



# LAW OF MARINE INSURANCE

---

---

**SUSAN HODGES**



Cavendish  
Publishing  
Limited

# **LAW OF MARINE INSURANCE**

**Susan Hodges, LLB, LLM, PhD**  
**Lecturer in the Department of Maritime Studies**  
**and International Transport**  
**University of Wales**  
**Cardiff**



Cavendish  
Publishing  
Limited

---

First published in Great Britain 1996 by Cavendish Publishing Limited,  
The Glass House, Wharton Street, London WC1X 9PX  
Telephone: 0171-278 8000 Facsimile: 0171-278 8080

© Hodges, S 1996

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher and copyright owner.

The right of the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Any person who infringes the above in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Hodges, S  
Marine Insurance Law  
1. Insurance, Marine - Law and Legislation - England  
I Title  
344.2'06862

ISBN 1-85941-227-0

Printed and bound in Great Britain

*In memory of Professor FJJ Cadwallader*



## PREFACE

---

This book is designed primarily for postgraduate students following a taught course of study in the law of marine insurance. It will prove useful not only to postgraduate students in law and maritime studies, but also to persons involved in the field of marine insurance such as arbitrators, adjusters of claims, brokers, in-house lawyers, legal practitioners, marine claims officers and P&I Clubs.

The approach of the works of *Arnould, Ivamy, Templeman* and *O'May* are professionally orientated and, therefore, are not ideally suited to student use. Moreover, they are all outside the range of the average student pocket. With the exception of the recent work by *O'May*, none of these discuss the cases of the last decade, some of which have introduced significant changes to the law. The need for such a book has become obvious over the years, and this work is designed to fill this gap by offering a reasonably priced, medium sized reference work aimed at the postgraduate and profession alike.

The aim of this book is to state the law as clearly as possible and to show the relationships between the Marine Insurance Act 1906, case law, and the standard terms of the Institute Clauses. As it is not possible to refer to all the Institute Clauses, this work will focus mainly on the Clauses for hulls and cargo. Emphasis is given to areas of the law which have been found by students to be particularly problematic. Special attention is awarded to recent leading judicial rulings. The intention has been to state the law as it stands at October 1995. Although the introduction of the new Institute Time Clauses, Hulls, on 1 November 1995 delayed the completion of this work, it has nevertheless enabled the changes made to the 1983 version of the Clauses to be discussed. As it is anticipated that the 1983 Institute Clauses will eventually be replaced by the new Clauses, the 1995 Clauses are used as the basis of the text.

It is a great pleasure to record my indebtedness to my friends who have helped me in the preparation of this book. I wish to express my thanks to Ms J Reddy, Ms K Nicol and the staff of Cavendish Publishing Ltd for their assistance, patience and understanding throughout the production of this work, Mr P Clinch, Mr D Montgomery and the staff of the law library for their help in locating materials, and Professor J King for his support and encouragement. I am also greatly indebted to Mr J Moloney, Secretary of Lloyd's Underwriters' Association, for his invaluable assistance and the many interesting and stimulating discussions which have helped to clarify my thoughts on some of the issues involved. Finally, I owe a particular debt of gratitude to P Wylie, and my colleague, Professor E D Brown for without their assistance and intervention the writing of this book would not have been possible.

Dr Susan Hodges  
March 1996



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

---

All Institute Clauses are reproduced by kind permission of The Institute of London Underwriters and Witherby & Co Ltd. The authors and publishers also thank Lloyd's of London for permission to reproduce Lloyd's Standard Form of Salvage Agreement, and Comité Maritime International for permission to reproduce The York-Antwerp Rules 1994.





# CONTENTS

---

<i>Preface</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Table of Cases</i>	<i>xxi</i>
<i>Table of Statutes</i>	<i>xliii</i>
<b>1 CONTRACT OF INDEMNITY</b>	<b>1</b>
A CONTRACT OF INDEMNITY	1
Not a perfect contract of indemnity	2
GAMING AND WAGERING CONTRACTS	2
No insurable interest or expectation of acquiring such an interest	3
‘Honour’ or ppi policy	3
DOUBLE INSURANCE, CONTRIBUTION AND RETURN OF PREMIUM	5
Double insurance	5
Contribution	5
Return of premium	5
SUBROGATION	7
Definition of ‘subrogation’	7
Settlement of total loss	8
Settlement of partial loss	14
<b>2 INSURABLE INTEREST</b>	<b>15</b>
INTRODUCTION	15
A contract of indemnity	
DEFINITION OF INSURABLE INTEREST	15
OWNER OF SHIP	16
OWNER OF GOODS	16
Contingent and defeasible interests	17
OWNER OF FREIGHT	18
MORTGAGOR AND MORTGAGEE	18
Lender of money on bottomry and <i>respondentia</i>	19
INSURER	19
WHEN INTEREST MUST ATTACH	20
The insurable interest clause	20
Exceptions	21
<b>3 SUBJECT-MATTER INSURED</b>	<b>23</b>
INTRODUCTION	23
SHIP	23
The policy (MAR 91 Form) and the Clauses	24
GOODS	24
Deck cargo and living animals	24
‘Usage to the contrary’	25
Containers and packing materials	25

Loss of voyage or of the adventure	26
The Frustration Clause	27
The Institute Cargo Clauses (A), (B) and (C)	27
MOVEABLES	27
FREIGHT	28
Definition of 'freight'	28
Freight payable by a third party	28
Owner's trading freight	33
PROFIT	33
Profit on goods	34
Profit on charter	34
COMMISSION	35
DISBURSEMENTS	35
Double insurance	36
Disbursements Warranty Clause	36
Institute Time Clauses – Hulls Disbursements and Increased Value Clauses (total loss only, including excess liabilities)	36
SEAMEN'S WAGES	37
SHAREHOLDER	37
LIABILITY TO A THIRD PARTY	39
<b>4 TIME AND VOYAGE POLICIES</b>	<b>41</b>
A – TIME POLICY	41
A DEFINITE PERIOD OF TIME	
Time policy with an extension or cancellation clause	42
Time policy with a geographical limit	42
THE NAVIGATION CLAUSE	43
'At all times'	43
Towage and salvage warranty	43
The use of helicopters	44
Loading and discharging operations at sea	44
THE CONTINUATION CLAUSE	46
AUTOMATIC TERMINATION	46
Change of Classification Society	47
Change, suspension, discontinuance withdrawal or expiry of her class	48
Overdue periodic survey	50
Change of ownership, flag, transfer to new management, or charter on a bareboat basis, or requisition for title or use of the vessel	50
Return of premium	50
B – VOYAGE POLICY	51

VOYAGE POLICY ON SHIP	51
'From'	52
'At and from'	52
Implied condition as to commencement of risk	55
Change of voyage	58
Deviation	60
Delay in voyage	64
VOYAGE POLICY ON GOODS	64
Attachment of insurance	65
Continuance of insurance	65
Termination of insurance	66
<b>5 VALUED AND UNVALUED POLICIES</b>	<b>71</b>
A – VALUED POLICIES	71
AGREED VALUE IS CONCLUSIVE	71
'As between the insurer and assured'	74
Scrapping voyages	74
EXCESSIVE OVER-VALUATION	75
'In the absence of fraud'	75
Breach of utmost good faith	76
Wagering or gaming	76
Non-disclosure of material fact	77
'Subject to the provisions of this Act'	79
B – UNVALUED POLICIES	80
INSURABLE VALUE	80
Insurable value of ship	80
Insurable value of freight	81
Insurable value of goods or merchandise	81
Insurable value of any other subject-matter	82
<b>6 UTMOST GOOD FAITH, DISCLOSURE AND REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>83</b>
UTMOST GOOD FAITH	83
'Utmost'	83
Disclosure and representations	83
An 'overriding duty'	84
Reciprocal duties of utmost good faith	85
'May be avoided'	85
DUTY OF DISCLOSURE	85
When to disclose	86
Material circumstance	88
Materiality and avoidance	89
REPRESENTATIONS	92
Types of representations	93

<b>7 WARRANTIES</b>	95
A – GENERAL PRINCIPLES	95
MATERIALITY TO THE RISK	95
EXACT COMPLIANCE	96
NO DEFENCE FOR BREACH	98
Excuses under section 34(1)	99
BREACH IS IRREMIEDIABLE	99
CAUSAL CONNECTION NOT REQUIRED	99
AUTOMATIC DISCHARGE FROM LIABILITY	100
A condition precedent	100
Automatic discharge	102
The future of the contract	103
A ‘new approach’	104
WAIVER OF BREACH OF WARRANTIES	106
Waiver and estoppel	106
Held covered clause	107
B – EXPRESS WARRANTIES	108
FORM OF WARRANTY	108
Exception clauses	109
Descriptive warranty	110
Limitation of liability clause	110
EXAMPLES OF EXPRESS WARRANTIES	111
Express warranty of neutrality	111
Express warranty of good safety	112
Disbursements warranty	112
Towage and salvage warranty	112
The classification clause	113
Warranties on geographical limits of navigation	115
CONSTRUCTION OF WARRANTIES	120
The rule of <i>contra proferentum</i>	121
C – IMPLIED WARRANTIES	121
IMPLIED WARRANTY OF PORTWORTHINESS	122
IMPLIED WARRANTY OF SEAWORTHINESS	123
Implied warranty of seaworthiness in voyage policies	123
No implied warranty of seaworthiness in time policies	135
IMPLIED WARRANTY OF CARGOWORTHINESS	139
IMPLIED WARRANTY OF LEGALITY	139
Illegality under British law	140
Legality of the adventure	140
Legality in the performance of the adventure	141
Legal effect of breach	141
Breach of the implied warranty of legality cannot be waived	143

<b>8 THE CAUSE OF LOSS</b>	145
INTRODUCTION	145
THE RULE OF PROXIMATE CAUSE	145
The law before 1918	145
One cause of loss	147
More than one cause of loss	147
More than one proximate cause of loss	151
‘Subject to the provisions of this Act’	154
‘Unless the policy otherwise provides’	167
<b>9 MARINE RISKS</b>	173
INTRODUCTION	173
A – PERILS OF THE SEAS RIVERS LAKES OR OTHER	
NAVIGABLE WATERS	173
DEFINITIONS OF ‘PERILS OF THE SEAS’	174
Ordinary action of the winds and waves	176
Distinction between sea and land risks	177
Perils <i>of</i> the seas and perils <i>on</i> the seas	178
Frost damage	179
Collision is a peril of the seas	179
Unascertainable peril of the seas	180
PERILS OF THE SEAS AND NEGLIGENCE	180
Negligence of the master or crew	181
Negligence of the assured	183
PERILS OF THE SEAS AND WILFUL MISCONDUCT	185
Scuttling is not a peril of the seas	185
<i>The ICC (A), (B) and (C)</i>	187
PERILS OF THE SEAS AND BARRATRY	187
PERILS OF THE SEAS AND WEAR AND TEAR	188
PERILS OF THE SEAS AND UNSEAWORTHINESS	188
The ‘Unseaworthiness and Unfitness Exclusion Clause’ of the ICC	192
THE INSTITUTE CARGO CLAUSES	192
The ICC (A)	192
The ICC (B) and (C)	193
B – FIRE AND EXPLOSION	201
ACCIDENTAL, FORTUITOUS AND DELIBERATE FIRE	201
Fire negligently started by the master or crew	202
Fire wilfully started by the master or crew	203
Fire negligently started by the assured	204
Fire wilfully started by the assured	205
Fire wilfully started by a stranger	205
LOSS CAUSED BY PREVENTIVE ACTION	207
EXCEPTIONS OF LIABILITY	208
Inherent vice	208

C – VIOLENT THEFT BY PERSONS OUTSIDE THE VESSEL	209
DEFINITION OF THEFT	209
Violent theft	209
Persons from outside the vessel	210
Dishonest intention	210
INSTITUTE THEFT, PILFERAGE AND NON-DELIVERY CLAUSE	211
D – JETTISON	211
E – PIRACY	212
Definition of ‘piracy’	212
F – CONTACT WITH LAND CONVEYANCE, DOCK OR HARBOUR EQUIPMENT OR INSTALLATION	214
G – EARTHQUAKE, VOLCANIC ERUPTION OR LIGHTNING	214
H – ACCIDENTS IN LOADING DISCHARGING OR SHIFTING OF CARGO OR FUEL	214
I – ALL RISKS: THE ICC (A)	215
Meaning of ‘all risks’	215
Burden of proof	219
<b>10 EXCLUDED LOSSES</b>	221
INTRODUCTION	221
WILFUL MISCONDUCT OF THE ASSURED	221
Meaning of ‘wilful misconduct’	222
Wilful misconduct of ‘the assured’	226
Proof of wilful misconduct	228
DELAY	229
ORDINARY WEAR AND TEAR	231
ORDINARY LEAKAGE AND BREAKAGE	233
Ordinary leakage	233
Insurance against leakage	234
Ordinary breakage	235
INHERENT VICE OR NATURE	235
Meaning of ‘inherent vice’	235
‘Unless the policy otherwise provides’	242
<b>11 BURDEN AND STANDARD OF PROOF</b>	245
INTRODUCTION	245
A – PROOF OF LOSS BY PERILS OF THE SEAS	246
BURDEN OF PROOF ON THE PLAINTIFFS	246
Presumption of loss by an unascertainable peril of the seas	248
Standard of proof	253
The ‘Third Alternative’	254
THE DEFENCE	255
The defence of wilful misconduct	255

B – PROOF OF LOSS BY BARRATRY	259
PROOF OF CONSENT OR ABSENCE OF CONSENT	260
<i>The Issaias Rule</i>	261
<i>The Martiartu-Michael Rule</i>	263
A solution?	265
STANDARD OF PROOF OF COMPLICITY	269
No absolute standard of proof	270
C – PROOF OF LOSS BY FIRE	271
Standard of proof	272
<b>12 THE INCHMAREE CLAUSE</b>	<b>275</b>
INTRODUCTION	275
‘CAUSED BY’	276
BURSTING OF BOILERS	278
BREAKAGE OF SHAFTS	278
LATENT DEFECT IN THE MACHINERY OR HULL	279
Meaning of latent defect	279
Error in design	280
Latent defect and unseaworthiness	281
NEGLIGENCE OF MASTER OFFICERS CREW OR PILOTS	283
Negligence as the proximate cause of loss	284
Negligence of the assured	286
Shipowner acting as master, officer, crew or pilot	287
Negligence of master or crew and unseaworthiness	289
NEGLIGENCE OF REPAIRERS OR CHARTERERS	291
BARRATRY OF MASTER OFFICERS OR CREW	292
Introduction	292
Definition of barratry	292
The common law	292
Statutory definition of ‘barratry’	294
CONTACT WITH AIRCRAFT, HELICOPTER OR SIMILAR OBJECTS, OR OBJECTS FALLING THEREFROM	308
THE DUE DILIGENCE PROVISIO	308
Want of due diligence	308
Assured, owners, managers or superintendents or any of their onshore management	309
Proof of breach of proviso	316
<b>13 3/4ths COLLISION LIABILITY</b>	<b>313</b>
INTRODUCTION	313
The insured vessel	313
Third party liability	314



THE COLLISION LIABILITY CLAUSE	315
Collision	315
Liability	318
THIRD PARTIES (RIGHTS AGAINST INSURERS) ACT 1930	322
‘Pay to be paid’	323
THE PRINCIPLE OF CROSS-LIABILITIES	326
Single liability	326
Cross liabilities	327
THE SISTERSHIP CLAUSE	328
THE PARAMOUNT CLAUSE	328
<b>14 WAR AND STRIKES RISKS</b>	<b>331</b>
INTRODUCTION	331
Warranted free of capture and seizure	331
WAR, STRIKES, MALICIOUS ACTS AND RADIOACTIVE CONTAMINATION EXCLUSIONS OF THE ITCH(95) AND THE IVCH(95)	332
The paramount clause	332
The rule of proximate cause	333
WAR AND STRIKES COVER	335
‘War civil war revolution rebellion insurrection or civil strife arising therefrom, or any hostile act by or against a belligerent power’	335
‘Capture seizure arrest restraint or detainment, and the consequences thereof or any attempt thereat’	339
‘Derelict mines torpedoes bombs or other derelict weapons of war’	345
‘Strikers, locked-out workmen, or persons taking part in labour disturbances, riots or civil commotions’	346
‘Any terrorist or any person acting maliciously or from a political motive’	350
‘Confiscation and expropriation’	350
The frustration clause	351
<b>15 TOTAL LOSS</b>	<b>353</b>
INTRODUCTION	353
Notice of claim and tenders	353
Prompt notice	353
Automatic discharge from liability	354
A – ACTUAL TOTAL LOSS	354
WHERE THE SUBJECT-MATTER IS TOTALLY DESTROYED	355
A total wreck	355
Presumption of an actual total loss: missing ship	356
CEASE TO BE A THING OF THE KIND INSURED	357
Obliteration of marks	359

