

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-341

FORM No. 1-341 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by Seaman--Maintenance and Cure

[Caption and Jurisdictional	l Statement] n1		
		at all times hereinafter mentioned and is a left to bring this complaint without prepay	
		or during the pendency of this action will	
information and belief, at a	ll times hereinafter r	mentioned the defendant,	was and still is a
corporation organized and e	existing under and b	y virtue of the laws of	with an office and place
of business at	, and ow	rned and operated the vessel	·
4. On or about	, 20	, the plaintiff signed articles at	to serve on
		e capacity of ordinary seaman for a voyag and back to a port of discharge	•
	nd on orders of the d	, the plaintiff was in the performance efendant, through its agents, officers and using injuries].	
the part of the defendant, th	ne defendant became hich to sustain and n	aintiff, and without regard to the question obligated to provide the plaintiff with proparation outpatien	oper medical care and attention
7 The plaintiff was a hospi	tal natient at	in	from 20 to

	, 20	_, and since		, 20	, has been an	outpatient a	at that
hospital, and continues	s to receive t	reatment and re	emain an outpatien	t at the hosp	ital. The defend	dant has pai	d the plaintiff
his maintenance at the	rate of \$		per day thr	ough		, 20	, but has
failed and refused to p	ay the plaint	iff his maintena	ance since that date	e.			
8. By reason of the maperiod fromplaintiff is \$, 20, ı	until he has been c	ured. The ar	nount due and t		
[Prayer for Process, L	Demand for J	udgment and V	/erification] n2				
FOOTNOTES:							
(n1)Footnote 1. See F	orm No. 1-1	supra.					
(n2)Footnote 2. S	eeForm Nos	. 1-3, 1-6, 1-10	and 1-12 <i>supra</i> .				

^{*} See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XIII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. VII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-342

FORM No. 1-342 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by Seaman--Injury; Maintenance and Cure

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1 5. On or about the ______ day of ______, 20 ____ while said vessel was lying at pier _____ the plaintiff, in the performance of his duties and in the exercise of due care and caution, was [describe seaman's activities and unseaworthy condition]. 6. Said injuries were not caused by any fault or negligence on the part of plaintiff but wholly and solely by reason of the unseaworthiness of the vessel ______, as aforesaid. 7. Plaintiff thereby became sick, sore, lame and disabled and was thereafter removed to a hospital for treatment; has been and will, for some time to come, be confined to his home; has been and will be prevented from working; has lost and will lose large sums of money which he otherwise would have earned; has suffered and will suffer great pain; will, as he is informed and believes, have to pay large sums of money for medical and surgical attendance and medicine, and has been permanently injured, all to his damage in the sum of \$_____ FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION Plaintiff realleges all the facts set forth in the first cause of action herein and in addition thereto, respectfully shows and alleges: 8. Upon information and belief it was the duty of the master to furnish plaintiff with prompt and proper medical and surgical care and medicines; that the plaintiff was forced to remain on board said vessel for a period of

without proper medical and surgical attendance; that during the said time, plaintiff was

suffering intense pain and agony and was in need of immediate medical and surgical attendance but was not furnished with medical aid and attendance and was not removed to a hospital for treatment until the	
9. By reason of the aforesaid failure and negligence on the part of the master, the plaintiff suffered excruciating pain agony, his injuries were greatly aggravated and, as he is informed and believes, have been rendered permanent and incurable and he has been damaged in the further sum of \$	and
FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION	

Plaintiff realleges all the facts set forth in the first cause of action herein and in addition thereto respectfully shows-and alleges:

10. By reason of the premises, plaintiff is entitled to maintenance, care and cure so long as he shall be disabled and unable to work by reason of the said injury, and to wages for the duration of the voyage on which the said vessel was engaged at the time of said injury to plaintiff.

[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment and Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-341 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6, 1-10 and 1-12 supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XIII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. VII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-343

FORM No. 1-343 Complaint In Rem by Seaman--Maintenance and Cure; Wages

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

4. Some time in the month of	, 20	, the master,	, of vessel
			stined on a
years' voyage to	, by himself or hi	is agent hired the plaintif	f as a green hand aboard the vessel fifth lay of share of what should be
			forth as Exhibit A to this complain
5. On or about as a gre			into the service of the vessel board, proceeded on her intended
voyage, and cruised about the months	and	d other places for the per	riod of about
6. As the vessel	9 9		, on or about id vessel, and while doing his duty
and obeying the commands of the		_	
7. While the plaintiff was so conf			
			or about, 2
			, where she
arrived on or about	20 and	d has since come to this	nort where she is now

8. During the said voyage the vessel	took a cargo of	of great value,
being, as the plaintiff is informed and believes,	; and the plaintiff c	laims to be entitled to
demand and have of and from the said ship, her master and	owners, his share, or lay of said	cargo, being the two
hundred and twenty-fifth part thereof, worth, as the plaintiff	verily believes, the sum of	dollars
and upwards, which the master and owners of the said ship l	have hitherto refused and still re	fuse to pay, to the great
damage of the plaintiff.		
9. By reason of the injuries so received in the service of the [state injuries].	said vessel, as above stated, the	plaintiff
[Prayer for Process and Verification] n2		
FOOTNOTES:		
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-341 supra.		
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-10 and 1-12 supplemental suppleme	ra.	

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XIII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. VII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-344

FORM No. 1-344 Complaint In Personam by Seaman (Jones Act)--Injury

[Caption] n1		
1. This action arises under 46 U.S.C. § 688, as hereinafter m	nore fully appears.	
2. During all the times herein mentioned defendant was the the transportation of freight for hire by water in interstate ar		_ and used it in
3. During the first part of [month and year] at		
able seaman on said vessel under seaman's articles of custor to the Orient and return at a wage of dollars per month as a shore work	dollars per month and found, which is eq	
4. On, said vessel was and was being navigated by the m ports. [here describe weather condinary complaint for personal injuries the negligent condi-	naster and crew on the return voyage to ditions and the condition of the ship and stat	te as in an
5. By reason of defendant's negligence in thus [brief statement unseaworthiness of said steamship, plaintiff was [describe p		2
6. Prior to these injuries, plaintiff was a strong, able bodied dollars per day. By these injuries l	man, capable of earning and actually earnin he has been made incapable of any gainful a	-
suffered great physical and mental pain, and has incurred ex medicine, medical attendance, and hospitalization.		•

	Wherefore plaintiff demands judgment against defendant in the sum of	dollars and costs.	n^2
--	--	--------------------	-------

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. This is substantially Form 15 of the Official Forms annexed to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XIII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. VII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-345

FORM No. 1-345 Complaint In Personam by Seaman (Jones Act)/Injury to Crewmember of Yachtn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2

A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

		upon information and belief, owns, registered and documented under the
Laws of the United States and	flying the American flag.	
	-	by of the defendant as a member of the crew of the ne capacity of
		[state where yacht was located], accident that occurred while she was boarding said
		n of the following negligence of the defendant and the t: [state alleged acts of negligence].
_	her injuries solely and alone by reases and did not contribute in any wa	ason of the negligence of the defendant and defendant's ay to the injuries sustained by her.
	oss of wages and upon information	was caused to sustain and endure pain and suffering and and belief plaintiff is permanently injured and

A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

11. That on or about	, 20	, while the yacht	was docked at the
, plaintiff unseaworthiness of said vessel, its			ies, all by reason of the
unseaworthness of said vesser, its	apphances, appurte	nances, and equipment.	
12. That said yacht			me aforesaid when the plaintiff
sustained her accident and injuries	s, in that [<i>describe al</i>	leged unseaworthiness].	
A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTI	ION		
13. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and 13 inclusive with the same force a	-	• •	n the Complaint numbered 1 through
unseaworthiness of the vessel, req duty and obligation to furnish to the failed to provide and afford; that b	uired prompt, adequence plaintiff prompt a by reason of the deferment further and addition	ate medical aid, care, and a nd adequate medical aid, c ndant's failure to provide a onal pain and suffering and	egligence of the defendant and the attention; that it was the defendant's are, and attention, which the defendant dequate and prompt medical care, aid, I more serious physical damage and,
15. That by reason of the premises	s, plaintiff suffered d	amages in the sum of \$	
A FOURTH CAUSE OF AC	TION		
16. Plaintiff repeats and realleges with the same force and effect as i			at numbered 1 through 16 inclusive,
	the yacht	an aggravat	e plaintiff was caused to suffer in the tion of a preexisting non-disabling worthiness of the vessel.
· ·	d will be required to	-	otain medical treatment and has been are and attention, all to her damage in
[Demand for Judgment] n3			
FOOTNOTES:			
(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted fro	m papers filed in Lit	tlejohn v. Bakwin, Civ. No	o. 83-4343 (E.D.N.Y. 1983).
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No	o. 1-1 and 1-5 <i>supra</i> .		
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No	o. 1-6 <i>supra</i> .		

^{*} See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XIII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. VII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-346

FORM No. 1-346 Complaint In Personam by Seaman for Maintenance and Cure, Attorney Fees, and Double Wages Under Jones Act--Injuryn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegation Concerning Parties] n2
3. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff,, was a Jones Act seaman who was entitled to all of the protections of the Jones Act as enumerated therein.
4. This action is brought under the purview of 46 U.S.C. § 688, hereinafter referred to as the Jones Act, and for breach of the general maritime law of the shipowner's duty to maintain a seaworthy vessel. Plaintiff would show that on or about the
[state alleged acts of negligent]
5. Plaintiff would show that by reason of the injuries sustained as a result of the accident which occurred on or about the day of, 20, he has suffered severe and disabling injuries. As a
result of said injuries, plaintiff has suffered the loss of earnings in the past, and the disability from which plaintiff now suffers and will, in all reasonable medical probability, continue to suffer for the rest of his life has caused his earning capacity to be permanently and materially diminished. In addition, plaintiff has suffered great physical pain and mental anguish in the past, and, in all reasonable medical probability, will continue to suffer on a permanent basis great

physical pain and mental anguish. Furthermore, as a result of the injuries which your plaintiff sustained, he has been permanently disfigured and afflicted with a substantial degree of physical impairment which, in all reasonable medical probability, is permanent. Plaintiff has also been forced to incur expenses for medical and hospital care as a direct result of the injuries complained of herein and, in all reasonable medical probability, as a result of the injuries complained of herein plaintiff will continue to incur medical and hospital expenses for the remainder of his lifetime. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff has been damaged by the defendants in an amount that exceeds the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court.

- 6. At all times material hereto, the plaintiff was a Jones Act seaman and, as such, he is entitled to all of the protections and remedies enumerated under the Jones Act. Defendants are, therefore, liable to your plaintiff to pay maintenance and cure to plaintiff until such time as plaintiff obtains his maximum medical improvement. Defendants have failed and neglected to honor their obligations to plaintiff to pay the expenses of his maintenance and cure while incapacitated as a result of the injuries complained of herein. Further, plaintiff would show that although demand has been made upon the defendants to pay the plaintiff the maintenance and cure that is properly due and owing him under law, defendants without just cause have wholly failed and refused to pay plaintiff the maintenance and cure to which he is legally entitled. Defendants' refusal to pay neither has nor had any basis in law or in fact, and defendants have not asserted and do not now assert that plaintiff did not become disabled while in service of the aforementioned vessel. By reason of the foregoing, the plaintiff has been required to obtain legal counsel to assist him in collecting sums which are rightfully due him as maintenance and cure, and has obligated himself to pay reasonable attorneys' fees for legal services rendered in regard to the collection of maintenance and cure which is rightfully due your plaintiff. Plaintiff herein prays that upon final trial of this cause, defendants be ordered to pay all maintenance and cure due and owing him, together with interest thereon, and a reasonable attorneys' fee to the undersigned counsel for legal counsel and assistance rendered in collecting said maintenance and cure.
- 7. In addition to the damages which plaintiff has heretofore complained of, the plaintiff has not been paid wages which are rightfully due and owing to your plaintiff until the end of the voyage of the aforementioned vessel, the ending date of said voyage being currently unknown to your plaintiff. Plaintiff has been refused payment of such wages without any basis in law or in fact. Therefore, under applicable provisions of the Jones Act, plaintiff is entitled to the statutory recovery of double the amount of wages originally due and owing to him. Plaintiff prays that upon final trial of this cause, he be awarded all past due wages, interest on these wages until date of judgment, and all amounts due him as penalties under applicable provisions of the Jones Act.

[Demand for Judgment] n3

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in De Oliveria v. Delta Marine Drilling Co., 684 F.2d 337 (5th Cir. 1982), furnished through the courtesy of Dixie Smith, Esq., Fulbright & Jaworski, Houston, Texas.

```
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.
```

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.

^{*} See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XIII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. VII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-347

FORM No. 1-347 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by Seaman--Injury

[Caption and Jurisdictional Statement] n1	
[Allegations Concerning Parties as in Form No. 1-341, supra]	
4. On or about, 20, the plaintiff signed articles at board the vessel the capacity of able seaman, at wages of \$ month, plus overtime, for a voyage from the port of to,	per
the port of discharge. 5. The plaintiff entered into the performance of his duties aboard the vessel and o	n or about
	the plaintiff
6. [state nature of accident, cause and alleged negligent acts, unseaworthiness fault of owner]	
A FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
25. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all of the foregoing para graphs with the same force and effect as though forth.	herein set

26. As a result of defendant's unwarranted refusal to pay maintenance and cure plaintiff has been forced to retain

attorneys and has incurred liability for attorneys fees and legal expenses.
27. As a result of the foregoing plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of \$
[Demand for Judgment] n2
Dated
Attorney for Plaintiff
FOOTNOTES:
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 supra.

^{*} See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XIII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. VII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-348

FORM No. 1-348 Complaint (Third Party) Against the United State--Personal Injury

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

4. At all times hereinafter mentioned, the t vessel, its identif		
5. Third-party plaintiffsaid answer being attached hereto and inco	<u>*</u>	h and every allegation of its answer, a copy of
• •	-	ain injuries and/or damages the cause thereof ng attached hereto and incorporated herein as
•	products liability, other than the in part by reason of the primary defendant herein with the neglige	

8. If judgment is rendered against defendant and third-party plaintiff based on the occurrences alleged in plaintiff's complaint, this defendant and third-party plaintiff would have been cast into damages by operation of law and thereby harmed and therefore this defendant and third party plaintiff is entitled to judgment over and against, in whole or in part, the third party defendant.

Wherefore, said third-party plaintiff	demands judgment dismissing plaintiff's complaint as to
this defendant and third-party plaintiff	further demands that the ultimate rights of the
defendant and third-party plaintiff be determined in this ac	ction, and that said defendant and third-party plaintiff
have judgment over and against,	in whole or in part, the third-party defendant
for any verdict or judgment which	ch my be obtained herein by the plaintiff against this
defendant and third-party plaintiff with costs and disburse	ments to abide the event.
Dated:	
Attorney for Defendant and	
Third-Party Plaintiff	
EQUITNOTES	
FOOTNOTES:	
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.	

^{*} See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XIII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. VII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-349

FORM No. 1-349 Complaint In Personam by Seaman's Estate (Jones Act)--Wrongful Death

7. The injuries to and ensuing death of the plaintiff's decedent were caused solely by the carelessness and negligence of the defendant, its officers, and agents and servants in:				
[state alleged negligent acts and unseaworthy conditions]				
8. The plaintiff's decedent left surviving him as his heirs and net of kin his wife,, and two infant sons, and, all of whom have sustained and will sustain pecuniary losses by reason of the decedent's death, all to their damage in the estimated sum of \$				
[Demand for Judgment] n2				
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.				
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 supra.				
* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XIII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. VII (Matthew Bender				

7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-350

FORM No. 1-350 Seaman's Complaint Under Suits in Admiralty Act, Public Vessel Act, and Pursuant to the Provisions of 28 U.S.C.A. 2016 Permitting Seaman to File Suit Without Prepayment of Costs

[Caption] n1
The Complaint of, plaintiff, by and, his attorneys, against the United States of America, in an action of tort, civil and maritime, respectfully represents:
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
1. That this Honorable Court has jurisdiction over the above entitled action by reason of the Suits in Admiralty Act (46 <i>U.S.C. Sec. 741, et seq.</i>) and by reason of the Public Vessels Act (47 U.S.C. Sec. 786).
2. That this is an admiralty or maritime claim within the meaning of Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(h).
3. That all and singular matters set forth herein are true and within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and of this Honorable Court.
4. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, the United States of America was and still is a sovereign which has, by law, consented to be sued herein.
5. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, the United States of America owned, operated and had in its possession and control the, a merchant and/or public vessel sailing under United States registry.
6. That the plaintiff was employed as a seamen in the capacity of aboard the

7. That on or about the aforesaid vessel and was in good health		, the plaintiff entered upon the performance of his duties aboard al condition.
8. That on or aboutincident].	_, 20	, the plaintiff was caused to be severely injured when, [describe
9. That the plaintiff sailed out of the port of	·	in the State of
pain and agony and he has required extension and attention, and he has lost and may conti	ve medical inue to lose	riff as aforesaid, he has suffered and will continue to suffer great care and attention, and he may require additional medical care large sums of money which he otherwise would have earned, pain and agony, and he will be permanently partially disabled as a
11. That all of said losses, damages and inju	uries are a d	lirect result of the negligent failure of the defendant to
[state alleged negligent acts]		
Dollars (\$). SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION		ages and makes claim in the amount of
forth herein at length, and in addition allege	_	1 11 of this complaint with the same force and effect as if see
with a safe and seaworthy vessel and with s	afe and sea d seaworth	direct result of the failure of the defendant to provide the plaintiff worthy personnel, and as a result of the failure of the defendant, y condition the equipment and appurtenances of the aforesaid unseaworthy.
Wherefore, the plaintiff has sustained lossed Dollars (\$ RU2).	es and dama	ges and makes claim in the amount of
Attorney for Plaintiff		
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form No. 1-1 <i>supra</i> .		

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XIII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. VII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty Form 1-351

Form 1-351 Complaint -- Denial of Payment to Hospital for Medical Treatment

Plaintiff [HOSPITAL], complains and alleges:

INTRODUCTORY ALLEGATIONS

- 1. This court's jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to 28 *U.S.C. Section 1332(a)* in that the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$50,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and the action is between citizens of different states.
- 2. Venue is properly laid within the central district of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1391(a)(2) because the acts complained of have occurred within this district; pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1391(a)(3) at least one of the defendants is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district at the time this action is commenced and there is no district in which the action may be brought otherwise; and because the ends of justice so require.
- 3. This action seeks damages, costs, and other appropriate relief for the improper, erroneous and illegal denial of payment for medical, surgical and hospital benefits provided to Defendant [SHIP OWNER]'s employee, [SEAMAN NAME]

THE PARTIES, AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS

- 2. Plaintiff [HOSPITAL] (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff") is, and at all times mentioned herein mentioned was, a [STATE] corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of [STATE] with its principal place of business in the [PLACE OF BUSINESS].
- 3. Defendant, [SHIP OWNER], (hereinafter referred to as "[SHIP OWNER]") is and at all relevant times herein mentioned was, a corporation, association, partnership or other business entity duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of Argentina, with its principal place of business in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Defendant [SHIP

OWNER] was authorized to transact and was transacting business in the State of California through its own employees and through agents, including shipping agents, Defendant [AGENT].

- 4. Defendant [AGENT] (hereinafter referred to as "[AGENT]"), DOES 1-100, inclusive. DOES 1 through 100 inclusive, are, and at all relevant times herein mentioned were corporations, associations, partnerships or other business entities duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of [STATE], authorized to and doing business within the State of [STATE], and maintaining offices in [PLACE OF BUSINESS], [AGENT] is the onshore shipping agent for the defendant [SHIP OWNER], in charge of onshore business for [SHIP OWNER], including, but not limited procuring crew, provisions and medical services for [SHIP OWNER]'s employees.
- 5. Defendant [CHARTERER'S AGENT] (hereinafter referred to as "[CHARTERER'S AGENT]"), DOES 1 through 100, inclusive. DOES 1-100 inclusive, are, and at all relevant times herein mentioned were, corporations, associations, partnerships or other business entities duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of [STATE]. [CHARTERER'S AGENT] is the onshore shipping agent in charge of onshore business for defendant [SHIP OWNER].
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that [AGENT] and [CHARTERER'S AGENT] are the same entity or are alter egos of each other. They share ownership, senior executives, corporate headquarters in [STATE] and office space throughout the United States, including two offices in [PLACE OF BUSINESS].
- 7. The true names or capacities, whether corporate, associate, or otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on such information and belief alleges, that each of the Defendants sued herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the events and happening referred to herein and will ask leave of this court to amend this complaint to insert their true names and capacities in place and instead of the fictitious names when the same become known to Plaintiff.
- 8. The true names or capacities, whether individual, or otherwise, of Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on such information and by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on such information and belief alleges, that each of the Defendants sued herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the events and happening referred to herein and will ask leave of this court to amend this complaint to insert their true names and capacities in place and instead of the fictitious names when the same become known to Plaintiff.
- 9. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, independent contractors, joint ventures and employees of each of the remaining Defendants, and were at all times acting within the purpose and scope of said agency, independent contract, joint venture and employment, and each Defendant has ratified and approved the acts of each of the remaining Defendants.
- 10. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, were co-conspirators with each of the other Defendants, and were at all times acting within the purpose and scope of said conspiracy, and each Defendant has ratified and approved the acts of each of the remaining Defendants.
- 11. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants [AGENT] and [SHIP OWNER] operated, managed, maintained, supervised, directed and controlled the activities of each of the other Defendants so that the activities, acts and omissions of each of the other Defendants were and are in reality the activities, acts and omissions of Defendants [AGENT] and [SHIP OWNER].
- 12. Defendants, and each of them entered into an oral contract with Plaintiff [HOSPITAL], in the State of [STATE], on [DATE]. In other ways and on other occasions, Defendants had availed themselves of the laws and benefits of the State

of [STATE] and/or have other connections with the State of [STATE], such that personal jurisdiction over those Defendants exists in this court.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 13. On [DATE], sixty-two-year merchant mariner, [SEAMAN NAME] of the cargo ship, Senator, arrived at the port of [HOSPITAL]. Upon arrival, [SEAMAN] suddenly experienced acute weakness, difficulty in breathing and coughing. He was subsequently seen at the medical offices of [DOCTOR] at the [HOSPITAL] Medical Clinic, where he was determined to be having either pneumonia or severe heart problems. [SEAMAN] was then transferred to [HOSPITAL] Doctor's Hospital and referred to [DOCTOR], who diagnosed [SEAMAN] condition as pulmonary edema. His condition was deteriorating and a coronary angiogram was deemed necessary. Because [HOSPITAL] Doctor's Hospital did not have the necessary equipment and was unable to perform this procedure, [SEAMAN] was transferred to [HOSPITAL].
- 14. [SEAMAN] was admitted to [HOSPITAL] and a coronary angiogram was performed. The coronary angiogram revealed that [SEAMAN] was afflicted with severely diseased left coronary artery disease. [SEAMAN] was found to have experienced an acute anterior wall myocardial infarction (heart attack) with cardiogenic shock.
- 15. On [DATE], [SEAMAN] was employed as a Chief Engineer by Defendant [SHIP OWNER], based in Buenos Aires, Argentina, where [SEAMAN] is a resident. [SEAMAN] had arrived at the port of [HOSPITAL] that same day.
- 16. On [DATE], [HOSPITAL] telephoned [AGENT] and verified [SEAMAN] insurance coverage. Additional verbal pre-authorization of benefits was obtained by [HOSPITAL] from [AGENT], prior to [SEAMAN] admission to [HOSPITAL].
- 17. Defendant [AGENT] informed [HOSPITAL] that [SEAMAN] was a visiting seaman from another country and that he was fully insured. [AGENT] orally agreed, warranted and guaranteed that it would pay all of [HOSPITAL]'s billed charges if [HOSPITAL] would provide immediate medical services to [SEAMAN]. Further, [AGENT] provided [HOSPITAL] with the phone number and billing address of [AGENT], identifying itself as the entity to which claims should be submitted. Thereafter, [SEAMAN] was admitted to [HOSPITAL] for medical treatment of acute anterior wall myocardial infarction with cardiogenic shock.
- 18. On [DATE], [SEAMAN] received emergent multiple coronary artery bypass surgery at [HOSPITAL] Memorial Hospital. On [DATE], [SEAMAN] was released from [HOSPITAL]. He subsequently returned to his home in [COUNTRY].
- 19. Beginning on [DATE] and continuing through [DATE], [HOSPITAL] submitted billing invoices and statements to [AGENT] and [SHIP OWNER] and had continuing telephonic communications with [AGENT] and [SHIP OWNER] requesting payments of insurance benefits. Alternatively, [HOSPITAL] requested that it be provided a written denial of benefits and an explanation for why Defendants refused and failed to reimburse [HOSPITAL] for the cost of [SEAMAN] emergent treatment.
- 20. On [DATE], [SHIP OWNER] offered "on a voluntary basis" to pay 50% of the charges for [SEAMAN] treatment. [HOSPITAL] refused this offer.
- 21. On [DATE], [SHIP OWNER] and [HOSPITAL] agreed to a settlement in which [SHIP OWNER] would pay 90% of the charges for [SEAMAN] treatment. No payment of any amount was ever received by [HOSPITAL].
- 22. On [DATE], [SHIP OWNER] represented to [HOSPITAL] that it had determined that its employee, [SEAMAN], had no insurance coverage and that [SHIP OWNER] was not responsible for the charges related to his emergent

admission and treatment at [HOSPITAL]. [SHIP OWNER] then offered to reinstate its original offer to pay only 50% of the charges for [SEAMAN] treatment "on a voluntary basis."

- 23. To date, [SHIP OWNER] and [AGENT] have failed and refused to provide any payments for medical services provided to [SEAMAN] by [HOSPITAL].
- 24. In detrimental reliance upon the aforementioned oral contract, verification, pre-certification and pre-authorization provided by Defendants, and each of them, [HOSPITAL] admitted [SEAMAN] and provided medical services and treatment to [SEAMAN]. Had representations of coverage not been made by Defendants, and each of them, [HOSPITAL] would not have allowed [SEAMAN] to be admitted nor would it have rendered services to him.

FIRST COUNT: FOR BREACH OF ORAL CONTRACT AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

- 25. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 24, inclusive, are incorporated herein by reference.
- 26. At all relevant times, an oral contract was in full force and effect between [HOSPITAL] and Defendants [SHIP OWNER], [AGENT], ROES, 1 through 100, inclusive, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive.
- 27. Pursuant to the terms of the oral contract, Defendants [SHIP OWNER], [AGENT], ROES 1 through 100 inclusive, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and each of them, agreed to pay all of the charges billed by [HOSPITAL], if [HOSPITAL] would provide immediate medical services and treatment to [SEAMAN], their employee/insured. Further, Defendants, and each of them, agreed to reimburse and indemnify [HOSPITAL] for the cost of the treatments and services provided to [SEAMAN], as long as [HOSPITAL] submitted billing statements to [AGENT] after the treatments or services were rendered to [SEAMAN]. Further, under Maritime Laws, [SHIP OWNER] was liable for all of [SEAMAN] necessaries, including emergency medical care and treatment.
- 28. [HOSPITAL] has performed and satisfied all obligations and conditions precedent required on its part to be performed pursuant to the oral contract. At no time prior to the time that [HOSPITAL] rendered medical services to [SEAMAN], did Defendants in any way qualify their guarantee or warrantee that they would pay [HOSPITAL] 100% of its billed charges for services rendered to [SEAMAN].
- 29. The Defendants, and each of them, have failed and refused and continue to fail and refuse to provide payment, indemnification and reimbursement to [HOSPITAL] for the cost of the treatment and services rendered to [SEAMAN]. In denying coverage for said care and treatment, Defendants, and each of them, have breached their obligation as set forth in the subject oral contract, without excuse or justification.
- 30. As an actual, legal and proximate result of the aforementioned conduct of Defendants, and each of them, [HOSPITAL] has suffered, and will continue to suffer in the future, damages pursuant to the oral contract, plus interest, and other economic and consequential damages, for a total amount to be shown at the time of trial.

