one part of *The Khedive*, if the *Benares* had put the *Gerarda's* officer in such a position that every reasonable man would have done what the officer of the *Gerarda* did, yet if the court could not come to the conclusion that the case was brought within article 23, the *Gerarda* would be held likewise to blame. But in this case the question is whether it is brought within article 23 and taken out of article 18? Was the necessity of the case such, and were the circumstances so special, that they rendered a departure from article 18 necessary? We are advised that these vessels were so placed that at the time when under ordinary circumstances article 18 would have been applicable the position was such that the only chance of escape was for the *Gerarda* to [port her wheel] and continue full speed ahead. There was therefore a necessity, within the meaning of article 23, for a departure from the rule laid down in article 18, and the facts take the case out of article 18. But then it has been argued that the danger referred to in article 23 is not the danger to either of the vessels approaching each other but to [sic] some outside danger. The decision of the House of Lords in *The Khedive* gives no countenance to any such contention as this, and there is nothing in that case to show that the present case is not within the meaning of article 23.

Bowen LJ, after disagreeing with the argument of counsel that the danger referred to in art.23 (of the 1880 Regulations) was "a risk other than that of collision alone, some peril by sea or from the land", said:

In truth, unless some reasonable force is given to article 23, and to the exception it contains, a captain will have to sail with his eyes open into the jaws of death. If he obeys article 18, let us assume that it is certain death for his passengers and crew, that he has only one chance still open to him, and that by disobeying the particular rule. Such a case would surely be one in which a departure from the rules becomes necessary, otherwise a captain's duty would be to obey article 18 and go cheerfully to the bottom of the sea with his ship and all on board sooner than take the one chance of safety still remaining to him. Such an interpretation of the regulations was never in my opinion intended by the House of Lords. I am of opinion that a departure from article 18 is justified when such departure is the one chance still left of avoiding danger which otherwise was inevitable.

In *The Memnon*,<sup>8</sup> on the other hand, it was held that necessity for departure from the rules had not been established and the principle which should guide the court in determining whether in any case the evidence establishes such necessity was clearly stated.

In *The Memnon*, a steamship of that name sighted, off the coast of Brazil, the mast-head and green lights of the steamship *San Salvador*,

<sup>6</sup>Cf. the regulations of 1880 and art.16 of the 1863 Regulations.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. art.19 of the 1863 Regulations and r.2(b) of the present Collision Regulations.

<sup>8</sup>*The Memnon* (1889) 6 Asp. M.C. 488; 62 L.T. 84.

distant about three miles and bearing about two-and-a-half points on the port bow. The *Memnon* kept her course and speed until the other vessel got within about three ships' lengths and was bearing about four points on the port bow. The *San Salvador* then suddenly ported her wheel, the *Memnon's* engines were immediately stopped, and the collision occurred. The *San Salvador* was held to blame. It was also held in the Court of Appeal that the best and most seamanlike course for the *Memnon* was to continue ahead, for had the *San Salvador* not ported her wheel she would have cleared by one-and-a-half lengths. But risk of collision was held to have arisen before the wrong helm action and therefore the Court of Appeal, affirming the judgment of Butt J, held that the *Memnon* was, under the statutory presumption of fault, also to blame for not stopping sooner in compliance with the regulation,<sup>9</sup> on the ground that the officer in charge of her was not justified in assuming, under the circumstances, that "the *San Salvador* would do what was right".

This decision was, in turn, affirmed by the House of Lords. Lord Herschell, in addressing the House, said<sup>10</sup>:

When once it is shown that it was brought home, or ought to have been brought home, to the mind of the master of a vessel, that the courses upon which the ships were approaching, and the circumstances, involved risk of collision, the onus is thrown upon him of justifying his not doing that which the rule prescribes . . . The question whether a departure was necessary or not must no doubt be determined by the court but it must be determined upon the point being raised, and upon some evidence being tendered to the court to show that to have followed the rule would have either created that very risk of collision which it was the purpose of the rule to avoid, or have increased instead of diminished the risk of collision.

This case must be distinguished from *The Otto and the Thorsa*,<sup>11</sup> where it was held that the one ship was justified in expecting the other to do the right thing (putting her wheel to starboard or ceasing to go to port), and therefore in not stopping and reversing, under the regulations then in force, until the collision had, in fact, become inevitable.

### § 6:17 Breaking down of fog-horn

In *The Chilian*,<sup>1</sup> the breaking down of a mechanical fog-horn was held to make a departure from the regulations necessary, and a ship sounding a mouth-horn under such circumstances was held not to be presumed in fault under the statute.

<sup>9</sup>Article 18: "Every steamship when approaching another ship so as to involve risk of collision shall slacken her speed, or stop and reverse if necessary."

<sup>10</sup>*The Memnon* (1889) 6 Asp. M.C. 488; 62 L.T. 84 at 490.

<sup>11</sup>*Wilson, Sons & Co v Currie (The Otto and the Thorsa)* [1894] A.C. 116.