‘IRRETRIEVABLY DEPRIVED THEREOF’	359
RECOVERY FOR A PARTIAL LOSS	360
ACTUAL TOTAL LOSS OF FREIGHT	361
Payment of freight and delivery of goods	361
Constructive total loss of goods	362
B – CONSTRUCTIVE TOTAL LOSS	362
INTRODUCTION	362
Scheme of section 60	362
A complete definition	363
Types of constructive total loss	365
REASONABLE ABANDONMENT OF SUBJECT-MATTER INSURED	365
Actual total loss appearing unavoidable	366
Expenditure which would exceed its value	372
DEPRIVATION OF POSSESSION OF SHIP OR GOODS	373
Meaning of ‘deprived of possession’	374
Meaning of ‘unlikely’	375
Cost of recovery	378
DAMAGE TO SHIP	379
The value of the ship when repaired	379
The cost of repairing the damage	381
DAMAGE TO GOODS	389
Sections 60(1) and 60(2)(i)	389
Cost of repairing the damage	389
Cost of ‘forwarding’ the goods	390
EFFECT OF CONSTRUCTIVE TOTAL LOSS	391
Abandonment of the subject-matter insured	391
<b>16 PARTICULAR AVERAGE LOSS</b>	<b>401</b>
MEANING OF ‘PARTICULAR AVERAGE LOSS’	401
Particular average loss and general average loss	401
Particular average loss and particular charges	402
Particular average loss and salvage charges	403
Types of partial loss	403
PARTICULAR AVERAGE LOSS OF SHIP	403
The deductible clause	404
Measure of indemnity	405
The doctrine of merger	415
PARTICULAR AVERAGE LOSS OF GOODS	418
Total loss of part of the goods	418
Damage to the whole or part of the goods	419
Goods incapable of identification	421
PARTICULAR AVERAGE LOSS OF FREIGHT	421
General average loss and salvage charges	421
Total loss of part of the cargo	421

Substituted cargo	422
Goods carried in substituted ship	423
Measure of indemnity	423
<b>17 SALVAGE, GENERAL AVERAGE, AND SUE AND LABOUR</b>	<b>425</b>
INTRODUCTION	425
Particular average warranties	425
A – SALVAGE CHARGES	426
INTRODUCTION	426
DEFINITION OF ‘SALVAGE CHARGES’	427
Life salvage	427
An enhanced award for preventing or minimising damage to the environment	428
Meaning of ‘independently of contract’	429
Salvage and general average	430
Salvage and sue and labour	432
A PERIL INSURED AGAINST	433
EXCLUSIONS	434
Special compensation	435
Expenses or liabilities incurred by the assured	435
B – GENERAL AVERAGE	436
INTRODUCTION	436
DEFINITIONS OF ‘A GENERAL AVERAGE ACT’	437
General average contribution	439
Extraordinary sacrifice or expenditure	439
Voluntarily and reasonably made	441
Properly charged	441
Peril or danger	441
Common adventure	442
Avoidance of a peril insured against	443
Success	444
Owned by the same assured	445
LIABILITY OF THE INSURER	446
Distinction between sacrifice and expenditure	446
General average sacrifice	446
General average expenditure	447
AVERAGE ADJUSTMENT	449
Foreign adjustment	449
C – SUE AND LABOUR	453
INTRODUCTION	453
ASSURED AND THEIR SERVANTS OR AGENTS	454
TO AVERT OR MINIMISE A LOSS	455
LOSS COVERED BY THE POLICY	456
Loss caused by insured peril	456

Type of loss	457
Cargo insurance	460
REASONABLE MEASURES	461
ADDITIONAL COVERAGE	462
BREACH OF DUTY TO SUE AND LABOUR	463
Negligence of the assured	463
Negligence of the crew	465
Negligence before and after a casualty	467
Proximate cause of loss	468
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
1 Marine Insurance Act 1906	471
2 Marine Insurance (Gambling Policies) Act 1909	502
3 Third Parties (Rights against Insurers) Act 1930	504
4 Lloyd's Marine Policy [MAR 91]	507
5 Institute of London Underwriters – Companies Marine Policy [MAR 91]	511
6 Institute Time Clauses Hulls (1983) [ITCH(83)]	515
7 Institute Time Clauses Hulls (1995) [ITCH(95)]	527
8 Institute Time Clauses – Hulls – Restricted Perils (1995)	540
9 Institute Voyage Clauses (Hulls) (1995) [IVCH(95)]	553
10 Institute Cargo Clauses (A)	564
11 Institute Cargo Clauses (B)	569
12 Institute Cargo Clauses (C)	574
13 Institute Time Clauses, Freight (1995) [ITCF]	579
14 Institute Voyage Clauses, Freight (1995) [IVCF]	587
15 Institute Dual Valuation Clause	593
16 Institute Additional Perils Clauses-Hulls (1995)	594
17 Institute Warranties	595
18 Institute Malicious Damage Clause	596
19 Institute Theft, Pilferage and Non-Delivery Clause	597
20 Institute War and Strikes Clauses Hulls – Time (1995) [IWSC(H)]	598
21 Institute War Clauses (Cargo) [IWC(C)]	601
22 Institute Strikes Clauses (Cargo) [ISC(C)]	606
23 Institute Mortgagees Interest Clauses Hulls [IMIC]	610
24 The York-Antwerp Rules 1994	614
25 Lloyd's Standard Form of Salvage Agreement 1995 [LOF]	623
<i>Index</i>	633



## TABLE OF CASES

---

### A

Agenoria SS Co Ltd v Merchants Marine Insurance Co Ltd (1903) 8 Com Cas 212.....	406
Aitchison v Lohre (1879) 4 App Cas 755.....	426, 427, 431, 432, 433, 434, 454, 455, 461
Ajum Goolam Hossen & Co v Union Marine Insurance Co [1901] AC 362.....	249
Allgemeine Versicherungs-Gesellschaft Helvetia v Administrator of German Property [1930] 1 KB 672.....	11
Allen v Sugrue (1828) 8 B & C 561 .....	380
Allison v Bristol Marine Insurance Co (1876) 1 App Cas 209 .....	18, 33
<i>Alps, The</i> [1893] P 109 .....	32
Alston v Campbell (1799) 4 Bro Parl Cases 476 .....	19
Andersen v Marten [1908] AC 334 .....	360
Anderson v Morice (1875) LR 10 CP; (1870) 2 Asp MC 431 .....	34, 188, 249, 250
Anderson v Royal Exchange Assurance (1805) 7 East 38.....	357
Anderson v Wallis (1813) 2 M & S 240 .....	26
Anderson, Tritton & Co v Ocean SS Co (1884) 10 App Cas 107 .....	431, 436, 440, 441
Angel v Merchants' Marine Insurance Co [1903] 1 KB 811 .....	382
Anghelatos v Northern Assurance Co Ltd, <i>The Olympia</i> (1924) 19 LIL Rep 255.....	266
Anglis & Co v P & O Steam Navigation Co [1927] 2 KB 456.....	127
<i>Annie Hay, The</i> [1968] 1 Lloyd's Rep 141 .....	288
Anonima Petroli Italiana SpA and Neste Oy v Marluclidez Armadora SA, <i>The Filiatra Legacy</i> [1991] 2 Lloyd's Rep 337, CA.....	267, 270, 272
<i>Antigoni, The</i> [1991] 1 Lloyd's Rep 209, CA .....	127
<i>Aquacharm, The</i> [1982] 1 Lloyd's Rep 7 .....	127
Arbitration between Jamieson and The New Castle Steamship Freight Insurance Association, Re, An [1895] 2 QB 90 .....	31
Arcangelo v Thompson (1811) 2 Camp 620.....	296
Arrow Shipping Co v Tyne Improvement Comrs [1894] AC 508 .....	9
Asfar v Blundell [1896] 1 QB 123, CA.....	30, 34, 357, 362
Ashworth v General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corpn [1955] IR 268.....	138, 145, 150, 152, 159, 161, 163, 164
Astrovlanis Compania Naviera SA v <i>The Linard</i> , <i>The Gold Sky</i> [1972] 1 Lloyd's Rep 331, CA .....	228, 255, 257, 261, 454, 465, 466, 467, 469
Athel Line Ltd v Liverpool & London War Risks Insurance Association Ltd, <i>The Atheltemplar</i> [1946] 1 KB 117, CA.....	146, 150, 170, 337, 441
Athens Maritime Enterprises Corpn v Hellenic Mutual War Risks Association (Bermuda) Ltd, <i>The Andreas Lemos</i> [1982] 2 Lloyd's Rep 483 .....	209, 212, 213, 347, 348

Atlantic Maritime Co Inc v Gibbon [1953] 2 All ER 1086, CA .....	147, 150, 153, 352, 371
Attorney-General v Adelaide SS Co Ltd, <i>The Warilda</i> [1923] AC 292.....	170, 224, 334, 337
Attorney-General v Ard Coasters Ltd (The Ardgantock Case); Liverpool & London War Risks Insurance Association Ltd v Marine Underwriters of SS <i>Richard De Larrinaga</i> (The Richard De Larrinaga Case) [1921] 2 AC 141 .....	170, 337
Attorney-General v Glen Line Ltd and Liverpool & London War Risks Association Ltd (1930) 37 LIL Rep 55; [1930] 36 Com Cas 1 .....	8, 9, 13
Atwood v Sellar & Co (1880) 5 QBD 286.....	437
Austin Friars SS Co Ltd v Spillers & Bakers Ltd [1915] 3 KB 586.....	438
Australian Agriculture Co v Saunders (1875) LR 10 C 668.....	201
Australian Insurance Co v Jackson (1875) 33 LT 286.....	293, 295
Australian Shipping Commission v Green and Others [1971] 1 All ER 353, CA.....	438
<b>B</b>	
Baker v Towry (1816) 1 Stark 426 .....	196
Ballantyne v Mackinnon [1896] 2 QB 455.....	147, 160, 192, 433
Balmoral SS Co Ltd v Marten [1902] AC 511, HL .....	74, 445
<i>Bamburi, The</i> [1982] 1 Lloyd's Rep 312.....	344, 374, 376, 377, 399
Banco de Barcelona & Others v Union Marine Insurance Co Ltd, <i>The Cruz</i> (1925) 30 Com Cas 316 .....	187, 245, 255, 261
Bank of Athens v Royal Exchange Assurance, <i>The Eftychia</i> (1937) 57 LIL Rep 37 .....	255, 256, 261
Bank of England v Vagliano Brothers [1891] AC 107 .....	157, 381, 384
Bank of Nova Scotia v Hellenic Mutual War Risks Association (Bermuda) Ltd, <i>The Good Luck</i> , [1991] 2 WLR 1279; [1991] 2 Lloyd's Rep 191, HL .....	44, 48, 100–103, 105, 106, 109, 114, 116, 118, 119, 142, 190, 282, 317, 354
Banque Keyser Ullmann v Skandia [1987] 1 Lloyd's Rep 69.....	83, 85
Banque Keyser v Skandia [1990] 2 Lloyd's Rep 377, HL.....	88
Bar Lias Tobacco & Rubber Estates v Volga Insurance Co Ltd (1920) 3 LIL Rep 155 .....	57
Barber v Fleming (1869) LR 5 QB 59 .....	30
Barclays v Cousins (1802) 2 East 544 .....	33, 38
Barker v Blakes (1810) 9 East 283.....	26, 368
Barker v Janson (1868) LR 3 CP 303.....	72, 73, 89, 356
Bater v Bater [1951] P 35.....	270
Baxendale v Fane, <i>The Lapwing</i> (1940) 66 LIL Rep 174 .....	182, 284, 285, 286
Bean v Stupart (1778) 1 Dougl 11.....	108, 120
Becker, Gray & Co v London Assurance Corpn [1918] AC 101 .....	124, 145, 150

Table of Cases

---

<i>Bedouin, The</i> [1894] P 1, CA .....	32
Bell v Bell (1810) 2 Camp 475 .....	55
Bell v Nixon (1816) Holt NP 423.....	355
Bennett SS Co v Hull Mutual SS Protecting Society [1914] 3 KB 57, CA .....	316
Bensaude v Thames & Mersey Marine Insurance Co Ltd [1897] AC 609.....	32, 170
Berger and Light Diffusers Pty Ltd v Pollock [1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep 442.....	78, 81, 87, 89, 358
Berk (FW) & Co v Style [1955] 1 QB 180 .....	217, 242, 243, 456
Biddle, Sawyer & Co Ltd v Peters [1957] 2 Lloyd's Rep 339 .....	243
Birds Cigarette Manufacturing Co Ltd v Rouse and Others (1924) 19 LIL Rep 301 .....	236
Birkley v Presgrave (1801) 1 East 220 .....	437
Birrell v Dryer (1884) 9 App Cas 345, HL .....	116, 118, 121
Bishop v Pentland (1827) 7 B & C 219.....	181
Black King Shipping Corpn v Massie, <i>The Litsion Pride</i> [1985] 1 Lloyd's Rep 437.....	84, 85, 87
Blackburn & Another v Liverpool, Brazil & River Steam Navigation Co [1902] 1 KB 290.....	181
Blackburn v Haslam (1888) 21 QBD 144 .....	85
Blackburn, Low & Co v Vigors (1887) 12 QBD 531, HL .....	85
Blackett, Magalhaes & Clombie v National Benefit Assurance Co (1921) 8 LIL Rep 293, CA .....	139
Blane Steamship Ltd v Minister of Transport [1951] 2 KB 965.....	11
Board of Trade v Hain SS Co [1929] AC 534, HL .....	149, 153, 170, 337
Boehm v Combe (1813) 2 Maule & Selwyn 172 .....	292
<i>Bona, The</i> [1895] P 125, CA .....	438, 439
Bond v Nutt [1777] 2 Comp 601.....	105
Boon & Cheah Steel Pipes Sdb Bhd v Asia Insurance Co Ltd [1975] 1 Lloyd's Rep 452 .....	97, 358, 360
Booth v Gair (1863) 33 LJ CP 99.....	458, 459, 460
Bouillon v Lupton (1863) 33 LJ CP 37 .....	128
Bowring (CT) & Co Ltd & Another v Amsterdam London Assurance Co Ltd (1930) 36 LIL Rep 309.....	238, 243
Boyd v Dubois (1811) 3 Camp 133 .....	208, 235
Bradley v Federal Steam Navigation Co (1927) 27 LIL Rep 221 .....	235
Brandeis Goldschmidt & Co v Economic Insurance Co Ltd (1922) 38 TLR 609 .....	436, 448, 449
<i>Brigella, The</i> (1893) P 189.....	436, 445, 451
Britain SS Co v King, <i>The Petersham</i> ; Green v British India Steam Navigation Co Ltd, <i>The Matiana</i> [1921] 1 AC 99 .....	156, 157, 168, 169, 339
British and Foreign Insurance Co Ltd v Wilson Shipping Co Ltd (The Wilson Case) [1921] 1 AC 188 .....	2, 415



British and Foreign Marine Insurance Co v Gaunt (The Gaunt Case) [1920] 1 KB 903; [1921] 2 AC 41, HL .....	25, 187, 199, 215, 216, 219, 239, 242, 306, 466
British and Foreign Marine Insurance Co v Samuel Sanday and Co (The Sanday Case) [1915] 2 KB 781; [1916] 1 AC 650, HL .....	26, 27, 39, 141, 341, 342, 351, 352, 360, 364, 368–373, 382, 460
British Dominions General Insurance Co Ltd v Duder and Others [1915] 2 KB 394 .....	20, 455
Brotherston v Barber (1816) 5 M & S 418.....	1
Brown v Nitrate Producer SS Co (1937) 58 LIL Rep 188 .....	133, 281
Bryant and May v London Assurance Corpn (1866) 2 TLR 591 .....	196, 197
Buchanan v London & Provincial Marine Insurance Co (1895) 65 LJ QB 92 .....	455
Buchanan v Faber (1899) 4 Com Cas 223; (1899) 15 TLR 383 .....	4, 20, 35
Burges v Wickham (1863) 3 B & S 669 .....	125, 126
Burnand v Rodocanachi (1882) 7 App Cas 333.....	7, 13
Burton v English (1883) 12 QBD 218, CA.....	436, 437
Busk v The Royal Exchange Assurance Co (1818) 5 B & A 171 .....	181, 202
Butler v Wildman (1821) 3 B & Ald 398 .....	198, 207
<b>C</b>	
Cambridge v Anderton (1824) 2 B & C 691 .....	355
Canada Rice Mills Ltd v Union Marine & General Insurance Co Ltd [1941] AC 55 .....	151, 201
<i>Cap Tarifa, The</i> [1957] 2 Lloyd's Rep 485.....	100
Captain J A Cates Tug and Wharfage Co Ltd v Franklin Insurance Co [1927] AC 698 .....	356, 397
<i>Caribbean Sea, The</i> [1980] 1 Lloyd's Rep 38 .....	133, 232
Carisbrook SS Co Ltd v London & Provincial Marine & General Insurance Co Ltd [1902] 2 KB 681 .....	442, 443, 446
Carras v London and Scottish Assurance Co Ltd [1936] 1 KB 291, CA.....	29, 31
Carruthers v Sydebotham (1815) 4 M & S 77 .....	196
Carter v Boehm (1766) 3 Burr 1905; (1766) 1 Wm Bl 593.....	84, 85, 86
Castellain v Preston (1883) 11 QBD 380 .....	1, 2, 7, 8
Cator v Great Western Insurance Co of New York (1873) 8 LR 8 CP 552.....	200
CCR Fishing Ltd and Others v Tomenson Inc and Others, <i>The La Pointe</i> [1991] 1 Lloyd's Rep 89 .....	176, 177
Chandler v Blogg [1898] 1 QB 32.....	317
Chartered Trust & Executor Co v London Scottish Assurance Corpn Ltd (1923) 39 TLR 608.....	185
Cheshire & Co v Vaughan Bros & Co [1920] 3 KB 240; [1919] 25 Com Cas 242, CA .....	3
Clason v Simmonds (1741) 6 Term Rep 533 .....	61