SECOND COUNT: FOR FRAUD AND INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

- 31. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 30, inclusive, are incorporated herein by reference.
- 32. Defendant [AGENT] specifically represented to [HOSPITAL] that [SEAMAN] was fully insured for the medically necessary services and treatments which [AGENT] requested that [HOSPITAL] perform. Additionally, Defendant [AGENT] assured, guaranteed, and warranted that Defendants would pay Plaintiff [HOSPITAL] 100% of the costs incurred by [SEAMAN].

- 33. Defendants, and each of them, falsely and fraudulently represented to Plaintiff [HOSPITAL] that Plaintiff could rely upon the accuracy and validity of [AGENT]'s representations that [SEAMAN] had insurance coverage. Defendants, and each of them, falsely and fraudulently represented to [HOSPITAL] that Plaintiff could rely upon the accuracy and validity of Defendants' verifications, pre-authorizations and pre-certifications of coverage. Defendants falsely and fraudulently represented that [SEAMAN] had insurance coverage and that they would be responsible for payment of 100% of the costs associated with [SEAMAN] medical treatment which was performed by Plaintiff [HOSPITAL].
- 34. As described above, Plaintiff [HOSPITAL] obtained verification of the insurance benefits for [SEAMAN] from the Defendants, and each of them, prior to performing the necessary medical treatment and services. Defendants, and each of them, represented that [SEAMAN] had insurance coverage and provided pre-certification and authorization for the medical treatment and services. Defendants, and each of them, further represented that the costs of the medical treatment and services would be covered fully under the insurance policy.
- 35. The representations made by the Defendants, and each of them, were in fact false in that Defendants, and each of them, have refused to pay for the claims submitted by [HOSPITAL] according to the above described representations made by the Defendants and each of them.
- 36. When the Defendants, and each of them, made these representations they knew them to be false. These representations were made by all of the Defendants with the intent to induce [HOSPITAL] to act in the manner herein alleged.
- 37. In reliance on the representations of Defendants, and each of them, [HOSPITAL] admitted [SEAMAN] and provided necessary medical services and treatment. [HOSPITAL] did not have knowledge of he falsity of the Defendants' representations and believed them to be true.
- 38. If [HOSPITAL] had been award of the existence of the facts not disclosed by Defendants, and each of them, [HOSPITAL] would not have admitted [SEAMAN] into its hospital and provided the medical services and treatment claimed herein.
- 39. [HOSPITAL]'s reliance on the representations of the Defendants, and each of them was justified. [HOSPITAL] did not have the access to the information in the Defendants' control at the time the medical services and treatment were rendered by [HOSPITAL], nor could it have known that the misrepresentations made by Defendants, and each of them, were false or fraudulent.
- 40. As a proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, and each of them, in intentionally misrepresenting the health insurance benefits for [SEAMAN] and in fraudulently and intentionally misrepresenting that they would pay for the care rendered to [SEAMAN], [SEAMAN] was admitted to [HOSPITAL] and was allowed to receive medical services and treatment from [HOSPITAL] and its doctors, thereby damaging [HOSPITAL] in an amount according to proof.
- 41. As a further proximate result of the breach of the oral contract and the intentional misrepresentations of Defendants, and each of them, [HOSPITAL] has incurred other damages, including, but not limited to costs of suit, interest charges and the loss of use of proceeds for the medical services rendered.
- 42. The aforementioned conduct of Defendants, and each of them, was an intentional misrepresentation, deceit or concealment of material facts known to the Defendant and each of them, with the intention on the part of Defendants of thereby inducing [HOSPITAL] to expend time and money in their services to [SEAMAN], and as such was despicable conduct that subject [HOSPITAL] to unjust hardship in conscious disregard of [HOSPITAL]'s rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages pursuer to *California Civil Code section 3294*.

THIRD COUNT: NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

- 43. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 42, inclusive, are incorporated herein by reference.
- 44. Defendants, and each of them, represented to Plaintiff [HOSPITAL] that Plaintiff could rely upon the accuracy and validity of [AGENT]'s representations that [SEAMAN] had insurance coverage and/or that Defendants would pay for the costs of the medical services rendered to [SEAMAN]. Specifically, Defendants, and each of them, represented to [HOSPITAL] that Plaintiff could rely upon the accuracy and validity of Defendants' verifications, pre-authorizations and pre-certifications of coverage. Defendants represented that [SEAMAN] had insurance coverage and that Defendants would be responsible for payment of 100% of the costs associated with [SEAMAN] medical treatment which was performed by Plaintiff [HOSPITAL].
- 45. As described above, Plaintiff [HOSPITAL] sought verification of the insurance benefits for [SEAMAN] from the Defendants, and each of them, prior to performing the necessary medical treatment and services. In response, Defendants, and each of them, represented that [SEAMAN] had insurance coverage and provided pre-certification and authorization for the medical treatment and services and further represented that the costs of the medical treatment and services would be fully covered under the policy.
- 46. The representations made by Defendants, and each of them, were in fact false. Defendants, and each of them, knew or should have known of the falsity of their misrepresentations when those misrepresentations were made. Defendants and each of them have refused to cover, and continue to refuse to cover, have refused to pay and continue to refuse to pay the costs and loss incurred by Plaintiff [HOSPITAL] in providing medical services and treatments to [SEAMAN].
- 47. The Defendants, and each of them, made these representations with no reasonable ground for believing them to be true. Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based upon such information and belief, alleges that Defendants, and each of them, did not have accurate information concerning the existence of insurance coverage for [SEAMAN], and that Defendants, and each of them, were aware that without such information they could not accurately make the representations herein alleged. Further, the Defendants, and each of them, did not perform a reasonable investigation of [SEAMAN] coverage. If the Defendants, and each of them had performed a reasonable investigation, they would have been discovered that Juan Fernando did not, in fact, have insurance coverage. At the time that the Defendants made these representations, and at all times thereafter, Defendants, and each of them, concealed from Plaintiff their lack of investigation of the facts.
- 48. These representations made by the Defendants, and each of them, were made with the intent to induce Plaintiff to act in the manner herein alleged in reliance thereon and these representations were made with negligent disregard of the truth.
- 49. In reliance upon the representations of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff [HOSPITAL] performed the medical services and has provided treatment to [SEAMAN]. Plaintiff [HOSPITAL] had no knowledge of the falsity of the representations of the Defendants, and each of them, and believed them to be true, when made.
- 50. Plaintiff [HOSPITAL] could not have discovered the true facts concerning [SEAMAN] lack of insurance coverage before the medical services and treatment were rendered to [SEAMAN]. If [HOSPITAL] had been aware that the representations made by the Defendants, and each of them, were false, Plaintiff would not have performed the medical services or rendered treatment to [SEAMAN].
- 51. Plaintiff's reliance upon the representations that insurance existed for [SEAMAN] treatment was justified and reasonable in that Defendants, and each of them, provided Plaintiff with pre-certification and pre-authorization to proceed with the hospital admission, and verified the existence of [SEAMAN] coverage. Further [AGENT] represented that Defendants, and each of them, would be responsible for payment of the costs associated with the medical services and treatment rendered to [SEAMAN].

52. As an actual, legal and proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, in making the above mentioned misrepresentations, Plaintiff performed the necessary medical services and provided treatment to [SEAMAN]. Plaintiff has thereby sustained damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

FOURTH COUNT ESTOPPEL AGAINST ALL DEFANDANTS

- 53. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 52, inclusive, are incorporated herein by reference.
- 54. At the time of [SEAMAN] emergent transfer and admission to [HOSPITAL], the Defendants, and each of them, represented to [HOSPITAL] that [HOSPITAL] could rely upon the accuracy and validity of Defendants' representations regarding verification, pre-authorization and pre-certification of coverage and guaranteed payment for [SEAMAN] medical service and treatment.
- 55. At the time of [SEAMAN] emergent transfer and admission to [HOSPITAL], Defendants had contacted [HOSPITAL] and verified, pre-authorized and pre-certified coverage regarding [SEAMAN]. At that time, the Defendants, and each of them, represented to [HOSPITAL] that [SEAMAN] was eligible for coverage and that Defendants, and each of them, would reimburse [HOSPITAL] for the costs associated with the care and treatment rendered to [SEAMAN].
- 56. The representations made by the Defendants, and each of them, as to the verification, pre-certification and pre-authorization of coverage, regarding [SEAMAN], pursuant to the oral contract, were in fact false. The true facts, which were unknown to [HOSPITAL], were that no insurance policy, under which [SEAMAN] medical services and treatment was to be covered, existed, leaving no coverage for the costs of the medical services and treatments rendered by [HOSPITAL].
- 57. In detrimental reliance upon the representations made by the Defendants, and each of them, [HOSPITAL] was induced to and did rely on the representations to provide, and in fact did provide the services as hereinbefore alleged. Had [HOSPITAL] known of the true facts, it would not have provided services to its detriment.
- 58. Defendants, and each of them, knew or reasonably should have known that [HOSPITAL] would rely on their representations as [HOSPITAL] was not otherwise inclined to allow [SEAMAN] admission and would not allow [SEAMAN] admission without a guarantee and assurance of payment.
- 59. The detriment suffered by the [HOSPITAL] is the amount required to reimburse [HOSPITAL] for the time, costs and money expended in rendering the subject services to [SEAMAN]. As a further direct, legal and proximate result of [HOSPITAL]'s detrimental reliance on the oral contract and the misrepresentations of Defendants, and each of them, [HOSPITAL] has been harmed in that it has incurred costs of suit, and [HOSPITAL] has been damaged due to the loss of monies expended in rendering said services for which it was not paid and has suffered damages in the loss of use of the proceeds and income to be derived from the services rendered to which it is entitled.
- * See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XIII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. VII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (SEAMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-371

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-371RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (LONGSHOREMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-372

FORM No. 1-372 Complaint In Rem by Longshoreman--Injury

accident as herein set forth, he had earned, on an average, wages of _______ dollars (\$

) per week.
10. The plaintiff, in addition to the expenses incurred by him and incapacity to labor, heretofore and hereafter, caused by his injuries, has been put to much expense for treatment and such expense is still continuing and he is unable to stat the full amount thereof.
11. By reason of the premises the plaintiff has sustained personal injuries and has been and will be put to expense in the treatment thereof, all to his damage in the estimated sum of \$
[Prayer for Process and Verification] n2
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-2 <i>supra</i> .
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-10 and 1-12 supra.

* See 1A Benedict on Admiralty (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (LONGSHOREMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-373

FORM No. 1-373 Complaint In Personam by Longshoreman--Injury

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 supra.

* See 1A Benedict on Admiralty (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and

15 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (LONGSHOREMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-374

FORM No. 1-374 Complaint In Personam by Longshoreworker Against Vessel Owner and Chemical Manufacturer--Injury

Allegations Concern	ing Parties] n1			
4. On	, 20	, the defendant,	, owned	I, operated, managed, and
controlled a certain s	steamship or vessel		, which was	s berthed on said date, and for
		, and for several days pric		ployer,
	[stevedore], w	vas engaged in loading cargo	on the	at the direction and
request, and with the	knowledge and su	pervision, of the defendant,		; at the time, plaintiff was
employed by the		as a longshoreman in the	e said loading; and on _	, 20
, he was lawfu	lly in Hold No	on sa	id vessel	in the course of
his employment.				
6. On	, 20	, and for some time prior	thereto, there were stor	ed in Hold No.
	of said vessel	certain drums containing da	ngerous, noxious chem	nicals or other substances; said
drums were in defect	tive, unsafe, damag	ged, or leaking condition; the	e defendant,	[vessel
holder], had knowled	dge and notice ther	eof, but the plaintiff had no	such knowledge or not	ice, nor did the defendant
warn him thereof, or presence on said ves	-	s or care as to the condition	of said drums or the m	anner of their storage or
				of said
vessel, the defendant	t so negligently and	I carelessly conducted the m	anagement, operation,	supervision, maintenance, and

control of said vessel and Hold I			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
was caused or permitted to beco				and gases, so
as to cause the plaintiff to be over	ercome and to sustain seve	re external and inter	nal injuries and shock.	
8. The aforesaid occurrence and	the injuries which the plai	ntiff sustained thereb	y were due solely and whol	ly to the
negligence and carelessness of the				
following: in failing to notify the	e plaintiff that Hold No		where he was required to	be and was
duly and lawfully engaged in do	ing his work, was dangero	us or harmful to his l	nealth and safety and an unf	it place in
which to work; in accepting or k				
and substances in defective, dan	naged, unsafe, or leaking co	onditions; in causing	or permitting said drums to	be stored in
or about Hold No	; in permitting	the contents of said	drums, or some of them, to l	eak and be
emitted into the hold in which th				
danger of the said cargo of drum	ns; in failing to make a prop	per and sufficient ins	pection of the said drums ar	nd of said
vessel, and, more particularly, or				
with reference to the transportati				
in Hold No.	at a time when it kne	ew or in the exercise	of due care should have kno	wn the said
hold was a dangerous and unfit	place in which to work; and	d in failing to take ar	y steps to prevent the occur	rence
complained of.	•			
CAUSE OF ACTION AGA	AINST DEFENDANT,		_,	
CHEMICAL MANUFACTURI				
9. On or about	20 the def	endant	Chemical Com	nnany
delivered to defendant,				iparij,
steel d			via the	
	<i>U</i>			
10. Said shipment was loaded ar				
deep to	ank of the	on	, 20	
11. On	, 20 , and for severa	l days prior thereto, t	he	was
engaged in loading cargo on the	vessel	the plaintiff w	as employed by the	
as a ste	evedore in the said loading	; on	, 20, he was	lawfully in
Hold No.				•
in the			_ •	
12. Defendant,	[ahamiaal aamaa	uul dalissamad aaid ah	imment of	for
corriage by the defendant	in in a	doguata dafactiva u	ipment of	, for
carriage by the defendant,drums; defendant,	know or shou	ld have known that a	uch containers or drums was	ro
inadequate, defective, unsafe, ar	, kilew of should	warn of or in any wor	acti containers of urums well	ie La inadaguata
defective, unsafe, and dangerous	_		-	•
and dangerous condition of such				
which the Noloaded as aforesaid, became con	tominated with navious an	d harmful fumas, an	, into which this shipmen	20
plaintiff herein was overcome up			1 011	, 20
plantiff herein was overcome uj	pon entering the aroresaid	deep tank.		
13. The aforesaid occurrence and	d the injuries which the pla	aintiff sustained there	eby were due to the negliger	ice of said
defendant,	, its agents, servants, a	nd employees, in fail	ing to have said	
proper	ly contained in adequate, p	proper and safe conta	iners for export shipment; in	n further
causing delivery of said shipmer				

warn anyone, including the plaintiff, that said containers were inadequate, unsafe, and dangerous.

14. [allege injuries and damages suffered]

[Demand for Judgment] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 supra.

* See 1A Benedict on Admiralty (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (LONGSHOREMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-375

FORM No. 1-375 Complaint (Cross-Claim) by Vessel Owner Against Marine Chemist--Injury to Harborworkern1

[Caption] n2		
CROSS-CLAIM		
Now COMES DEFENDANT,	e of action and expressl	y reserving benefits thereof, for a
1. Plaintiff, has filed a complaint against cross-claima was injured on the asphalt vessel allegedly committed negligent acts making cross-claima plaintiff's complaint.	owned by	and that cross-claimant
2. In connection with the repair of the vesselin, performed tests on the, 20 and	, an	, a marine chemist and president of the d issued certificates dated
was "safe for hot work" and "safe for men." 3. Cross-claimant herein avers that the damages alleg ensuing therefrom were not caused or contributed to lor cross-defendant, but, in the alternative, and only in	by any fault, neglect or	want of care on the part of cross-claimant,

found liable to plaintiff herein, then cross-defendant is liable to cross-claimant for full indemnity and/or contribution for any sums which may be judged in favor of plaintiff in the main demand and against cross-claimant herein, together with

all costs, expenses and attorneys' fees incurred by cross-claimant herein as a result of cross-defendant's negligence, fault, breach of contract, and breach of express and implied warranties arising out of cross-defendant's performance of services onboard the
4. In the further alternative, and only in the alternative, that if there should be a determination by this Court that there was negligence on the part of cross-claimant, which is specifically denied, then cross-claimant avers that such fault was only technical, secondary and passive, as contrasted to the acts of primary negligence on the part of cross-defendant herein. Cross-claimant avers that it is, therefore, entitled to full indemnity and/or contribution from cross-defendant, plus all costs, expenses and attorneys' fees incurred by cross-claimant in this action.
Wherefore, cross-claimant, in the alternative and only in the alternative, prays for judgment in favor of cross-claimant and against cross-defendant,, for full indemnity and/or contribution for any sums which may be adjudged in favor of plaintiff in the main demand and against cross-claimant herein, together with all costs, expenses and attorneys' fees incurred by cross-claimant in this litigation. Dated:
Attorney for Defendant
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Magee v. Bayou Teche, 548 F. Supp. 270 (E.D. La. 1982), furnished
(III)I DOMORE I. I OIM AGADRO HOM PAPEIS MEG III MASEE V. DAYOU I COIC, 540 I. SUPP. 2/0 (E.D. La. 1702), IUMISHCU

through the courtesy of James A. Cobb, Jr., Esq., Emmett, Cobb, Waits & Kessenich, New Orleans, Louisiana.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (LONGSHOREMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-376

FORM No. 1-376 Petition for Review--Denial of Claim Under Longshoremen's and Harborworkers' Compensation Act Based on Ruling that Petitioner was Not Engaged in Maritime Employmentn1

[Caption] n2	
	, petitioner herein submits his Petition for Review:
ISSUES RAISED	

1. The issue raised for purposes of this appeal is whether or not an employee of a boat building employer, who is injured while testing and sorting a boat for his employer on a navigable waterway, and who in addition, performs other boat inspection and evaluation functions for his employer, is an employee covered under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

CONTENTION OF PETITIONER

2. The contention of the petitioner here is that he is an employee covered under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. In that he was injured while testing a boat in the _______ Estuary, there is no question that the petitioner has satisfied the situs requirement of the LHWCA. In addition, petitioner asserts that since he was testing a vessel for his employer at the time he was injured and, in that, he repeatedly performed similar testing and development tasks for his employer, and, in that, he continually and repeatedly performed other vessel inspection and evaluation functions for his employer, that he has also satisfied the status requirement of the LHWCA. Petitioner consequently contends that, in that he has satisfied both status and situs requirements of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act that he is therefore to be considered a maritime employee within the purview and coverage of that act.

Wherefore, the petitioner respectfully submits that the case should be remanded to the administrative law judge with
rections to resolve any remaining issues affecting the amount of compensation payable under the Longshoremen's ar
arborworkers' Compensation Act and to enter a compensation order awarding benefits in accordance with such
solution.
ated:
ttorney for Petitioner
OOTNOTES:
1)E 1 E - 1 - 10 C - C1 1' C1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - C - D (02 E 2 1 2 0 0 (0.1 C' - 1 0 0 0)

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Schwabenland v. Sanger Boats, 683 F.2d 309 (9th Cir. 1982), furnished through the courtesy of Richard C. Watters, Esq., Miles, Sears & Eanni, Fresno, California.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (LONGSHOREMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-377

FORM No. 1-377 Complaint In Personam by Longshoreworker's Estate--Wrongful Death

[Caption and Jurisdictional Statement] n1	
2. Prior to the commencement of this action, and on or about	out, 20, in and by a decree
duly made and entered in the office of the Clerk of the	
, the plaintiff was duly appointed	personal representative of the estate of
, deceased, and has duly qualified	and is now acting as such.
3. At the time hereinafter mentioned the defendant, owned, operated and controlled the vessel	, was and still is a foreign corporation and
4. At the time hereinafter mentioned, the plaintiff's intestat	e was in the employ of the
5. At the time hereinafter mentioned, the defendant and its for the purpose of making certain	•
6. At the time hereinafter mentioned, the plaintiff's intestate was lawfully engaged in the course of his employment the	e was lawfully upon the vessel and reon.
7. At the time hereinafter mentioned, the vessel	was lying in the navigable waters of the
United States, at	[state location] Street.
8. On or about, 20, while	plaintiff's intestate was lawfully engaged in the course of his
employment upon the vessel, the	plaintiff's intestate suddenly, without any fault on his part,
and wholly and solely through the carelessness and negligon	ence of the defendant, its officers, agents, servants and

employees, was caused to injuries that he thereafter died		[describe injuries] as a result of which he	sustained such severe
injuries that he thereafter thet	1.		
9. [describe negligent acts of	vessel owner]		
10. The plaintiff's intestate le	ft him surviving as I	his sole heirs and next of kin,	, his widow, his
son,	and	, his daughters, who have incurred	l funeral expenses and
suffered damages, including l	loss of society, nurti	ure and guidance, all in the sum of	dollars (\$
[Demand for Judgment] n2			
FOOTNOTES:			
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No.	o. 1-1 <i>supra</i> .		
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form	m No. 1-6 supra.		
	* See 1A Benedict	t on Admiralty (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (LONGSHOREMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-378

FORM No. 1-378 Complaint In Personam by Estate of Harborworker--Wrongful Deathn1

[Caption and Jurisdic	tional Statement] n2		
2. Plaintiff,	, is the surviving widow o	f	, deceased, and was at all
	and now is a resident of		
	has been appointed and now is the pe , deceased, under		
3. Defendant,	, a corporation of the St	ate of	, was at all times material
hereto and now is the	owner of the vessel involved in the casua g operation that was underway at the time	alty in question, and the	owner of a certain batter pile
4. On or about	, 20,	, while w	orking in the course and scope of
	defendant, was aboard the vessel		
maritime duties owed	occurred as a direct at to R.M., deceased. The aforesaid breach [describe alleged negligence].	_	
6	was born on	, 20, and was	at the time of his death
	years of age, with a working life expe	ectancy of	years and a life
	years. He was, prior to		
	ween approximately \$		
surviving him his	, and	children,	of whom

was dependent upon him at the time of his death. The family and/or surviving wife, independently, have been deprived
of the love, society, affection, consortium, care, comfort, services, companionship, guidance, training, and support
which provided and each member of the family has sustained pecuniary loss by reason of his
death in addition thereto. Expenses for funeral and related items have been incurred in an amount which will be set forth
at or prior to the time of trial underwent extreme pain, both physical and mental, and related
suffering between the date of the casualty on, 20, and the date of his demise on
, 20, The estate of, deceased, has been deprived of the present
value of accumulated income and earnings of said decedent had he lived out his normal life plus his non-market
services less the present value of his future personal consumption. Plaintiff,, as personal
representative and individually is entitled to all other additional or different damages now or hereafter by law allowed.
[Demand for Judgment] n3
FOOTNOTES:
(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in In the Matter of the Complaint of Hurlen Construction Co., 551 F. Supp. 854 (W.D. Wash. 1982), furnished through the courtesy of Shannon Stafford, Esq., Stafford, Frey & Mertel, Seattle, Washington.
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (LONGSHOREMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-379

FORM No. 1-379 Complaint by Longshoreman Against Foreign Vessel Owner--Injury Caused by Fall Through Hole in Ramp

[Caption] n1			
The Complaint of	, individually	v; and	and, as Husband and Wife, by
			_ Lines, as owners and operators of
, de	fendant, as follows:		•
1. That the plaintiffs are citiz	zens of the State of	and t	hat the defendant,
, In	c. and	Lines, are body co	orporates duly organized and existing
			exceeds Fifty Thousand Dollars
(\$50,000.00) exclusive of in			
	d that the defendants, at the, using the v	times of the wrongs al vaterways of the State	leged, owned, managed, and operated a of and then and
3. That at all times hereinafte	•	vas employed as a long	shoreman by the
COUNT I			
4. That on or about	, 20,	said vessel was afloat	in Berth #,
State of	at the	Terminal.	

5. That the ship when moored at the aforementioned terminal	was afloat on a waterway of the State of	of
6. That through its duly authorized agents, the defendants autl Corporation, including the plaintiff,	horized, permitted and invited the empl a longshoreman, to board said vessel a	•
work thereon at the aforesaid time and place.		
7. That in the performance of his duties, the plaintiff, follower to perform certain work aboard said vessel. After boarding the stepped into a hole in the ramp. That the plaintiff's fall was call and the ramp was not properly lighted.	e vessel, the plaintiff was caused to be i	njured when he
8. That as a result thereof, the plaintiff was caused to sustain scaused to endure considerable pain and suffering, and that as treatment, was caused to lose time from his employment, and said loss of work from his employment, he has been prevented usual occupations, pastimes and pursuits which he would have plaintiff was otherwise injured and damaged.	a result thereof was obliged to obtain me to sustain the monetary and financial led and will continue to be prevented from	nedical care and oss occasioned by m engaging in his
9. That all of the injuries and damages herein complained of vof the defendants, their agents, servants and employees in that condition created by the hole in the ramp and negligently failed. And the defendants, their agents, servants and employees kne ramp and negligently failed to correct same or warn of same a servants and employees were otherwise, careless, reckless and	t the defendants negligently failed to could to warn the plaintiff and other works we or should have known of the existence as herein complained of. And the defendance of the complained of the defendance of the	orrect the dangerous nen of the hole. ce of said hole in
10. That all of the injuries and damages herein complained of the part of the defendants, their agents, servants and employed contributing thereunto.		
Wherefore, this suit is brought and the plaintiff claims damages.	Dollars (\$)
COUNT II		
and, as He respectfully allege:	usband and Wife, complaining of the de	efendants herein,
11. That the plaintiffs do hereby incorporate and adopt by reference on the part of the defendants, their agents, servants and employ and they further allege that they were Husband and Wife at the through Tenth; and as Husband and Wife, they further allege injury to their marriage relationship as a result of the injuries resulting from the negligence of the defendants.	byees, as set forth in Paragraph First thr the time of the occurrence set forth in Pa that they have suffered interference wit	ough Tenth herein; ragraphs First h, damage, and
Wherefore, this action is brought and the plaintiffs,Dollars (\$	and	, claim
Dollars (\$) damages.	