### [Section 6:17]

<sup>1</sup>*The Chilian* (1881) 4 Asp. M.C. 473.

### § 6:18 Ships' lights: reasonable compliance with the regulations sufficient

It appears that what the law required in respect of the fixing and mechanical details of ships' lights was a reasonable compliance with the regulations. A very small departure from the letter of the regulations on these points was not an infringement within the meaning of the statute so as to bring the presumption into operation. This was the view taken by the court in the following case.

In *The Fire Queen*,<sup>1</sup> an obscuration by the starboard cathead of the green light to the extent at the distance in question of an arc of 212 or 3 degrees was held not to be an infringement: "What we must look to", said Butt J, "is whether there is a reasonable compliance with the regulations". The learned judge held also that the obscuration did not and could not have contributed to the collision but the value of the decision upon the first point is not, it is submitted, thereby lessened.

Having regard to the class of people for whose guidance the regulations were framed, and by whom they were worked, and also to the circumstances under which they were worked, it is difficult to suppose that the legislature could have intended anything more than a reasonable compliance with the regulations as to lights and sound signals.

In *The Glamorganshire*,<sup>2</sup> it was held that carrying the sidelights in the rigging, where it was impossible for them to be fixed with mathematical accuracy, did not bring the ship within the penalty of the statute.

So where lights had to be shifted from riding, towing, or fishing to under-way lights or vice versa, a ship would, probably, not have been held in fault under the statute because the change of lights was not instantaneous. As regards the steering and sailing rules, the decision in *The Voorwaarts and the Khedive*<sup>3</sup> shows that a stricter view was taken.

### § 6:19 Whether the presumption of fault applied where the collision was from the first inevitable

The regulations in force during this period, as at present, were "for preventing collisions at sea", and it would seem that, if that were their only object, where a collision was from the first inevitable, the regulations did not apply, and therefore could not be infringed. The point arose

#### [Section 6:18]

<sup>1</sup>*The Fire Queen* (1887) 12 P.D. 147; cf. *The General Birch* 6 Quebec L.R. 300, as to shape of lantern, *The HMS Sans Pareil* [1900] P. 267 at 276; *The Acasta* (1925) 23 Ll. L. Rep. 25.

<sup>2</sup>*The Glamorganshire* (1888) 13 App. Cas. 454; *The Gannet* [1900] A.C. 234; and *The Philadelphian* [1900] P. 262 are also decisions as to the position of lights.

<sup>3</sup>See § 5:16.

in *The Buckhurst*,<sup>1</sup> but the facts of that case made a decision of the point unnecessary. It seems, however, to have been the opinion of Sir R. Phillimore that the statute might apply, though the collision was inevitable. In *The Voorwaarts and the Khedive*, the opinions of the majority of the learned lords and the judgments of the Court of Appeal and Admiralty Division assume that the collision was not inevitable when the *Voorwaarts* first showed her red light. But Lord Blackburn<sup>2</sup> appears to have been of the opinion that the collision was then inevitable, and that the manoeuvre of the *Khedive*, though well adapted to lessen the force of the collision, being contrary to the regulations, placed her in the wrong under the statute. As pointed out above, there is some difficulty in supporting this view of the effect of the statute, if the only object of the regulations was the prevention of collisions. But in *The Voorwaarts and the Khedive* Lord Watson stated that the object of the "stop and reverse" rule was "to obviate the risk and minimise the results of collision".<sup>3</sup> A regulation having this object might well be infringed, where the collision, but not the damage, was from the first inevitable.

### § 6:20 Whether presumption applied where the infringement was in the agony of the collision

In *The Voorwaarts and the Khedive*, the captain of the *Khedive* deliberately elected to depart from the regulations. It is submitted that the decision of the House of Lords is not authority for the proposition that a ship would have been held in fault for a step taken in the agony of a collision and due entirely to the imminence of the danger. In the case, for example, of a sailing ship going about—"altering her course"—under the bows of a steamship, where the latter had approached her so close as to frighten her into doing something, the question arises, whether the sailing ship was to be held in fault under the statute? If she did not alter her course until the collision was inevitable it would seem that the statute did not apply at all.<sup>1</sup> If she stood on until the risk was so great that human nature could go no further, and then bore up or went about, it would seem reasonable to hold that her change of course at such a moment was not an infringement of the regulations, but rather an act caused by the imminence of the peril and the fault of the other ship.

#### [Section 6:19]

<sup>1</sup>*The Buckhurst* (1881) 6 P.D. 152.

<sup>2</sup>*The Voorwaarts and the Khedive* (1880) 5 App. Cas. 895.

<sup>3</sup>*The Voorwaarts and the Khedive* (1880) 5 App. Cas. 903 at 904. And see *Maclaren v Compagnie Francaise de Navigation a Vapeur* (1883) 9 App. Cas. 640 at 651 and 652.

#### [Section 6:20]

<sup>1</sup>See paras 4-081 et seq.