Table of Cases

---

Cleveland Twist Drill Co (GB) Ltd v Union Insurance of Canton (1925) 23 LIL Rep 50, CA .....	211
Coast Ferries Ltd v Century Insurance Co of Canada & Others, <i>The Brentwood</i> [1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep 232.....	138, 161, 162, 165, 167, 286, 289, 290, 309, 310
Coe v Smith (1860) 22 Dunlop 95.....	321
Cohen v Hinckley (1809) 2 Camp 51.....	252
Cohen, George Sons & Co v Standard Marine Insurance Co (1925) 21 LIL Rep 30.....	138, 163, 166, 224, 359, 375
Colledge v Harty (1851) 6 Exch 205; (1851) 20 LJ Ex 146 .....	115, 116, 118
Cologan v London Assurance Co (1816) 5 M & S 447 .....	368
Coltman v Bibby Tankers Ltd, <i>The Derbyshire</i> [1986] 1 WLR 751 .....	127
Colvin & Others v Newberry & Benson (1828) 8 B & C 166.....	304
Commercial Trading Co v Hartford Fire Insurance [1974] 1 Lloyd's Rep 179.....	305
Commonwealth Shipping Representative v P & O Service, <i>The Geelong</i> [1923] AC 191, HL .....	337
<i>Commonwealth, The</i> [1907] P 216, CA, affg, <i>The Welsh Girl</i> (1906) 22 TLR 475.....	14
Compania Maritima Astra SA v Archdale, <i>The Armar</i> [1954] 2 Lloyd's Rep 95.....	410
Compania Maritime San Basilio SA v Oceanus Mutual Underwriting Association (Bermuda) Ltd, <i>The Eurysthenes</i> [1977] 1 QB 49, CA .....	42, 46, 136, 161, 166, 224, 225
Compania Naviera Bachi v Henry Hosegood & Co Ltd [1938] 2 All ER 189.....	294
Compania Naviera Santi SA v Indemnity Marine Assurance Co Ltd, <i>The Tropaioforos</i> [1960] 2 Lloyd's Rep 469.....	246, 247, 253, 255, 257, 261, 262, 265
Compania Naviera Vazcongada v British & Foreign Mar Insurance Co Ltd, <i>The Gloria</i> (1934) 54 LIL Rep 35 .....	136, 247, 256, 258, 261, 270
Container Transport International Inc v Oceanus Mutual Underwriting Association (Bermuda) [1984] 1 Lloyd's Rep 476.....	83
Continental Grain Co v Twitchell (1945) 61 TLR 291, CA .....	34
Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Co of Chicago and Xenofon Maritime SA v Alliance Assurance Co Ltd, <i>The Captain Panagos DP</i> [1989] 1 Lloyd's Rep 33, CA.....	205, 206, 260, 261, 265, 266, 267, 270, 271, 272
Corcoran v Gurney (1853) 1 E & B 456 .....	196
Cory v Burr (1883) 8 App Cas 393 .....	153, 296, 297, 298, 339
Cory v Patton (1874) LR 9 QB 577 .....	87
Costain-Blandevoort (UK) Dredging Co v Davenport, <i>The Nassau Bay</i> [1979] 1 Lloyd's Rep 395.....	198, 346

Court Line Ltd v R, <i>The Lavington Court</i> [1945] 2 All ER 357, CA .....	32, 362, 365, 366, 367, 372, 375
Coxe v Employers' Liability Assurance Corpn Ltd [1916] 2 KB 629 .....	167, 171, 284
Crooks v Allan (1879) 5 QBD 36 .....	449
Crouan v Stainer [1904] 1 KB 87 .....	455
CTI Case [1984] 1 Lloyd's Rep 476 .....	84, 89, 90, 91, 92
Cullen v Butler (1816) 5 M & S 461 .....	178, 179
Cunard v Marten [1902] 2 KB 624 .....	319
Currie, (MR) & Co The Bombay Native Insurance Co (1869) LR 3 PC 72 .....	286, 463, 465
Czarnikow Ltd v Java Sea & Fire Insurance Co Ltd [1941] 3 All ER 256 .....	368, 376
<b>D</b>	
Davidson & Others v Burnard (1868) LR 4 CP 117 .....	179, 181
Dawsons Ltd v Bonnin [1922] 2 AC 413 .....	116
De Hahn v Hartley (1786) 1 TR 343 .....	93, 96, 97
De Hart v Compania Anonima de Seguros, <i>The Aurora</i> [1903] 2 KB 503 .....	451, 452
De Mattos v Saunders (1872) LR 7 C 570 .....	196
De Maurier (Jewels) Ltd v Bastion Insurance Co Ltd [1967] 2 Lloyd's Rep 550 .....	116
De Monchy v Phoenic Insurance Co of Hartford & Another (1929) 34 LIL Rep 201 .....	215, 233
De Vaux v Salvador (1836) 4 Ad & E 420 .....	146, 314, 315
De Wolf v The Archangel Maritime Bank Insurance Co Ltd (1874) LR 9 QB 451 .....	57, 58
Dee Conservant Board v McConnell [1928] 2 KB 159 .....	11
Delaney v Stoddart (1785) 1 TR 22 .....	62
Demetriades & Co v Northern Assurance Co, <i>The Spathari</i> (1923) 17 LIL Rep 66 .....	252, 261, 263
Denoon v The Home and Colonial Assurance Co (1872) LR 7 CP 341 .....	28, 361
Dickenson v Jardine (1868) LR 3 CP 639 .....	438
<i>Dimitrios N Rallias, The</i> (1922) 23 LIL Rep 363 .....	133
Dixon v Reid (1882) 5 B & Ald 597 .....	305
Dixon v Sadler (1839) 5 M & W 405; (1841) 8 M & W 895 .....	125, 182
Dixon v Whitworth (1880) 4 Asp MLC 327, CA .....	433, 462
Dobell & Co Steamship v Rossmore Co [1895] 2 QB 408 .....	125
Dobson v Sotherby (1827) Moo & M 90 .....	116
Dodwell & Co Ltd v British Dominions General Insurance Co Ltd (cited as a note in) [1955] 2 Lloyd's Rep 391 .....	215, 234
Douglas v Scougall (1816) 4 Dow 278 .....	98

Table of Cases

---

Doyle v Dallas (1831) 1 M & Rob 48 .....	369, 373, 382
Dreyfus (Louis) & Co v Tempus Shipping Co [1931] AC 726.....	127
Dudgeon v Pembroke (1875) 1 QBD 96;	
(1877) 2 App Cas 284, HL.....	135, 166, 190, 191
Duff v Mackenzie (1857) 3 CBNS 16 .....	24, 419
Duthie v Hilton (1868) LR 4 CP 138.....	358, 362
Dyson v Rowcroft (1802) 3 B & T 474 .....	357
<b>E</b>	
Earle v Rowcroft (1806) 8 East 126 .....	293, 296
Edwards & Co Ltd v Motor Union Insurance Co Ltd [1922] 2 KB 249; (1922) 11 LIL Rep 170; [1922] 17 Com Cas 367 .....	8
Elcock and Another v Thomson [1949] 2 All ER 381 .....	409
Elder Dempster & Co v Paterson Zochonis & Co [1924] AC 522.....	125, 127, 139
Eliot v Wilson (1776) 4 Bro Parl Cas 470 .....	61
Elton v Brogden (1747) 2 Str 1264.....	301
Emperor Goldmining Co v Switzerland General Insurance Co [1964] 1 Lloyd's Rep 348 .....	453
<i>Engineer, The</i> (1898) AC 382 .....	321
Entwistle v Ellis (1857) 2 H & N 549 .....	438
Everth v Hannam (1815) 2 Marsh R 72; (1815) 6 Taunt 375.....	260, 296
Existological Laboratories Ltd v Century Insurance of Canada, <i>The Bamcell II</i> (1983) 2 SCR 47.....	176
<b>F</b>	
Falkner v Ritchie (1814) 2 M & S 290 .....	295
<i>Fanti, The</i> and <i>The Padre Island</i> [1990] 2 Lloyd's Rep 191, HL.....	323
Farnworth v Hyde (1866) LR 2 CP 204.....	378, 390, 396
Farr v Motor Traders Mutual Insurance Society [1920] 3 KB 669 .....	96, 116, 117
Fawcus v Sarsfield (1856) 119 ER 836; (1856) 6 E & B 192.....	138, 147, 160, 190
Field v Burr [1899] 1 QB 571 .....	407
Field v The Receiver of Metropolitan Police [1970] 2 KB 853.....	347
Firemen's Fund Insurance Co v Western Australian Insurance Co Ltd (1929) 138 LT 108.....	124, 131
Fitzherbert v Mather (1785) 1 TR 12.....	85
Fiumana Societa Di Navigazione v Bunge & Co Ltd [1930] 2 KB 47 .....	127
Flint v Flemyn (1830) 1 B & Ad 45 .....	28, 29, 33, 34
Foley v Tabor (1861) 2 F & F 683.....	99, 126
Foley v United Fire and Marine Insurance Co of Sydney (1870) LR 5 CP 160.....	54
Forbes v Aspinall (1811) 13 East 323.....	30, 75, 80
Ford Motor Co v Prudential Assurance (1958) 14 DLR 2d 7.....	348
Forshaw v Chabert (1821) 3 Br & B 159.....	98
France, Fenwick & Co Ltd v Merchants Marine Insurance Co Ltd [1915] 3 KB 290, CA.....	318

France, Fenwick & Co v The King [1927] 1 KB 458 .....	345
Francis v Boulton [1895] 1 Com Cas 217 .....	358
Francis, Times and Co v Sea Insurance Co (1898) Com Cas 229 .....	140
Franco v Natusch (1836) Tyr & Gr 401 .....	134
Frangos v Sun Insurance Office (1934) 49 LIL Rep 354 .....	136, 166, 191
<i>Friso, The</i> [1980] 1 Lloyd's Rep 469 .....	127
Fuerst Day Lawson v Orion Insurance Co Ltd [1980] 1 Lloyd's Rep 656 .....	219
Furness Withy and Co Ltd v Duder [1936] 2 KB 461 .....	321
<b>G</b>	
Gabay v Lloyd (1825) 3 B & C 791 .....	199
Gas Float Whitton (No 2) [1897] AC 337 .....	317
<i>Gaupen, The</i> (No 3) 24 LIL Rep 355 .....	126
Gedge & Others v Royal Exchange Assurance Corpn [1900] QB 214; [1900] 5 Com Cas 239; (1900) 16 TLR 344.....	4, 143
Gee Garnham Ltd v Whittall [1955] 2 Lloyd's Rep 562.....	217, 242
General Shipping & Forwarding Co & Another v British General Insurance Co Ltd (1923) 15 LIL Rep 175.....	76, 78
Gibson v Small (1853) 4 HL Cas 353.....	123, 126, 129, 135
Gladstone v King (1813) 1 M & S 35 .....	85
Glafki Shipping Co SA v Pinos Shipping Co (No 1), <i>The Maria</i> [1986] 2 Lloyd's Rep 12, HL.....	73
Glennie v London Assurance Co (1814) 2 M & S 371 .....	358
Goldschmidt v Whitmore (1811) 8 East 126 .....	296, 305
Gooding v White (1913) 29 TLR 312 .....	77
Goole & Hull Steam Towing Co Ltd v Ocean Marine Insurance Co Ltd [1928] 1 KB 589.....	12, 13, 407
Gordon v Rimmington (1807) 1 Camp 123.....	158, 201
Goss v Withers (1758) 2 Burr 683.....	374
Graham Joint Stock Shipping Co Ltd v Merchants' Marine Insurance Co (1923) 17 LIL Rep 44 .....	185, 227
Grand Union Shipping Ltd v London SS Owner's Mutual Insurance Assocn Ltd, <i>The Bosworth</i> (No 3) [1962] 1 Lloyd's Rep 583.....	428
Grant, Smith & Co v Settle Construction and Dry Dock Co [1920] AC 162 .....	177
<i>Gratitude, The</i> (1801) 3 Ch Rob 240 .....	438
Gray & Another v Barr [1971] 2 Lloyd's Rep 1, CA.....	149, 150, 151
Great Indian Peninsular Railway Co v Saunders (1862) 2 B & S 266 .....	458, 459, 460
Green Star Shipping Co v The London Assurance, <i>The Andree</i> [1933] 1 KB 378.....	437, 447, 448, 452
Green v Brown (1743) 2 Str 1199 .....	252, 357
Greenhill v Fedal Insurance Co [1927] 1 KB 65.....	86
Greenock Steamship Co v Maritime Insurance Co [1903] 1 KB 367.....	62, 108, 127, 129, 131

Table of Cases

Gregson v Gilbert (1783) Doug KB 232 .....	438
Griffiths v Bramley-Moore and Others (1878) 4 QBD 70 .....	31, 422
Guthrie v North China Insurance Co Ltd (1902) 7 Com Cas 130, CA .....	31

**H**

Hagedorn v Whitmore (1816) 1 Stark 157 .....	148
Haigh v De la Cour (1812) 3 Camp 319 .....	75, 89
Hall Brothers SS Co Ltd v Young [1939] 1 KB 748, CA .....	321
Hall v Hayman [1912] 2 KB 5 .....	381, 382
Hallett v Wigram (1850) 9 CB 580 .....	437
Hamilton v Mendes .....	374
Hamilton, Fraser & Co v Pandorf & Co (1887) 16 QBD 629; (1887) 12 App Cas 518 .....	175, 178, 180
Harman v Vaux (1813) 3 Camp 429 .....	195
Harris v Scaramanga (1872) LR 7 CP 481 .....	438, 451, 452
Harrison v Bank of Australasia (1872) LR 7 Ex 39 .....	440
Hart v Standard Marine Insurance Co (1889) 22 QBD 499 .....	120
Haughton v Empire Marine Insurance Co (1866) LR 1 Exch 206 .....	54, 55
Havelock v Hancill (1789) 3 Term Rep 277 .....	295
Hearne v Edmunds (1819) 1 Brod & B 381 .....	196
Helmville Ltd v Yorkshire Insurance Co Ltd, <i>The Medina Princess</i> [1965] 1 Lloyd's Rep 361 .....	404, 406, 410, 411, 414
Herring v Janson & Others (1895) 1 Com Cas 177 .....	77
Heskell v Continental Express Ltd & Another [1950] 1 All ER 1033 .....	151, 152
Hewitt v London General Insurance Co Ltd (1925) 23 LIL Rep 243 .....	63
Heyman v Parish (1908) 2 Camp 149 .....	292
Hibbert v Martin (1808) 1 Camp 538 .....	301
Hick v The Governor & Co of the London Assurance (1895) 1 Com Cas 244 .....	451
Hicks v Shield (1857) 26 LJ QB 205 .....	33
Hingston v Wendt (1864) 1 QBD 367 .....	401, 440
Hobbs v Hannam (1811) 3 Camp 93 .....	304
Hoff Trading Co v Union Insurance Society of Canton Ltd (1929) 45 TLR 466 .....	86
Hoffman & Another v Marshall (1835) 2 Bing NC 383 .....	193
Hogarth v Walker [1900] 2 QB 283 .....	23, 81
Hongkong Fir Shipping Co v Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha [1962] 2 QB 26; [1961] 2 Lloyd's Rep 478 .....	127
Hooley Hill, Re [1920] 1 KB 257, CA .....	201
Hornal v Neuberger Products Ltd [1957] 1 QBD 247 .....	270
Houstman v Thornton (1816) Holt NP 242 .....	9, 253, 357
Hudson v Harrison (1821) 3 Brod & Bing 9 .....	397
Hunting v Boulton [1895] 1 Com Cas 120 .....	128
Hutchins Brothers v Royal Exchange Assurance Corpn [1911] 2 KB 398, CA .....	277