Attorney for Plaintiffs

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (LONGSHOREMEN) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-399

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-399RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-400

FORM No. 1-400 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by Passenger--Injury

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

	and had paid the	e compensation require	was lawfully a passenger for led to be paid the defendant for	
going down a stairwa	y provided for the u I trip on a	se of the passengers on	o'clock of the day a the vessel a result the plaintiff fell down	, the plaintiff was
6. The plaintiff's injur of the plaintiff contrib		ely by the negligence o	of the defendant and without an	ny negligence on the part
7. The negligence of t	he defendant consis	sted in failing to [state of	alleged negligence].	
Prayer for Process, 1	Demand for Judgme	ent and Verification] n2		
FOOTNOTES:				
(n1)Footnote 1. See I	Form Nos. 1-1, 1-2	and 1-5 <i>supra</i> .		

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6 and 1-10 through 1-13 supra.



[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and

23 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-401

FORM No. 1-401 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by Passenger Who Fell in Stateroom--Injuryn1

3. That on ________, 20 ______, plaintiff, in consideration of the payment of a specified sum of money, boarded the vessel _______ as a passenger to be transported between the Port of ______.

4. That on _______, 20 _____, plaintiff requested that the personnel of the vessel place a ladder in his cabin to facilitate his ascent and descent from the upper berth to which he had been assigned.

5. That on _______, 20 _____, plaintiff, while utilizing the ladder supplied, sustained a fractured nose and multiple contusions of the face and head due to the defective condition of the bunk, cabin, and ladder.

6. That the aforesaid injuries were sustained solely by the fault, negligence, and carelessness of the defendants, their agents, employees, and officers and crew.

7. That the aforesaid injuries were not caused or contributed to by the plaintiff in any way, but were solely the fault of the defendants.

8. That by reason of such injuries plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer physical and mental pain, all to his damage in the sum of \$______.

9. That plaintiff has been compelled to spend large sums of money for medical treatment and care and for operative

procedures and has lost time form work, all to his further damage in the sum of \$_____

[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment and Verification] n3

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Iannucci v. Costa Armatori S.p.A., Civ. No. 84-2653 (E.D.N.Y. 1984).

- (n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1, 1-2 and 1-5 supra.
- (n3)Footnote 3. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6, 1-10 and 1-12 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-402

FORM No. 1-402 Complaint In Personam By Passenger--Injury Due to Defective Door

4. On the ______ day of ______, 20 ____, plaintiff was lawfully a passenger on defendant's vessel, _____.

5. On the _____ day of ______, 20 ____, during a heavy rainstorm at sea, plaintiff was thrown by the sudden rolling of the ship against a door jamb and while he was holding himself against it, the door suddenly slammed shut on plaintiff's hand and plaintiff sustained the injuries hereinafter alleged.

- 6. The accident and the injuries to plaintiff resulting therefrom were caused solely by the negligence of the defendant in maintaining the door in a defective and dangerous condition with its fastenings defective and insufficient for the purpose of holding the door shut, permitting the door to swing open as the ship rolled at sea and to close violently.
- 7. Defendant had notice and knowledge of the defective condition but it failed to repair the same or warn passengers and in particular this plaintiff of the dangerous and defective condition of the door and its fastenings.

 $[Demand\ for\ Judgment]\ n2$

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2

25 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-403

FORM No. 1-403 Complaint In Personam by Passenger for Failure to Provide Adequate Medical Care, With Claim for Loss of Consortium--Injuryn1

3. At all times hereinafter mentioned, plaintiffs were lawfully passengers on a cruise ship named the

4. Upon information and belief, defendant _______ at all times hereinafter mentioned, owned the

5. Upon information and belief, defendant, ______, at all times hereinafter mentioned operated, managed and/or otherwise controlled the ______.

6. Upon information and belief, defendant, ______, was at all times hereinafter mentioned engaged in the business of a common carrier of passengers for hire.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

7. From ______, 20 ____, to ______, 20 ____, plaintiff, ______, was lawfully a passenger aboard the aforesaid ______.

8. During said period of time, while plaintiff was lawfully aboard said vessel, plaintiff experienced

[describe medical problems].

During said period of time, while plaintiff was lawfully aboard said vessel, plaintiff sought medical assistance aboahe vessel.	ard
10. During said period of time, while plaintiff was lawfully aboard said vessel, plaintiff received medical assistance coard said vessel.	n
11. The medical assistance, services, and facilities provided by defendant,, were inadequate and improper.	
12. Defendant,, had a duty to provide adequate medical care to its passengers while they we not the exclusive custody of said defendant.	re
13. Defendant,, negligently and carelessly failed to provide adequate medical coverage for it passengers, more particularly, plaintiff herein.	ts
4. As a result of defendant's negligence, plaintiff was caused to sustain serious personal injuries. [describe]	
15. As a result of the negligence of defendant,, plaintiff was damaged in the amount of \$	
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION	
16. Plaintiff,, repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 hrough 15 with the same force and effect as if fully set forth at length herein.	
17. Due to the aforementioned injuries sustained by plaintiff,, herein, plaintiff, was deprived of her husband's services.	
18. As a result of the negligence of defendant,, plaintiff,, was damaged in the amount of \$	
[Demand for Judgment] n3	
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Schachner v. Costa Lines, Inc., Civ. No. 84-1656 (E.D.N.Y. 1984)).
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-4 supra.	
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-5 supra.	
* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 226 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-404

FORM No. 1-404 Complaint In Personam by Passenger--Unsafe Passageway

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

4. Upon information and belief, at all the tincontrolled a certain vessel known as the of passengers for hire between		and were	engaged in the business of common carrier
5. On or about the passenger for hire aboard the said vessel		_ and had p	paid the compensation required to be paid
the defendant for such transportation from		and to _	·
6. At all the times herein mentioned, the law that then and there existed between the plai with a passage on the said ship and to provi and go about on the ship and to refrain from the ship and its appliances throughout the v	ntiff and the defendantide her with a reasonab in injuring her and to pro-	t the defend ble safe pas rotect her f	dant was required to furnish the plaintiff ssageway and a reasonable safe place to live
7. On the day of _		, 20	, at about
o'clock in the, wh			
was going through a passageway provided	for the use of the passe	engers on the	he said vessel, plaintiff was caused to
sustain the injuries hereinafter alleged when	n	[desci	ribe incident].
8. The injuries were caused solely by the ne	egligence of the defend	dant.	

- 9. The negligence of the defendant consisted in [state alleged negligent acts]
- 10. [allege injuries and damages suffered]

[Demand for Judgment] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-405

FORM No. 1-405 Complaint In Personam by Passenger Thrown from Motor Boat--Injury

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

4. The defendants, A	or	В	or both of the	m. were at all times
hereinafter mentioned and in part	ticular on	, 20 _	, the owners	of a planed bottom
which is known to the defendants, used the	s, A	and B		The defendant, A
defendant, B				r
5. On or about				
, a naviş request				
aforesaid motor boat. The defend	lant, B	, knew, o	or should have kn	own, that the defendant, A
and steer the said boat. Both the				
have known that the defendant, C	·	, was an inexp	erienced boat ope	erator, yet, despite this
knowledge, the defendant, A				
, to open	ate the aforesaid	d motor boat.		
6. At the aforesaid time and place in such fashion as to cause the pl				
completed its swerve, or the boat	, while under the	e negligent control of C_		and/or A
. did ret				

extricate herself and did then strike and injure her.

7. As a direct and proximate result of the carelessness and negligence of the defendant(s) [allege injuries and damages suffered].

[Demand for Judgment] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2

28 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-406

FORM No. 1-406 Complaint In Personam by Passenger Against Boat Owner, Power Company and Boat Manufacturer--Injuryn1

4. On or about the ______ day of ______, 20 ____ the plaintiff, ______, and ______, were passengers on a certain ______, the property of ______.

5. At the said time and at all times relevant to this complaint, C was piloting the vessel on the ______ in a _____ direction in the vicinity of certain high tension wires owned and maintained by the Defendant, _____ , which high tension wires crossed the ______ approximately

7. At the said time and place, the negligence of each and all of the defendants hereinafter described jointly and concurrently combined to cause injury and harm to the plaintiffs as hereinafter described.

8. At the said time and place, the ______ [power company] well knew that many sailing vessels frequented the navigable water of the _____ and the _____ [power company] failed to establish its power lines at a sufficient height to give safe passage across the navigable waters.

9. The	[power company] was guilty of negligence as hereinafter described:
	(a) Maintaining power lines carrying high voltage electricity across navigable waters at a height and under conditions that constituted a hazard to navigation.
	(b) Inadequately maintaining their power lines by permitting undue sag in them over navigable waters and installing inadequate and improper circuitry and circuit breakers.
	(c) Failing to warn or put warning signs in any way to lawful users of said navigable waters at the time and place described when the [power company] knew or should have known their lines constituted a hazard to and interference with navigation.
	ne action of [power company] obstructing navigable waters in an unreasonable and way constituted a public and private nuisance.
	was the senior instructor at placed a \$750.00 deposit with to purchase a 22 foot sail boat and while that boat was on order,
	ted a dangerous instrumentality, to wit, the "" 22 foot sailing vessel hereinbefore
	bed to The act of entrusting said dangerous instrumentality to
	act of negligence because in the exercise of reasonable caution the said knew or should
	cnown that was an inexperienced pilot and unfamiliar with the waters of the
	and the hazards connected with an encounter between the mast of the vessel and the high
	n lines of the Furthermore, knew or should have known when
	rusted said dangerous instrumentality to that would be using
	at as a pleasure craft for the transportation of passengers and as a result of said negligent entrustment injury to
	assengers was foreseeable by the defendant, The said as also
	ent in that he failed to warn of dangers in connection with the navigation of the sailing
vessel	in the vicinity of the lines.
12	, a corporation, was the owner of the vessel entrusted by the said
12	to, and said was acting as the agent and
corvan	to, and said was acting as the agent and tof, at the time of the said entrustment.
scivan	, at the time of the said chaustment.
	was a dangerous instrumentality and therefore,, was liable for the negligence and carelessness of the operators of the craft.
way as to the	the said time and place, did sail the 22 foot sailboat hereinbefore described in such a s to cause the mast of the said vessel to contact or come sufficiently close to certain high tension wires that belong that a charge of high intensity electricity was caused to run down the mast and into the , inflicting injury and harm on the plaintiffs as hereinafter described.
15.	was negligent in installing a mast on a vessel sold by it with the
"	was negligent in installing a mast on a vessel sold by it with the " 22 foot sailboat which was in no way grounded to avoid the effects of electrical shocks from
either	the contact with high tension wires or from lightning, and further in installing on the said craft sails of a high
	e of inflammability, thereby creating a danger of great proportions to the occupants of the sailing vessel.
plainti perma	s a direct and proximate result of the negligence and carelessness of the defendants hereinabove described, the fft,, was severely burned on a large portion of her body; the injuries sustained by her are nent. The said, permanently mutilated and scarred, has suffered severe physical pain and the same and said and scarred before the first in the factor of the fa
surreri	ing and mental distress, and will continue to do so for a long period of time in the future, to-wit, permanently. The

earning capacity of the said B has been severely impaired.

17. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence and carelessness of the defendants hereinabove described, the plaintiff A sustained the following damages:

(a) She was caused to expend large sums of money for the care a	and treatment of her child,
(b) She was required to render nursing care and custodial care to source of such care, thereby causing the saidloss of income.	-
(c) She has lost the services of her daughter	, for a long period of time.
(d) She was personally injured and burned as a result of the negledefendants hereinabove described and was caused thereby to sur and mental distress and to incur medical expenses for the treatment.	stain severe physical pain and suffering

[Demand for Judgment] n3

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers used in Jowanowitch v. Florida Power & Light Co., 277 So. 2d 799 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1973).

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-407

FORM No. 1-407 Complaint In Personam by Passenger's Estate (Death on the High Seas Act)--Wrongful Deathn1

[Capnon] n	2
------------	---

COUNT I

1. This is a case of ac	dmiralty and maritime juri	sdiction as hereinafter mor	re fully appears.	
the negligent act or d	lefault leading to the death	l et seq., commonly known of plaintiff's decedent, any state, territory or depe		, occurred on the high
3. Plaintiff,	, resides in	n	_,	, and is the widow of
	, intestate decedent, a	nd was appointed administ	ratrix of the estate of	
		County, State o		
		nging this action on her ow		
	estate of			1
4. Plaintiffs,	, a minor	·, and	, a minor, are the	e stepchildren of
	and they reside with	their mother.	is their n	nother, natural guardian
	s also bringing this action			-
5. At the time of	deat	h he was in good health an	nd had a life expectan	cy of
	years.			
6. Mr. and Mrs	are tl	he father and mother of dec	cedent,	, and are also

designated beneficiaries und	er the Death on the	e High Seas Act, 46 U.S.	C. § 761 et seq. The	y are residents of
7. Defendant,	, is the F	Executrix of the Estate of	ıf	and resides in
Co	unty,	. He was a 1	esident of	prior to his
death.				r
8. On or about Po	, 20	, the yacht	(office	cial number
, Po	[vessel] wa	, was docked at Isla Mu is under the control and	jeres, Yucatan, Mexic direction of the afore	co and at all time mentioned mentioned
9. On said date unsettled we United States and Cuba and				
10. On said date plaintiff's d of,				
11. On or about of any state, territory or depote to transfer to a life raft on the	endency of the Uni	_	-	•
12. From about continuously suffered great food, water, and shelter, and	physical pain and n	nental anguish because	of exposure to the hig	
13. On or aboutbody was never recovered.	, 20	,	disappeared f	from the life raft and his
14. The sinking of the	of the willful and/or	wanton carelessness or	negligence of defend	dant's decedent,
15. As a result of the death of the defendant, plaintiffs a Do		med by 46 U.S.C. § 761	•	
Wherefore, plaintiffs demand).	nd judgment agains	t defendants in the amo	unt of	Dollars (\$
COUNT II				
16. Plaintiffs repeat and real	lege paragraphs 1 t	hrough paragraph 14 he	rein.	
17. Plaintiffs bring this action the admiralty and maritime j			[state s	survival statute] and under
18. By reason of the pain an plaintiff's decedent.	_	exposure and the mental	-	ation of pending death, Dollars (\$

) by the consc	cious pain and suffering	g up until the time o	f his death that was	proximately caused
by the willful and/or wanton carelessne	ess and negligence of the	he defendant.		-
Wherefore, plaintiffs demand judgment of the pain of t				
the and the ti				
Dollars (\$	_	•		
COUNT III				
19. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege parag	raph 1 through paragra	ph 14.		
20. The sinking of the	and the pain,	suffering and death	of	were a
direct and proximate result of the carel	lessness and negligence	e of defendant's dece	edent,	, in that
he negligently caused additional fuel to	_			=
the Florida Straits, causing the hold of		to be expose	d to the open sea and	d to take on water
thereby causing the	to sink.			
21. Plaintiffs have been damaged as fo	ollows:			
(a)(\$	3) Dollars for the	pain and suffering o	of
(b)(\$	S) Dollars for the	wrongful death of	
Wherefore, plaintiff's demand judgme) Dollars for t sinking of the	the pain and suffering e	endured by plaintiff'	s decedent between	
) Dollars for t			(
COUNT IV				
22. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege parag	raphs 1 through paragr	aph 11, paragraph 1	3 and paragraph 15	
23. At all times pertinent hereto the op	eration and maintenand	ce of the yacht		was within the
exclusive control of the defendant's de				
24. Plaintiffs are without knowledge as				
, which ultimate	ately caused the pain, s	suffering and death of	of	and relies
on the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur in t	hat the sinking of the y	acht	would no	ot ordinarily occur
in the absence of negligence by the ow	ner and operator,		, detendant's deced	ent.
Wherefore, plaintiffs demanddecedent and	(\$) Dollars for the	death of plaintiff's
decedent and	_(\$) Dollars for c	onscious pain and s	uffering by plaintiff
"s decedent from the time of the sinking	ng of the	until his	death.	

Wherefore, plaintiff prays that process in due form of law, according to the course and practice of this Honorable Court in cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, issue against said defendant, citing it to appear and answer under oath all and singular matters aforesaid; that plaintiff be awarded a decree for its damages as aforesaid and costs, against said

efendant; and that plaintiff be granted such other and further relief as may be proper.
attorney for Plaintiff
Dated:
COOTNOTES:
n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers used in Spaulding v. Denton, 407 F. Supp. 931, 2076 A.M.C. 1225 (D. Del
976), courtesy of Abramo & Abramo, Wilmington, Delaware.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-408

FORM No. 1-408 Complaint In Personam by Passenger's Estate (Death on the High Seas Act)--Wrongful Death

[Caption and Jurisdiction	al Statement] n1		
2. The plaintiff is the duly	appointed administratrix of the	estate of	, deceased, late of
(County, State of	, under letters of ad	ministration of the County Court
of	_ County, State of dated	, 20	
3. At all times hereinafter	mentioned, the defendant was ar	nd still is a corporation duly of	organized and existing under and
by virtue of the laws of the	e State of	, with its principal office a	nd place of business at
	n the City of		
5. The defendant, as a con	nmon carrier for hire, agreed to to	_	
	on or about		
6. After departing from	for	, on	, 20,
	on board as a passenger, the		
	but so far as is known met with s		
destroyed.			
7. As a result of the disast	er was	killed or was so injured that	he died at the time of the disaster
or shortly thereafter, toget	her with all the other persons on	the vessel.	

8. A quantity of wreckage was recover	ed floating on the wat	ers of the	Ocean approximately
500 miles from	, and more than thre	ee miles from the nearest	t land, including various articles
that had been in the possession of	·		
9. Neither the body of	nor that of a	ny other person in the ve	essel was recovered.
10. The death of			
defendant, its servants and employees,	in causing or permitti	ng the disaster aforesaid	l.
11. The death of	was caused by the	e wrongful act, neglect, d	lefault or carelessness of the
defendant, and such act, neglect, defau	lt or carelessness was	such as would have enti	tled, if
death had not ensued, to maintain an a	ction against and to re	cover damages from the	defendant in respect thereof.
12 was the h	usband of	and the fa	ther of
and, infants;	he was	years of age	at the time of his death, and was
then employed by the	Company in	the capacity of foreign a	agent stationed at
; he was the s	ole support of his wife	e and minor children; at	the time of his death he was earning
wages in the employ of the; he devoted t			
necessary for their care, maintenance a			• •
guidance, love and protection, as well	as his financial suppor	rt, all to their loss and da	image.
13. The plaintiff, by virtue of the statu administratrix against the defendant for		-	
14. By reason of the premises, the esta	te of the decedent	an	nd his wife and children have
sustained damages in the amount of			
[Demand for Judgment] n2			
FOOTNOTES:			
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-			
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6	supra.		



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-409

FORM No. 1-409 Complaint In Personam by Business Invitee Against Vessel Owner and Charterer--Injury

2. On information and belic				and
3. On information and belic				
under and by virtue of an a, t	greement or charter party			
4. Under and by virtue of the targe and the targe and the targe and the targe are the targe.			_ Corporation among	other things was
5. On the the said barge upon the requires for one were so performed at the ir	uest of the defendants and, his employe	d with their permission and er, which duties were requi	d consent and he was p	performing his usual

which supported a cover over a hatchway, he was required to support and protect himself from falling through said hatchway by holding on to another beam which likewise supported the hatch cover; while he was doing this the beam to which he was holding gave way and broke precipitating the plaintiff through the hatchway into the hold of the said

barge, causing him to sustain the injuries hereinafter set forth.

- 7. The accident and the injuries resulting to plaintiff therefrom were caused wholly and solely by reason of the negligence and carelessness of the defendants and each of them.
- 8. Such negligence consisted in failing to keep the said barge and in particular the said hatch cover and the beams supporting it in proper repair, in permitting the beam which gave way to be insecurely and improperly fastened to the said vessel, and in permitting a defective and improper beam to be attached to said barge.
- 9. [allege injuries and damages suffered]

[Demand for Judgment] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-410

FORM No. 1-410 Complaint by Cruise Ship Passenger Against Vessel Owner--Head Injury Due to Driven Golf Ball

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

I. NEGLIGENCE

1. On or about	, 20	, Plaintiffs and		boarded one of Defendant's
owned and operated cruise				
,				
h	ad previously contract	cted with and paid De	efendant	Inc.,
I	Oollars (\$) for res	servations upon the s	aid cruise ship, the
				nt,
Inc.				
2. On	, 20, at ap	proximately		m., Plaintiffs, while still
being paid invitees and pas	ssengers, were on the		side of the	Shortly
after	m., Plainti	ff,	, and another	passenger proceeded toward
the "Lido Bar," adjacent to	the "Lido Deck," wh	ich is located at the s	tern (rear) and on th	e top of the ship. At the very
rear of the "	" is a golf p	olatform used for golf	f driving. A person v	who is using the golf platform
takes three steps up from t	he "	" to get to the	golf platform. The g	golfer then drives shots from
the platform out into the o	cean away from the b	ody of the ship. The	golf platform is semi	-enclosed by two small fences
on the sides of the platform	n. Alongside one of th	nese fences is a tall fl	agpole. Approximate	ely
feet directly across from the	e golf platform is the	"	."	
3. While Plaintiff	was	approaching the "Lic	lo Bar," approximate	elv

feet therefrom, a golf ball which Plaintiff			nd ricocheted back to strike
4. The Plaintiff			
negligence contributing to the a and collapsed to the deck of the			y the impact of the golfball,
and conapsed to the deek of the	sinp, sustaining serious and p	ermanent injuries.	
5. On the occasion in question,			the following negligent acts
or omissions, among others:	[descri	be negligent acts]	
6. As a direct and proximate res	sult of the aforesaid negligent:	acts and omissions of the Defo	endant
	the invitee Plaintiff		
the deck of the ship due to the in	mpact of the astray golfball.		•
7. As a further direct and proxir	nate result of the negligence o	f the Defendant	Inc. the
remainder of the Plaintiff's "			
vacation at all. In effect, he lost	the benefit of his bargain with	Defendant.	
8. As a further direct and proxir	nate result of the negligence o	f the Defendant	Inc. the invitee
Plaintiff			
protracted shock to his nervous			
and will continue to cause him §			
9. As a further and direct proxir	nate result of the Defendant's	aforasaid nagliganca, the Plai	ntiff
=	een forced to and will continue		
hospitalization, x-rays, doctors,		-	-
aforesaid injuries.			
10. As a further result of the neg	gligence of the Defendant	, Inc., th	e Plaintiff
	een forced to lose time from hi		
sustained a disability rating rela			-
11. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays the	hat he he awarded:		
11. Wherefore, Frankiir prays a	nat he be awarded.		
1. Compensatory damag	ges in the amount of	Dollars (\$	
	_).		
2. The costs of this actio	on.		
II. LOSS OF CONSORTION	U M		
12. The allegations of fact herei	nabove set forth are adopted h	nerein and made a part hereof.	
13. As a further and direct proxi	imate result of the aforesaid no	egligence of the Defendant	, the
Plaintiff,	and	, who were then and are no	ow husband and wife, were
caused to sustain and suffer a lo in nature.	ss of consortium to the detrim	ent of their marital relation sh	nip, which loss is permanent
14. The sole and proximate cause	se of the injuries sustained by	the Plaintiffs,	and
=	oresaid was the negligence of t		Inc., without any

negligence on the part of the Plaintiffs in any way contributing thereto.			
15. Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray that they be awarded:			
1. Compensatory damages in the amount of Dollars (\$).			
2. The costs of this action.			
Attorneys for Plaintiffs			
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form No. 1-1 <i>supra</i> .			



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INJURY AND DEATH (PASSENGERS) *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-425

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-425RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-426

FORM No. 1-426 Complaint In Personam by Vessel Owner--Insurance

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement, and

disbursements of this action.

Allegations Concerning Parties] n1 4. On or about ______, 20 _____, defendants, in consideration of an agreed premium, issued their policy of marine insurance, ______, under which defendants agreed to and did insure certain barges against marine risks. 5. On or about _______, 20 ______, for an additional premium an endorsement to said policy of insurance was issued by defendants under which they undertook to and did insure the vessel _____ under the terms and conditions of said policy, effective _______, 20 _____, and in said endorsement defendants insured the ownership interests of plaintiffs in the barge ______, which interests defendants value at \$ ______. 6. On ______, 20 _____, the vessel ______ stranded at _____ _____ during a severe storm, and was extensively damaged as a result of those insured perils. 7. By reason of the foregoing defendants each are liable to plaintiffs in the amount of ______, or a sum in the aggregate of \$ _____, with interest from 20 ____ at the rate of _____ per annum, no part of which has been paid although duly demanded. Wherefore plaintiffs demand judgment against each defendant in the amount of \$______, or in the aggregate amount of \$ _____ against all defendants with interest at the rate of

Attorney	for	Plaintiff	f

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-427

FORM No. 1-427 Complaint In Personam by Vessel Owner For Explosion--Insurancen1

[Caption and Jurisdictional Statement] n2 2. Plaintiff, _____, is and was at all times herein mentioned a corporation organized under the laws of the State of ______ with its principal place of business in the City of ______, State 3. The plaintiff, ______, is and was at all times herein mentioned a corporation organized under the laws of _____, with its principal place of business in _____, 4. The defendant is and at all times herein mentioned was a corporation organized and existing under the laws of a state other than the State of ______, with its principal place of business in the _____. 5. Plaintiff, ______ at the time of its insurance and loss as hereinafter mentioned, and the plaintiff, ______, had an interest at said times in said vessel. In addition, plaintiff, , has assigned to its rights and interest in and to all proceeds of insurance in connection with the loss hereinafter described. A copy of said Assignment is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit "A." 6. In consideration of the premium paid to it, the defendant did on or about ______ execute a certain policy of insurance insuring against loss or damage to said ______ directly caused by explosion aboard ship or elsewhere. A copy of said policy of insurance, together with endorsement thereon, are attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit "B." As shown thereby, the insuring was from ______, to ______, the named insureds on the face of said

policy were amended to include the pl	aintiffs and	In addition, there was also a loss payable
clause including	Bank. All parties	above named were insured as their interest may appear. At
the time of the loss hereinafter set fort	h and thereafter	had no interest in said vessel, and
		age on said vessel, has been paid and satisfied in full and,
therefore, has no further interest therei		
		ed damage directly as a consequence of an explosion in the [state location]. The damage resulting therefrom
and sustained to said vessel was appro		
8. Following said loss above described plaintiffs' damages, but defendant has	•	ne defendant thereof and made claim to the defendant to pay pay the same or any part thereof.
<u>*</u>	•	iffs have been compelled to employ its counsel undersigned mable attorney's fee for which defendant is liable.
[Demand for Judgment] n3		
· · ·	•	orida Terminal Co. v. Interstate Fire & Casualty Co., 423 n, Dell, Frank & Trinkle, Tampa, Florida.
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-	1 supra.	
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-	6 supra.	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-428

FORM No. 1-428 Complaint In Personam by Vessel Owner--Insurance

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement, and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

4. At all times herein the plaintiff was the owner of		was engaged in
commerce between the United States and foreign co	ountries.	
5. In and about the month of	, 20, the defendant issued its value	ed policy of marine
insurance bearing No, wh	nerein and whereby it insured the vessel	, in
consideration of the premium of \$, for account of whom it may conce	ern, loss if any payable to
, mortgagee, and/or		
and \$		
, 20, midnight to the		
, midnight, from loss from perils of the sea, a		
upon the loss of the vesse	l by peril of the sea.	
6 was the previous owner	r of the vessel and after the issuance of the	policy and pursuant to the
agreement of sale thereof the defendant did agree to	o modify the policy and did modify the poli	cy by making the loss
payable to as mortgagee of	or as their respecti	ve interests might appear.
7. Prior to the loss hereinafter mentioned the mortg	age to had been p	aid and its insurable
interest ceased and the interest of	was that of second mortgagee in the	e sum of \$
and the interest of the plain		
•		
8. Upon information and belief, the premiums on the	ne insurance were paid to the defendant.	