<b>I</b>	
<i>ICS, The</i> [1984] 1 Lloyd's Rep 154 .....	461
<i>Ikerigi Compania Naviera SA &amp; Others v Palmer &amp; Others, Globas Transeas Corpn &amp; Another v Palmer, The Wondrus</i> [1992] 2 Lloyd's Rep 566, CA .....	342, 343
<i>Ingram and Royle Ltd v Services Maritimes du Treport</i> [1913] 1 KB 304; (1913) 108 LT Rep 304; (1913) 12 Asp Mar Law Cas 493 .....	124
<i>Inman Steamship Co v Bischoff</i> (1882) 7 App Cas 670, HL .....	29, 32
<i>Integrated Container Service Inc v British Traders Insurance Co Ltd</i> [1984] 1 Lloyd's Rep 154, CA .....	218, 453, 455, 457
<i>Ionides v Pacific Fire and Marine Insurance Co</i> (1871) LR 6 QB 674 .....	87
<i>Ionides v The Universal Marine Insurance Co</i> (1863) 14 CB (NS) 259 .....	145, 148, 169, 338, 344
<i>Ionides v Pender</i> (1874) LR 9 QB 531 .....	76, 77, 88, 89
<i>Iredale &amp; Another v China Traders Insurance Co</i> [1900] 2 QB 519, Ca .....	361
<i>Irish Spruce, The</i> [1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep 63 .....	127
<i>Irvin v Hine</i> [1950] 1 KB 555 .....	363, 364, 367, 376, 377, 378, 408, 409, 410, 456
<i>Irving v Manning</i> (1847) 1 HL Cas 287 .....	2, 71, 74, 380
<i>Irwin v Eagle Star Insurance Co, The Jomie</i> [1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep 489 .....	133, 280
<i>Israel (Simon) &amp; Co v Sedgwick</i> [1893] 1 QB 303, CA .....	52, 60, 69
<i>Issaias (Elfie A) v Mar Insurance Co Ltd</i> (1923) 15 LIL Rep 186, CA .....	246, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 272, 302
<b>J</b>	
<i>Jackson v Mumford</i> (1902) 8 Com Cas 61 .....	278, 280
<i>Jackson v The Union Marine Insurance Co Ltd</i> (1874) LR 10 CP 125 .....	31, 32
<i>Jacob v Gailler</i> (1902) 7 Com Cas 116 .....	215
<i>James Yachts v Thames &amp; Mersey Marine Insurance Co Ltd &amp; Others</i> [1977] 1 Lloyd's Rep 206 .....	142
<i>Jenkins v Heycock</i> (1853) 8 Moore's PC Cases 350 .....	136
<i>Job v Langton</i> (1856) 6 E & B 779 .....	439
<i>Joel v Law Union &amp; Crown Insurance</i> [1908] 2 KB 863, CA .....	86
<i>Johnson v Sheddon</i> (1802) 2 East 581 .....	419
<i>Jones v Nicholson</i> (1854) 10 Exch 28 .....	228, 295, 304
<b>K</b>	
<i>Kacianoff v China Traders Insurance Co Ltd</i> [1914] 3 KB 1121, CA .....	207
<i>Kallis, George v Success Insurance Ltd</i> [1985] 2 Lloyd's Rep 8 .....	201
<i>Kaltenbach v Mackenzie</i> (1878) 3 CPD 467 .....	391, 392, 394, 395
<i>Kann v WW Howard Brothers &amp; Co Ltd</i> [1941] 3 All ER 62, HL .....	351
<i>Karlshamns Oljefabriker &amp; Another v Monarch SS Co Ltd</i> 81 LIL Rep 137 .....	148
<i>Kemp v Halliday</i> (1866) LR 1 QB 520 .....	384, 385, 387, 390, 437, 440, 442

Table of Cases

Kidston v Empire Marine Insurance Co (1866) LR 1 CP 535 .....	423, 456, 458, 459, 461, 462
Kingsford v Marshall (1832) 8 Bing 458 .....	196
Kingston v Phelps (1795) 7 Term Rep 165 .....	62
Kish v Taylor [1912] AC 604.....	301
<i>Knight of St Michael, The</i> [1898] P 30 .....	207, 208, 361
Knight v Cambridge (1724) 2 Ld Raym 1349 .....	292
Knight v Faith (1850) 19 LJ QB 509 .....	411, 416, 417
Kopitoff v Wilson (1876) 3 Asp MCL 163 .....	125, 126, 139
Koster v Innes (1825) Ry & Mood 334 .....	252
Koster v Reed (1826) 6 B & C 19 .....	252, 357
<i>Kryiaki, The</i> [1993] 1 Lloyd's Rep 137 .....	430
Kulukundis v Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society [1937] 1 KB 1, CA.....	29, 31
<b>L</b>	
La Compania Martiartu v Royal Exchange Assurance, <i>The Arnus</i> (The Martiartu Case) [1923] 1 KB 650, CA .....	187, 222, 247, 252, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 263, 264, 266, 267, 269, 271
La Fabrique de Produits Chimiques v Large [1923] 1 KB 203.....	209
Lakeland, The (1927) 28 LIL Rep 293 .....	246, 247, 254, 257, 258, 268
Lamb Head Shipping Co Ltd v Jennings, <i>The Marel</i> [1992] 1 Lloyd's Rep 402 .....	180, 189, 248, 250, 251, 252
Lambert v Liddiard (1814) 5 Taunt 480.....	53
Lane v Nixon (1866) LR 1 CP 412 .....	124
Lane, (W & J) v Spratt [1970] 2 QB 480.....	100
Lawrence v Aberdeen (1821) 5 B & Ald 107.....	199
Lawther v Black (1900) 6 Com Cas 5.....	35
Le Cheminant v Pearson (1812) 4 Taunt 367 .....	415
Lee and Another v The Southern Insurance Co (1870) LR 5 CP 397.....	463
Lee v Beach (1792) Park, Insurance (8th Edn) .....	98
Lemar Towing v Fireman's Fund Insurance Co (1973) AMC 1843.....	290
Letchford v Oldham (1880) 5 QBD 538 .....	196
Levin v Allnut (1812) 15 East 267 .....	350
Levy v Assicurazioni Generali [1940] 3 All ER 427 .....	348
Lewis v Rucker (1761) 2 Burr 1167.....	71, 76, 89, 419, 420
Leyland Shipping Co Ltd v Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society Ltd [1918] AC 350, HL .....	146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 192, 201, 297
Lidgett v Secretan (1871) LR 6 CP 616.....	72, 417
Lind v Mitchell (1928) 45 TLR 54, CA .....	168, 182, 284, 367, 466
Lishman v Northern Maritime Insurance Co (1875) LR 10 CP 179 .....	87
<i>Litsen Pride, The</i> [1985] 1 Lloyd's Rep 437 .....	395



Liverpool & London War Risks Association Ltd v Ocean SS Co Ltd, <i>The Priam</i> (1942) 73 LIL Rep 1, HL .....	168, 169, 337
Livie v Janson (1810) 12 East 648 .....	415, 416
Lloyd's (JJ) Instruments Ltd v Northern Star Insurance Co Ltd, <i>The Miss Jay Jay</i> [1987] 1 Lloyd's Rep 32, CA .....	133, 138, 150, 152, 153, 159, 165, 167, 175, 176, 188, 189, 190, 191, 286
Lockyer v Offley (1786) 1 TR 252 .....	297, 299, 418
Loders and Nucoline Ltd v The Bank of New Zealand (1929) 33 LIL Rep 70 .....	73, 75, 79, 89
London & Lancashire Fire Insurance Co v Bolands Ltd (1924) 19 LIL Rep 1; [1924] AC 836, HL .....	347
London and Provincial Leather Process Ltd v Hudson [1939] 3 All ER 875 .....	204, 217, 218, 242
London County Commercial Reinsurance Office Ltd, Re [1922] 2 Ch 67 .....	4
London SS Owners' Insurance Co v The Grampian SS Co, <i>The Balnacraig</i> (1889) 24 QBD 663, CA .....	326
Lozano v Janson (1859) 2 E & E 160 .....	368
Lucena v Craufurd (1806) 2 Bos & PNR 269 .....	15, 38
Lynch v Dunsford (1811) 14 East 494 .....	85
<b>M</b>	
M'Cowan (David) v Baine & Johnson & Others, <i>The Niobe</i> [1891] AC 401, HL .....	315, 316
M'Dougle v Royal Exchange Assurance Co (1816) 4 Camp 283 .....	196
M'Swiney v Royal Exchange Assurance Corp'n (1849) 14 QB 634 .....	34
Macaura v Northern Assurance Co Ltd [1925] AC 619 .....	37
Macbeth & Co v Marine Insurance Co Ltd [1908] AC 144, HL .....	381, 382
Maccoll and Pollock Ltd v Indemnity Mutual Marine Assurance Co Ltd (1930) 38 LIL Rep 79 .....	277
Mackenzie v Whitworth (1875) 1 Ex D 36 .....	23
Magnus v Buttemer (1852) 11 CB 876 .....	177, 194, 196
<i>Main, The</i> [1894] P 320 .....	71, 80
<i>Makedonia, The</i> [1962] 1 Lloyd's Rep 316 .....	127
Manchester Lines v British Foreign Marine Insurance Co [1901] 7 Com Cas 26 .....	34
Manchester Ship Canal v Horlock [1914] 2 Ch 199 .....	362
Manfield v Maitland (1821) 4 B & Ad 582 .....	33
Manifest Shipping & Co Ltd v Uni-Polaris Insurance Co Ltd & La Reunion Europeene, <i>The Star Sea</i> [1995] 1 Lloyd's Rep 651 .....	85, 136
Margetts v Ocean Accident, Re [1901] 2 KB 792 .....	315, 316
<i>Maria, The</i> (1937) 91 Fed Rep (sd) 819 .....	127
Marine Insurance Co v The China Transpacific SS Co, <i>The Vancouver</i> (1886) 11 App Cas 573 .....	406

Table of Cases

---

<i>Marine Sulphur Queen, The</i> [1973] 1 Lloyd's Rep 88.....	127
<i>Marstrand Fishing Co Ltd v Beer, The Girl Pat</i> [1937] 1 All ER 158 .....	295, 359, 375, 376, 377
<i>Mary Thomas, The</i> (1894) P 108 .....	447, 451, 452
<i>Mathie v The Argonaut Marine Insurance Co Ltd</i> (1925) 21 LIL Rep 145, HL .....	79, 89
<i>Mavro, The v Ocean Marine Insurance Co</i> (1874) LR 7 CP 481 .....	451
<i>Mayor &amp; Corp'n of Boston v France, Fenwick &amp; Co Ltd</i> (1923) 15 LIL Rep 85; [1923] 28 Com Cas 367.....	10
<i>McAllister &amp; Co v Western Assurance Co of the City of Toronto</i> (1926) 27 LIL Rep 109 .....	181
<i>McFadden v Blue Star Line</i> [1905] 1 KB 697.....	126
<i>McIver &amp; Co v Tate Steamers Ltd</i> [1903] 1 KB 362.....	127
<i>Mentz, Decker &amp; Co v Maritime Insurance Co</i> [1910] 1 KB 132.....	63, 108, 131, 301
<i>Merchants' Trading Co v The Universal Marine Insurance Co</i> [1987] 1 Lloyd's Rep 264.....	188, 189
<i>Merchants Marine Insurance Co v North of England P &amp; I</i> <i>Association</i> (1926) 32 Com Cas 165, CA .....	317
<i>Mersey Mutual Underwriting Association v Poland</i> (1910) 15 Com Cas 205 .....	122, 128
<i>Meyer v Ralli</i> (1876) CPD 358 .....	457, 458, 461, 465
<i>Miceli v Union Marine &amp; General Insurance Co Ltd</i> (1938) 60 LIL Rep 275 .....	247
<i>Michalos (N) &amp; Sons Maritime SA v Prudential Assurance</i> <i>Co Ltd, The Zinovia</i> [1984] 2 Lloyd's Rep 264 .....	247, 255, 257, 261, 264, 270
<i>Miller v Law Accident Insurance Soc</i> [1903] 1 KB 712.....	340, 341, 342, 369
<i>Mills v Roebuck, The Mills Frigate</i> (1790) Park, <i>Insurance</i> (7th edn).....	98, 133
<i>Montgomery &amp; Co v Indemnity Mutual Marine Insurance</i> <i>Co Ltd</i> [1902] 1 KB 734.....	445
<i>Montoya and Others v The London Assurance Co</i> (1851) 6 Exch 451.....	199, 200, 358
<i>Moore v Evans</i> [1918] AC 185, HL.....	368, 374
<i>Moore v Lunn</i> (1923) 39 TLR 526 .....	125
<i>Moran, Galloway &amp; Co v Uzielli and Others</i> [1905] 2 KB 555 .....	35
<i>Morgan and Provincial Insurance Co, Re</i> [1932] 2 KB 70; [1933] AC 240, HL .....	116, 117, 118, 120
<i>Morrison v Universal Insurance Co</i> (1872) LR 8 Exch 40.....	85
<i>Moss v Byrom</i> (1795) 6 Term Rep 379 .....	296
<i>Moss v Smith</i> (1850) 9CB 94 .....	379
<i>Mostyn, The</i> [1928] AC 57 .....	9
<i>Mount v Larkins</i> (1831) 8 Bing 121.....	56, 58
<i>Mountain v Whittle</i> [1921] AC 615, HL.....	177
<i>Munro, Brice &amp; Co v War Risk Association Ltd &amp; Others</i> [1918] 2 KB 78 .....	180

**N**

*Nanfri, The* [1978] 2 Lloyd's Rep 132 .....32

National Benefit Assurance Co Ltd, Re Application  
of HL Sthyr (1933) 45 LIL Rep 147 .....17

National Justice Compania Naviera SA v Prudential  
Assurance Co Ltd, *The Ikarian Reefer* [1993] 2 Lloyd's Rep 68 .....202, 205,  
245, 254, 258, 259,  
260, 265, 266, 271, 272, 418

Nautilus Steam Shipping Co Ltd, Re (1935) 52 LIL Rep 183, CA .....324

Naviera de Canarias SA v Nacional Hispanica  
Aseguradora SA, *The Playa de Las Nieves* [1978] AC 857, HL.....32, 170

Navigators and General Insurance Co Ltd v Ringrose [1962] 1 WLR 173 .....119

Nelson Line v James Nelson [1980] AC 16 .....129

Nesbitt v Lushington (1792) 4 TR 783.....212

*New Horizon, The* [1979] 1 Lloyd's Rep 314, CA .....346

Newcastle Fire insurance Co v MacMorran & Co (1815) 3 Dow 255.....96

Nicholson v Chapman (1793) 2 H Bl 254 .....426

Niger Co v Guardian Assurance Co of Yorkshire Insurance  
Co (1920) 13 Lloyd's Rep 75, HL.....87, 201

Nishina Trading Co Ltd v Chiyoda Fire and Marine Insurance  
Co Ltd [1969] 2 All ER 776 .....204, 210, 218

North Atlantic SS Co Ltd v Burr (1904) 9 Com Cas 164 .....380

*North Britain, The* [1894] P 77 .....321

North British and Mercantile Insurance Co Ltd v London  
and Globe Insurance Co (1877) 5 ChD 569.....5

North of England Steamship Insurance Association  
v Armstrong (1870) LR 5 QB 244; (1870) 39 LJ QB 81.....10, 11, 74, 89

Northumbrian Shipping Co v Timm & Son Ltd [1939] AC 397 .....127, 128

Northwestern Mutual Life Assurance Co v Linard,  
*The Vainqueur* [1973] 2 Lloyd's Rep 275 .....245, 246, 247, 254, 257, 261

Norwich Union Fire Insurance Soc v Price [1934] AC 455 .....397

Noten BV v Harding [1990] 2 Lloyd's Rep 283, CA.....237, 238, 240, 242

Nourse v Liverpool SS Owner's Mutual Protection  
and Indemnity Association [1896] 2 QB 16 .....427