9. Upon information a	and belief, on or about the	day of	, 20,
and while the insurance	ce was in full force and effect the vessel		was lost at sea off the
	in the, a pe	eril insured against, and th	ne plaintiff and
	thereupon became entitled to the pay	yment of the sum of \$	and the
sum of \$	making a total of \$	·	
10. Upon information	and belief, on or about the	day of	, 20,
	wrongfully and without right deliver	red the insurance policies	to
which represented the	insurers for the collection of premiums	and requested their cance	ellation, all against the protest of
the plaintiff and the de	efendant on or about the	day of	, 20,
marked the policies ca	ancelled whereby the interest of the	in th	ne policies ceased.
•	anded payment of the sum of \$ but the defendant has refused to pay		um of \$
[Demand for Judgmen	nt] n2		
FOOTNOTES:			
(n1)Footnote 1. See F	Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.		
(n2)Footnote 2.	See Form No. 1-6 supra.		



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-429

FORM No. 1-429 Complaint In Personam by Container Leasing Company as Beneficiary of Lessee's Policy/Insurancen1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement, and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2

7. Plaintiffs are each engaged in the business	of leasing ocean cargo containers, cha	ssis, and related equipment for the
international carriage of cargo by sea. In 20	or earlier plaintiffs each entered	into lease agreements with
and various of	subsidiary and as	sociated companies for the lease to
Line of containers,		
international common carrier by water. Pursu		
the responsibility to procure insurance cover	ing the leased equipment for the benefi	t of the plaintiff lessors.
did, in fact, obtain	from defendant	[insurance company] a policy or
policies of all-risk insurance insuring the least		
and	, and insuring the interest of	each plaintiff in the equipment
leased by it to again	nst all risks of loss or damage. Each lea	ase either contains a stipulation of the
value of each type of equipment leased there	under or specifies the manner by which	n the value may be determined,
which value governs any claim for loss of da	mage to the equipment under the insur	ance policy.
8. Each plaintiff is either an additional insure	ed, and/or a loss payee, and/or is a bene	eficiary entitled to make claim and
receive payment from	pursuant to said policy or policies f	or containers leased to
but not returned to	plaintiffs, for damage to said container	s and related equipment recovered
by plaintiffs, and for related sue and labor cla	<u>-</u>	
equipment. Each such policy of insurance iss	- ·	
0. In the latter part of 20	became insolvent and in	20

leased to but failed to return the equipment. During and after t	he
leased to, but failed to return the equipment. During and after to cessation of operations by, plaintiffs are informed and believe that said equipment was least to the equipment of the e	net
destroyed, or damaged by external causes, including natural forces, the acts (wrongful or under a claim of right) of	ist, Ethird
parties, and fortuitous or mysterious causes.	uma
10. Plaintiff lessors, and each of them, went to great effort and expended significant sums to find, recover, and save leased equipment from loss. Many of the units leased to	o ach oenses
is covered by the policy or policies issued by Insurance Co.	
11. Plaintiffs are each an additional insured or a loss payee or are otherwise entitled to make claim directly upon supplicy and receive direct payment thereon.	aid
12. Plaintiffs have suffered the total or constructive total loss of equipment leased to, wh valued in accordance with the provisions of the leases between plaintiffs and at \$, and this loss is a covered loss within the provisions of the Insu	
Co. policy or policies referred to above.	
13. In addition, containers and related equipment on lease to have been recovered damage eternal cause to the extent of \$ and additional repair charges are being incurred and expe Such repair charges are a covered loss under the Insurance Co. policy directly and as sue labor charges which save property from covered losses and reduce the claim for total and constructive total loss.	nded.
14. In making reasonable efforts to recover the aforementioned equipment, to save leased equipment from loss, an minimize the amount of any claim against Insurance Co. pursuant to the policy or policie referred to above, plaintiffs have incurred sue and labor expenses in the amount of \$ In addition to the amounts for sue and labor expenses listed above, plaintiffs are continuing to make reasonable effor locate and recover units of leased equipment and are therefore continuing to incur additional sue and labor expenses.	es ts to
15. Plaintiffs have demanded, and do hereby demand, payment by Insurance Co. of the amounts due for lost equipment, repair, and the sue and labor expenses incurred as set forth above Insurance Co. has failed to pay any portion of the amounts so claimed.	
[Demand for Judgment] n3	
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Interpool, Ltd. v. U.S. Fire Insurance Co., 553 F. Supp. 385 (S.D.N.Y. 1983), furnished through the courtesy of Gerard A. Dupuis, Esq., Ober, Kaler, Grimes & Shriver, New New York.	York,
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.	
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-430

FORM No. 1-430 Complaint In Personam by Cargo Owner--Insurance

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement, and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

7. At the time of the commencement of this risk and thereafter until the loss, the plaintiff as the owner of the insured cargo has suffered damages in the sum of \$ _____ as nearly as can be ascertained at this time.

1	norized agents of the insurers of the loss promptly, and gave the duly of of the loss.
9. No part of the sum \$	has been paid, although duly demanded by the plaintiff, and by reason
of the premises such sum is now due and	owing from the defendant to the plaintiff with interest thereon from
, 20	
[Demand for Judgment] n2	
FOOTNOTES:	
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1	-5 supra.
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 su	pra.
* See 1 Bened	dict on Admiralty § 242 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-431

FORM No. 1-431 Complaint In Personam by Cargo Owner--Wreck--Insurance

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

4. On or about the	day of	, 20	, in consideration of the premium
	paid to defendant by plaintiff, the de		
	ce bearing No w		
	_ against all loss of or damage to certain		
to be laden) in the vessel	, then lying in th	e harbor of	, to be
transported from the port	of to	du	ring its voyage whether by perils of
the sea or of fire or of oth	ner perils in the policy mentioned.		
interest therein.			
	day of		
	on the voyage described in the policy,		_
	ea [or fire or otherwise), was wrecked and	•	-
the sum of \$	by reason of the total destruc	ction and loss of the	ne goods, wares and merchandise.
	days prior to the commence		
	day of 20, plaintiff gave to the def	endant notice and	proof of the loss as required by the
policy.			
8. No part of the sum of _	has been paid to	plaintiff by defen	dant although demanded.

[Demand for Judgment] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-4 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-5 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-432

FORM No. 1-432 Complaint for Declaratory Relief by Insurance Company Against Insured To Void Insurance Policy For Lack of Due Diligence to Make Vessel Seaworthyn1

[Caption and Jurisdictional Statement] n2	
	off, [insurance company], was and still is a nd by virtue of the laws of and doing business
3. On information and belief, the defendant,	is now, or as within this district residing at
	, was and still is a national banking corporation e laws of the United States, with an office and principal place of
as Exhibit A, the plaintiff issued a policy of insu	, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein trance to the defendant,, the assured, with loss Said policy was for the coverage of the hull and
sank in the Gulf of Me	of, 20, the vessel exico in the vicinity of, made against the plaintiff by defendants, under the aforesaid marine
insurance policy, for total loss of the vessel	In furtherance of that claim, the defendant, the Court of in which he claims compensation

under the aforesaid policy for total loss of the vessel
7. At the date for inception of the aforesaid marine insurance policy,
was not in a seaworthy condition and the assured failed to exercise due diligence to keep the
vessel in a seaworthy condition thereafter. When the vessel embarked upon the voyage which
ended in its sinking on or about, 20, it was not in a seaworthy condition and the assured
had not exercised due diligence to put the said vessel or to maintain that vessel in a seaworthy condition.
8. At the time for inception of the said marine insurance policy, the assured knew or should have known of the unseaworthy condition of the said vessel and misrepresented the condition of the vessel to the plaintiff herein and concealed facts as to the seaworthiness of the vessel from the knowledge of the plaintiff.
9. The vessel sank as aforesaid as a result of its unseaworthy condition, the lack of due diligence by the assured or the intentional scuttling of the vessel by the assured. The said marine insurance policy did not cover loss resulting from want of due diligence by the assured, unseaworthiness, or intentional scuttling.
10. The plaintiff is ready, willing and able to return all premiums to the assured upon declaration by this Court that the
aforesaid policy was void at the date of inception, or a pro rata portion of premiums upon declaration by this Court that
said policy became void at some date after inception.
Wherefore, plaintiff prays for declaratory judgment by this Court as follows: that said marine insurance policy was null and void as a result of the concealments, misrepresentations and breaches of warranty at the date for inception of the policy; that it was void as a result of the subsequent breaches of warranty by the assured in failing to maintain the vessel in seaworthy condition and in failing to exercise due diligence that the vessel be maintained in a seaworthy condition; that the loss of the vessel was occasioned by the unseaworthiness of the vessel, the failure of the assured to exercise due diligence toward the maintenance and operation of the vessel and/or the intentional scuttling of the vessel; that the plaintiff has no liability to the defendants under the aforesaid policy of insurance.
The Plaintiff further prays this court to enjoin the defendant,, from pursuing his claim in the Court of County in Civil Action Number referred to hereinabove, and further prays for such other and different relief as this Court deems proper.
Attorney for Plaintiff
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers used in Stonewall Insurance Co. v. Sessions, 404 F. Supp. 858 (S.D. Ala. 1974), courtesy of Vickers, Riis, Murray & Curran, Mobile, Alabama. Defendants' motion to dismiss the action was granted because of a pending suit in state court for breach of the identical contract of insurance. For Lack of Due Diligence to Make Vessel Seaworthy">

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-433

FORM No. 1-433 Complaint In Personam With Maritime Attachment by Insurance Carrier To Recover Unpaid Premiumsn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and
Allegations Concerning Parties] n2
4 This is a claim for the balance of Protection and Indemnity insurance premiums that remain due and owing and for
failure to make payment against various Supplemental Call Debit Notes rendered to defendant in the normal course of
plaintiff's business.
5. As a result of the foregoing, plaintiff has been damaged, as nearly as can be calculated, in the sum of \$
, no part of which has been paid although duly demanded.
6 Defendant has no office or place of hyginess within this District and connet he found within the District within the
6. Defendant has no office or place of business within this District and cannot be found within the District within the meaning of Supplemental Rule B of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. However, defendants have property within
the district, to wit, the vessel,

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Oceanus Mutual Underwriting Association (Bermuda) Ltd. v. Shell Compania Agentina de Petroleo S.A., Civ. No. 84-466 (E.D.N.Y. 1984).

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-7 supra.

[Prayer for Process, Affidavit and Verification] n3

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form Nos. 1-8, 1-9, and 1-10 through 1-13 supra.



[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and

42 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-434

FORM No. 1-434 Complaint In Personam by Seaman for Injuries--Insurance

Allegations Concerning Parties	r] n1			
4. On or about the	day of	, 20	, the defendant issue	ed and
delivered to				
the policy is hereto annexed, ma	arked Exhibit A.	_		
5. The policy of insurance was annexed to the policy of insurar insurance is made through stated in the application or appl	nce the liability of members of to, and i	ofs accepted by, defendant	for which application in respect to the vesse	on for el or vessels
6. On or about the	day of	, 20		
effected insurance under and su				
referred to issued in the name o	f the	_, covering liability of		_ in respect
to the vessel	to an amount not exce	eding \$	in any one ca	asualty,
which insurance was to continu	e for a period of one year from	m the	day of	
, 20	, at noon to the	day of		, 20
at noon Eastern Standard Time				
as mo	re fully appears by the defend	dant's certificate of insu	rance issued by it on th	e
day of	f, 20			
is attached hereto and incorpora	ited herein as Exhibit B.			

7. The policy of insurance aforesaid under its protection and indemnity clauses protected and indemnified the insurer as

ship owner as follows:	[state p	rovisions]			
8. Upon information and belief, the p day of, 20			ed to was or	the	
9. Upon information and belief,	41	_ was on the		day o	of
			·	wnich owner	snip was entered in
10. On or about the sustained c					
11. Upon information and belief, the the day of hereinbefore set forth.	vessel	and in, 20, co	ts owner overed and i	nsured by the	were on policy of insurance
12. Thereafter and on or about the the United States District Court for the, the plainting	he	District of	f		_ wherein
given in favor of plaintiff and agains judgment was entered in the office o					
13. On or about the in the Unite in the territ resides directed to the marshal of the thereafter returned wholly unsatisfied remains wholly unpaid.	ed States District Co orial jurisdiction of court against the pr	ourt for the which court roperty of		Distric then , which	t of resided and still execution was
14. Pursuant to	defendant herein, fr cy, in case execution rned unsatisfied becaused person against to	om the payment of on on a judgment of cause of the insolve the insurance carrie	f damages for btained againency or banker, the defen	or injuries sus nst the assure ruptcy of the dant herein, t	tained or loss and in an action assured, then an under the terms and
15. Defendant has failed and refused demanded.	to pay plaintiff the	sum of \$		or any p	art thereof although
[Demand for Judgment] n2					
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form Nos. 1-1 a	and 1-5 supra.				
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1	-6 supra.				



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-435

FORM No. 1-435 Complaint--Claims for Breach of Duties Under a Maritime Insurance Contractn1

[Caption] n2			
	, and for their complaint herein allege a		igned attorneys,
JURISDICTION	AND VENUE		
1. This Court has juris under a maritime insu	ediction over this civil action pursuant rance contract.	to 28 U.S.C. § 1333 in that it arise	es from breach of duties
2. Venue lies in this d	istrict pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)).	
THE PARTIES			
3. Plaintiff	, (hereafter "	") is a	corporation
	e of business located at uring, importing and selling		times engaged in the
4. Plaintiff,	(hereafter "	") is a banking instit	ution organized under the
aws of the State of _	, and was at all	relevant times engaged in the busi	iness of, among other
	lit to finance the business operations o		
ousiness at	·		
5. Upon information a	and belief, defendant	is a corporation organized	l under the laws of the

State of	, with its	s principal p	lace of business at		, and was at all
relevant times engage	ed in the insurance br	rokerage bu	siness.		
FACTS					
6. At all relevant time	es, defendant was the	e insurance	broker for plaintiff		In this capacity,
					ehalf of plaintiffs. Defendant
obtained an all risk m	narine insurance polic	cy, No		(hereafter "tl	ne policy") for
	with the		Insurance C	o. (hereafter "th	ne Company") effective
				_	cargo policy under which
		•		-	nipped and insured. The policy
					ed in certain domestic
					endorsed to cover goods stored
by	at		located at		(hereafter "the warehouse")
up to a limit of	I	Dollars (\$ _).	
7. The policy specific	cally named defendar	nt as the bro	ker and intermedia	ry between	and the
					and forward to the
	reports of shipm	ents and pre	emium payments as	s required by th	e policy. It also specifically
authorized defendant	to receive on behalf	of	ar	ny notice of can	cellation issued by the
Company.					
8. Plaintiff	was	specifically	named, by endorse	ement executed	by the,
as a loss payee under		1	, . ,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1 7	1 ,				
9. In and about mid-J	anuary 20, the	e Company'	s underwriter,		, advised
	, then an employ	ee of defend	dant, that there wer	e certain allege	d overdue premiums under X's
policy with the Comp	pany. The underwrite	er told the er	nployee that unless	s the outstandin	g premiums were received by the
Company by	, 20), the	policy would be ca	ancelled.	
10. On	20		na	id and received	and deposited, the amount of
					ansmit the funds to the Company
prior to the deadline.	defination on the mou.	rance pone	y. However, defend	iant fance to tra	institute runds to the Company
prior to the deadline.					
11. Upon information	and belief, on		. 20	. the underwrite	er sent to defendant, and
					Sective,
20 . At no time	, however, did defen	dant inform		of said	notice of cancellation, nor did
defendant take any st					,
·	1				
12. On or about	,	, 20,	the warehouse was	destroyed by fi	re. Over
	Dollars (\$) of		's goods were destroyed in the proceeds of same.
fire	had perfecte	ed security i	interests in said goo	ods and/or the p	proceeds of same.
13. On	. 20	, the Com	nany denied covera	ge under the no	olicy for the warehouse fire by
					, claiming that
	's policy had bee	n effectively	y cancelled prior to	the warehouse	fire. That action remains
	s poney nad see.				

CLAIM FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT AND NEGLIGENCE

14. Paragraphs 1 through 13, above, are incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
15. Defendant, as broker and the named intermediary in the marine insurance policy was obliged under the policy to forward premium payments from to the Company with reasonable promptness and to notify the insureds with reasonable promptness of any change in or cancellation of coverage of which defendant received notice.
16. Defendant breached its duties under the contract by failing to forward
17. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach of its duties, plaintiffs suffered substantial damages in that they were effectively without insurance coverage at the warehouse at the time of the fire loss, which could have been easily secured in ample time prior to the fire had defendant informed plaintiffs of the Company's cancellation.
18. As an additional direct and proximate result of defendant's breach of its duties, plaintiffs were required to expend substantial time and money in litigating the coverage issues against the Company, and therefore suffered additional actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial, but in a minimum amount of
Wherefore plaintiffs demand judgment against defendant Corporation as follows:
a. Such actual damages as shall be proved at trial but in a minimum amount of
b. Prejudgment interest.
c. Costs and attorneys' fees.
d. Such other relief as may be just.
Respectively submitted,
Attorney for Plaintiff
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Continental Cameras Co. v. FOA & Son Corporation, 658 F. Supp. 287 (S.D.N.Y. 1987). Papers furnished through the courtesy of Rivkin, Radler, Dunne & Bayh, Uniondale, New York.
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms **CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INSURANCE** *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-436

FORM No. 1-436 Complaint--Declaratory Judgment Lack of Timely Notice of Voyage

[Caption] n1	
VERIFIED COMPLAINT	FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
	[insurance company] ("Plaintiff"), by its undersigned attorneys, for its complaint, for its Verified Complaint for Declaratory Relief, alleges as follows:
JURISDICTION AND VE	ENUE
1 This action is filed under and	pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act. 28 U.S.C. 8 2201

- 1. This action is filed under and pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201.
- 2. This matter involves a declaration of rights regarding the extent of insurance coverage under an admiralty or maritime contract of insurance and, thereby, comes within the Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction of the United States District Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1333. This is an admiralty and maritime claim within the meaning of Rule 9(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 3. An actual controversy of justiciable nature exists between the Plaintiff and the Defendant involving the rights and obligations under a marina contract of insurance, and, depending upon the construction of said contract, this controversy may be determined by a judgment of this Court.
- 4. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff is a corporation in the business of, among other things, the sale and issuance of marine insurance policies

and is licensed to conduct the business of insurance in the State of Illinois.	
6. Upon information and belief, Defendant is a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of with its principal place of business in the State of	
FACTS	
7. On or before, 20, Defendant, by its broker, ("Brande an application to Plaintiff for a marine policy of charterer's legal liability insurance.	roker"),
8. On or about	from
copy of the Policy is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and is fully incorporated herein.	0011000
9. The Policy is an insurance policy for marine insurance.	
10. The Policy includes claims for Protection and Indemnity as defined in the SP 23 Form of Protection and Policy, which was incorporated in and as part of the Policy (with certain exclusions).	Indemnity
11. Defendant, through their broker, renewed the Policy for the policy years, 20	
through, 20 and, 20 through 20	······································
12. Upon information and belief, on or about, Defendant chartered the vessel, for the purpose of transporting a load of from to 13. Defendant did not, as required by the Policy, advise Plaintiff as soon as practicable of the name, tonnage and off hire date of the voyage of the vessel,	e, on hire
14. Upon information and belief, on or about, the vessel	arrived at
15. Upon information and belief, on or about, the vessel cargo suffered certain damage due to a fire in the cargo holds in which were stored the on behalf of the Defendant.	
16. Defendant did not, as required by the Policy, give notice of this occurrence to Plaintiff as soon as practic	cable.
17. Defendant did not, as required by the Policy, exercise due diligence in giving Plaintiff prompt notice of occurrence.	this
18. The voyage of the vessel and its attendant cargo was neither declared nor was voyage or claim relating to it given to Plaintiff within the Policy year.	notice of the
19. On, 20, at approximately p.m., Defendant's broon behalf of Defendant, in a handwritten letter to Plaintiff, purported to declare the voyage of the vessel to the Policy and to give Plaintiff notice of a possible claim relating to this vessel, expiration of the Policy year, and advised Plaintiff that the charter of the vessel	

was the only	y charter known to it.	
	, Plaintiff declined to cove vas not properly declared on the Policy for cove	
by the late reporting.		r .J
and pending	rd-party defendant in a lawsuit for damages arisg in the United States District Court for the	District of
entitled	, under Case No	(the "Litigation").
22. Defendant retained counsel to defesatisfaction of Plaintiff.	end the Defendant in the Litigation without the	e written consent of or to the
23. On , 20	, upon request of the broker, Plaintiff agr	eed to defend the Defendant in the
Litigation without prejudice and with		
24. On, 20 _ purporting to enclose declarations for	the broker sent Plaintiff a copy of a lette.	er from the Defendant to the broker
through	charters under the Po	for the voyage of the vessel,
25. Before this date, Plaintiff had not through26. Paragraph		year
• •	urer as soon as practicable the Name, Tonnage	, and On Hire and Off Hire date of
27. Paragraph	of the Policy provides as follows:	
expense, for which these Assurers are	ed that in the event of any occurrence which may or may become liable under this insurance, no urther that any and every process, pleading and tly to these Assurers.	otice thereof shall be given to these
28. The SP 23 Form incorporated in the	he Policy provides in relevant part:	
expense for which this Assurer is or n	hat in the event of any occurrence which may r nay become liable, the Assured will use due di soon as practicable after receipt thereof, all co	ligence to give prompt notice

Law costs. The Assurer shall not be liable for the cost or expense of prosecuting or defending any claim or suit unless the same shall be incurred with the written consent of the Assurer, or the Assurer shall be satisfied that such approval could not have been obtained under the circumstances without unreasonable delay, or that such cost and charges were reasonably and property incurred, such cost or expense being subject to the deductible.

and other legal papers or documents relating to such occurrences.

*

29. The Defendant has breached the foregoing Policy language in the following respects:

-	advise Plaintiff as soon as practicable of the name, tonnage, and on hire and off hire chartered during the currency of the Policy, including the vessel;	
•	give Plaintiff notice of loss as soon as practicable as required by Paragraph of the Policy;	
-	use due diligence to give Plaintiff prompt notice of any occurrence which may result in for expense for which Plaintiff is or may become liable, as required by the SP 23 Form the Policy; and	
consent of Plaint	counsel and sustained costs or expenses in defending the Litigation without the written ff or satisfying Plaintiff that such approval could not have been obtained under the thout unreasonable delay, as required by the SP 23 Form incorporated in the Policy.	
	t, under the facts as set forth herein, the Policy does not cover Defendants for losses, claim royage of the vessel and the Litigation described in Paragraph.	ns or
31. Based on this dispute	, pursuant to 28 <i>U.S.C.</i> § 2201 , it is necessary and proper for the Court at this time to decl liabilities of the parties under the Policy.	are
	[insurance company], requests that this Court enter judgment in its and enter an Order providing the following relief:	favor
A. A declaration of right	s that the Policy does not cover the voyage of the vessel;	
	s that Plaintiff is not obligated to indemnify the Defendant for any of the costs, expenses, as relating to the Litigation or the voyage of the vessel; and	
C. Award Plaintiff its co	sts and all other relief that the Court deems fair and appropriate.	
[Insurance Company] By:		
One of Its Attorneys		
COUNTY OF) STATE OF) ss:)	
VERIFICATION		
I,	, being first duly sworn on oath, hereby attest that I am the Ocean Marine Claims Super [insurance company], that I have read the foregoing Verified Complaint for have personal knowledge of the facts alleged therein and believe them to be true and corr	visor rect to

Subscribed and Sworn to before me	
this, 20	
Notary Public	
FOOTNOTES:	
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1, supra.	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-437

FORM No. 1-437 Complaint--Intermodal Shipment--Subrogated Insurance Company

[Caption] n1			
COMPLAINT			
·	, and complain against D	efendants	to as "Plaintiff"), by their attorneys[trucker A] ("A"),
[intermodal carrier] (col		[rail carrier] Defendants"), as follows:	and
JURISDICTION AN	ND PARTIES		
			izenship, and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 0,000.00, exclusive of interest and
2. Venue is proper in this place in this District.	District, pursuant to 28 8	U.S.C. § 1391, because the action	ns out of which this claim arose took
3. Plaintiff	is a	corporation with	n its principal place of business in
4. At all times hereinafter			usiness of insuring various cargo, and pment of
			for the account of
Subrogor	("Insured") and	d is subrogated to the rights of re	ecovery of Insured for those goods as

a result of its payment to Insure	d for the losses sustained by Insured.				
5. Subrogor Insured is a	corporation with i	corporation with its principal place of business in			
6. Defendantplace of business in		corporation with its principal			
intermodal transportation service transport several containers con	taining from the deliver said containers to	er] operated as a common carrier for hire providing contracted with Insured to m to (A) using Defendant			
8. Defendantbusiness in		corporation with its principal place of			
conjunction with the intermodal	transportation services provided by	and is a rail common carrier for hire which, in [intermodal carrier] had along its rail line to its railhead in			
10. Defendantbusiness in		corporation with its principal place of			
with Insured to pick up and deli railhe	ver several containers containing ad in to a	Warehouse (the			
		corporation with its principal place of			
		notor common carrier for hire which sub-contracted iners from the railhead to			
contracted with	[intermodal carrier] and _ from	agent, ("Agent"), (A) for the interstate to The Bill of			
for hire, arranged with the to rent or lease the use of the carrier] tracks, engines, employ	[railroad components and other facilities for the carria	l carrier], acting as an intermodal common carrier any] and the [rail carrier] npany] and the [rail ge of the shipment. In addition, the and deliver and deliver			
		at the railhead in			

	with Insured,				
	to the				
	(A) from	tne	raiine	ad. The	
Shipping Order is attac	thed as Exhibit 2.				
17. After receiving said	d containers from		[intermodal carri	er],	(A)
	e services from the		railhead to the V	Varehouse	to complete the interstate
shipment.					
18. The containers left		on or about		, 20	and arrived at the
	railhead on the mornin	g of	, 20	·	
10 After the chipment	had danartad from				a faccimila transmission
was sent by	had departed from [agent] to	the	,	arriorl and	a raesimme transmission
	ties of the container numb				
	e on the morning of			chively of	the containers could be
made to the warehouse	on the morning of				
20. On	, 20 the _		[rail carrie	[r] notified	
(A) via facsimile that t	he trailers would be availa	able to	(A	on	, 20
, for delivery to			,		
21. On information and	l belief,	(A) w	as unable to deliver th	ne containe	ers to the Warehouse and
	(B)				
Warehouse, without th	e knowledge or consent of	f Insured or _		_ [agent].	
22. On information and	l belief,	(A) co	ommunicated to		(B) the
	address of the Warehouse				
	e of the containers at the			-	
, ,					
23. At approximately _	a	.m. on	, 20) a c	lriver in
	(B) Tractor No				
the	[rail carrier] releas	ed Container	No	to	the driver.
24. At approximately	a	.m. later that i	morning, four tractors	and drive	rs from
- approximately <u>-</u>	(B) arrived at the		railhead to picl	c up the co	ntainers to be delivered to
the Warehouse. Howev	ver, Container No		. which had previ	ously been	released by
	, was missing from the		railhead.	After inqui	ry by the
	driver, the		informed		(B) that Container No.
	had been picked up one	e-half hour ear	rlier by a		(B) driver, giving the
name of	and driving		(B) Tractor	No	·
25 On information and	l belief, one of the		(R) drivers conto	octed his or	mervisor and was notified
	did not employ a d				
	(B) determined that Tra				
26. The goods contained	ed in Container No		were never deli	vered to th	e Warehouse.

27. As a result of the Defendants' failure to deliver	the goods, Insured was damaged in the amount of
	for the loss of the goods and Plaintiff is thereby subrogated to the bunts, under the bill of lading issued by e goods.
COUNT I Interstate Commerce Act	
Plaintiff realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1 th	rough 30 as paragraphs 1 through 30 of Count I.
and(A) concerned the int	red entered into with [intermodal carrier] terstate shipment of goods under the jurisdiction of the Interstate the Defendants as common carriers are each subject to the
obligations to offer full liability terms to or on behavior	g. 14348 [see 49 C.F.R. P 1090.2), the Defendants had statutory alf of Insured consistent with 49 U.S.C. § 11707 (the "Carmack written agreement for released value rates or other limitation of
	or otherwise, to any limitation of liability, the Defendants are subject nt or, in the alternative, to liability pursuant to 46 U.S.C. § 10505 and bility terms of the Carmack Amendment.
32. Container No was de and complete condition, however, said container w	elivered to [intermodal carrier] in a good ras never delivered to the Warehouse.
33. Pursuant to its contract with Insured,	[intermodal carrier] owed a duty to Insured, as the
initial receiving carrier and as the delivering carrier delivered to (A) in	r in, to insure that the goods would be
	to Insured individually, and through its delivering agent, ainer No was mis-delivered to the custody s inside the railhead.
	's [intermodal carrier] failure to properly deliver(A), Insured was damaged in the amount of
36. Pursuant to its contract with Insured, pick up and deliver the containers from the interstate shipment.	(A) owed a duty to Insured, as a common carrier, to railhead to the Warehouse to complete the
37(A) breached its duty Warehouse.	by failing to deliver Container No to the
38. As a direct and proximate result of, Insured was damaged in	's (A) failure to deliver Container No. the amount of

39. The	[<i>rail carrier</i>] ow	ed a duty to Insured, as a comn	non carrier, to properly deliver
Container No	only to the	e party authorized by Insured as	s the notify party.
40. The	[<i>rail carrier</i>] bre	ached its duty to Insured by car	relessly and negligently delivering
Container No			
41. As a direct and proximate	te result of the careless	and negligent acts of the	[rail carrier],
			d Insured was damaged in the amount
of			C
42. Pursuant to its agreemen	nt with	(A),	(B) owed a duty to Insured,
			railhead to the Warehouse
to complete the interstate sh	ipment.		
43.	(B) breached its duty	to Insured by carelessly and ne	gligently failing to pick up and deliver
Container No.			
		's (B) careless and	
Wa	is never delivered to the	e Warehouse and Insured was o	damaged in the amount of
Wherefore, Plaintiff	reqı	uests this Court to enter judgme	ents against the Defendants in the
amount of	·		
COUNT II Federal Co	mmon Law		
Plaintiff realleges and incorp	porates paragraphs 1 th	arough 30 as paragraphs 1 throu	igh 30 of Count II.
		common carriers subject to the eliver the containers to the Wa	e jurisdiction of the ICC, jointly and rehouse.
32. Pursuant to federal community the loss during this interstate		re subject to the full liability te	rms of the Carmack Amendment for
			[intermodal carrier] in a good ever delivered to the Warehouse.
34. Pursuant to its contract y	with Insured.	[intermodal ca	rrier] owed a duty to Insured, as the
initial receiving carrier and	as the delivering carrie	r in , t	o insure that the goods would be
delivered to			
35	_ [intermodal carrier]	breached its duty to Insured ind	lividually, and through its delivering
agent, the	[rail carrier], v	when Container No	was mis-delivered to
		ontainer was inside the	
36. As a direct and proxima	te result of	's [intermodal car	rier] failure to properly deliver
Container No		(A), Insured	
·•			
37. Pursuant to its contract v	with Insured,	(A) owed a dut	y to Insured, as a common carrier, to

pick up and deliver the containers from the	railhead to th	e Warehouse to complete the
interstate shipment.		
38 (A) breached its duty by Warehouse.	by failing to deliver Container	No to the
39. As a direct and proximate result of, Insured was damaged in t		
40. The [rail carrier] owed Container No only to the		
41. The [rail carrier] brea Container No to an unauth	•	elessly and negligently delivering
42. As a direct and proximate result of the careless a Container No was never of		
43. Pursuant to its agreement with as a common carrier, to pick up and deliver the cont to complete the interstate shipment.		
44 (B) breached its duty to the Ware		gligently failing to pick up and deliver
45. As a direct and proximate result of was never delivered to the	` , ,	
Wherefore, Plaintiff requeamount of	ests this Court to enter judgme	nts against the Defendants in the
By: One of Their Attorneys		
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form No. 1-1, <i>supra</i> .		



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
INSURANCE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-458

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-458RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
LIMITATION

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-459

FORM No. 1-459 Complaint--Exoneration or Limit of Liability--Oil Pollutionn1

[Caption] n2		
COMPLAINT		
Now come the plaintiffs,		
from or limitation of liability, allege as foll		3,,, 1, 1
1. Plaintiffs file this complaint as a defensi		
citizens and corporations have filed actions [state], which act		
10. Plaintiffs herein have moved for dismiss on the pleadings in those actions under <i>Rull</i> paragraphs 17 and 18; this Court has not ye state court. Under <i>46 U.S.C. § 183 et seq.</i> receiving a written notice of claim. Plaintiff requirements, to preserve their right to seek abovementioned class actions should not re-	te 12, Federal Rules of Civil Procedet ruled on those motions nor on per, a complaint for limitation of liabilities therefore are now filing this compactification of liability, particularly esult in the dismissal of those suits.	ure, as is more fully described in ading motions to remand those cases to ty must be filed within six months of plaint to meet the statutory time in the event that the motions in the
2. This is a case of admiralty and maritime Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.		
3. At all material times, plaintiff		
corporation with its principal place of busing		
operator] was and is a	corporation having its principa	al place of business at

				corporation
having its principal pla	ce of business at	Plaint	tiff	[corporate officer]
was and is a resident o	f the State of	and was a	nd is an employee of	f plaintiff
	[parent].			
4.753				1 6 1
4. The motor tanker		_ was a	screw, steel ta	ank vessel of about
		net to		
		readth and		
		The vessel		
		umber	_	e port at
	At all material tim	nes the ship was used to tran	sport crude oil.	
5. Before and at the be	ginning of the vovage	e and at all times material to	the casualty, due di	ligence was exercised to
				l compartments in which the
cargo was carried fit an				r
6 m	•	G) (T)		
		GMT on		
vessel	loaded a par	rt cargo of crude oil at		and on
	, completed	loading at	The total of	cargo, about
		oil, was destined to be discl		
		aded and carried pursuant to		
		eting loading on		
		en route to its destin		
		s stranding and loss on the _		off the coast of
	, in	, on	·	
7. A4		CMT	41	r n
/. At approximately		GMT on	, tne	[vesset]
was proceeding in near	vy seas on the coast o)I	within a traffic separ	ration scheme specified
		the Prevention of Collision		
		nd installed by the builder of		
		that time in any immediate		
		the near		
		on the coast of		•
_	_	steering gear, the ship's lice	_	_
_		ystem to operation. Despite	_	=
		ns. Thereupon, Captain		
	, took steps to asce	rtain the location of salvage	tugs and requested	the assistance of salvage
tugs. The	, under tr	ne command of	, owned	by the firm of
**************************************	, arrived at the	[vesse] [vesse] [vesse] [vesse] [vesse] [vesse] [vesse]	t] at about	GM1.
Without delay, the tow	line from the tug was	s prepared and put aboard th	ne	[vessel] and the tug
commenced maneuver	ing and attempted to t	tow the	[vessel]. At ap	proximately
	GMT, the tow line	trom the tug to the	[v	essel] suddenly and hours elapsed while the tug
unexpectedly broke. A	fter the tug's tow line	parted, approximately		hours elapsed while the tug
		w tow line, and secured that		
		tug was recovering its brok		
		rel] took appropriate steps to		
		e ship's engine astern and u		
		of the seas, the condition of		
securing its second tov	v line to the	[vessel] at a	about	GMT, the tug
	commenced attem	pting to tow the ship and wa	as towing the ship w	hen the

[ves	[sel] grounded in territorial water	rs on the rocks off	shortly after
GM	T. The force of the grounding ca	aused breaches in the sh	ip's hull, its cargo of crude oil
began to escape, its engine ro	om was flooded and it lost all po	ower. By approximately	GMT
, son	ne hou	rs after stranding, most	of the crew of the
[ves	sel] was lifted off the ship by	•	Captain
	[vessel] until		
approximately	GMT, he was lifted of	off the ship by	Subsequently, the
	sel] broke up further and its rem		
territorial waters off the coast			
8. The said casualty and all lo	osses and damages caused thereb	by or otherwise incurred	on that voyage were not due to
	of due care on the part of plaintif		
	hom plaintiffs were or are respon	_	
	hiness of the		
			e solely to and caused wholly by
	_		m plaintiffs are not responsible, or
=	for which plaintiffs are not liabl	_	•
9. The casualty happened, and	d the losses, damages, injury or o	destruction resulting the	refrom or occurring on that
voyage, were done, occasione	ed, and incurred without the priv	ity or knowledge of the	plaintiffs within the meaning of 46
<i>U.S.C.</i> § 183(a), and without	the privity or knowledge of the	master or of plaintiffs' si	uperintendents or managing agents
at or prior to the commencem	ent of the aforesaid voyage with	in the meaning of 46 U.	.S.C. § 183(e).
10. Following the casualty, th	ree suits were brought in the	(Court of
County,	against plaintiffs in this suit	t and were removed to the	his Court. Those suits, which
purport to be class actions, se	ek damages totalling more than		Attorneys for the claimants in
those suits are	Those actions are sty	led as follows:	[list suits].
Notices or threats of claim ha	ve also been received from the f	following:	[list claimants].
Districts assert that the dame	ndo modo in ough octions and al	aims aroand the volue o	f plaintiffel interest in the
	nds made in such actions and cla		
[ves	esel] and its pending freight; further	her, plaintiffs fear the fi	ling of additional claims.
11. There are no demands, un	satisfied liens or claims of lien a	against the	[vessel] or plaintiffs
arising out of the aforesaid vo	byage, or any suits pending, so fa	ar as is known to plainti	ffs, other than as above set forth.
12 This complaint is filed pri	or to the expiration of six month	ns from the date plaintiff	fs received the first written notice
	ollowing the aforesaid voyage an	-	
13. No part of the hull, engine	e, boilers, machinery and tackles	s, etc., nor of the cargo c	of the
	all are deemed to be a total loss.		
	[vesse		
plaintiffs' interest in the	[vessel] was	s for pending freight (tir	ne charter hire) for that voyage.
earned by plaintiff	[owner]. The val	ue of the pending freigh	at did not exceed the sum of
	set forth in the affidavit of		
	their interest, plaintiffs herewith		
claimants, a stipulation for se	curity in the sum of	plus intere	est at per
	stipulation. Plaintiffs file this stip	pulation without prejudic	ce to their right to urge
applicability of foreign law as	s specified hereinbelow.		

15. Plaintiffs contest their liability and the liability of the[vessel] for the injuries, losses and
damages occasioned or incurred upon said voyage. Plaintiffs have valid defenses thereto on the facts and on the law.
Although filing stipulation for security herein, plaintiffs do not admit but expressly deny that they are liable for any los
or damage. Plaintiffs here claim and reserve the right to contest in this or any other Court any claim of liability, whether
against any of them or against the[vessel].
against any of them of against the
16. Plaintiff [vessel owner] claims exoneration from or limitation of liability as owner of the
[vesset]. The complaints in the three class actions described in paragraph 10 allege that
plaintiffs, as corporate parents of [vessel owner and operator] and
, as an officer and agent of those corporations, by reason of alleged negligent acts and
omissions "in the ownership, navigation, operation, maintenance, chartering and control of the
[vessel] were responsible for the stranding of the [vessel] and the damages caused thereby, all
of which plaintiffs deny. If those and other allegations of ownership, navigation, operation, maintenance, chartering an
control of the [vessel] are sustained, those plaintiffs are also entitled to limitation of liability
under 46 U.S.C. § 183 et seq., as owners or owners pro hac vice of the[vessel].
17. The oil pollution damage claims asserted in the three class actions described in paragraph 10 and all other such
claims which may be asserted against plaintiffs are governed by the law of
law incorporates the terms of the 2069 International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil
Pollution Damage ("CLC"), a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A". Under law, the
courts are exclusively competent to decide all claims of oil pollution damage asserted against
plaintiffs herein. Plaintiffs' right to exoneration from or limitation of liability is governed by the law of
because the plaintiffs allegedly caused injury in, because
has the most significant relationship to the case, and because principles of international comit
require that United States courts respect's claim to exclusive jurisdiction under the CLC.
Under the CLC, upon filing of a claim for damages, the owner of the ship must constitute a fund in the appropriate cou
in the country where oil pollution damage occurred or where steps were taken to minimize oil pollution damage. Art. V
Pursuant to a decree rendered on April 25, 1978 by the, the court with jurisdiction under the
CLC, plaintiff [vessel owner] constituted such a fund, in the amount of
. Under the terms of the CLC, the is therefore the only court
competent to hear and determine all pollution claims arising out of the stranding of the
[vessel]. Arts. III(4) and IX. Plaintiffs therefore claim and are entitled to exoneration from or limitation of liability from
the above casualty, if any, in accordance with the law of and are subject to any claims for oil
pollution damages only in the courts of and solely for defensive purposes in
response to the class action suits which plaintiffs believe were improperly filed in this country and other claims,
plaintiffs claim immunities and the benefit of exoneration from or the limitation of liability provided by 46 U.S.C. § 18
et seq., and the various statutes supplemental thereto and amendatory thereof.
18. By reason of the improper institution of the aforesaid actions in the Court of
County,, which actions have been removed to this Court, and by
virtue of the possibility that others may file actions in the United States against these plaintiffs, plaintiffs have been
compelled to file this Complaint within the statutory period of limitation set forth in the above-cited statutes of the
United States in order to preserve their rights. Accordingly, plaintiffs assert herein, as they asserted in the aforesaid
pending actions in this Court by their Motions to Dismiss Complaint for Forum Non Conveniens and their Motions to
Dismiss Complaint or for Judgment on the Pleadings Pursuant to Rule 12 (all of which were filed on
but have not yet been ruled upon), that the proper forum for the determination of the claims
asserted in those pending actions, and for any other claim resulting from oil pollution caused by the stranding of the
[vessel], is the Plaintiffs reserve all rights asserted in those motions
Upon the filing of any claim for oil pollution damage in this proceeding, plaintiffs intend and reserve the right to move

for the dismissal of such claims on the ground the	nat under the law of	, such claims are
enforceable only in the courts of	Plaintiffs also reser	ve the right to move for the dismissal of
all other claims that may be filed in this proceed	ling which should be adjudicate	ed in a foreign jurisdiction. Plaintiffs also
reserve the right to move for such other and furt	her relief as may be appropriat	e.
Wherefore, plaintiffs pray:		
1. That this Court make an order approving the		
, deposited with the Co		the value of plaintiff's interest in the
[vessel] and its pendin	g freight.	
2. That this Count issue a nation to the named al	aintiffs in the three class ection	as described in management 10 and to all
2. That this Court issue a notice to the named pl		1 0 1
persons asserting claims with respect to which the admonishing them to file their claims with the C	_	
thereof on or before a date to be named in the no		
thereof on of before a date to be named in the ne	onec, and also to appear and an	is wer the anegations of this complaint.
3. That the Court enjoin the prosecution of any a	and all proceedings already beg	gun arising out of the voyage or the
casualty of the [vessel]		
any nature, except in the present proceeding, again	_	
[vessel], in respect of a	any claim arising out of the afo	resaid voyage and casualty; provided,
however, that the injunction shall permit final re-	esolution of the pending Motion	ns to Remand, Motions to Dismiss
Complaint for Forum Non Conveniens and Mot	ions to Dismiss Complaint or f	or Judgment on the Pleadings Pursuant to
Rule 12, previously filed in the three abovement	tioned class actions.	
4. That the Court in this proceeding dismiss any		
proper forum for the determination of such clair		
claims in that court, and that this Court dismiss	any other claim which should t	be adjudicated in a foreign jurisdiction.
5. With respect to claims filed in this proceeding	g and not dismissed, that this C	ourt adjudge that plaintiffs are not liable
to any extent for any loss, damage, injury or des	=	
stranding, or done, occasioned or incurred on the		
shall be adjudged liable, that such liability be lir		
of the United States, and that plaintiffs be discha		=
paid or secured to be paid be divided pro rata ac	-	•
accordance with the provisions of the order pray	ed for, saving to all parties any	y priority to which they may be legally
entitled, and that a judgment may be entered dis	charging plaintiffs from all fur	ther liability.
6. That plaintiffs may have such other and further	er relief that the justice of the c	cause may require.
Respectfully submitted,		
FOOTNOTES:		
(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers used	I in the AMOCO CADIZ litigat	ion courtesy of Warren J. Marwedel,
Esq., Chicago, Illinois.		

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1, supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
LIMITATION

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-471

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-471RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS LIMITATION

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-472

FORM No. 1-472 Complaint--Mortgage Foreclosuren1

[Caption and Jurisdiction	nal Statement] n2				
2. Plaintiff,			corporatio	on with its place of	business at
3. The Towboat now at or near within the jurisdiction of	is , wi	and was at all tim			
4. On	incipal sum of \$ _		, payable to	the order of	
5. On owner of the Towboat	, Official Number _. , Inc., duly execute	, formerly cal	led the To secu: o plaintiff a prefe	re the payment of erred mortgage upo	egistered at the Port of said note, on said vessel dated
6. Said mortgage was dul Coast Guard, at the Port of U.S.C. § 31321 et seq. A status of a preferred mort	of ll of the acts and the	on hings required to b	pe done by said A	, 20, in a	accordance with 46 e said mortgage the

Port of	, including the endorsement of said m	nortgage upon the	e outstanding document of said
vessel.			
	, Inc., failed to make the interest and princher default in the payment of each and every inst		
in default under the to note elected to declar	erms of said note and mortgage. By reason of sai e due and payable immediately the entire indebto	d defaults plainti edness secured by	ff has under the terms of said y said mortgage. There is now due
	ote and Mortgage the principal sum of \$ % per annum from		
the rate of	/o per annum moni	, 20	, unim paid.
Wherefore, plaintiff	demands:		
1. That the said prefe	rred mortgage may be foreclosed, and that the Te	owboat	her engines,
•	ickle, apparel, furniture and equipment may be c		± •
claims of the plaintiff	herein under the preferred ship mortgage herein	ibefore described	
	r an order herein directing that said defendant vel equipment be sold in the manner provided by lattiff herein.	_	•
Attorney for Plaintiff	<u> </u>		
[Verification] n3			
FOOTNOTES:			
	n adapted from papers used in First State Bank v ll. 1975), courtesy of Elmer M. Walsh, Jr., Esq.,		
(n2)Footnote 2.	See Form No. 1-1 supra.		
(n3)Footnote 3.	See Form No. 1-11 supra.		



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
LIMITATION

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-473

FORM No. 1-473 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--Mortgage Foreclosuren1

aption] n2
e complaint of [credit association] against the vessel, Official No, her rigging, tackle, apparel, furniture, engines, nets and fishing gear and all other necessaries
reunto appertaining and belonging, and against, a corporation, in a cause, civil and ritime, for foreclosure of a preferred ship mortgage, respectfully shows:
Plaintiff is a corporation organized and existing under the Act of the Congress of the United tes as amended, with its principal place of business in the City of,
Defendant, is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of, with its principal place of business and offices at
The vessel, Official No, with her rigging, tackle, apparel, niture, engines, nets and fishing gear and all other necessaries thereunto appertaining and belonging, is now afloat in, and within this district.
On, 20, Defendant, executed and delivered to Plaintiff, for uable consideration, a promissory note dated, 20, in the amount of
) per annum. The principal amount of that note was advanced to Defendant, Inc., on, 20

5. On, 20), in order to secure the payment of the promiss	sory note described in paragraph
4 above, Defendant	, in accordance with and pursuant to the 46	5 U.S.C. §§ 31321, et seq.
executed and delivered to Plaintiff	a preferred mortgage covering the vessel	, and by the terms
of that mortgage granted, bargained	d, and sold mortgagor's vessel, the vessel	, to Plaintiff, to
secure the payment of the note des	cribed in paragraph 4 above and all other obligations	of the preferred mortgage
described in this paragraph. A copy	y of that preferred mortgage is annexed hereto as Exh	nibit "A".
6. At the time the preferred morton	age described in paragraph 5 above was executed and	delivered to Plaintiff and at all
	was, and has been, duly enrolled under	
with her home port at		the laws of the Chited States
	·	
7. The preferred mortgage describe	ed in paragraph 5 above was duly filed with the Unite	ed States Coast Guard Marine
	the home port of the vessel, and the	
	, shows the name of the resp	
	mortgage, the interest in the respondent vessel mortga	
maturity of the note described in pa	aragraph 4 above. The preferred mortgage was duly e	endorsed on the documents of the
respondent vessel, and affidavits w	vere filed with the record of the preferred mortgage, to	o the effect that the mortgage
=	it any design to hinder, delay or defraud any existing	
mortgagor or any lienor of the mor	tgaged vessel.	
8. At the time Defendant	, executed and delivered to Plaintiff the	he note described in paragraph 4
above and the mortgage described	in paragraph 5 above, Defendant's vessel,	, was encumbered
by a valid and subsisting first prefe	erred mortgage in favor of,	executed by Defendant
, on	, 20, and delivered the sam	ne date to
	of Plaintiff's mortgage is superior to the lien of the m	
	e of a Subordination Agreement dated	
expressly subordinated the lien of	the mortgage to the lien of I	Plaintiff's mortgage of
	A copy of that Subordination Agreement is attache	
	y filed with the United States Coast Guard Marine Do	
	, 20, and affidavits were fi	
	ffect that the Subordination Agreement was entered in	•
any design to hinder, delay or defra	aud any existing or future creditor of the mortgagor o	or any lienor of the mortgaged
vessel.		
9. The Defendant	, has refused and neglected to pay the indebto	edness secured by the mortgage
	accordance with the terms thereof. Defendant	
	incipal and interest when due. There is presently due a	
	erest at the rate of per annul	
20	to date, and all recoverable expe	enses incurred by Plaintiff herein
including, but not limited to, the co	ost of port risk insurance. Plaintiff has further advance	ed the sum of \$
	ance premiums and repairs to the vessel. In accordance	
	leclare, and did declare, the whole of the outstanding	_
	$\frac{1}{2}$, 20 $\frac{1}{2}$, to be immediately due and p	
therefor has been duly made, neith	er the whole nor any part of the outstanding indebted	ness has been paid.
10 DI 1 (1001)		
	incur reasonable attorney's fees and expenses and may	
damages from or by reason of the d	default of the mortgagor, all in amounts not presently	known to Plaintiff.

11. All and singular the premises are true and within the Admiralty and Maritime jurisdiction of the United States of

America and of his Honorable court.

and Maritime jurisdiction issue agains engines, nets and fishing-gear and all	st the vesselother necessaries thereunto ap	ctice of this Honorable Court in causes of Admiralty, her rigging, tackle, apparel, furniture, appertaining and belonging, and that all persons
		n oath, all and singular, the matters aforesaid; that swer on oath, all and singular, the matters aforesaid.
Defendant,	inc. be cited to appear and ans	iswer on oath, an and singular, the matters aforesaid.
	officer or caretaker of the vess	notice of the commencement of this suit hall be sel, and to any person, firm narged lien upon the vessel.
3. That the preferred mortgage be dec	clared to be a valid and subsist	ting lien in the sum of
Dollars (\$) 1		
(%) from	, 20	, together with the
Dollars and	Cents (\$) and all other amounts required to be disbursed
and all other advances, expenses, atto	rneys' fees, costs and disburse	st of any additional insurance on Defendant vessel, ements on Plaintiff herein, with interest at
	t, liens, or claims of any and a	%) per annum thereon, such lien all persons, firms or corporations whatsoever, except e liens on the vessel.
other necessaries thereunto appertaini	ing and belonging be condemi	parel, furniture, engines, nets and fishing-gear and all ned and sold to pay the demands and claims purchaser at any sale of the mortgaged property.
	barred and foreclosed of and f	s claiming any interest in the vessel from all right or equity of redemption or claim of, in
or to the mortgaged vessel and every	part thereof.	
		, Inc. the amount of any deficiency that may be due essel to the amount of the decree herein.
7. That Plaintiff have such other and f	further relief as in justice it ma	nay be entitled to receive.
Attorney for Plaintiff		
[Verification] n3		
FOOTNOTES:		

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers used in Southern Oregon Production Credit Association v. Oil Screw Sweet Pea, 435 F. Supp. 454 (D. Or. 1977), courtesy of Souther, Spaulding, Kinsey, Williamson & Schwabe, Portland, Oregon.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form Nos. 1-10 through 1-13 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS LIMITATION

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-474

FORM No. 1-474 Complaint In Rem and In Personam In Intervention--Enforcement of Preferred Ship Mortgagen1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
FOR THE DISTRICT OF	
Shipping Company,)
Plaintiff,)
vs. The, her engines, boil	-)
ers, tackle, etc., In Rem,)
and Shipping Agency,)
In Personam, Complaint In)
Defendants. Intervention)
TheBank,)
Plaintiff in Intervention, Civil Action)
No)
vs. The, her engines,)
tackle, furniture, etc., In Rem,)
and)
Marine Corporation,)
In Personam,)
Defendant in Intervention.)
)

The Complaint of The		
		Marine Corporation, in personam, and maritime, alleges upon information and
	tter under 28 U.S.C. & 1333 and 46)	U.S.C. § 31321 et seq. This is an admiralty
and maritime claim within the meaning		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2. At all times hereinafter mentioned, The national banking association organized a place of business at	and existing under the laws of the Un	nereinafter "Bank") was and now is a nited States of America with an office and
3. At all times hereinafter mentioned det	fendant is a	and was a vessel documented under the law
and flag of the		
		aws of, as owner
thereof, and having official number	, being of appro	oximately gross
tons, and approximately		
	± •	Certificate of Ownership and Encumbrance
for the is attack	hed and incorporated herein as Exhil	bit 1.
4.00	20 1.5 1	The second of th
4. On or about	, 20, defendant	executed a First Preferred Ship
Custometry dated	in layor o	of Bank as Mortgagee as security for a delivered by
The animal and animal and animal and animal	_, 20, which was executed and	d derivered by
True series of the Mortsess and	.s and the f	maturity date is
True copies of the Mortgage and	Guaranty are attached hereto as Exi	mons 2 and 3 respectively.
5 The Mortgage was duly filed for reco	rd on 20	, at P.M. in
		the proper place for
the recording of a mortgage covering the	e vessel	, the proper place for
, Page		
Certificate of Registry on		
certificate of Registry on	, 20, at	1vi. at the 1 oft of
·		
6. On or about	. 20 defendant	executed a Supplement to the
Mortgage covering the	in favor of Bank as Mortga	agee as additional security for the Guaranty
Guaranty dated	. 20 . The Supplement increa	, 20, as well as the sed the principal amount of the Mortgage to
		, 20 True copies of the
Supplement and Guaranty Confirmation		
7. The Supplement was duly filed for red	cord on , 20	0, at A.M.
in the Office of the Deputy Commission		
recorded in Book	, Page	at said office. The Supplement was endorsed
on the vessel's certificate of Registry on	, 20	at said office. The Supplement was endorsed, at at the Port of
·		
8. The first part of the indebtedness secu		
, 20, in t		
	• •	gations arising out of a Loan Agreement
("First Agreement") dated	, 20 , with Amend	ments dated .