Nutt & Others v Bourdieu (1786) 1 Term Rep 323 .....302, 305, 306

**O**

Oceanic SS Co v Faber (1907) 13 Com Cas 28, CA .....276, 277

Oceanic Steam Navigation Co v Evans (1934) 50 LIL Rep 1, CA .....11, 39

Oliver v Cowley (1792) Park, *Insurance* (8th edn).....98

Oliver v Loughman (1815), reported as a footnote  
in *Weir v Aberdeen* (1819) 2 B & Ad 320.....128

Oppenheim v Fry (1864) 3 B & S 873 .....442, 446

Overseas Commodities Ltd v Style [1958] 1 Lloyd's Rep 546.....97, 100,  
110, 215, 243

Table of Cases

P

<i>Pacific Queen, The</i> [1963] 2 Lloyd's Rep 201 .....	137, 141
Palamisto General Enterprises SA v Ocean Marine Insurance Co Ltd, <i>The Dias</i> [1972] 2 Lloyd's Rep 60, CA .....	228, 255, 257, 261, 269
Palmer v Blackburn (1822) 1 Bing 61 .....	424
Palmer v Fenning (1833) 9 Bing 460.....	58
Palmer v Marshall (1832) 8 Bing 317.....	55, 57
Palmer v Naylor (1854) 10 Ex 382.....	212
Pan American World Airways Inc v The Aetna Casualty & Surety Co & Others [1974] 1 Lloyd's Rep 207 .....	348
Pan Atlantic Insurance Co Ltd and Another v Pine Top Insurane Co Ltd [1994] 2 Lloyd's Rep 427, HL .....	89, 90, 91, 92
Panamanian Oriental SS Corpn v Wright, <i>The Anita</i> [1970] 2 Lloyd's Rep 355.....	332, 343, 344, 399
Papadimitriou v Henderson [1939] 3 All ER 908.....	34, 222
Papayanni & Jeromia v Grampian SS Co Ltd (1896) Com Cas 448.....	208, 441
Parente RA v Bayville Marine Inc & General Insurance Co of America [1975] 1 Lloyd's Rep 333.....	281
Parfitt v Thompson (1844) 13 M & W 393.....	131
Parker and Others v Potts (1815) 3 Dow's R 23 .....	134
Parmeter v Cousins (1809) 2 Camp 235.....	55
Pateras & Others v Royal Exchange Assurance, <i>The Sappho</i> (1933) 49 LIL Rep 400.....	186, 256
Paterson v Harris (1861) 1 B & S 336; (1861) 30 LJ QB 354 .....	39, 241
Pawson v Watson (1778) 2 Cowp 785.....	93, 96, 108
Peele v Merchants Insurance Co (1822) 3 Mason R 27 .....	404
Pelly v Royal Exchange Assurance (1757) 1 Burr 341 .....	201
Pelton SS Co v North of England P & I Association (1925) 22 LIL Rep 510 .....	317
Pesquerias y Secaderos de Bacalao de Espana SA v Beer (1946) 79 LIL Rep 417 .....	11, 397
Phillips & Another v Nairne & Another (1847) 4 CB 343.....	130
Phyn v The Royal Exchange Assurance (1798) 7 Term Rep 505.....	301
Pickup v Thames and Mersey Marine Insurance Co (1878) 3 QBD 594, CA.....	134, 249
Piermay Shipping Co SA and Brandt's v Chester, <i>The Michael</i> [1979] 1 Lloyd's Rep 55, CA .....	136, 187, 255, 259, 260, 261, 263, 265, 266, 268, 269, 271, 302, 303
Pink v Fleming (1890) 25 QBD 396 .....	66, 146, 148, 216, 230
Piper v Royal Exchange Assurance (1932) 44 LIL Rep 103.....	16, 78, 89
Pipon v Cope (1808) 1 Camp 434 .....	141, 299, 300, 309
Piracy Jure Gentium, Re (1934) 49 LIL Rep 411; [1934] AC 586 .....	213

Pitman v Universal Marine Insurance Co (1822) 3 Mason R 27 .....	404, 408, 411, 412, 413, 414
Pittegrew v Pringle [1832] 3 B & Ad 514 .....	128
Planche v Fletcher (1779) 1 Dougl 251 .....	140
Plummer v Wildman (1815) 3 M & S 482 .....	438
Polpen Shipping Co v Commercial Union [1943] 1 All ER 162 .....	317
Polurrian SS Co Ltd v Young [1915] 1 KB 922, CA .....	373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 398, 399
<i>Pomerian, The</i> [1895] P 349 .....	456, 459
Popham and Willett v St Petersburg Insurance Co (1904) 10 Com Cas 31 .....	176, 196
Power v Whitmore (1815) 4 M & S 141 .....	438, 450, 451
President of India, The [1963] 1 Lloyd's Rep 1 .....	127
Price and Another v Maritime Insurance Co [1900] 5 Com Cas 332; [1901] 2 KB 412, CA .....	361, 421
Price v Noble (1811) 4 Taunt 123 .....	436
Probatina Shipping Co Ltd v Sun Insurance Office Ltd, The Sageorge [1974] 1 Lloyd's Rep 369, CA .....	228
Promet Engineering (Singapore) Pte Ltd v Sturge and Others, <i>The Nukila</i> [1996] 1 Lloyd's Rep 85 .....	232, 277
Proudfoot v Montefiore (1867) Law Rep 2 QB 511 .....	85
Provincial Insurance Co of Canada v Leduc (1874) LR 6 PC 224 .....	106, 115, 397
Prudent Tankers Ltd SA v The Dominion Insurance Co Ltd, <i>The Caribbean Sea</i> [1980] 1 Lloyd's Rep 338 .....	49, 280
Pyman SS Co v Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty [1919] 1 KB 49, CA .....	434
<b>Q</b>	
Quebec Marine Insurance Co v The Commercial Bank of Canada (1870) LR 3 PC 234 .....	98, 99, 122, 128, 130, 282
Queen, The v Freeman (1875) 9 IR 9 CL 527 .....	127
<b>R</b>	
<i>Raisby, The</i> (1885) 10 PD 114 .....	430, 431
Rankin v Potter (1873) LR 6 HL 83 .....	29, 31, 361, 391, 392, 394, 396, 421, 422
Rayner v Godmond (1821) 5 B & Ald 225 .....	196
Read v Bonham (1821) 3 Brod & B 147 .....	367
Redman v Wilson (1845) 14 M & W 482 .....	181, 291
Redmond v Smith (1844) 7 Man & G 457 .....	140, 142
Reed v Page [1927] 1 KB 743 .....	126
Regazzoni v KC Sethia (1944) Ltd [1958] AC 301; [1957] 2 Lloyd's Rep 298, HL .....	140
Reid v Darby (1808) 10 East 143 .....	382
Reischer v Borwick (1894) 2 QB 548, CA .....	146, 148, 149, 197

Table of Cases

Republic of Bolivia v Indemnity Mutual Marine Assurance Co Ltd [1909] 1 KB 785, CA.....	212
Republic of China, China Merchants Steam Navigation Co Ltd and United States of America v National Union Fire Insurance Co of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, <i>The Hai Hsuan</i> [1958] 1 Lloyd's Rep 578.....	154, 294, 297, 298
Rhesa Shipping Co SA v Edmunds, <i>The Popi M</i> [1985] 2 Lloyd's Rep 1, HL.....	233, 245, 246, 247, 253, 254, 256, 258, 269, 310
Rickards v Forestal Land, Timber and Railways Co [1941] 3 All ER 52 .....	1, 59, 211, 303, 305, 351, 363, 375, 389, 396, 399
Rio Tinto Co Ltd v The Seed Shipping Co Ltd (1926) 134 LT 763; (1926) 24 LIL Rep 316 .....	125
River Wear Comrs v Adamson (1877) 2 App Cas 743.....	9
Riverstone Meat Co Pty v Lancashire Shipping Co Ltd [1961] 1 All ER 496.....	308
Roberts v Anglo Saxon Insurance Association Ltd (1927) 10 LIL Rep 313.....	116, 117
Robertson v Ewer (1786) 1 Term Rep 127 .....	296
Robertson v Petros Nomikos Ltd (The Robertson Case) [1939] AC 371, HL .....	29, 31, 363, 364, 393
Robetson v Middows Ltd .....	351
Robinson v Price (1877) 2 QBD 295, CA.....	438
Robinson Gold Mining Co v Alliance Marine & General Insurance Co Ltd [1901] 2 KB 919.....	345
Roddick v Indemnity Mutual Marine Insurance Co [1895] 1 QB 836.....	23, 35, 81
Rodoconachi v Elliot (1874) LR 9 CP 518 .....	26, 369
Rosa and Others v Insurance Co of the State of Pennsylvania, <i>The Belle of Portugal</i> [1970] 2 Lloyd's Rep 386 .....	202, 284
Rosetto v Gurney (1851) 11 CP 176.....	378, 390
Ross v Hunter (1790) 4 Term Rep 33 .....	301, 305
Roura & Forgas v Townend [1919] 1 KB 189.....	393
Roux v Salvador (1836) 3 Bing NC 266 .....	355, 358, 379
Ruabon SS Co v London Assurance [1900] AC 6, HL .....	406
Russell v Provincial Insurance Co Ltd [1959] 2 Lloyd's Rep 275.....	112
Russian Bank for Foreign Trade v Excess Insurance Co Ltd [1918] 2 KB 123.....	32, 170
Ruys v Royal Exchange Assurance Corp'n [1897] 2 QB 135 .....	398, 399
<b>S</b>	
Safadi v Western Assurance Co (1933) 46 LIL Rep 140 .....	67
Sailing Ship Blairmore Co Ltd v Macredie, <i>The Blairmore</i> [1898] AC 593 .....	355, 356, 398, 400
Sailing Ship Holt Hill Co v United Kingdom Marine Association [1919] 2 KB 7789 .....	380

Samuel v Dumas [1923] 1 KB 592; [1924] AC 431.....	18, 105, 112, 138, 153, 155, 161, 176, 185, 186, 187, 195, 223, 226, 227, 247, 255, 303, 306, 307, 352
Sassoon (ED) & Co Ltd v Yorkshire Insurance Co (The Sassoon Case) (1923) 16 LIL Rep 129, CA .....	216, 236, 238, 240, 241
Sassoon (ED) v Western Assurance Co [1912] AC 563 .....	175, 178, 190, 231
Sawtell v Loudon (1814) 5 Taunt 359.....	85
Schiffshypothekenbank Zu Leubeck AG v Norman Philip Compton, <i>The Alexion Hope</i> [1988] 1 Lloyd's Rep 311, CA .....	158, 202, 205, 206, 260, 266
Schloss Brothers v Stevens [1906] 2 KB 665.....	215, 216, 230, 242
Scindia Steamships Ltd v The London Assurance [1937] 1 KB 636.....	277, 278, 279
Scottish Metropolitan Assurance Co Ltd v Stewart (1923) 39 TLR 497 .....	41
Scottish Shire Line Ltd v London and Provincial Marine and General Insurance Co Ltd [1912] 3 KB 51 .....	29, 32, 34
Sea Insurance Co v Blogg [1898] 3 Com Cas 218, CA.....	52, 128
Seaman v Fonereau (1743) 2 Stra 1183.....	86
Semco Salvage & Marine Pte Ltd v Lancer Navigation Co Ltd, <i>The Nagasaki Spirit</i> [1995] 2 Lloyd's Rep 44 .....	435
Seymour v London & Prov Marine Insurance Co [1872] 41 LJ CP 193 .....	105
Share & Triest Co v Fireman's Fund Insurance Co (1919) 261 F 777 .....	197
Shaw v Robberds (1837) 6 A & E 75.....	116
Shell International Petroleum Co Ltd v Caryl Anthony Vaughan Gibbs, <i>The Salem</i> [1983] 1 Lloyd's Rep 342.....	145, 151, 155, 210, 218, 294, 303, 305, 306
Simmonds v Cockell [1920] 1 KB 843 .....	116, 121
Simonds v White (1824) 2 B & C 805.....	436, 437, 449, 450
Simons v Gale, <i>The Cap Tarifa</i> [1957] 2 Lloyd's Rep 485.....	109
Simpson v Thomson (1877) 3 App Cas 279 .....	7, 10, 328
Sipowicz v Wimble & Others, <i>The Green Lion</i> [1974] 1 Lloyd's Rep 593, CA.....	133, 279, 280
Skandia Insurance Co Ltd v Skoljarev (The Skandia Case) [1979] 142 CLR 375.....	176, 248, 249, 250, 251
Slattery v Mance [1962] 1 Lloyd's Rep 60.....	89, 158, 205, 221, 265, 266, 271
Small v United Kingdom Marine Mutual Insurance Association (The Small Case) [1897] 2 QB 311, CA .....	176, 185, 186, 306
Smith Hogg & Co v Black Sea and Baltic Insurance Co [1940] AC 997; (1940) 19 Asp MLC 382.....	127, 148, 149
Smith v Robertson (1814) 2 Dow 474.....	397
Smith v Scott (1811) 4 Taunt 126.....	179
Smith v Surridge (1801) 4 Esp 25.....	53, 57, 58
Soares v Thornton (1817) 7 Taunt 627 .....	302, 305

Table of Cases

---

Societe Nouvelle D'Armement v Spillers & Bakers Ltd [1917] 1 KB 865 .....	440, 442
Soya GmbH Mains Kommanditgesellschaft v White [1982] 1 Lloyd's Rep 136.....	231, 235, 238, 239, 240, 241
Spence and Another v The Union Marine Insurance (1868) LR 3 CP 427 .....	359, 421
Spinney's v Royal Insurance Co Ltd [1980] 1 Lloyd's Rep 406 .....	349
Spirit of the Ocean, The (1865) 34 LJ Ad 74 .....	288
Spot Pack, The [1957] AMC 655.....	137
St Macher, The (1939) 64 LIL Rep 27.....	317
Stamma v Brown (1742) 2 Stra 1173 .....	293, 294, 301, 305
Standard Oil Co of New York v The Clan Line Steamers Ltd [1924] AC 100.....	127
Stanley v Western Insurance Co (1868) LR 3 Ex 71.....	201, 207
State Trading Corpn of India Ltd v M Golodetz Ltd [1989] 2 Lloyd's Rep 277 .....	104
Steaua Romana, The (1944) P 43 .....	345
Steel v State Line SS Co (1877) 3 App Cas 72 .....	125, 189
Steinman & Co v Angier Line [1891] 1 QB 619, CA .....	210
Stewart v Greenock Marine Insurance Co (1848) 2 HL Cas 159 .....	9
Stewart v West India & Pacific SS Co (1873) LR 8 QB 362 .....	438
Stirling v Vaughan (1809) 11 East 619.....	16
Stoomvaart Maatschappij Nederland v Peninsula & Oriental Steams Navigation Co, The <i>Khedive</i> (1882) 7 App Cas 795 .....	326
Stott (Baltic) Steamers Ltd v Marten and Others [1916] AC 304.....	178, 214
Stranna, The [1938] 1 All ER 458; [1937] P 130; [1938] P 69.....	177, 181, 194
Stribley v Imperial Marine Insurance Co (1876) 1 QBD 507.....	85, 86
Stringer & Others v The English and Scottish Marine Insurance Co Ltd (1869) LR 4 QB 676.....	360, 376, 378, 389, 462
Subro Valor, The [1995] 1 Lloyd's Rep 509 .....	127
Svensden v Wallace Brothers (1885) 10 App Cas 404.....	437, 439
Symington & Co v Union Insurance Society of Canton Ltd (1928) 3 LIL Rep 280; (1928) 34 Com Cas 23, CA.....	65, 207, 208
 <b>T</b>	
Tanner v Bennett (1825) Ry & M 182.....	463, 464, 465
Tasker v Cunnigham (1819) 1 Bliqh 87, HL .....	53, 58, 60
Tate v Hyslop (1885) 15 QBD 368.....	86
Tatham v Hodgson (1796) 6 Term Rep 656 .....	216, 230
Taylor v Curtis (1816) 6 Taunt 608 .....	440
Taylor v Dewar (1864) 5 B & S 58.....	321
Taylor v Dunbar (1869) LR 4 CP 206 .....	199, 216, 230
Taylor v Liverpool and Great Western Steam Co (1874) LR 9 QB 546 .....	210



Thames & Mersey Marine Insurance Co v Hamilton, Fraser & Co, <i>The Inchmaree</i> (1887) 12 App Cas 484, HL .....	173, 177, 275, 276, 285
Thames & Mersey Marine Insurance Co v Van Laun [1917] 23 Com Cas 104 .....	60, 61, 63
Thames & Mersey Marine Insurance Co, The v Pitts, Son & King [1893] 1 QB 476 .....	193
Thames and Mersey Marine Insurance Co Ltd v 'Gunford' Ship Co (The Gunford Case) [1911] AC 529 .....	4, 5, 6, 36, 75, 77, 79, 81, 89, 112
Thames and Mersey Marine Insurance Co v British and Chilian Steamship Co [1916] 1 KB 30, CA .....	12
The llusson v Flethcer (1793) 1 Est NP 72 .....	397
<i>Theodegmon, The</i> [1990] 1 Lloyd's Rep 52 .....	127
Theodorou v Chester [1951] 1 Lloyd's Rep 204 .....	215, 219, 233
Thin v Richards & Co [1892] 2 QB 141, CA .....	127, 128
Thomas and Son Shipping v The London and Provincial Marine and General Insurance Ltd (1914) TLR 595 .....	137, 161, 163, 164, 166
Thomas v Tyne and Wear Steamship Freight Insurance Association Ltd [1917] KB 938 .....	137, 138, 161, 164, 165
Thompson v Hopper (1856) 6 E & B 937; (1858) EB & E 1038 .....	157, 166, 192, 222, 226
Thomson v Weems (1884) 9 App Cas 671 .....	101
<i>Thrunscoc, The</i> [1897] .....	201
Todd v Ritchie (1816) 1 Stark 240 .....	300
<i>Torenia, The</i> [1983] 1 Lloyd's Rep 210 .....	127
Toulin v Anderson (1809) 1 Taunt 227 .....	295
Toulmin v Inglis (1808) 1 Camp 421 .....	309
Traders & General Insurance Association Ltd, Re (1924) 18 LIL Rep 450 .....	65, 215, 234
Trinder, Anderson & Co v Thames & Mersey Marine Insurance Co [1898] 2 QB 114, CA .....	158, 175, 183, 184, 185, 204, 221, 222, 224, 287, 300
Turnbull, Martin & Co v Hull Underwriters' Association [1900] 2 QB 402 .....	32, 170
Twemlow v Oswin (1809) 2 Camp 85 .....	253
<b>U</b>	
Union Insurance Society of Canton Ltd v George Wills & Co [1916] AC 281 .....	96
Union Marine Insurance Co v Borwick [1895] 2 QB 279 .....	315
US Shipping Co v Empress Assurance Corpn [1908] 1 KB 295 .....	34, 424
Usher v Noble (1810) 12 East 673 .....	82, 420
Uzielli v Boston Marine Insurance Co (1884) 15 QBD 11 .....	20, 455

Table of Cases

---

**V**

Vacuum Oil Co v Union Insurance Soc of Canton (1926) 25 LIL Rep 546.....	378, 392, 395
Vallejo v Wheeler (1774) 1 Cowp 143.....	148, 293, 302, 305
Visscherij Maatschappij Nieuw Onderneming Assurance Co Ltd v The Scottish Metropolitan (1922) 27 Com Cas 198, CA.....	78, 89
Vlassapoulos v British and Foreign Marine Insurance Co, <i>The Makis</i> [1929] 1 KB 187.....	441
<i>Vortigern, The</i> [1899] P 140, CA.....	128

**W**

Wadsworth Lighterage and Coaling Co v Sea Insurance Co (1929) 34 LIL Rep 285.....	147, 188, 190, 194, 231, 232
Walker v Maitland (1812) 5 B & Ald 171.....	181
Watson v Clark [1813] 1 Dow 336.....	135
Watson, Joseph & Son Ltd v Firemen’s Fund Insurance Co of San Francisco [1922] 2 KB 355.....	208, 441
Wavertree Sailing Ship Co Ltd v Love & Another [1897] AC 373.....	449
Way v Modigliani (1787) 2 Term Rep 30.....	52
Wayne Tank & Pump Co Ltd v Employer’s Liability Insurance Corpn Ltd [1974] QB 57, CA.....	149, 150, 152, 153, 154, 159
Wedderburn & Others v Bell (1807) 1 Camp 1.....	98, 127, 129
Weir & Co v Girvin & Co [1899] 1 QB 193.....	30
Weissburg v Lamb (1950) 84 LIL Rep 509.....	457
Wells v Hopwood (1832) 3 B & Ad 20.....	196
West India & Panama Telegraph Co v Home & Colonial Marine Insurance Co, <i>The Investigator</i> (1880) 6 QBD 51.....	276
Western Assurance Co of Toronto v Poole [1903] 1 KB 376.....	20, 453, 455
Westport Coal Company v McPhail [1898] 2 QB 130, CA.....	184, 228, 304
Whitecross Wire Co Ltd v Savill (1882) 8 QBD 653, CA.....	438
Whiting v New Zealand Insurance Co Ltd (1932) 44 LIL Rep 179.....	233, 236, 420
Wild Rose SS Co, The v Jupe & Others (1903) 19 TLR 289.....	382
William Brothers (Hull) Ltd v Naamloose Vernootschap WH Berghuys Kolanhandel 21 Com Cas 253.....	346
Williams & Others v North China Insurance Co [1933] 1 KB 81, CA.....	80
Williams v Atlantic Assurance Co Ltd [1933] 1 KB 81, CA.....	81, 89
Williamson v Innes (1831) 8 Bing 81.....	30
Willmott v General Accident Fire & Fife Assurance Corpn (1935) 53 LIL Rep 156.....	87, 89, 136, 175, 192
Wills (CF) & Sons v The World Marine Insurance Co Ltd (1911) <i>The Times</i> 14 March.....	232, 233, 278
Wilson & Others v Salamandra Assurance Co of St Petersburg (1903) 8 Com Cas 129.....	85
Wilson Brothers Bobbin Co Ltd v Green [1917] 1 KB 860.....	458, 459, 460, 463
Wilson v Bank of Victoria (1867) LR 2 QB 203.....	439

Wilson v Boag [1956] 2 Lloyd's Rep 564 .....	42, 119
Wilson v Jones (1867) LR 2 Exch 139 .....	38, 39
Wilson, Sons & Co v Owners of Cargo per, <i>The Xantho</i> (1887) 7 HL Cas 504 .....	178, 179, 193, 197, 313, 333
Winter v Haldimand (1831) 2 B & Ad 649 .....	33
Winters v Employers Fire Insurance Co [1962] 2 Lloyd's Rep 320 .....	119, 121
Wood v Associated National Insurance Co Ltd [1984] 1 Qd R 507 .....	152, 154, 155, 164, 222, 223, 224, 226, 227
Woodside v Globe Marine Insurance Co Ltd [1896] 1 QB 105.....	72, 89, 416
Wooldridge v Boydell (1778) 1 Doug KB 16.....	52, 61
<b>X</b>	
Xenos v Fox (1868) LR 3 CP 630 .....	319, 320, 453
<b>Y</b>	
Yamatogwa, The [1990] 2 Lloyd's Rep 39 .....	127
Yorkshire Dale SS Co Ltd v Minister of War Transport, <i>The Coxwold</i> (1942) 73 LIL Rep 1 .....	149, 168, 169, 332, 333, 336, 337, 338, 339
Yorkshire Insurance Co Ltd v Campbell [1917] AC 218 .....	110
Yorkshire Insurance Co v Nisbet Shipping Co Ltd [1961] 1 Lloyd's Rep 479 .....	8, 9, 12, 13
Young v Turing (1841) 2 Man & Gr 593 .....	380

# TABLE OF STATUTES

---

Carriage of Goods by Sea Act 1971 .....	308
Finance Act 1959.....	41
Interpretation Act 1978 ss 9, 23(3) .....	41
Marine Insurance Act 1745 .....	4
Marine Insurance Act 1906 .....	1, 2, 4, 10, 15, 16, 20, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 53, 54, 72, 76, 91, 95, 98, 103, 123, 145, 181, 276, 350, 353, 356, 387
s 1 .....	13, 15
s 2(1) .....	64
s 3 .....	23, 28, 123, 139, 339, 341
(2)(a) .....	23, 28, 38
(b) .....	18, 23, 28, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38
(c) .....	23, 39, 315
s 4 .....	15, 76
(1) .....	3, 143
(2)(a) .....	3, 15, 20
(b) .....	3, 15, 143
s 5 .....	15, 20, 123
(1) .....	15
(2) .....	3, 15
s 6 .....	21, 22
(1) .....	3, 21
(2) .....	20
s 7(2) .....	17
s 8 .....	16
ss 9, 10 .....	19
s 11 .....	37
s 12 .....	18, 81, 422
s 14(1) .....	18
(2) .....	16, 226
(3) .....	16, 18
s 15 .....	22
s 16(1) .....	74, 80, 81
(2) .....	28, 81, 422, 424
(3) .....	419, 420
(4) .....	82, 420
s 17 .....	7, 76, 83, 84, 85, 87, 92, 93
ss 18–21 .....	85
s 18 .....	7, 23, 78, 83, 85, 87
(1) .....	90, 92
(2) .....	88, 89, 90, 91
(3) .....	88

Marine Insurance Act 1906 (contd)—

s 20.....	85, 92, 108
(1).....	90, 93, 94
(2).....	88, 90, 93, 94
(3).....	93, 94
(4).....	93, 94, 96
(5).....	96
s 21.....	53, 87, 92
s 25.....	41, 42, 51
(1), (2).....	41
s 26(1).....	23, 25, 29, 371
(4).....	27
s 27(2).....	71
(3).....	2, 71, 74, 75, 76, 409
(4).....	380
s 28.....	80
s 29.....	82
(4).....	80, 82
s 32(2)(a), (b)–(d).....	5
ss 33–34.....	104
s 33.....	101, 102
(1).....	95, 96, 111
(2).....	95
(3).....	44, 94, 95, 96, 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, 108, 111, 142, 282, 317
(5).....	190
s 34.....	98
(1).....	99
(2).....	95, 99, 104
(3).....	102, 103, 106, 107, 113, 130, 143
s 35(1).....	108
(2).....	93, 282
(3).....	282
s 36.....	111
(2).....	109, 121
s 38.....	112
s 39.....	122, 123, 160, 283
(1).....	122, 123, 124, 127, 132, 133, 160, 189, 190, 192, 281, 282, 291
(2).....	122, 126
(3).....	128
(4).....	124
(5).....	123, 124, 125, 133, 135, 137, 138, 155, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, 185, 224, 225, 226, 283, 286, 289, 290, 291, 311
s 40(2).....	122, 123, 132, 133, 139
s 41.....	99, 122, 139, 141
s 42.....	54, 55, 56, 57, 58
(2).....	57
s 43.....	52

Table of Statutes

Marine Insurance Act 1906 (contd)—

s 44.....	52, 53, 59
s 45.....	52, 58, 59, 60, 67, 69
(1).....	69
(2).....	60
s 46.....	57, 62, 67
(1).....	61
(3).....	62
s 47.....	61
s 48.....	56, 57, 64, 65, 66, 67
s 49.....	62
(1)(b).....	62
(d).....	301
s 50.....	22
(1), (2).....	19
s 51.....	19, 22
s 55.....	157, 169, 201, 202, 225, 333, 344
(1).....	145, 146, 148, 150, 154, 156, 157, 165, 167, 169, 170, 221, 298, 311
(2).....	182, 208, 221
(a).....	138, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 165, 166, 168, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 202, 203, 205, 217, 221, 224, 225, 226, 229, 259, 283, 284, 285, 286, 290, 298, 311, 312, 454, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468
(b).....	64, 66, 155, 156, 215, 216, 217, 221, 229, 230, 231, 369, 457
(c).....	156, 188, 208, 215, 221, 229, 231, 232, 233, 235, 237, 239, 240, 243, 275, 276, 278, 279
s 56.....	364
(2).....	353
(4).....	360
(5).....	359, 421
s 57.....	354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 370, 391
(1).....	368
(2).....	355
s 58.....	9, 253, 357
s 59.....	461
ss 60–63.....	365
s 60.....	157, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 370, 382, 385, 389
(1).....	360, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 370, 371, 372, 374, 375, 382, 389, 390, 391
(2).....	362, 363, 364, 389
(i).....	344, 362, 363, 364, 365, 368, 373, 374, 376, 379, 381, 382, 389
(a).....	368, 373, 374, 389
(b).....	373, 378, 389, 390

Marine Insurance Act 1906 (contd)—

(ii).....	362, 363, 365, 372, 373, 378, 379, 387, 388, 390, 404, 416, 426
(iii).....	362, 363, 365, 368, 372, 373, 378, 383, 389, 390
ss 61–63.....	363
s 61.....	10, 391, 393, 397
s 62.....	391, 393
(1).....	391
(2).....	391, 397
(3).....	377, 396
(5).....	397
(7), (9).....	394
s 63.....	8, 10, 391
(1).....	9
(2).....	9, 10
s 64.....	425
(1).....	401, 402, 425, 457
(2).....	401, 402, 403, 425, 453
s 65(1).....	427, 428, 434
(2).....	401, 403, 427, 428, 429, 430, 432, 453
s 66(2).....	437, 439, 441
(3).....	402, 439
(4).....	389, 438, 439, 446, 447
(5).....	439, 447
(6).....	402, 443, 444, 451
(7).....	445, 446
s 67.....	404
(1).....	411
ss 69–71.....	401
s 69.....	404, 405, 407, 411, 415
(1).....	405, 407
(2).....	405, 407, 408, 420
(3).....	406, 407, 408, 409, 413, 420
s 70.....	28, 424
s 71(1), (2).....	419
(3).....	409, 419, 420
(4).....	420
s 72.....	419
s 73.....	421
(1).....	401, 445
s 74.....	315
s 75(2).....	80
s 76(1).....	419, 425
(2).....	401, 403, 419, 423, 425, 426, 453, 459
s 77(1).....	414
(2).....	414, 415, 416
s 78.....	402
(1).....	403, 423, 426, 459, 462
(2).....	401, 453

Table of Statutes

---

Marine Insurance Act 1906 (contd)—

(3).....	455, 456
(4).....	185, 402, 454, 455, 456, 461, 462, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469
s 79.....	7, 10, 13
(1).....	7, 8, 11, 13
(2).....	7, 14
s 80.....	6
s 81.....	14, 411
s 82.....	21
s 84 (3)(b).....	21
s 84(3)(f).....	6
s 88.....	64, 377
s 90.....	27, 28
s 91(2).....	27, 98, 123, 142, 371, 387
Sched 1.....	347

Marine Insurance (Gambling Policies) Act 1909.....	3
s 1(1)(a).....	4
s 84(3)(a).....	3, 4

Maritime Conventions Act 1911.....	320
------------------------------------	-----

Merchant Shipping Act 1894.....	285, 317
s 506.....	39

Public Order Act 1986.....	347
s 10(2).....	347

Summer Time Act 1972.....	41
---------------------------	----

Third Parties (Rights Against Insurers) Act 1930.....	322–326
s 1(1).....	322, 323
(3).....	325
(4).....	322, 325
s 3.....	331, 341
s 30(2).....	341
s 33.....	331





# CHAPTER 1

---

## CONTRACT OF INDEMNITY

### A CONTRACT OF INDEMNITY

The basis of a contract of marine insurance is contained in the opening section of the Marine Insurance Act 1906,<sup>1</sup> which reads as follows:

‘A contract of marine insurance is a contract whereby the insurer undertakes to indemnify the assured, in manner and to the extent thereby agreed, against marine losses, that is to say, the losses incident to marine adventure.’

The operative word here is ‘indemnify’. A contract of marine insurance is essentially a contract of indemnity. This is the cardinal principle upon which the whole contract is founded, and from which the rules relating to the right of claim under a policy emanate. The rights and liabilities of the parties are dictated by this basic concept, and the amount recoverable by the assured, which is measured by the extent of his pecuniary loss, is also governed by it. This should not come as a surprise, for the very purpose of effecting a policy of insurance, marine or non-marine, is for indemnity for loss.

The most incisive comment on the subject of indemnity can be found in Lord Wright’s judgment of the House of Lords in *Rickards v Forestal Land, Timber and Railways Co*,<sup>2</sup> where he said:

‘The object both of the legislature and of the courts have been to give effect to the idea of indemnity, which is the basic principle of insurance, and to apply in the diverse complications of fact and law in respect of which it has to operate. In this way, the law merchant has solved, or sought to solve, the manifold problems which have been presented by insurances of maritime adventures.’

In *Castellain v Preston*,<sup>3</sup> Mr Justice Brett remarked:

‘The contract of insurance contained in a marine or fire policy is a contract of indemnity, and of indemnity only, and this contract means that the assured, in case of a loss against which the policy has been made, shall be fully indemnified, but shall never be more than fully indemnified.’

As will be seen, the incidents and legal consequences of the contract all stem from this ‘great principle’.<sup>4</sup> Many of the main legal principles, for example, the rules relating to insurable interest; gaming and wagering policies; excessive over-valuation; double insurance, contribution, and return of premium; abandonment and right of subrogation; and the merger of losses, all spring from this concept.