20,	, 20, a	and	, 2	20	, and a Loan Agre	eement
("Second Agreement") dated		, 20	, with an Am	endment	dated	,
20, True copies of the Fin	-	ith Amendme	ents and Second	Agreeme	nt with Amendme	ent are attached
hereto as Exhibits 6 and 7 respe	ctively.					
9. The rest of the indebtedness s	ecured by the S	unnlement to	the Mortgage is	evidence	d by a Guaranty (Confirmation
dated,						
money lent pursuant to a Loan A	Agreement ("Th	ird Agreemen	t") dated		20	and as
further security for the First Agr	reement with an	additional Ar	mendment dated		, = =	20 and
the Second Agreement with an a	additional Amer	ndment dated			20 . True c	opies of the
Third Agreement, the		20 , Aı	mendment to the	First Ag	reement, and the	1
, 20	Amendme	nt to the Secon	nd Agreement are	e attache	d hereto as Exhibi	its 8, 9 and 10.
10. I			4.4.1	14.1.1.		
10. Long prior to the commence						
Mortgage and the Supplement c	•			_	-	
upon the mortgaged vesselwhich the vessel is requested]		, in accor	dance with the p	rovisions	s of line law of the	e country in
which the vesset is requested]						
11. At the time of the filing of the	nis action, defer	ıdant		is in defa	ault under the Mo	rtgage and the
Supplement. Among other defau						
Mortgage as and when due.						
12. Pursuant to the terms of the	Mortgaga Ranl	has notified.	defendant		that an	avant of dafault
has occurred. Bank has further r						
the indebtedness under the Mort						
attached and incorporated herein		iemanaea oy i	Bank. 11 true cop	y or notic	ce of default and t	iccoloration is
attached and meorporated herein	rus Exmon II.					
13. Pursuant to the foregoing, _		owes	in principal the s	sum of \$, plus
interest accrued thereon in the a	mount of \$		through _		, 2	0, and
accrued thereafter pursuant to the	ie Mortgage.					
14. In addition to the debt of det	fendant		to Bank as ev	videnced	by the Guaranty	and Guaranty
Confirmation secured by the Mo						Ž
, may t						al. Under the
terms and provisions of the Mor						
and Supplement.				•	•	
Wherefore, in consideration of	the premises, pl	aintiff prays a	as follows:			
1. That process in due form of la	aw according to	the course an	d practice of this	Honorah	ole Court in cause	s of admiralty
and maritime jurisdiction may is						
appurtenances, etc., and that all						
under oath the allegations of this	-	.g,	8			
2. That process issue in the man	ner provided by	law, upon the	e defendant		Marir	ne Corporation.
citing it to appear and answer up						r 3.44.011,
0 mm - 1 - m - m - m - m - m - m - m - m				_		
3. That the First Preferred Mortg						
mortgage on the whole of the and on shore, etc., prior and sup	erior in right an	d interest to a	ngmes, tackie, lu ny claim therein	or thereo	ippaici, appuitella n by any other ne	rson firm or
and on shore, etc., prior and sup	CITOI III II GIIL AII	a mucical to a	ny Ciann uititill	or micico	n by any built De	150H, 1111H, UI

corporation whomsoever or whatsoever;
4. That plaintiff have a decree against the, her engines, tackle, furniture, apparel, appurtenances on board and on shore, etc., for the full amount of its aforesaid claims, attorneys' fees and costs, as provided in the attached documents;
5. That the, her engines, tackle, furniture, apparel, appurtenances on board and on shore, etc be condemned and sold free and clear of all liens and encumbrances to satisfy the decree of the plaintiff, and that this Honorable Court award to the plaintiff out of the proceeds of said sale the full amount of its claims as aforesaid with preference and priority over all other persons, firms, and corporations whomsoever and whatsoever;
6. That this Court decree the manner in which notice of the commencement of this action be given by plaintiff to the Owner, Master, or caretaker of the, to the defendant Marine Corporation, and to any person, firm, or corporation having or claiming to have recorded a notice of claim of an undischarged lien as provided for by the applicable statutes and rules;
7. That should the proceeds of the sale of the be insufficient to satisfy the claims of the plaintiff against defendant Marine Corporation <i>in personam</i> , that the Court enter a judgment for such deficiency against the defendant Marine corporation <i>in personam</i> ; and
8. That the court grant such other and further relief to which the plaintiff may show itself justly entitled.
Attorney for Plaintiff In Intervention
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Laguna Shipping Limited v. M/V Oceanus Countess, Civ. No.

84-2664 (E.D.N.Y. 1984).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS LIMITATION

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-475

FORM No. 1-475 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--Foreclosure of Preferred Ship Mortgage

[Caption] n1				
Plaintiff sues the defendant, vessel " corporation, and		," and defendant		, a
1. Plaintiff herein is a corporation, organi	zed and existing und	der the laws of the S	tate of	, with
its principal place of business in	; that	at at all times releva	nt herein, plaintiff w	as Mortgagee
under a certain Mortgage secured by the	vessel "	"·		
2. The vessel ",	Official No	,	is an American enrol	led yacht, with
home port of, a	nd is now and will b	e during the penden	cy of this action, aflo	oat upon the waters
of the District of	of	in	and v	vithin the
admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the	s Honorable Court.			
(a) On information and belief the name h	as been wrongfully a	and illegally change	d from "	" to
"" in violation o	f the federal laws of	the United States.		
3. Upon information and belief, the defer	ıdant,	, is a corp	poration organized ar	nd existing under
the laws of the State of				
4. This is an admiralty and maritime claim	n <i>in rem</i> and <i>in pers</i>	onam with a prayer	for process of mariti	me attachment
within the meaning of Rule 9(h), Federal	Rules of Civil Proce	edure and the Admir	ralty Rules of this Ho	onorable Court.

COUNT I

5. Upon information and belief, on	, 20,	, as maker, executed a
promissory note, a copy of which is attached	ed hereto as Exhibit "A" [omitted] and ma	ade a part hereof as though fully set
forth herein. This note was delivered to the	Mortgagee, the payee thereof, and the pl	laintiff herein, on
6. Upon information and belief, in order to	secure the payment of the principal of th	e note with interest and amount
both principal and interest, evidenced there		
, Inc., as maker, d		
, file., as maker, d	20 a same of which is attached has	esta as Erbibit "D" [amitted]
mortgage dated, 2	20, a copy of which is attached her	reto as Exilibit B [omitiea].
7. Upon information and belief, by the term		
, as maker, admitt	ed that it was justly indebted to the mortg	gagee in the sum of
Dollars (\$		
assigned remised, released, mortgaged, set	over and confirmed unto the mortgagee,	his successors and assigns, the
whole of the Yacht "	," together with her engines, boilers, n	nachinery, masts, bowsprits, boats,
anchors, cables, rigging, tackle, apparel, fu	rniture, and all other appurtenances there	unto appertaining and belonging,
and any and all additions, improvements ar	nd replacements thereafter made in or to t	the vessel or any part or
appurtenance or equipment thereof, provide	=	
cause to be paid to the mortgagee, his succe		
	reon as required by Exhibit "A," by paym	
by paying interest on the note, and if	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
covenants and promises in the note and in t		
should cease, determine and be void, other		
all the terms, conditions and provisions the	tem contained, as though the same were	nerem runy and at length set form is
attached as Exhibit "B."		
8. Upon information and belief, the preferr		
Officer of the Port of		
Documentation Officer in Book	, Page Number	, at
P.M	, 20, which record sh	lows the name of the vessel, the
names of the parties to the mortgage, the time	me and date of the reception of the mortg	gage, the interest in the vessel
mortgaged and the amount and date of mat	urity of the mortgage.	
9. Upon information and belief, the Docum	nentation Officer of the Port of	, upon the recording
of the preferred mortgage, delivered two ce	ertified copies thereof to the mortgagor, _	, Inc., who
placed and used due diligence to retain one	e copy on board the Yacht "	" and caused the copy
and documents of the vessel to be exhibited	d by the master to any person having busi	iness with the vessel, which might
give rise to a maritime lien upon the vessel		
master of the vessel, upon the request of an		
the preferred mortgage placed on board the	* ±	ients of the vesser and the copy of
the preferred mortgage placed on board the	acor.	
10. Upon information and belief, the prefer	erad martanga stated the interest of the me	ortgogor in the Vecht
	t conveyed or mortgaged, and before the	
had been acknowledged within the	, State of	, before a notary public
authorized by the laws of the State of	and of the United St	ates to take acknowledgments of
deeds with the County of	and State of	·
11. Upon information and belief, the defendance		
to Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B," and on	, 20, the plai	ntiff herein then and there fully

demanded payment of the note with interest at the lawful rate of eighteen percent (18%) per annum and payment of the principal and interest of the sum represented by the note, all as provided therein. But, refused and neglected and ever since has refused and neglected to pay the amount of the balance of the principal of the note or any part thereof, or the interest thereon, or any part thereof.
12. The mortgagor was, by the terms of the mortgage, particularly Section thereof, to keep the vessel insured at all times.
13. Upon information and belief, the mortgagor has allowed the policy of insurance, in effect at the time the mortgage was given, to lapse and the vessel is now uninsured.
14. Inter alia, the preferred mortgage provides in part as follows:
But if default be made in such payments, or in any one of such payments, or if default be made in the prompt and faithful performance of any of the covenants herein contained, [mortgagee] is hereby authorized to take possession of the property, at any time, wherever found and sell and convey the same to satisfy said debt.
15. Pursuant to the provisions of the note and preferred mortgage and particularly the provisions of its page, the plaintiff, as mortgagee under the preferred mortgage, has declared all of the principal balance, and the note herein above referred to, to be immediately due and payable.
16. That the plaintiff has retained [attorneys], to represent its interests in this cause and has promised to pay their reasonable attorney's fees.
Wherefore, plaintiff prays:
1. That a warrant for the arrest of the Yacht "," her engines, tackle, rigging, etc., may issue, and that all persons claiming any interest therein may be cited to appear and answer the matters aforesaid, and that the Yacht "," her engines, tackle, rigging, etc., may be condemned and sold to pay the demands and claims aforesaid in the amount of Dollars (\$) from
, 20, until paid and for costs and actual attorneys fees and pay any and all other amounts required to be paid by the Mortgagor to the Mortgagee under the note and preferred mortgage with interest and costs, and that the plaintiff may have such other and further relief as the justice of the cause may require.
2. That the preferred mortgage, dated
her engines, tackle, rigging etc., in the preferred mortgage described and thereby conveyed and transferee prior and superior to the interests, liens or claims of any and all persons, firms, or corporations whatsoever, except such persons, firms or corporations as may hold preferred maritime liens on the vessel.
3. That in default of the payment of the sums found to be due and payable to plaintiff under the note and preferred mortgage, within the time to be limited by a decree of this Honorable Court, together with a sum sufficient to pay the costs of this suit, it may be decreed that any and all persons, firms and corporations claiming any interest in the Yacht "" are forever barred and foreclosed of and from all right or equity of redemption or claim of, in or to the mortgaged Yacht "," her engines, tackle, rigging, etc., and every part thereof.
4. That this court may direct the manner in which actual notice of the commencement of this suit shall be given by the plaintiff to the master, other ranking officer or caretaker of the Yacht "" and to any person, firm or corporation who has recorded a notice of claim of an undischarged lien upon the Yacht " ".

5. That judgment may issue against Defendant,	_, to pay any and all amounts required to be paid
by the Mortgagor to the Mortgagee under the note and preferred mortga	ge with interest as aforesaid until paid and for
costs and actual attorneys fees and, in the event of condemnation and sa	1
pay to plaintiff any deficiency sums and for such other and further relies	f as the justice of the cause may require.
Dated:	
Attorney for Plaintiff	
FOOTNOTES	
FOOTNOTES:	
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
LIMITATION

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-476

FORM No. 1-476 Complaint-Foreclosure of First Preferred Ship Mortgage--United States Plaintiff

[Caption] n1		
The United States of Amer	rica, plaintiff herein, alleges upon informatio	a and baliaf as fallows:
The Officer States of Affici	nea, pramitiri nerem, aneges upon informatio	if and benef as follows.
		naritime jurisdiction, as hereinafter more fully in the meaning of <i>Rule 9(h)</i> , <i>Federal Rules of</i>
	tates of America, a sovereign nation authorizates at America, a sovereign nation at Ameri	ed to bring this action under 28 <i>U.S.C.</i> § 1345, <i>V.S.C.</i> § 1275(<i>e</i>).
"Vessel" or		is a vessel of the United States, and is now and ct and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable
laws of the State ofagreement between it and	, not in its individual capac , settlor, dated ner") is the owner of the Vessel and is doing	rganized and existing under and by virtue of the city, but solely as owner trustee under a trust
5. Theformerly	was originally owned by, and is currently chartered by	("")from the Shipowner.

	, 20, in order to fin			
	duly created and issued United	States Government Inst	ured Merchant Marine Bond	s, Series
	(the "Bonds") in the principal a	amount of \$	Said Bonds b	ear interest
at the rate of six pe	(the "Bonds") in the principal a	1	and	of each
year until	, 20, with sem	i-annual payments in the	e principal amount of \$	
	plus interest on the outstanding	g principal amount of Bo	onds.	
7. On or about	, 20,	for	a valuable consideration so	ld and
delivered the said l	Bonds to, a 1	national banking associa	tion (the "Indenture Trustee	") as trustee
	under terms of Trust Indenture No.			
	ded as of, 20, by Third Suppleme		plemental Indenture, and an	nended as of
	, 20, by Third Suppleme	mai maemure.		
	, 20, as security fo		= =	
•	XLI delivered a first preferred ship n			
	referred to as the "First Mortgage," a			
	conditions of which are incorporated		the	_ in the
amount of \$	to the Indenture T	rustee.		
	age was duly filed and recorded, toget			
the Vessel's docum	, 20 at, 20, 20	at P.M.	and was c	andorsed on
and the preferred s 11. Concurrently w Commerce, as repr provisions of Title Mortgage, a true co the terms of which unpaid balance of t payment by the Sec	Trustee performed or caused to be per tatus of the mortgage has not been want with the execution of the First Mortgage resented by the Assistant Secretary of XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 2036 oppy of which will be submitted to the the United States insured the payment the principal of the First Mortgage, as cretary to the Indenture Trustee on the nee, the Bonds together with the First d to the Secretary.	ge, the United States, act Commerce for Maritime 5, as amended ("Title I") court at the time of trial at to the Bondholders of such debt is evidenced be behalf of the Bondhold	ting by and through the Secret Affairs (the "Secretary") usentered into Contract of Ins., with all of the unpaid interest on by the outstanding Bonds. Users of the amounts due under	retary of nder the nurance of under and the Upon er the
	an to leverage the financing of the		solo	the Vessel
to the Shipowner a	nd, subsequently, chartered the Vesse	l from the Shipowner.		
the terms of the Fin	n Agreement and Supplement No. 1 to rst Mortgage were amended to reflect aption of liability for the Bonds.	the First Mortgage date the assumption by the S	ed, hipowner of the First Mortg	20, age and the
	on Agreement and Supplement No. 1 t			
the Affidavit of Go	ood Faith of Mortgagor, on	, 20	_, at	P.M. in
	ollector of Customs [or Coast Guard)			Vessel's
documents on	, 20	, at	P.M.	
15. On	, 20, the Shipowi	ner executed Supplemen	t No. 2 of the First Mortgage	e pursuant

Mortgage") on the			=	the First Mortgage.
				of a loan in the amount of \$
	, the shipowner	second mortga	ged the	and another vessel to the
	Bank, N.A. (%) as co-mortg		%) and	Bank-New York
	Trust Company	y became Inden	ture Trustee for the Bo	No. 3 to the First Mortgage, ondholders in place of reduced to \$
18 On	20		Rank-N	A assigned its interest in the Second
Mortgage to the	, 20	, Bank and the	discharge amount was	A. assigned its interest in the Second s reduced to \$
	onds and this failu	re constituted a	"Default" under the te	The Shipowner failed to make the erms of the First Mortgage (Article der the Bonds.
Indenture Trustee was, after due dema terms of its Contract o	entitled to make a and for payment un of Insurance, the en, 20 in the	a demand for pander the Contraction tire principal and total amount	yment on all the Bond et of Insurance was ma mount and all of the ac of \$	tion of such failure for thirty days, the ls, and on, 20 ade by the Indenture Trustee, under the ccrued interest due on the Bonds as of was paid by the plaintiff. (A true and incorporated by reference herein.)
any other security to the	he Secretary and is nds. (A true copy o	ssued a Bond to of the assignmen	the Secretary (the "Sent of the First Mortgag	of its rights under the First Mortgage and ecretary's Bond") in the principal amount te is attached as Exhibit 2 and a true copy
demand letter to the Si	hipowner, accelera , 20, the	ated the maturity total sum due a	y of all sums due with nd owing and unpaid t	the terms of the First Mortgage and by a respect to the First Mortgage. As of to the Secretary under the First Mortgage ruing thereon at the daily rate of
omitted	(A true copy o	of the Secretary'	s demand letter is anno	exed hereto as Exhibit 4.) [Exhibit
23. Defendant Shipow continues to exist under the and the Secretary has	er the terms of the under the te the right as against e all rights and rem	First Mortgage erms of the Firs t defendants to enedies given to	The aforesaid unpaid t Mortgage, upon Defa exercise all of the righ	the Secretary's Bond and thus a "Default" balance constitutes a maritime lien upon ault and assignment of the First Mortgage, its and remedies provided in the First U.S.C. § 31321 et seq., including the right
24. There have been n Mortgage, and the amo				on the Secretary's Bond and the First

25. No part of the amounts due to the United States of America has been paid.

26. Plaintiff also alleges that after	, 20	, and during the pendency of this action, plaintiff,
in addition to the administrative expenses of arrest,	may pay insura	ance premiums and other vessel care and preservation st thereon from the date of payment at the default rate
27. Attorneys' fees, costs, expenses, and disbursement and owing from defendants in accordance with the		urred in the prosecution of this action and will be due
Wherefore, plaintiff, United States of America pray	ys:	
	-	oproved by the Court be given to the master or other or corporation which has recorded a Notice of Claim
2. That, pursuant to Rule (3) of the Supplemental R effective, 20), this of the Vessel, her engines, boilers, tackle, apparel, a	Honorable Cour	rt enter an order authorizing a warrant for the arrest
3. That a warrant be issued for the arrest of the Vess at any time on board.	sel, her engines,	, boilers, tackle, apparel, appurtenances, etc., now or
4. The plaintiff be declared the holder of a valid first of its claim herein.	t preferred ship	o mortgage maritime lien on the Vessel to the extent
5. That judgment of condemnation and sale be enter appurtenances, etc.	red against said	vessel, its engines, boilers, tackle, apparel,
6. The Vessel be sold and the proceeds of the sale of this action and then applied to payments of the First		
the sums due and owing to the Secretary's Bond, for	r insurance pren	essel, <i>in rem</i> , and the Shipowner, <i>in personam</i> , for all miums and other vessel care, preservation costs paid for reasonable attorney's fees, and for the costs of this
8. The Court decree that any person, firm or corpora and foreclosed as to any right, equity of redemption	_	any interest as to or in the Vessel, be forever barred in or to said Vessel, and every part thereof.
9. Plaintiff have such other and further relief as may Dated:	/ be just and pro	oper.
Attorney for Plaintiff		
FOOTNOTES:		

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
LIMITATION

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-477

FORM No. 1-477 Complaint--Mortgage Foreclosure for Failure to Maintain Insurance Policyn1

[Caption and Jurisdictional Stateme	ent] n2		
2. Plaintiff is an individual residing	at		
3. The vesselaction will be, within this district.	, official number	is now, or d	uring the pendency of this
4. Plaintiff with principal place of business at _		der the laws of the State of	·
5. The defendant	is an individual residing	g at	_·
6. On, 20, as true, for a total	lawful and sole owner of the	vessel	, sold the vessel to
in cash and the balance by a promise with interest per month	sory note executed in favor of est thereon at	the plaintiff, in the face amount of the plaintiff, in the face amount paya	ount of \$ ble as follows: \$
principal, with the balance of princi is annexed hereto as Exhibit A [omi	pal and interest payable four ye	ears from the date of the no	te, a true copy of said note
to be paid on or before the defendant, who, upon information that time,	on and belief, is the sole stockhalso executed and delivered to	older of the defendant plaintiff a mortgage as secu	At urity for the payment of the
promissory note. Under the terms ar	nd conditions of the mortgage,	g	ranted, bargained and sold

appurtenances thereto, conditioned that on payment by of the promissory note, with interest, ir accordance with the conditions specified therein, then the mortgage was to be null and void, otherwise to remain in full force and effect. A copy of the mortgage is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by reference.
7. At the time plaintiff sold the vessel to and the promissory note and mortgage were executed and at all times thereafter, the vessel was and is a vessel of the United States, duly documented under the laws of the United States. The mortgage and the above mentioned record thereof in all respects comply with the requirements of 46 U.S.C. § 31321 et seq. and the mortgage is entitled to the status of a preferred mortgage.
8. Under the terms and conditions of the promissory note and mortgage, any failure by
9. On, 20,
10. The promissory note contained a clause under which the maker agreed to pay all insurance premiums and, in the event of a default, all costs, disbursements and attorneys' fees incurred in any action to collect the note or to establish right in accord with the security interest agreement.
11. The mortgage contains a clause specifically including within the lien of the mortgage advances for insurance premiums and costs, disbursements, and attorneys' fees.
12. Plaintiff was informed that the maritime insurance policy then in force on the vessel was about to lapse for non-payment of premium. In order to avoid a gap in coverage, plaintiff advanced the sum of \$ for the payment of the maritime insurance renewal premium.
13. As a result of the defaults by the defendant above mentioned, plaintiff will be obligated to pay costs, disbursements and attorneys' fees in an amount estimated to be \$
14. Plaintiff hereby declares the full remaining balance due under the mortgage of \$ to be due and payable.
15 has paid a total of \$ of the principal indebtedness secured by the mortgage, leaving the sum of \$ due and owing on the indebtedness together with interest thereon at % per annum since, 20
Wherefore, plaintiff prays that:
1. Process in due form of law according to the practice of this Court in causes of Admiralty and Maritime jurisdiction may issue against the vessel:
2. All persons claiming any interest therein may be cited to appear and answer all and singular the matters aforesaid;
3. The Court enter judgment in favor of plaintiff in the amount of its claim, together with interest and costs thereon:

4. The vessel	be condemned and be sold to satisfy the claim in the amount of \$
, wit	th the proceeds thereof distributed according to law and with the above described mortgage
being given the status of a pro-	eferred mortgage entitled to the priority of a preferred mortgage lien.
Attorney for Plaintiff	
[Verification] n3	
FOOTNOTES:	
(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapte (E.D.N.Y. 1980)	d from papers used in Myerow v. The Vessel Top of the Morning, Civ. No. 80-2208
(n2)Footnote 2. See For	m No. 1-1 supra.

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-11 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS LIMITATION

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-478

FORM No. 1-478 Complaint In Personam by United States--Foreclosure of First Preferred Ship Mortgage and Recovery on Personal Guaranteesn1

[Caption] n2			
		merica, against defendants missory note and personal guarantees, s	
1. Plaintiff United States of	America is a corporate	e sovereign authorized to sue under 28	U.S.C. § 1345.
		, husband and wife and personal, within this District.	, reside within this District at
3. At all pertinent times, def		was and still is a general pa	urtner in the
		Partnership was and still is a partn, Official No	
United registry].			
		C made, executed, and delivered to	
Lender) a guaranteed Promitherein (the Guaranteed Pro	issory Note for \$ missory Note). Plaintif	, bearing interest a ff contemporaneously executed and de th a guarantee agreement (Guarantee A	t a variable rate as set forth livered to the Lender a

6. On	, 20	, the Guaranteed F	Promissory Note was amen	ded by plaintiff, the	
	Partnership, a	and the Lender in ord	er to fix the interest rate at		percent
per annum. True and co	orrect copies of	the Guarantee Agreen	ment and Guaranteed Prom	nissory Note, both as	amended,
are attached hereto as E	Exhibit "A" and	incorporated herein a	as though fully set forth.		
7 On	20	the	a Partnership	hv	а
			plaintiff, United States of A		
			iterest at a variable rate as		
executed acknowledge	d and delivered	to plaintiff a First P	referred Ship Mortgage (th	e "Mortgage") on the	aury
			Promissory Note to the U		
			Partne		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
8 On	20	the Promissory N	Note and the Mortgage were	e amended by plaintif	ff and the
			rest rate at		
	_		rtgage, both as amended, a		
and incorporated as tho		-	rigage, bour as amended, as	te attached hereto as i	Eximon B
0. On	20	dafandants	and		huchand
			l, unconditional, joint, and		
			ion of the		
to the financing of the _				r articiship,	with respect
to the imalicing of the _		with the Le	nuci.		
10 On	20	the Guaranty A	greements were amended b	ny the parties thereto	to
			antees in light of said chan		
		_	s Exhibit A and incorporate	_	
euen Guaranty i igreeni	J.10, as a	., 15 u.u.u	5 2	ou noronn us unough n	wary 500 10101
11. Effective		, 20,	Inc., for va	aluable consideration,	duly
assigned to	I1	nsurance Company (t	he Holder) all of its rights,	title, and interest in a	and to the
Guaranteed Promissory	Note, as amend	ded. A true and corre	ct copy of the assignment i	s attached hereto as F	Exhibit "D"
and incorporated herein	as though fully	set forth.			
12 The	Partr	ership failed to comr	oly with the provisions of the	he Guaranteed Promi	ssorv Note
		•	ne Mortgage, all as amende		•
=			nn event of default under A		
Mortgage as amended.	,	C		,	
			ccordance with the provisi		
			on of the		
-			lemand for payment and pl		bursement,
Schedule H, are attache	ed hereto as Exh	nibit "E" and incorpor	rated herein as though fully	set forth.	
14. Plaintiff has perform	ned all of its ob	ligations under the va	arious agreements set forth	herein.	
15 Attorneys' fees ees	te avnances en	d dichurcamante will	be incurred in the prosecut	tion of this action and	l will be due
•	-		ory Note to the United Stat		
the Guaranty Agreemen			ory riote to the Office Stat	co of ranicilea, the M	origuge, and
and Community rigitation	, all as alliell				
A FIDST CALISE	OF ACTION A	CAINST			

16. Plaintiff repeats and realleges hereinafter set forth at length.	paragraphs 1 through 1	.5 of this Complaint with the sa	me force and effect as if
17. By reason of the default of the the Guaranteed Promissory Note, amended, elected to declare the eaccelerated and immediately due	the Promissory Note to ntire balance of the and payable. A true and	the United States of America, Partnersh Correct copy of plaintiff's	and the Mortgage, all as ip's obligation thereunder, 20
notice of acceleration to theherein as though fully set forth.	Pa	rtnership is attached hereto as E	xhibit "F" and is incorporated
18. The	Partnership did not pay	the aforesaid obligation althou	gh duly demanded.
19. Defendant Promissory Note to the United St			
20. There is currently due, owing plus into being into being into	erest accruing from nterest on \$, 20 at the default rate	, at the per diem rate of
percent per annum as set forth in true and correct copy of the according forth.		_ [state mortgage provisions] c	of the Mortgage as amended. A
21. Plaintiff also alleges that after may pay insurance premiums and [state m the date of payment at the default A SECOND CAUSE OF AC BOTH DEFENDANTS	other vessel care and portgage provisions] of rate of 18% per annum	reservation costs for which defe the Mortgage, as amended, toge	endants will be liable under
22. Plaintiff repeats and realleges hereinafter set forth at length.	paragraphs 1 through 2	21 of this complaint with the sar	ne force and effect as if
23. On	naranteed to pay in the on the first the Guaranty Agree	event of a default, but each defe ement, as amended. A true and	ndant failed to pay this or any correct copy of each said
Wherefore, plaintiff, United State	es of America prays:		
A. That defendants and severally, be adjudged liable 20 at the per diem rate of \$	and to plaintiff for \$, husband and with interest	wife, and each of them, jointly from
20 at the per diem rate of \$\frac{9}{20}\$ rate of printsurance premiums and other verthereon at the agreed upon default	ercent per annum, and, ssel care and preservati	additionally, for any and all su on costs after	ms expended by plaintiff for , 20, with interest
plaintiff; and B. That if the defendants, or any of			

property of any description whatsoever, including other vessels, located within this district be attached to the amount sued for herein, and condemned and sold to pay plaintiff's claim; and

- C. That plaintiff receive reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, expenses, and disbursements incurred in prosecuting this action, according to proof; and
- D. That plaintiff receive such other and further relief as this.

United States Attorney

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in United States v. Ronick, Civ. No. 84-2704 (E.D.N.Y. 1984).

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
LIMITATION

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-499

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-499RESERVED



[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement, and

said ship, and himself proceeded on board of said ship, ready to sail.

57 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PASSENGERS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-500

FORM No. 1-500 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by Passenger--Breach of Contract

4. The plaintiff, being desirous to go to _______ applied to ______, agent of defendant, for information in regard to the terms and accommodations of the ship ______ and also as to the time of her sailing from this port, whereupon said agent then and there represented and stated to the plaintiff that the ship ______ was of the very best class and condition and would take fifty passengers on said voyage. The agent marked out and represented to plaintiff where the plaintiff's room should be, and represented that such room was at least six feet square, well lighted and ventilated, and represented that in consequence of the pressure of passengers, it was necessary for the plaintiff to engage his passage without delay.

5. Relying upon such representations and other like deceptive and unfair representations, the plaintiff paid to defendant's

6. Plaintiff thereupon ascertained, and alleges to be the fact, that the representations aforesaid were false and deceptive, that the owners of the said vessel have made and fitted up in the ship aforesaid, between decks (calling it a cabin), a number of berths and pretended staterooms, which are close, confined, and unhealthful, and have engaged to take and transport in and on board of the said vessel as cabin passengers, one hundred and seventy-two persons, rendering it uncomfortable and unsafe for the plaintiff to proceed in such vessel upon the said voyage.

agent the sum of \$ _____ as and for plaintiff's passage money in advance, and sent his baggage to

7. Plaintiff, on discovery of the matter, refused to proceed on the said voyage and demanded a return of the said passage money paid by him, but the same has been refused, and the plaintiff, by reason of the premises, has sustained and will sustain damages, as he believes, beyond the amount of said passage money, to the amount of \$

[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment, and Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1, 1-2 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6, 1-10 and 1-12 supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 226 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.). For passenger injury or death see Form Nos. 1-400-1-425 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PASSENGERS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-501

FORM No. 1-501 Complaint In Rem by Passenger--Damage to Baggage

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

4. On or about the		day of	, 20	, plaintiff, ir	n consideration of an
agreed price, then and th					
	on the vessel	-	Thereafter, plai	intiff took passage	on the said vessel
	_ at	for		and delivered to	those in charge of
the vessel					
	_ from	to		·	
5. Thereafter, the said ve	essel	sailed fr	om the port of		and on or about
the	day of	, 20, arrived		at the port of	
and there made delivery	of plaintiff's wardro	be trunk, not, how	ever, in like good	order and condition	on as when received
but itself and contents se	eriously injured and	damaged.			
[Prayer for Process and	Verification] n2				
FOOTNOTES:					
(n1)Footnote 1. See For	m Nos. 1-1 and 1-5	supra.			
(n2)Footnote 2. See	e Form Nos. 1-3, 1-1	0 and 1-12 <i>supra</i> .			

^{*} See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 226 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.). For passenger injury or death see Form Nos. 1-400-1-425 supra.



[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

59 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PASSENGERS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-502

FORM No. 1-502 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by Passenger Against Master--Misconduct

plaintiff was asleep in the state room allotted to her, defendant entered said room, awoke plaintiff, and made indecent and insulting proposals to her, and upon plaintiff's ordering said defendant out of her said room, defendant used indecent and vulgar expressions to her, and for several days in succession after the last-mentioned occurrence, defendant came into plaintiff's room, awakened her out of her sleep, attempted violence to her person, and used indecent and vulgar expressions; upon plaintiff's threatening to inform the other cabin passengers of his conduct toward her, defendant shortly afterwards, and in the hearing of the other cabin passengers, ordered plaintiff to remain in her room, and not to leave the same, and said that if the plaintiff attempted so to do he would send her amongst the steerage passengers, and closely confined plaintiff to her said state room for the space of two weeks; defendant also falsely and maliciously slandered plaintiff to other of the said passengers on board such ship during such voyage.

6. Plaintiff was injured in health, fretted and annoyed in body and mi	nd in consequence of such conduct of defendant
and was sick for some time after her arrival in said city of	, and by reason of the premises is
damnified in the sum of \$.	

[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment and Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1, 1-2 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6, 1-10 and 1-12 supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 226 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.). For passenger injury or death see Form Nos. 1-400-1-425 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS PASSENGERS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-503

FORM No. 1-503 Complaint In Personam by Passenger for Breach of Bailment--Personal Effect Lost in Firen1

[Caption, Jurisdictional S	tatement and Allegations Concern	ing Parties] n2	
_	herein mentioned and prior theret		owned, managed,
•	herein mentioned and for some ti was a secure, fire proof ve	-	
6. At and during the times	herein mentioned, the plaintiffs h	erein desirous of a honeymo	oon cruise did purchase for
dollar consideration fly/cr	uise passage aboard the	to	and were
assigned cabin #	on the	·	
	day of	, 20, the	was
berthed at	·		
_	imes herein mentioned and prior the security of free safety deposit		· •
representing to plaintiffs a	nd other passengers aboard, and it	ts vessel	that said safety deposit
boxes were each safe and			
9. That on said	day of	, 20, the	e plaintiffs herein, relying on
defendant's representation	s, individually and jointly accepte	d defendant's offer of free u	se of a safe deposit box and
deposited certain items of	jewelry therein of a declared valu	e for safekeeping while on s	shore excursion and received

	a certain receip		
when	rein their individual other worldly goo	ods remained.	
10. That on said	day of	, 20	, while the plaintiffs herein were
jointly on shore excursion and	while the master and all officers of th	ıe	save one, were ashore,
			and crewmen remaining aboard did not
	icer having, without reasonable cause,		
	ting said fire to spread and consume the	he	so that she thereafter
sank at her berth.			
11. That said fire aboard the _	was caused so	olely by the ne	egligence of the defendant, the master,
officers and crew aboard the _	, with the known	wledge and pr	rivity of defendant in that he suffered
			galley of said vessel, which ignited and
consumed the vessel together	with plaintiffs' joint and individual val	luables in the	vessel's safety deposit boxes and their
individual and joint other worl	dly goods in cabin #	•	
12. That by reason of defender	nt's negligence and by reason of said d	dafandant's in	dividual failure to properly train the
•	in the use of f		1 1 .
	ssistance offered, defendant herein bre		
*	g and proper and prudent bailment of		• • •
		•	ividual and joint damage in the sum of
\$	if worldry goods in their assigned cab	in to their ind	iividuai and joint damage in the sum of
Ψ			
[Demand for Judgment] n3			
Dated:			
Attorney for Plaintiff			
FOOTNOTES:			
•	l from papers filed in Mirak v. Costa A	Armatori S.p.	A. Genova, et al., Civ. No. 80-652
(E.D.N.Y. 1980).			
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form	1 Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.		
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form	1 No. 1-6 <i>supra</i> .		
* See 1 Renedict on Adn	niralty § 226 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.) For passen	ger injury or death see Form Nos

1-400-1-425 *supra*.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PASSENGERS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-525

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-525RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS PILOTAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-526

FORM No. 1-526 Complaint In Rem--Pilotage Fees

[Caption and Jurisd	ictional Statement]	n1			
2. The plaintiff is a p	pilot duly licensed	under the laws of the	State of	·	
3. The vesselplaintiff.		is a	vessel, the n	name of whose ov	wner is unknown to
		, the n a foreign voyage fro			
plaintiff went on the	;	he vessel to sea from, safely pilotec ce the plaintiff left he	l her to sea, and she a	arrived safely at t	
as pilot on the vesse regular and lawful fe	l to the best of his ees for such pilotag , to wit the su	ot under the laws of tability and thereby bege services so rendere m ofd and still do refuse t	came entitled to be p d by him in accordan dollars, whi	aid by the vessel ace with the laws ich sum or any pa	of the State of art thereof the vessel
	e lien against the _	, a			
7. The	is now	in the port of	, ar	nd within this dis	strict.

[Prayer for Process and Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Forms Nos. 1-3, 1-10 and 1-12 supra.

* See 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 8, 9, 44 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PILOTAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-537

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-537RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS POLLUTION *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-538

FORM No. 1-538 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by Marina--Oil Pollution Damage

[Caption, Jurisdictional S	tatement and Allegations Concerning Parties	I] nI	
4. On or about the	day of	, 20	, the plaintiff owned and
	, where it was and still is		
[[describe business].		
5. During the early morning	ng hours of, 20	, the vesse	l, was tied
up starboard side to her be	erth at the oil receiving terminal of		on navigable waters in the port of
,	discharging a cargo of	to the	terminal
-	ipment, gear, and with the full reach of the ve ervants of defendant		ole possession and control of her
6. At about	hours, on	, 20,	an officer or crew member aboard
the vessel	on plaintiff's information and belie	f, shut off or	opened a valve causing the
discharging of	barrels, more or less, of		to flow into the waters of
t	through an offshore overboard discharge above	ve the waterl	ine, and the officers and crew of the
vessel	and other agents of defendant		did not discover the dereliction
until informed by personn	el in the employ of	who observe	ed that the's
terminal facility was not re	eceiving oil in the quantity it should some		minutes after the
misdirection of the pumpi	ng effort occurred.		
7. The	floated southwestward, influenced by	winds from t	he northeast and the tide which was
ebbing; and by	hours a substantial amount of	the	had worked its way
towards plaintiff's marina	the officers and craw of the vessel		and defendant

's other servants and agents taking no steps whatsoever to alert plaintiff and others in plaintiff's
position of the approaching danger and also not taking any effective action to inhibit the flow of the pollutant toward
and into plaintiff's marina, where it came into contact with various pleasure craft tied up at the marina, the pier and dock
facilities owned by the plaintiff, as well as plaintiff's shore and beach facilities.
8. The pollution incident was caused, without any contributing fault or neglect on the part of the plaintiff, and is solely
due to the fault and negligence of the master and crew of the vessel and her owner defendant
, in the following particulars, among others which will be presented at the trial of this action:
(a) Failure to take adequate steps to instruct the crew on proper and safe oil transfer procedures.
(b) Failure to have responsible officers standing by and supervising the oil transfer operation.
(c) Failure to maintain the vessel in adequate repair and condition to alleviate any mechanical
breakdown which would permit her cargo to pollute navigable waters.
(d) Failure to warn plaintiff so it could take action to prevent its damage.
(e) Failure to contain the oil once the spill was brought to their attention.
9. Plaintiff has sustained severe damage and loss in the sum of dollars (\$
) and upwards consisting of:
(a) Expenses associated with booming off and containing the oil when it was first discovered at daylight.
(b) Expenses associated with skimming and otherwise cleaning up the oil.
(c) Labor costs and other expenses associated with restraining oil, not contained or boomed off, from pleasure craft tied up at plaintiffs facility.
up at plantings facility.
(d) Consequential damages in the form of loss of profits to plaintiff's business while clean-up operations proceeded.
[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment and Verification] n2
FOOTNOTES:
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1, 1-2 and 1-5 supra.
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6, 1-10, 1-11 and 1-12 supra.
* See 3 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. IX (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



others for whom it was responsible.

65 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS POLLUTION *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-539

FORM No. 1-539 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by United States Oil Pollution Damage

[Caption and Jurisdictional	Statement] n1		
2. Plaintiff, United States of of 28 U.S.C. § 1345 ad 33 U		still is, a corporate sovereign	and authorized to sue under the provisions
3	state allegations co	oncerning defendant(s)]	
4]	state allegations co	ncerning vessel(s)]	
			was moored at the ts and fault of the defendants.
6. As a result of the aforeme in harmful quantities.	ntioned sinking, oil	was discharged into or upon	the navigable waters of the United States
		plaintiff incurred costs and expertained at the present time,	•
8. No part of the aforemention demanded.	oned sum has been	paid to plaintiff, United State	s of America, to date, although duly

9. The aforementioned costs and expenses were caused, solely or contributed to, by the negligent acts and fault of the defendants and were not caused or contributed to by any action of the plaintiff, its agents, servants, employees, or any

10. All and singular, the premise of this complaint are true and within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of this Honorable Court.

[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment and Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1, 1-2 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6 and 1-12 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS POLLUTION *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-540

FORM No. 1-540 Complaint In Rem (Refuse Act)--Pollution

[Caption and Jurisdict	ional Statement] n1		
2. The vesselpropulsion power.	is a vessel of Amer	ican registry and uses oil as fue	el for the generation of
3. The	was on the	day of	, 20 within
	, to wit, at		
United States.			
4. On the	day of	, 20, garbage w	as thrown overboard from the
	itle 33, Section 407, United States (
5. By reason of the forthan	egoing, the vessel became and is lia	ble for the payment to the Unit	ed States of a fine not more
6. The	is now located at	, within this di	istrict.
[Prayer for Process an	d Verification] n2		
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Fo	orm No. 1-1 <i>supra</i> .		
(n2)Footnote 2. S	ee Form Nos. 1-3 and 1-12 supra.		



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS POLLUTION *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-541

FORM No. 1-541 Complaint (Criminal)--Failure To Report Oil Spill

United States of America v. John Doe))))	Criminal No Failure To Notify U.S. Agency of Discharge of Oil, 33 U.S.C. § 1321(b)(5)
The United States Attorney for	the District of	charges:
On or about the	day of	, 20, in the State and District of
JOHN DOE		
immediately the United States	Coast Guard, the appropriate	did fail, as soon as he had knowledge thereof, to notify agency of the United States, of a discharge of oil from such tes and their adjoining shorelines.
33 U S.C. § 1321(b)(5).		
United States Attorney		

^{*} See 3 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. IX (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS POLLUTION *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-542

FORM No. 1-542 Claim by State Against Barge Owner for Damage Caused by Oil Spill With Exhibitn1

[Caption] n2			
	nonwealth of Claim against the plaintiff, as follows:		
FIRST CLAIM			
	Board (hereinafter "clain and is charged with the authority		
2. Plaintiff,	(hereinafter "	"), was, at all t	times pertinent to this Claim,
	nown as the tank barge		
	's vessel").	·	
3. On or about the	and	days of	, 20,
	's vessel was on a voyage from _	under th	e tow of the tug
		01	(neremanter
"	"), with	_'s vessel carrying, as cargo, a la	arge amount of oil, a
petroleum product.			
4. On or about the	and/or	days of 20	

miles from	, within the navigable	waters of the Commonwealth of	,
		nd suffered the discharge of oil into said	
sufficient to cause dam	age to aquatic life therein and to the	e lands and beaches adjacent thereto.	
life therein, and to oyst	er beds, lands and beaches, both pu	we damage to the waters of the Common blic and private, adjacent thereto, and ca Commonwealth for the benefit of its cit	aused the death of
_	equired the expenditure by the Comunities life, lands and beaches of the S	nmonwealth of large sums of money to a State.	bate and remove said
	[set forth provisions pro	, as amended provides phibiting discharge of petroleum product	
8. Section	<u> -</u>	in pertinent part, as follows:	[set
9. The aforementioned	discharge was in violation of §	of the Code.	
	, pursuant to § _ said claim for civil penalties bein orporated herein by reference.	liable to the claimant for civil penalties of the Code, for two violations on more fully set forth in Exhibit A, a co	f §
11. The claimant realle though fully set forth.	ges and incorporates herein the alle	gations contained in paragraphs 1 throug	gh 6 of this Claim
		of the above provided, in ating to the state's right to recover clean	
value of destroyed wild	Ifowl and for damage to State owne eanup costs and damages being more	a liable to the claimant for all associated ed oyster beds, pursuant to re fully set forth in Exhibit A, a copy of	of the
THIRD CLAIM			
14. The claimant realle though fully set forth.	ges and incorporates herein the alle	gations contained in paragraphs 1 through	gh 6 of this Claim as
		in part by the negligence ofr	
patriae for the value of	destroyed wildfowl, a natural resound oyster beds, as more fully set for	liable to the claimant in its capacity as tarce held in trust by the State for the ben orth in Exhibit B, a copy of which is atta	efit of its citizens, and

	is further liable to the claimant for all costs incurred by the up and removal of said oil, as more fully set forth in Exhibit A, a copy of herein by reference.	2
FOURTH CLAIM		
18. The claimant realleges and incorporate though fully set forth.	es herein the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 6 of this Clain	n as
19. The said discharge into the waters of t enjoyment of said waters by the citizens o	the Commonwealth created a public nuisance, interfering with the free use of the Commonwealth.	e and
patriae for the value of destroyed wildfow	is liable to the claimant in its capacity as trustee and/or pardl, a natural resource held in trust by the State for the benefit of its citizens more fully set forth in Exhibit B, a copy of which is attached hereto and	
	is further liable to the claimant for all costs incurred by the move said nuisance. Said costs are more fully set forth in Exhibit A, a copherein by reference.	
22. This claim is being made without prejulimitation of liability, pursuant to 46 U.S.	udice to the claimant's right to contest the right of	to
Wherefore, your claimant presents this C thereon.	claim in the amount of \$, together with lawful in	terest
Commonwealth of By		
Of Counsel		
[Verification and Certificate of Service]		
Exhibit A		
Claim of the Commonwealth of	.	
ITEM 1		
	nalty for illegal discharge of petroleum product, pursuant to, as amended, on, 20	: \$
ITEM 2		
	nalty for illegal discharge of petroleum product, pursuant to, as amended, on, 20	: \$
·		

ITEM 3

(a) Total wage expense for State personnel engaged in cleanup operation \$\$
(b) Total travel expenses incurred in cleanup operation by State personnel\$
(c) Total expenditure for equipment utilized in cleanup operation by State personnel\$
(d) Total expenditures for supplies utilized in cleanup operation by State personnel\$
(e) Total for all other expenditures by State personnel in cleanup operations
Γotal costs of the Commonwealth incurred associated with the cleanup of the discharged oil by personnel of the Commonwealth \$
(a) Total damage to state-owned oyster beds
\$
(b) Total damage by loss of waterfowl owned by the Commonwealth of dead waterfowl \$
Total damage incurred by the Commonwealth as a result of the oil discharge of the Tank Barge: \$
Total claim of the Commonwealth of for civil penalties, associated cleanup costs, and dam incurred as a result of the illegal discharge of oil from the Tank Barge (Items 1, 2, 3 and 4)
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers used in Complaint of Steuart Transportation Co., 435 F. Supp. 798, 2078 A.M.C. 2006 (E.D. Va. 1977), courtesy of Vandeventer, Black, Meredity & Martin, Norfolk, Virginia.
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.
* See 3 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. IX (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS POLLUTION *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-563

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-563RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-564

FORM No. 1-564 Complaint In Rem to Recover Vessel Withheld on Claim of Title--Possessory Action

[Caption and J	urisdictional Statement] n1		
2. Plaintiff is a r	resident of,,	, and is a	and was at the time hereafter
	rue and lawful owner, absolutely, of the ves		
tons, now lying	in the port of, and ereof as such owner until deprived of her as	d within the jurisdiction of t	
	el is wrongfully withheld from plaintiff by		
	,, on an		
	, as master of said vessel		
	nd without any legal survey or condemnation as master, was in fraud of plaintif		•
4. On or about the	he early part of the month of	, plain	tiff purchased the said vessel,
then lying in the	e port of, for the s	um of \$; upon such purchase bein
made, a bill of s	sale was duly executed and delivered by the	then owners of said vessel	to plaintiff whereby plaintiff
became the lega	al owner of said vessel, and said vessel was	duly registered according to	the Act of Congress in such ca
made and provide	ded, as belonging to plaintiff.		
-	aintiff purchased and supplied, from his ow	•	
	as master of said vessel, and with		
	, on or about the		
	as captain, bound to	, and arriv	ed at and came to anchor near a
place called	·		

6. Plaintiff further alleges upon information	mation and belief that or	n or about the	day of
, 20,		left the said vessel and	chored at or near
with only the	ne mate on board,	[sta	ute facts leading to sale of vessel].
Thereafter, and on the	of	[master	r], having returned to the vessel,
called a survey on said vessel and on	the following day expos	sed her for sale at aucti	on, and bio
her in at such sale, at the sum of \$			
said vessel. And plaintiff alleges that			
illegal, and void, and conferred no tit	•		
alleged purchase at said sale,			
trifling expense, not to exceed, as pla			
and when so hove off, the said vessel			
[describe do thereafter, without any other repairs,	to	. a distance of abou	it or
miles, and t	here took in a full cargo	of	and proceeded to
, where she	arrived in safety after a	quick passage of	days in a good
and sound condition, on or about the	and the same of all of a	of 20 without	receiving any repairs except as
aforesaid.		_ 01 20,	recorning any repuns encope as
urorosara.			
7. After the said sale	Master retaine	ed the entire proceeds o	f said auction sale, no part which
has ever been received by plaintiff, o		=	r said addion said, no part windi
	,, p		
Wherefore plaintiff prays:			
A. That process in due form of law, a	according to the course s	and practice of this Hor	orable Court in causes of admiralty
and maritime jurisdiction, may issue			
and martine jurisdiction, may issue	ugumst the vesser	, ne	r tackie, apparei, and furniture,
B. That, and	d any other nerson clain	ning to have any interes	et in said vessel may be cited to
appear before this Honorable Court, a			
plaintiff as having full title to the pos		bbession of the said ves	ser should not be derivered to
planting as having ran title to the pos	session dicteor,		
C. That this Honorable Court would	be pleased to decree the	said vessel to be delive	ered to plaintiff, and that
	_		ts earned by said vessel while in his
possession, with damages and costs;	2 4 2	ir, un morgin una morgin	ts carned by said vesser while in ins
possession, with duringes and costs,			
D. That plaintiff may have such other	r and further relief in the	e premises as in law and	d justice he may be entitled to
receive.		· r	
Attorney for Plaintiff			
[Verification] n2			
E			
FOOTNOTES:			
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 su	ıpra.		
	•		
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos.	1-10 through 1-13 supra	a.	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-565

FORM No. 1-565 Complaint In Rem and In Personam to Recover Possession of Yacht Wrongfully Taken--Possessory Actionn1

[Caption] n2

1. This is a claim within the admiralty appears, is of an admiralty and maritin	3		•
<i>Procedure</i> , and proceeds under the Ru	lles of Civil Procedure for the	United States District Courts	s and particularly
Supplemental Rules D and E.			1
2. At all times hereinafter mentioned,	plaintiff was and now is a citiz	zen of the United States with	a residence at
and was and	<u>.</u>		a residence at
3. On information and belief the			
within this District at the	Marina,	Road,	·
4. On information and belief defendan yacht, which			
5. On, 20	, in the port of	, plaintiff purcl	hased the yacht
from her ow			
paying over and delivering to them the			•
6. After taking possession of the yacht maintained her as a pleasure craft, pay			_

7. During the month of	, 20	, defendants boarded the yacht	and
broke ground on a voyage to ports unknown to wrongfully dispossessing plaintiff of the yach		tiff without the authorization or consent of the p	olaintiff, thereby
8. Plaintiff's attempts to repossess the yacht demand her restitution have been unavailing a to the plaintiff, desp	and defenda	1	ndants to
Wherefore, plaintiff prays:			
A. That a warrant for the arrest of the yacht issue, placing the yacht repossession by plaintiff;	under t	her spars, sails, tackle, apparel, arche custody and control of the Marshal of this D	nd furniture may istrict pending
B. That defendants and any other persons wro personally cited to appear and answer the com-		oard and in possession of the yachtresaid;	be
	al of this D	ils, tackle, apparel, furniture, and any and all equistrict and delivered to the plaintiff and that deforts of this action; and	
D. That plaintiff may have such other and furt	ther relief a	as may to this Honorable Court appear just in th	e cause.
Attorney for Plaintiff			
[Verification] n3			
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers fil furnished through the courtesy of DeOrchis &		ereux v. The Cyrene, Civ. No. 74-260-S (S.D. C New York, New York.	Cal. 1974),
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-10 thro	ough 1-13 s	upra.	
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form Nos. 1-10 thro	ough 1-13 s	upra.	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-566

FORM No. 1-566 Complaint In Rem and In Personam Against Crew--Possessory Action

[Caption and Jurisdictional Statement] n1

	and still is the true and or	nly owner of the vessel	, and at all times, now lying in the
3. The individual defendants	s are and were at all time	es hereinafter mentioned offic	ers and members of the crew of the
vessel	, having signed on as	s such at various ports in	between the
month of	and	, 20	
and crew employed by the p	laintiff were on board th	e vessel, the members of the	implaint, and while the master, officers crew of the vessel wrongfully, continuously withheld her from the
	•		ontrol over her, contrary to the
		-	portunity to continue in command on
-	•		ne defendants has since been further
•	• •	•	ng to detain and unlawfully confine the
			rcise any authority on behalf of the
			her enforced the unlawful seizure and
			ssel on behalf of the plaintiff on proper
•	- 1		wfully continued to exercise control by
•			ne plaintiff from resuming possession
		•	e master that they intend to continue
permanently in possession a	•	_	The seizure and withholding of the

vessel from the plaintiff was not done in accordance with any authority conferred on the crew or defendants by law, or by the plaintiff, but was done by them wrongfully and without authority of law, and wholly without title, right or interest of the crew or defendants.