---

1 Hereinafter referred to simply as ‘the Act’. See Appendix 1.

2 [1941] 3 All ER 62 at p 76, HL.

3 (1883) 11 QBD 380 at p 386.

4 Per Lord Ellenborough in *Brotherston v Barber* (1816), 5 M & S 418 at p 425, ‘The great principle of the law of insurance is that it is a contract for indemnity. The underwriter does not stipulate, under any circumstances, to become the purchaser of the subject-matter insured; it is not supposed to be in his contemplation: he is to indemnify only’.

## Not a perfect contract of indemnity

Lord Justice Bowen in *Castellain v Preston*<sup>5</sup> was confident that the principle of indemnity will solve all problems. His words were:

‘In all these difficult problems, I go back with confidence to the broad principle of indemnity. Apply that and an answer to the difficulty will be found ... But can it be any exception to the infallible rule that a man can only be indemnified to the extent of his loss?’

Admittedly, most of the problems can be resolved by applying the principle. But this, as will be seen, is a somewhat optimistic point of view. A contract of marine insurance, though a contract of indemnity, is by no means a perfect contract of indemnity. As in all walks of life, there is always a margin of error: in some instances, the theory may more than indemnify the assured for his loss, and in others, he may be under-indemnified. That the principle is not infallible was noted by Lord Sumner in *British and Foreign Insurance Co Ltd v Wilson Shipping Co Ltd*<sup>6</sup> where he said: ‘In practice contracts of insurance by no means always result in a complete indemnity, but indemnity is always the basis of the contract’. In similar terms, Mr Justice Patten in *Irving v Manning*,<sup>7</sup> who, also resigned to the fact that perfection may be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve, openly declared that: ‘A policy of assurance is not a perfect contract of indemnity.’ He acknowledged the fact that it has to be taken with qualifications, one of which is the effects of a valued policy, the problem he was asked to resolve.<sup>8</sup>

Ideally, an assured should be compensated only to the extent of his loss. In practice, however, this is not always easy to attain. But having said that, the principle is always at hand and may be invoked whenever judges feel that justice may be better served by its application rather than by a strict and literal adherence to rules. It is fair to say that judges have in the past employed the principle of indemnity as a fall-back whenever the main ground of their decisions needed further support or reinforcement.

## GAMING AND WAGERING CONTRACTS

There are essentially two broad types of gaming or wagering contracts identified by the Act. The first relates to contracts where the assured has no insurable interest or expectation of acquiring such an interest, and the second to policies which declare that the policy itself is proof of interest, commonly referred to as ‘honour’ or ‘ppi’ policies.

---

5 (1883) 11 QBD 380 at p 401, CA.

6 [1921] 1 AC 188 at p 214, HL.

7 (1847) 1 HLC 287 at p 307.

8 In a valued policy, the agreed total value is conclusive; the parties have conclusively admitted that this fixed sum shall be that which the assured is entitled to receive in event of a loss: see s 27(3).

## No insurable interest or expectation of acquiring such an interest

As was seen, the very essence of a contract of marine insurance is that of indemnity. This necessarily means that an assured who has no insurable interest in the subject-matter insured, in the sense as defined in s 5(2), would not be able to show that he has suffered a loss. In the words of s 5(2), he is not 'prejudiced by its loss or by damage thereto, or by the detention thereof'. Such a contract, where the assured has not an insurable interest as defined by the Act, is deemed to be a gaming or wagering contract and, therefore, void by s 4(1). Where the policy is void, the general rule is that the assured is, by s 84(3)(a), entitled to a return of premium. But as such a contract is forbidden by the Marine Insurance (Gambling Policies) Act 1909, the premium is not refundable by reason of illegality – a defence specifically laid down in the said section.

There are two parts to s 4(2)(a): the first refers to the case discussed above, where the assured has not an insurable interest, and the second to 'where the contract is entered into with no expectation of acquiring such an interest'. The corollary of the latter is that if the assured has a genuine expectation of acquiring an interest, then the policy is not a wager policy. Naturally, this has to be read with s 6(1) where it is laid down that the crucial moment when the assured must have an insurable interest in the subject-matter insured is at the time of the loss; 'he need not be interested when the insurance is effected'.

## 'Honour' or ppi policy

Section 4(2)(b) states:

'A contract of marine insurance is deemed to be a gaming or wagering contract:

Where the policy is made "interest or no interest" or "without further proof of interest than the policy itself," or "without benefit of salvage to the insurer", or subject to any other like term:

Provided that, where there is no possibility of salvage, a policy may be effected without benefit of salvage to the insurer.'

It is to be noted that such a policy does not automatically rule out the possibility of the assured having, in fact, an insurable interest. The fact that the wording of the policy dispenses with proof of interest does not necessarily mean that the assured does not or cannot have an interest in the subject-matter insured.

*Cheshire & Co v Vaughan Bros & Co*<sup>9</sup> has ruled that such a policy is still void even though the assured may, in fact, have an interest. In an action brought by the assured against their brokers, the defendants, for negligence in failing to make full disclosure to the insurers, the defendants pleaded that the suit was not maintainable because the policy was void. This contention was upheld by both the trial judge and the Court of Appeal. The wording of s 4 clearly covers not only contracts of insurance where there is no insurable interest, but also

---

9 (1919) 25 Com Cas 242; [1920] 3 KB 240, CA.

those which use words that might well suggest that no insurable interest exists.<sup>10</sup>

But whether an action arising from such a contract may be adjudicated upon by a court of law is questionable. It is submitted that a court should not lend its hand to the parties by trying a case where the contract is void in law, and all the more so if the contract is illegal by reason of the assured not having in fact an insurable interest.<sup>11</sup>

The fact that the ppi clause may have been detached by the assured at the time of claim makes no difference to the validity of the contract. In *Re London County Commercial Reinsurance Office Ltd*,<sup>12</sup> it was held that the crucial moment for consideration is at the time when the policy was issued.

Though void in law, such policies are not illegal.<sup>13</sup> Thus, the assured is entitled to a return of premium, if he is able to prove that he has in fact an insurable interest in the subject-matter insured.<sup>14</sup>

Lord Robson, in *Thames and Mersey Marine Insurance Co Ltd v 'Gunford' Ship Co*,<sup>15</sup> observed that, 'The sums insured under such policies are, under ordinary circumstances, paid with the same regularity as if they were legally due'. By reason of this fact, ppi policies have earned the 'much-abused' name of 'honour' policies.

### *'Without benefit of salvage'*

A policy 'without benefit of salvage' is a gaming or wagering policy and, therefore, void. But if the nature of the subject-matter insured is such that there is no possibility of salvage (eg, commission, unsecured loan or anticipated profit to be earned from the sale of cargo on its arrival at the port of destination), the policy, though 'without benefit of salvage', is valid.

---

10 It was argued that, as the plaintiffs had an insurable interest the section did not apply. Bankes LJ (at p 248) said: '... the language of the section does not permit that construction ... it makes void a contract where the instrument contains one of those objectionable clauses.'

11 In *Buchanan v Faber* (1899) 4 Com Cas 223; 15 TLR 383, the court acceded to the request made by the parties to try the case as though the contract did not contain the provision that the policy was to be deemed sufficient proof of interest. Cf *Gedge & Others v Royal Exchange Assurance Corpn* [1900] QB 214; 5 Com Cas 239; 16 TLR 344, where the court held that, though not pleaded by the insurers, the action could not be heard because of the ppi clause.

12 [1922] 2 Ch 67, Ch D.

13 Ppi policies were illegal under the Marine Insurance Act 1745, but with the repeal of this Act they are now no longer illegal, but merely void under the 1906 Act.

14 See s 84(3)(a) and s 1(1)(a) of the Marine Insurance (Gambling Policies) Act (1909) where it is only an offence if an assured effects a contract of insurance 'without having any *bona fide* interest ...'.

15 [1911] AC 529 at p 550, HL, hereinafter referred to as *The Gunford Case*.

## DOUBLE INSURANCE, CONTRIBUTION AND RETURN OF PREMIUM

The legal rules on double insurance and the return of premium therefor, and contribution all emanate from the principle of indemnity that the assured is entitled only to indemnity and not profit. Just as the assured is not allowed to profit from a marine policy, the same applies to the insurer, who is not allowed to retain the premium for a policy where he runs no risk or where the subject-matter insured is not exposed to maritime perils.

### Double insurance

Over-insurance by double insurance occurs when 'two or more policies are effected by or on behalf of the assured on the same adventure and interest or any part thereof, and the sums insured exceed the indemnity allowed by ... [the] Act'. The same assured is insuring the same subject-matter, for the same adventure, for the same interest, and for the same perils. There is no double insurance where one or more of these subjects are different, or where one of the policies is, for whatever reason, unenforceable.

The common law definition provided by Lord Justice Mellish in *North British and Mercantile Insurance Co v London, Liverpool and Globe Insurance Co*,<sup>16</sup> albeit a fire policy, clearly explains the basis of the rule. He said:

'The rule is perfectly established in the case of a marine policy that contribution only applies where it is an insurance by the same person having the same rights, and does not apply where different persons insure in respect of different rights.'

As two or more policies with different insurers are in operation, the assured is permitted by s 32(2)(a) to 'claim payment from the insurers in such order as he may think fit, provided that he is not entitled to receive any sum in excess of the indemnity allowed by ... [the] Act'. Should he receive more than full indemnity under either policy, valued or unvalued, he must give credit for the sum in excess of the indemnity and is deemed to hold such sum in trust for the insurers, according to their right of contribution among themselves.<sup>17</sup>

Double insurance on a ship is said to be extremely rare, but occasionally arises, inadvertently rather than intentionally, in practice in respect of insurance of cargo. In this regard, it has to be said that 'Increased Value Policies', common in cargo insurance, do not give rise to double insurance. This is because the subject-matter under such a policy is not on the goods themselves but the increased value thereof.

### *Over-insurance by ppi policies*

An assured may over-insure by taking up a ppi policy in addition to the standard hull, cargo or freight policy. This occurred in *The Gunford Case*, where, in addition to the hull and freight policies, additional valued policies on

---

<sup>16</sup> (1877) 5 Ch D 569 at p 583.

<sup>17</sup> See s 32(2)(b)-(d).

disbursements, and on hull and disbursements, were also taken out by the assured.<sup>18</sup> The House of Lords held that even though the insurances on disbursements were ppi policies, nonetheless there was a double insurance, as much that was covered in the hull and freight policies were also covered by the policies on disbursements. To quote from the judgment of Lord Shaw of Dunfermline:<sup>19</sup>

‘... the disbursements were the very things which had been already accounted for in the freight, and when the ship became a wreck the payment on these policies was not to be a payment of indemnity, but a present to the assured of this sum of money ...’

There was clearly an over-insurance by double insurance. Though the disbursements policies may be void in law, nevertheless the assured could still be indemnified under them should the insurer chooses to honour them. He could not, however, ‘legally avail [himself] of it to enforce recovery of any sum in excess of the indemnity allowed by law’. The House held that the hull and freight insurers were entitled to avoid their policy on the ground of non-disclosure of a material fact: the existence and the amounts of the wager policies were circumstances material to be disclosed.<sup>20</sup>

## Contribution

In the event of over-insurance by double insurance, fairness has also to be observed amongst the insurers. Each insurer should not have to contribute more than his proportion of the loss. Section 80 spells out the rules as to how the matter is to be resolved amongst the insurers *inter se*. The fundamental rule is that he should not incur more than ‘the amount which he is liable under his contract’.

## Return of premium

An insurer is not liable for more than his share of the risk. The corollary of this is that an assured who has over-insured by double insurance would be able to recover a proportionate part of the several premiums which he has paid to the various insurers. The right to demand a return of premium in such a case is, however, subject to the proviso in s 84(3)(f) that a premium is not returnable if:

- ‘(a) the policies are effected at different times, and an earlier policy has at any time borne the entire risk; or
- (b) a claim has been paid on one policy in respect of the full sum insured thereby, or

---

18 The only source from which these disbursements could be repaid was the freight earned by the ship, which freight was itself insured Lord Robson observed (at p 549): ‘So far as these payments consisted of current working expenses necessary to earn freight they were covered by the insurance on the gross freight, and so far as they consisted of repairs, outfit, and insurance premium on hull they would ordinarily be included in the policy on ship and materials.’

19 [1911] AC 529 at p 542, HL.

20 The over-insurance was a matter which ‘might well make a prudent underwriter hesitate both as to undertaking the risk and consider the premium which he should require before doing so’: *per* Lord Alverstone CJ, *ibid*, at p 538 in *The Gunford Case*.

- (c) the double insurance is effected knowingly by the assured.<sup>21</sup>

## SUBROGATION

There is no doubt that the right of subrogation is a 'necessary incident of a contract of indemnity'.<sup>22</sup> In the words of Lord Justice Brett in *Castellian v Preston*, subrogation is '... a corollary of the great principle law of indemnity', and it is from this principle that an assured is not permitted to recover more than his actual loss. In the Act, the law relating to subrogation is contained in s 79 which is divided into two subsections. Subsection 79(1) refers to subrogation in the event of a total loss and sub-s 79(2), a partial loss.

### Definition of 'subrogation'

According to Lord Blackburn in *Burnand v Rodocanachi*,<sup>23</sup> the doctrine of subrogation is a rule of law and of equity:

'The general rule of law (and it is obvious justice) is that where there is a contract of indemnity ... and a loss happens, anything which reduces or diminishes that loss reduces or diminishes the amount which the indemnifier is bound to pay; and if the indemnifier has already paid it, then, if anything which diminishes the loss comes into the hands of the person to whom he has paid it, it becomes an equity that the person who has already paid the full indemnity is entitled to be recouped by having that amount back.'

In the earlier case of *Simpson v Thomson*,<sup>24</sup> Lord Cairns described the principle in the following terms:

'I know of no foundation for the right of underwriters, except the well-known principle of law, that where one person has agreed to indemnify another he will, on making good the indemnity, be entitled to succeed to all the ways and means by which the person indemnified might have protected himself against or reimbursed himself for the loss.'

On settlement of a loss, the indemnifier, the insurer, is, by the rule of subrogation, entitled to step into the shoes of the assured.<sup>25</sup> Having paid the assured for the loss, he is 'subrogated to all the rights and remedies of the assured in and in respect of that subject-matter as from the time of the casualty causing the loss'. The objective of this process is to prevent the assured from taking with both hands: once indemnified, he would not be allowed to be compensated twice over for the same loss.

---

21 An assured who deliberately over-insures by double insurance may well be found guilty of a breach of the duty of utmost good faith (s 17) and of disclosure (s 18).

22 *Chalmers' Marine Insurance Act* (1906, 10th edn), p 131; hereinafter referred to simply as 'Chalmers'.

23 (1882) 7 App Cas 333 at p 339.

24 (1877) 3 App Cas 279 at p 284, HL.

25 By way of subrogation, the insurer has to sue in the name of the assured, whereas in the case of an assignment, he may sue in his own name.



It is to be noted that there is no right of subrogation in respect of a ppi policy. Void in law, the policy is not only unenforceable, but no rights can be derived from it.<sup>26</sup>

## Settlement of total loss

In the event of a settlement of a total loss, the insurer is, by s 79(1):

- 'entitled to take over the interest of the assured in whatever may remain of the subject-matter so paid for'; and
- 'subrogated to all the rights and remedies of the assured in and in respect of that subject-matter as from the time of the casualty causing the loss'.

There are two separate aspects to this rule: the right to take over the interest in the remains of the subject-matter insured (involving abandonment and proprietary rights) and the right to subrogation. Though distinct, both rights are kindred to the principle of indemnity. In *Attorney-General v Glen Line Ltd and Liverpool & London War Risks Association Ltd*,<sup>27</sup> Lord Atkin, drawing the distinction between the rights of abandonment and the rights of subrogation, said that 'in respect of abandonment the rights exist on a valid abandonment, whereas in respect of subrogation they only arise on payment ...'. Later, Mr Justice Diplock in *Yorkshire Insurance Co v Nisbet Shipping Co Ltd*<sup>28</sup> warned that:

'It is to be noted that the subsection [referring to s 79(1)] which comes into operation only upon payment for the total loss by the insurer, deals with two distinct matters: (1) the interest of the assured in the subject-matter insured, and (2) the rights and remedies of the assured in and in respect of that subject-matter.'

A failure to recognise that they are distinct has caused some confusion in the law.

### *Abandonment and proprietary rights*

The word 'entitled' appearing in s 79(1) clarifies that the insurer is not compelled to take over whatever may remain of the subject-matter insured. The effect of this rule has raised interesting questions relating to proprietary rights over the abandoned property. This provision has to be read with s 63 (on the effects of abandonment) stating that:

'Where there is a valid abandonment, the insurer is entitled to take over the interest of the assured in whatever may remain of the subject-matter insured, and all proprietary rights incidental thereto.'

The connection between a constructive total loss and the notice of abandonment was highlighted by Lord Justice Brett in *Castellain v Preston*<sup>29</sup> as follows:

---

26 See *Edwards & Co Ltd v Motor Union Insurance Co Ltd* [1922] 2 KB 249; 11 Ll L Rep 170; 27 Com Cas 367 where McCardie J remarked: 'Legal proceedings to enforce subrogative rights cannot be based on a document which is stricken with sterility by an Act of Parliament.'

27 (1930) 37 Ll L Rep 55 at p 61; (1930) 36 Com Cas 1 at p 13.

28 [1961] 1 Lloyd's Rep 479.

29 (1883) 11 QBD 380 at p 387, CA.

‘The doctrine of constructive total loss and the doctrine of notice of abandonment engrafted upon it were invented or promulgated for the purpose of making a policy of marine insurance a contract of indemnity in the fullest sense of the term.’

Section 63(1), using the same expression – ‘entitled to take over’, emphasises the fact that the insurer has on abandonment the option to take over ‘all proprietary rights incidental thereto’.

### Acceptance of abandonment

In practice, insurers rarely accept the abandonment, for this carries with it not only rights but also liabilities in respect of the abandoned property.<sup>30</sup> However, should they agree, whether expressly or impliedly, to assume ownership over the remains of the subject-matter insured, they would be able to retain any profit made on its sale. This rule was first established in *Attorney General v Glen Line Ltd*,<sup>31</sup> where the insurer was allowed to retain the whole of the proceeds of the sale even though he profited as a result. Justice Diplock in *Yorkshire Insurance Co v Nisbet Shipping Co Ltd*<sup>32</sup> observed that in the case of abandonment, ‘the insurer is entitled although not bound to take over; if he does, the whole interest of the assured in the subject-matter insured is transferred to him’.

In this regard, some may say that the principle of indemnity has failed to realise its full potential, that the contract is not one of perfect indemnity. In accepting the abandonment, the insurer takes over not only rights but also liabilities in relation to the remains of the subject-matter insured. Thus, it could be validly argued that as he had assumed all responsibility in respect of the subject-matter insured, he should be allowed to keep any reward arising therefrom, which may be regarded as the consideration (or ‘price’) for accepting the good with the bad with the transfer of ownership.<sup>33</sup>

The insurer is also, by reason of s 63(2), entitled to any freight earned after his acceptance of the abandonment.<sup>34</sup> According to Lord Blackburn in *Simpson v Thomson*,<sup>35</sup> ‘the right to receive payment of freight accruing due but not earned at the time of the disaster is one of those rights so incident to the property in the ship, and it therefore passes to the underwriters because the ship has become their property ...’.<sup>36</sup>

---

30 Obvious liabilities are expenses incurred for the removal of the wreck and damage caused by oil pollution See *River Wear Comrs v Adamson* (1877) 2 App Cas 743; *The Mostyn* [1928] AC 57; and *Arrow Shipping Co v Tyne Improvement Comrs* [1894] AC 508.

31 [1930] 36 Com Cas 1; [1930] 37 Ll L Rep 55.

32 [1961] 1 Lloyd’s Rep 479.

33 The same rule applies to the case of a missing ship: the insurer, on paying out, is entitled to keep the vessel should she later reappear: see s 58 and *Houstman v Thornton* (1816) Holt N P 242.

34 See *Stewart v Greenock Marine Insurance Co* (1848) 2 HL Cas 159. To negate the operation of s 63(2), the ‘Freight Waiver’ clause (cl 20 ITCH(95) and cl 18 IVCH(95)) states: ‘In the event of total or constructive total loss no claim to be made by the Underwriters for freight whether notice of abandonment has been given or not.’

35 (1877) 3 App Cas 279 at p 292, HL.

36 How the ship has become the property of the underwriter is another separate question altogether which will be discussed later. Suffice it is here to say that Lord Blackburn was of the view that it automatically passes over to the insurer on settlement of the loss.

## No acceptance of abandonment

Problematic issues, however, arise where the insurer does not exercise the right to 'take over the interest of the assured in whatever may remain of the subject-matter insured so paid for ...'. It is now necessary to consider the particular circumstance where the insurer who has paid the assured for the loss has declined to accept, expressly or impliedly, the abandoned property. The pertinent question is: Who is the owner of the abandoned property?

There are three possibilities as regards the subject of ownership on abandonment pursuant to a total loss: ownership could be automatically transferred to the insurer on settlement of the loss; the abandoned property could be *res nullius* – belongs to no one; or all proprietary rights remain with the shipowner.

### *Automatic transfer of ownership to insurer*

In *Simpson v Thomson*, decided before the Act, Lord Blackburn of the House of Lords advocated the notion of automatic transfer. He had no doubt at all that:

'... where the owners of an insured ship have claimed or been paid as for a total loss, the property in what remains of the ship, and all rights incident to the property, are transferred to the underwriters as from the time of the disaster ...'

He argued that the validity of the rule as regards the insurer's right to freight (now contained in s 63(2)) can only be supported if this was the case.<sup>37</sup> His comments on this subject have already been cited. It is to be noted that Chief Justice Cockburn in *North of England Steamship Insurance Association v Armstrong* also supported this rule.<sup>38</sup>

### *Res nullius*

Mr Justice Bailhache in *Mayor & Corp'n of Boston v France, Fenwick & Co Ltd*<sup>39</sup> expressed the view that the wreck must be *res nullius*, meaning, in lay terms, that it belongs to nobody, but to the world at large. His remarks were: 'I will only say that there is a good deal to be said ... in favour of the wreck in such circumstances becoming a *res nullius*'. There does not appear to be overwhelming support for this view.

Both the above rule of automatic transfer of ownership and of *res nullius* are regarded by many as difficult to support, not only on the ground of the wording of both ss 63 and 79 but also of s 61 where an assured may, in the event of a constructive total loss, treat the loss as a partial loss. If the assured was held

---

37 The wording of s 63(2) does not say anything about transfer of ownership. It is capable of two interpretations, namely, that the insurer is entitled to the said freight only if he accepts the abandonment, or, regardless of whether or not he accepts the abandonment. Unless the insurer has exercised the right to take over the interest or the notion of automatic transfer of ownership applies, it is difficult to see how he could be entitled to the freight earned subsequent to the casualty causing the loss. Lord Blackburn obviously prefers the latter construction.

38 (1870) LR 5 QB 244 at p 248. He said: 'Now, I take it to be clearly established, in the case of a total loss, that whatever remains of the vessel in the shape of salvage, or whatever rights accrue to the owner of the thing insured and lost, they pass to the underwriter the moment he is called upon to satisfy the exigency of the policy ...'.

39 (1923) 15 Ll L Rep 85; 28 Com Cas 367 at p 373.

to have been divested of ownership of the remains, it would be impossible for him to treat the loss as a partial loss.

### ***Ownership remains with the assured***

The third view, held by Lord Justice Greer in *Oceanic Steam Navigation Co v Evans*,<sup>40</sup> is that if the abandonment is not accepted by the insurer, the owner (assured) is not divested of ownership of the wreck. In other words, there is no automatic transfer of ownership and the property is not *res nullius*, but remains in the ownership of the assured until such time as the insurer exercises his right to take over control or ownership over the abandoned property. This appears to be the preponderant view.<sup>41</sup>

### ***Rights of subrogation***

The second part of s 79(1) confers upon the insurer 'all the rights and remedies of the assured in and in respect of that subject-matter'. In this regard, the extent of the subrogative rights has to be considered in relation to recovery of damages from a wrong-doer; gifts and voluntary payments received by the assured; and the right to salvage in the case of under-insurance.

### **Recovery of damages from a wrong-doer**

In the event of a collision for which a third party is liable, an assured may well receive by way of damages an amount in excess of what he is entitled to claim under the policy. It is also possible that the insurer himself may, after having indemnified the assured for his loss, by exercising his right of subrogation recover from the wrong-doer a sum in excess of what he has paid to the assured. The crux of the matter is: Which party, the assured or insurer, is entitled to keep the excess? It should not make any difference to the question of entitlement to the sum already paid by the insurer to the assured, and to the excess, whether the assured or the insurer has recovered the damages from the third party.

### ***Recovery of the amount paid by the insurer***

In the early case of *North of England Steamship Insurance Association v Armstrong*,<sup>42</sup> the insurer paid the assured the sum of £6,000 (the full sum insured) as for a total loss, when the insured vessel was run down and sunk by another ship. Subsequently, a sum of £5,000 was recovered against the owners of the other vessel. The real value of the insured vessel was £9,000. The insurers asserted that they were entitled to the whole of £5,000. Chief Justice Cockburn awarded judgment in favour of the insurers on two grounds: first, by reason of the conclusive nature of a valued policy,<sup>43</sup> and, secondly, on the point of law

---

40 (1934) 50 Ll L Rep 1 at p 3, CA.

41 See also *Blane Steamship Ltd v Minister of Transport* [1951] 2 KB 965 at p 990 where Cohen LJ agreed with Greer LJ's opinion; *Pesquerías y Secaderos de Bacalao de España SA v Beer* (1946) 79 Ll L Rep 417 at p 433; *Dee Conservancy Board v McConnell* [1928] 2 KB 159 at p 163; and *Allgemeine Versicherungs-Gesellschaft Helvetia v Administrator of German Property* [1930] 1 KB 672 at p 688.

42 (1870) LR 5 QB 244; 39 LJ QB 81.

43 This issue which need not concern us here will be examined later.

relating to the right to salvage pursuant to payment for a total loss.<sup>44</sup> Using the right to salvage as analogy, Chief Justice Cockburn has implied that the insurer would be entitled to the whole sum (including the excess) in the event of a settlement with the assured. He was only able to arrive at this decision on the ground of automatic transfer of ownership.<sup>45</sup> It has to be said, and with due respect, that he has failed to appreciate the distinction between the right of the insurer to take over the interest of the assured in whatever may remain of the subject-matter insured with all proprietary rights incidental thereto, and the right of subrogation. In so far as the sum recovered from the wrong-doer did not exceed the amount which the insurer had paid to the assured, the decision of the court is correct. But real problems, however, would arise if the recovery was to exceed the amount paid out by the insurer.<sup>46</sup>

In *Thames and Mersey Marine Insurance Co v British and Chilian Steamship Co*,<sup>47</sup> the Court of Appeal, on similar facts, also held that the insurer was entitled to the whole sum recovered by the assured from the wrong-doer. But again, as the amount so recovered was not in excess of the sum paid out by the insurer, the decision cannot be faulted. However, in so far as the amount of damages recovered was calculated on the basis of a figure (the real value of the ship) higher than the agreed value stated in the policy, the decision is open to criticism.

### *Recovery of the excess*

As was seen, there was no excess in either of the above two cases. Thus, they cannot be cited as authority for having laid down the rule that an insurer is entitled to any excess which may be recovered from a wrong-doer. The case which is directly on point as regards such a claim is *Yorkshire Insurance Co Ltd v Nisbet Shipping Co Ltd*,<sup>48</sup> where the insurer had, in accordance with the terms of the policy, paid the assured £72,000 for a total loss. Subsequently, the assured, because of a devaluation of the pound, received from the third party liable for the collision a sum in excess of what they had received from the insurer. The

---

44 He said at p 248: 'It is admitted that if this ship had been recovered from the bottom of the sea ... the body of the vessel would have passed to the underwriters. If moreover, the value had proved to be more than the estimated value in the policy, the underwriters would still have been entitled to the vessel so recovered. And I think it is clear also, where we have, instead of the ship, the supposed value of the ship, or so much of it as the delinquent vessel could be called upon to contribute for the loss, that what is recovered must be taken to represent the lost ship; and then, just as the underwriters would be entitled to the ship if it could have been bodily got back, so they are entitled to what which is the representative of the ship in the shape of damage to be paid by the owners of the vessel which caused the collision.'

45 In *Goole & Hull Steam Towing Co Ltd v Ocean Marine Insurance Co Ltd* [1928] 1 KB 589 at p 598, Mackinnon J (as he then was) suggests that Cockburn CJ's reasoning can only be supported if it is based on 'cession of property to the underwriter upon payment for a total loss'.

46 Mellor J's views on the question of indemnity appears be more acceptable. Using the agreed valuation as the ceiling, he said, at p 250, that: '... as a matter of course ... all those rights, which spring out of the payment by an underwriter for a total loss, must be governed by the agreed value.'

47 [1916] 1 KB 30, CA.

48 [1961] 1 Lloyd's Rep 479.

insurers then proceeded against the assured claiming not only what they paid out, but the whole sum which the assured had received from the third party. There was no doubt whatsoever that the insurer was entitled to recover the sum which he had paid out to the assured under the policy. By the doctrine of subrogation, they were clearly entitled to at least £72,000. But whether this right to subrogation extends to recovery of the excess was the main ground of contention. The court held that the insurers were entitled to be paid only the amount which they had paid under the policy. The excess windfall belonged to the assured. According to Mr Justice Diplock, the law has never 'suggested that the insurer can recover from the assured the amount of the excess'. More pointedly, his interpretation of the second part of s 79(1) was that it was 'limited to recovering any sum which he has overpaid; he cannot recover more than he has in fact paid'.<sup>49</sup>

The rule that the insurer is entitled only to what he has in fact paid out under the policy is derived from the principle of indemnity as spelt out in s 1 of the Act; in this context, the words 'in the manner and to the extent thereby agreed' are particularly relevant. For the same reason, if the assured were allowed to retain both sums, he would be paid twice over for the same loss: He would be more than indemnified for the loss. Summing up, '[t]he simple principle ... is that the insurer cannot recover under the doctrine of subrogation now embodied in s 79 of the Marine Insurance Act 1906, anything more than he has paid'.<sup>50</sup> In the words of Lord Atkin, subrogation only arises on payment, and 'will only give the insurer rights up to 20s in the £ on what he has paid ...'.<sup>51</sup>

### *Gifts and voluntary payments*

Whether an insurer who has paid the assured and has thereby been subrogated to the rights of the assured is entitled to claim any benefit which has been conferred on the assured by third parties is a question which has to be considered. The real issue here is: How far does the principle of subrogation extend? An assured may receive gifts and voluntary payments made by third parties for the purpose of compensating him for his loss. This precise point arose in *Burnand v Rodocanachi*,<sup>52</sup> where a compensation was paid to the assured in respect of the difference between the real value of the cargo and the sum which the assured received from their insurers. The insurers claimed from the assured, as salvage, this sum which the assured had received from the compensation fund. The House of Lords held that the insurers were not entitled to this sum because it was a gift made not for the purpose of reducing the loss against which the insurers had to indemnify the assured, but to compensate the assured personally for the loss actually sustained by him. In each case, the purpose of the gift or voluntary payment has to be ascertained. An insurer

---

49 The principle was applied in *Goole & Hull Steam Towing Co Ltd v Ocean Marine Ins Co Ltd* [1928] 1 KB 589 in relation to a partial loss.

50 [1961] 1 Lloyds Rep 479 at p 487, *per* Diplock J.

51 *Attorney General v Glen Line Ltd* [1930] 36 Com Cas 1 at p 13.

52 (1882) 7 App Cas 333.

cannot claim a gift or payment the purpose of which is to indemnify the assured for that portion of the loss which the insurance had not covered.

### ***Under-insurance***

An assured may insure 'for an amount less than the insurable value, or, in the case of a valued policy, for an amount less than the policy valuation'. In such an event, he is under-insured and is deemed by s 81 to be his own insurer in respect of the uninsured balance. An assured who is under-insured may find himself out of pocket even though he may have been fully indemnified by the insurer under the policy. As he is his own insurer for a proportion of the loss, he is entitled consequent to abandonment to a proportionate share of the salvage. The doctrine of subrogation, which originates from the principle of indemnity, will not permit an insurer from recovering more than he has paid out for his share of the risk. This principle was applied in *The Commonwealth*,<sup>53</sup> where the Court of Appeal held that '... the underwriters are to take all that is recovered, provided it does not exceed the amount they have paid ...'.

### **Settlement of partial loss**

As there is no question of abandonment of the insured property in the case of an indemnity for a partial loss, the insurer has no proprietary right to the subject-matter (or the remains of it) insured. By s 79(2), he is subrogated only to the rights and remedies of the assured, but only in so far as the assured has been indemnified. On the other side of the coin, the assured would not be allowed to retain any recovery from a third party when he has already been indemnified by his insurers.

---

53 [1907] P 216, CA; affirming *The Welsh Girl* (1906) 22 TLR 475, the assured who were their own insurers for a 350/1,350th share were entitled to recover from their insurers that proportion of the sum which the insurer had obtained from the ship at fault.