5. The plaintiff is entitled to possession of the vessel _____.

[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment, and Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6, 1-11 and 1-12 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-567

FORM No. 1-567 Complaint In Personam Against Trucking Company--Recovery of Possession of Leased Cargo Containersn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegation Concerning Parties] n2

<u></u>	as a carrier of merchandise by wate iding shipping containers to the truck ily charges.		<u>*</u>
8. On or after the	day of	, 20, plair	tiff provided to defendant at
	tainers and chassis owned by plaintif		
rate, such containers to be retur		, 8 8	<i>3</i> /
9. Since that time, and after the	agreed rental period had run, plainti	ff demanded of the defe	ndant that the
abovementioned containers ide	ntified asa	and chassis identified as	be
returned, but the latter neglecte	d and refused to do so and has failed	to pay any rental charge	es thereon.
9 9	and without plaintiff's consent detain	-	
from the plaintiff. Such contain	ers and chassis are of the reasonable	value of \$, equal to,
conta	iners at a depreciated value of \$	and an	d
chassis at a depreciated value o	f\$		
11 Said containers have been v	granafully withhold from the plaintif	ff their egents and emp	over notwithstanding that

11. Said containers have been wrongfully withheld from the plaintiff, their agents, and employees, notwithstanding that plaintiff has not sold such containers or parted with title thereto, and plaintiff further alleges that neither the above-named defendant nor any one else except plaintiff has any legal title to such containers nor any right to possession thereof.

12. The said containers are now within the jurisdiction of this Court and a	are located at .
---	------------------

[Demand for Judgment] n3

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Orient Overseas Container Line, Inc. v. Harreen Truck Leasing Co., Civ. No. 83-412 (E.D.N.Y. 1983).

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-568

FORM No. 1-568 Complaint In Rem Against Master--Possessory Action

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

4. Plaintiffs are the true and only o	wners of the vessel	, her engines, tacl	kle, apparel, and
furnishings, and being such owners			
they appointed	, as master of said vesse	, to navigate and sail her for the	em, at wages agreed
upon between them, and			
such master till the			
him as master and appointed			
5. When	er,re	fused to give up the possession	or the papers of said
Wherefore plaintiffs pray that procin causes of admiralty and maritim and that the master that the said vessel, her tack)e, app may be considered.	e jurisdiction, may issue agair may be personally of arel, and furniture, may be del	ast the said vessel, her tackle, ap eited to appear and answer all the ivered to plaintiffs, and that the	parel, and furniture, e matters aforesaid, and vessel
may have such other and further re			
Attorney for Plaintiff			

[Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-10, 1-11 and 1-12 supra.



FOOTNOTES:

75 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-569

FORM No. 1-569 Complaint In Rem Against Merchandise and In Personam Against Master--Possessory Action

[Caption and Jurisa	lictional Statement] n1	
_	esident of the City ofs his place of business at	, and is engaged in the business of importing foreign
		was lying in the port of,
		on board the vessel, consigned to the plaintiff,
	, of snipped (
		sual bill of lading for the same, whereby he agreed to
		payment of the freight for the same at the rate of
	<u>.</u> .	
4. The vessel, having	g arrived in the port of	, the plaintiff paid to the master his freight on the
		refused to deliver the same to him unless the plaintiff
would pay	dollars as an average contr	bution, which the plaintiff was not bound to pay, not
being liable therefor,	, and the master still refused to deliver to hi	m the, to the great damage of
the plaintiff.		
5. The merchandise	is now within this district.	
[Prayer for Process,	Demand for Judgment and Verification] na	2

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6 and 1-10 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-570

FORM No. 1-570 Complaint In Rem Against Unshipped Merchandise Possessory Action

[Caption and Jurisdictional Statement] n1

	s herein mentioned was and still is a corporation duly organized, and was and still is the owner of	÷
	er of the, or on lighters alongside said	
	and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court.	
	, 20, a contract in writing was entered	-
	[steamship company] whereby the plaintiff agreed to ship a	
[steamship company]	agreed to carry at a freight rate of \$	per ton on
the vessel	which vessel agreed to sail from	to
	in late	
4. Thereafter the	[steamship company] issued permits for	tons of
	covered by contract above mentioned and requested plaintif	If to deliver same to its dock. In
	request and permit the plaintiff duly delivered on or about	
=	[cargo] of to the pier designar	
	[steamship company], and received from it dock receipts co	•
5. The said	[steamship company] has wholly failed and negl	lected to carry the said cargo
	vessel, on which it contracted to carry	
	, and so far as plaintiff knows will not be there for a long tim	_
	act that the said [steamship company]	
	carry forward the said cargo in question to	
memorica agreed to c	carry forward the said eargo in question to	in the fatter part of

6. Plaintiff has duly demanded the return of the said cargo to it and offered to surrender the dock receipts given for said cargo, but the [steamship company] has wrongfully refused to deliver it.
7. By reason of the premises the plaintiff has become entitled to immediate possession in of the said pounds of
Wherefore, the plaintiff claiming the right to immediate possession of said pounds of, prays:
1. That process in due form of law, according to the course of this Honorable Court in causes of possession within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, may issue against the said [cargo], and that all persons having or claiming to have any interest therein may be cited to appear and answer on oath all and singular the matters aforesaid.
2. That this Honorable Court order that the said [cargo] of be delivered to the plaintiff forthwith.
3. That this Honorable Court will grant to the plaintiff such other and further relief as may be just.
Attorney for Plaintiff
[Verification] n2
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form No. 1-1 <i>supra</i> .
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-12 supra.
* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-571

FORM No. 1-571 Complaint In Rem by Carrier Against Cargo Held by a Strike--Possessory Action

6. In view of the urgency of the situation plaintiffs show that upon such terms as the Court may require an order should

e entered immediately directing that process issue against said cargo laden on the vessel	_ and aid
der, including the right to take temporary possession of the said vessel, move the said vessel to a wharf, and disc e said cargo, and to employ such men or means as may be necessary to carry out said order.	charge
Wherefore, plaintiffs pray:	
That process in due form of law according to the course and practice of this Honorable Court in causes of admind maritime jurisdiction may issue against all of the cargo now laden on the vessel;	ralty
That an order may be entered as above described, requiring the United States Marshal to take possession of said deliver same to plaintiff; and	d cargo
For all general and equitable relief.	
attorney for Plaintiff	
Verification] n2	
OOTNOTES: 1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.	
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-11, 1-12 and 1-13 supra.	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-572

FORM No. 1-572 Complaint In Rem Against Vessel--Recovery of Possession of Leased Cargo Containers and Unpaid Rentn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2

A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

o. During the months of	,, and	, 20,
	s, and similar equipment for use on the vessel	
•	the order and at the request of defendant. The lease	
thereby are as follows:	[set forth details of leases and equipment and	identify all equipment].
been and is being used for and on the vessel 8. Plaintiff has rendered invoices to defendar	dant and, upon information and belief, some or all entered and its agents on account of the agreed upon price	
equipment.		
9. Neither the owners of the vessel	, nor its Master, nor the agents of the	he owner, have paid the
amounts due on the leases, although proper d	lemand has been made. As of the date of the filing	of this complaint, the
, & 1 1		equipment].



said port of _____, where she belongs;

79 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-573

FORM No. 1-573 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by Minority Owner to Obtain Security for the Safe Return of Vessel or for Possessory or Partition Action

[Caption and Jurisdictional Statement] n1
2. Plaintiff is the true and lawful owner of one-quarter of the vessel
her tackle, apparel, and furniture, and boats, and defendant is owner of the remaining three-quarters of said vessel, and no other person is owner of said vessel or any portion thereof, and the said vessel is now lying in the port of District of
3. Defendant has hitherto acted as ship's husband of said vessel, and has now the possession thereof, and declares his intention of dispatching said vessel on a voyage to the Plaintiff has
expressed to defendant his dissent from said voyage, and has remonstrated with him on the subject, and still dissents from the same, but defendant persists in his determination to send her on said voyage, and is now procuring her outfit and crew.
Wherefore plaintiff prays:
A. That process in due form of law, according to the course and practice of this Honorable Court in cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, may issue against the said vessel, her tackle, apparel, furniture, and boats;
B. That all persons claiming any right in said vessel, and especially defendant, three-quarters owner as aforesaid, may
be cited to appear and answer the matters aforesaid, and to show cause why defendant should not be restrained from sending the said vessel on the said voyage until good and sufficient security shall be given in this court to the full value
of the plaintiff's interest in said vessel, her tackle, apparel, furniture, and boats, for the safe return of said vessel to the

C. That this Honorable Court will be pleased to decree that such security be given or the possession of said vessel, her tackle, etc., be delivered to plaintiff, with costs, or that the said vessel, her tackle, etc., may be sold under the direction of this Honorable Court, and the proceeds of such sale brought into this court, to be divided according to law; and

D. That plaintiff may have such other and further relief in the premises as in law and justice he may be entitled to receive.

Attorney for Plaintiff

[Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-10 and 1-12 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-574

FORM No. 1-574 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by Part Owner-- Partition Action

[Caption] n1		
Plaintiffinformation and belief,		, complaining of the defendants, upon
maritime claim within t	•	nafter more fully appears, and is an admiralty or ules of Civil Procedure and Rule "D" of the
	er mentioned, plaintiff owns an undivided_, Official No,	
	mes hereinafter mentioned, defendant, and resides at	, owns an undivided one-half
4. The said defendant v the jurisdiction of this I		ocess hereunder will be within this district and within
	arel, furniture, etc.; that defendant,	ne-half interest in the vessel, also owns an undivided one-half
6. In consequence of di	versity of opinion and interest in relation	to the employment of said vessel, which is

irreconcilable, the said owners are unable to agree upon any voyage or business for said vessel. Plaintiff has named a

reasonable price for said vessel at which he is willing to sell his share or buy the share of his co-owner, but said defendant refuses either to buy or sell at a fair and reasonable price, and in consequence of his impracticability and obstinacy, plaintiff is unable to sell to any other person.

W	here	fore	the	nla	int	iff	pray	s:

A. That process in due form of law, according to the practice of this Court in causes of Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction, may issue against the said defendant,, citing him to appear and answer on oath all and singular the matters aforesaid.
B. That process in due form of law according to the practice of the Court in causes of Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction may issue against the vessel, her engines, boilers, tackle, etc., and that all persons claiming right, title or interest in the said vessel may be cited to appear and answer on oath all and singular the matters aforesaid with costs.
C. And that said vessel, her engines, tackle etc., may be sold under the direction of this Honorable Court and the proceeds thereof brought into Court to be provided and distributed according to law.
D. And that the plaintiff may have such other and further relief in the premises as in law and justice he may be entitled to receive.
Attorney for Plaintiff
[Verification] n2
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-10 and 1-12 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
POSSESSORY, PETITORY, AND PARTITION ACTIONS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-595

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-595RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS PRODUCTS LIABILITY

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-596

FORM No. 1-596 Complaint--Negligent Design and Installation of Helmsman's Chair

[Caption] n1			
Plaintiffs,	and	, by their attorney,	allege the
following as and for their Coupon information and belief	omplaint against the defendants,:	, and	
A FIRST CAUSE OF	ACTION:		
	Street, Such, they are citizens of the State		
	(hereinafter referred to r and by-virtue of the laws of the S		
	, as such,		
	(hereinafter referred to r and by virtue of the laws of the S		
	, as such,		
4. By reason of the foregoin <i>U.S.C.</i> § 1332.	g, there exists complete diversity of	of citizenship among the par	ties, in accordance with 28

5. The amount in controversy exceeds Fifty Thousand Dolla	rs (\$50,000.00), exclusive of interest and costs.
6. At all times hereinafter mentioned,servants or employees manufactured and assembled boats, in	
·	
7. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff,, known as, known as,	, owned one such model, assembled by , and bearing United States Coast
Guard Registry Number	
8. At the time of its manufacture, assembly and sale at retail was equipped with a certain helmsman's chair and support as	
9. Upon information and belief, no modifications or changes helmsman's chair or support assembly, from the time of its s	
10. Upon information and belief, the helmsman's chair and s for installation on the, by	
11. Upon information and belief,, helmsman's chair and support assembly upon the	
12. On, 20, while the plaints	
13. The occurrence as aforesaid was a proximate result of th manufacture, assembly, and installation of the helmsman's c	
14. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff suffered serious, disthe sum of Dollars (\$	sabling and permanent personal injuries, all to his damage in).
A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:	
15. Neither the helmsman's chair and support assembly, nor quality or fit for their intended use.	the vessel to which it was attached, were of merchantable
16. As such, defendant breached its warranties of merchanta of Dollars (\$	bility and fitness for use, all to plaintiff's damage in the sum).
A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:	
17. The design, manufacture and assembly of the helmsman defects were a substantial factor in causing the occurrence g	
18. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiffs operated the vessel, the helmsman's chair or its support assembly.	as intended, without misusing the
20. By reason of the foregoing, defendants are liable to plair	ntiffs in accordance with the doctrine of strict liability in

tort, in the sum of	Dollars (\$).
A FOURTH CAU	USE OF ACTION:	
		was and continues to be the lawful wife of services, support, companionship and consortium.
		was deprived of the benefits of her marriage to mm of(\$)
Dollars.		
	Dollars (\$ Dollars (\$	r with respect to the First Cause of Action in the sum of); with respect to the Second Cause of Action in the sum of); with respect to the Third Cause of Action in the sum of); and, with respect to the Fourth Cause of Action in the
), together with the costs of this action and interest
as taxed. Dated:		
Attorney for Plaintiff		
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Footnote 1.	orm No. 1-1 <i>supra</i> .	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PRODUCTS LIABILITY

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-597

FORM No. 1-597 Cross-Claim--Negligent Design and Installation of Helmsman's Chair

[Caption] n1		
Now comes defendant/cross	claimant	and for its cross complaint against defendant/cross
defendant	states as follows:	

Upon information and belief, prior to and at all times mentioned in the complaint, there was in effect an indemnity and hold harmless agreement between this defendant/cross plaintiff and defendant/cross defendant, whereby the cross defendant, agreed to indemnify, defend and hold this answering cross claims harmless from and against all claims (whether deemed bodily injury or personal injury), costs, damages and expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees incurred by this answering defendant arising out of the performance or default in performance by an officer, employee or agent of the codefendant(s), of any of the service which shall have contracted to perform for plaintiff, and this answering defendant is therefore entitled to indemnify from and to judgment over and against the defendant(s), in the event of any discovery hereby by the plaintiff against this answering defendant, together with any and all attorneys' fees incurring by this answering defendant in the defense of this action.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

That if the plaintiff(s) were caused to sustain damages at the time and place s	set forth in the plaintiff(s) complaint
through any carelessness, recklessness, negligence and/or breach of warranty	or because of strict liability in tort or other
than the plaintiff(s) own negligence, carelessness and recklessness, said dama	ages were sustained by reason of the sole
action and primary carelessness, recklessness and negligence and/or affirmat	ive acts of omission or commission and/or
breach of warranty by the defendant cross defendant	_, its agents, servants and/or employees,

without any active or affirmative negligence on the part of the answering defendant(s) contributing thereto.
That by reason of the foregoing, the defendant/cross defendant will be liable to the answering defendant/cross plaintif in the event and in the amount of recovery herein by the plaintiff. Dated:
Attorney for Plaintiff

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PRODUCTS LIABILITY

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-598

FORM No. 1-598 Complaint--Products Liability Negligence Warranties for Property Loss Against a Vessel Manufacturer and Appliance Manufacturer

ption	

COUNT I PRODUCTS LIABILITY

	, and for Count I of its co	ce carrier] as subrogee ofomplaint against defendant	
Rule $9(h)$ in that the event which waterway, and involved docking	ch gives rise to this action occ ag and mooring which are trace	vers of this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C curred at a marina on ditional maritime activities in that the	, a navigable
and is subrogated to all of the r	, is an insurance compa	any doing business in the State of, by virtue of having j under a policy of insurance issu	paid a claim made by
3. Defendant, of	, was and is a corpor	ation and at all relevant times was en	gaged in the business
4. In 20,personal use.	purchased	from	for his
5. On and prior to	20	used the	at al

times for their intended purpose				
6. On or about	, 20,	while	w	ras
[describe event].				
and distribute the vessel	W	hich was not d	efective and which	a duty to design, manufacture, sell was reasonably safe when put to
the use for which it should have	been designed, man	ufactured, solo	and distributed.	
8. On and prior to was de	, 20	, said onably safe for	the purpose for w	[vessel] manufactured by hich it was intended.
9. As a direct and proximate res she was destroyed. As a result o	f the loss,		was required to p	ay its insured,
expenses, all of which totaled in	excess of \$		·	
Wherefore, plaintiff,, on Coprejudgment interest, costs and	ount I of this complain	int in a sum in	excess of \$	
COUNT II NEGLIGENCE		ins court shan	deem proper.	
Now comes the plaintiff,complaint against defendant,				
1-8 rough 8 of Coun		1 through 8 of	Count I of its com	plaint as though set forth in full as
9. On or before the following wrongful acts or o				was guilty of one or more of lars of case].
(a) Carelessly and neglig	gently designed and o	constructed the		;
(b) Carelessly and neglig	gently failed to warn	the plaintiff _		;
(c) Carelessly and neglig	gently designed and o	constructed the		;
(d) Carelessly and negliques improperly designed so	gently usedthat it was prone to r	malfunction	_ which it knew o	r should have known was
(e) Was otherwise neglig	gent and careless.			
10. As a direct and proximate re		of	's neg	ligent acts or omissions, the
11 pa	id its insured,		, for that loss p	oursuant to the policy of insurance
issued to him and has incurred s	substantial additional	expenses. Said	d loss and expense	s were in excess of

	prays this Court to grant it a judgment against defendant,	
	, on Count II of its complaint for a sum in excess of \$,	plus
prejudgment interest, c	costs and such other relief this Court shall deem proper.	
COUNT III IMPI	LIED WARRANTY FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE	
	by its attorneys,, and for Count l	III of its
complaint against defe	endant, [vessel manufacturer], states as follows:	
	, realleges paragraphs 1 through 8 of Count I of its complaint as through 8 of Count III of its complaint.	though set forth
9. On and prior to	, 20, defendant impliedly wa	rranted to
	that the and all of her equipment were fit for the purp	ose of which
they were intended.		
10. On and prior to	, 20, relied upon said implic	ed warranty of
fitness for a particular	purpose.	
11. As a direct and pro	eximate result of the breach of said implied warranty of,	the
	caught fire and was rendered a total loss and was obli	
	, for said loss pursuant to the policy of insurance issued to him. As sub-	rogee of
	has incurred a substantial loss in excess of \$	
	.	
Wherefore, plaintiff.	, prays this Court to grant it a judgment against	
	nplaint for a sum in excess of \$ plus prejudgment interest	
other relief as the Cour		,
COUNT IV IMPI	LIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY	
Now comes plaintiff	, by its attorneys,, and for Count	IV of its
	endant [vessel manufacturer], states as follows:	
1.0. Districting		1 C 1.
	realleges paragraphs 1 through 8 of Count I of its complaint as through 8 of Count IV of its Complaint.	nough set forth
in run as paragrapiis r	unough 8 of Count IV of its Complaint.	
9. On or before	, 20 , impliedly warranted to	
	, 20, impliedly warranted to that said and equipment were merchantable.	
10. On and prior to	20 ralied upon said impli	ad morrontm of
merchantability.	, 20, relied upon said implie	ed warranty or
merchantability.		
11. As a direct and pro	eximate result of the breach of said implied warranty of,	the
	caught fire and was rendered a total loss and was obli	gated to pay its
insured,	, for said loss pursuant to the policy of insurance issued to him. As sub-	rogee of
	has incurred a substantial loss in excess of \$	

		s this Court to grant it judgment again	
	, on Count IV of its complain	int in a sum in excess of \$	plus
	osts and such other relief this		
COUNT V PROD	OUCTS LIABILITY		
		s attorneys,,	
complaint against defer	ndant,	, ("[appliance manufacturer]"), state	es as follows:
1. This is an admiralty $Rule 9(h)$,	and maritime matter and juris	diction of this court is founded on 28	U.S.C. § 1333 and F.R.C.P.
2. Plaintiff	is an insurance	company doing business in	and is
		by virtue of having pa	
	for the loss of his vessel	under a policy	of insurance issued to him.
3. Defendant,	, is a corporat	tion or a corporate type entity and at al	ll relevant times was engaged
in the business of desig		and distributing a	
4. Sometime prior to _	, 20	, defendant,	, purchased a
	unit from	and installed it in the vessel _	
which was then sold to	·		
5. On or about	, 20, _	used the	unit on
board the	to	[describe activity].	
6. On or about	, 20, s	subsequent to the use of the	unit by the
	, the unit malfunctioned,	[describe incid	lent] which
	eventually consumed the en	ntire vessel and rendered it a total loss	
7. On and prior to	, 20	, had a duty	y to design, manufacture, sell
and distribute	units which v	were not defective and which were rea	sonably safe when put to the
use for which they wer	e designed, manufactured, sol	d and distributed.	
8. On and prior to	, 20	, said unit i	manufactured by
	was defective and not reaso	onably safe for the purpose of	[describe
activity].			
9. As a direct and prox	imate result of the defective a	nd not reasonably safe condition of sai	id
•		ndered a total loss. Therefore,	
obligated to pay its inst	ured	for said loss pursuant to a policy of ir	nsurance issued to him and
incurred additional exp	enses all of which totaled in e	excess of \$	
Wherefore, plaintiff,	, prav	s this Court to grant it judgment again	st defendant,
, r ·· · · · · · ·	, on Count V of its complain	nt for a sum in excess of \$, plus
	_	Court shall deem proper.	

COUNT VI NEGLIGENCE

Now comes the plaintiff,				
complaint against defendant,		[appliance manufo	acturer], states as	s follows:
1-7 realle	agaa naraaranh 1	through 7 of Count	V of its complein	t as though set forth in full as
paragraphs 1 through 7 of Count VI			v of its complain	t as though set forth in full as
paragraphs 1 through 7 of Count VI	or its complaint	••		
8. On or before	, 20	, defendant,		was guilty of one or more of
the following wrongful acts or omiss	sions:			
(a) Carelessly and negligentl	y designed and	constructed the		unit;
(b) Carelessly and negligentl malfunction;	y failed to warn	users that the		_ unit was prone to
(c) Was otherwise careless a	nd negligent.			
9. As a direct and proximate result o unit caugh was obliga	t fire causing th	e	to burn and	l rendering it a total loss.
insurance issued to him and incurred				
Wherefore, plaintiff,, on Count				
prejudgment interest, costs and such	other relief wh	ich this Court shall de	eem proper.	<u> </u>
Now comes plaintiff,	hv.i	to attornove		and for Count VIII of its
complaint against defendant,	, by 1	[appliance manuf	acturer], states as	s follows:
1-7. Plaintiff,			of Count V of it	es complaint as though set
8. On and prior to that said _	, 20	, defendant, unit was fit f	or the purpose of	, impliedly warranted to
9. On and prior to fitness for a particular purpose.	, 20		relied up	on said implied warranty of
10. As a direct and proximate result caught fire	and was render	ed a total loss and		was obligated to pay its
insured,, for expenses all of which totaled in exce	or said loss purs	uant to the policy of i	nsurance issued	to him and incurred additional
expenses all of which totaled in exce	ess of \$	·		
Wherefore, plaintiff,, on Count	, pray	ys this Court to grant laint for a sum in exce	it judgment agair	nst defendant, plus
prejudgment interest, costs and such				_

COUNT VIII IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANDISE

Now comes the plaintiff,		_, by its attorneys,	, and for Count VIII of its
complaint against defendant,		[appliance manu	facturer], states as follows:
			7 of Count V of its complaint as though set
forth in full as paragraphs 1 through 7	of Count V	VIII of its Complaint.	
			, impliedly warranted to
that said		was mercha	antable.
9. On and prior to merchantability.	, 20 _	,	relied upon said implied warranty of
10. As a direct and proximate result o		_	nty of, the was obligated to pay its
	said loss p	ursuant to the policy of	f insurance issued to him and incurred additional
Wherefore, plaintiff,, on Count V			t it judgment against defendant,
prejudgment interest, costs and such o	other relief	which this Court shall d	deem proper.
COUNT IX			
			, and for Count IX of its
complaint against the defendant		[appliance ma	anufacturer], states as follows:
			of Count I as paragraphs 1 through 7 of this count IX as if more fully stated herein.
2. As a result of that fire certain claim	s have been	n filed against	for damage to other boats and
			the fire. The persons filing claims are all
and a list of those claimants is attached			, Case Number
3. In the event that plaintiff,is found liab	ale for any o	, becomes obligate	ed to pay those claims or which liability denied, said liability
will be due in whole or in part to the a any conduct, acts or omission of	acts of omis	ssion or negligence of d	lefendant,, and not to
Wherefore	requests the	Court for the followin	ag relief on this Count IX in accordance with
			, in an amount commensurate with their
liability for the acts and damages alle	ged by the a	above mentioned claims	ants; (2) judgment against defendant,
			finding that defendant,y of the acts and damages alleged by the above
mentioned claimants; and, (4) such ot	her further	relief as this Court may	deem proper.
By:			
One of its attorneys			



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PRODUCTS LIABILITY

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-619

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-619RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-620

FORM No. 1-620 Complaint In Personam Against Vessel Owner--Destruction of Leased Equipmentn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2
4. On or about, 20, defendant entered into a lease with plaintiff whereby defendant took possession of certain, equipment of plaintiff, which equipment at the time defendant took possession thereof, was in good, undamaged and serviceable condition, and which equipment was placed aboard the vessel, owned and operated by defendant.
5. The lease and agreement referred to above provided that the defendant shall, at its own expense, protect and preserve the equipment, and that in the event said equipment shall be lost, destroyed or damaged, defendant shall pay the fair market value thereof.
6. Subsequent thereto while aboard the said vessel and in the exclusive care, custody and control of the defendant, said equipment was completely and totally damaged and destroyed.
7. The defendant has failed to return the said equipment in its original condition, less ordinary wear and tear, and the defendant has failed to pay the fair market value of said equipment at the time of its loss.
8. The said equipment had a fair market value at the time of its loss on or about, 20 of \$
[Demand for Judgment] n3
FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers used in Radiomarine Corp. v. Gulf Northern Co., Inc., 394 F. Supp. 381,

2075 A.M.C. 2331 (E.D. Mo. 1975), courtesy of Lucas & Murphy, St. Louis, Missouri.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-621

FORM No. 1-621 Complaint In Personam Against Shipyard-- Damage to Yacht

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1 4. The plaintiff is, and was at all times pertinent hereto, the owner of the Yacht ______. The defendant, _____, is, and was at all times pertinent hereto, the owner and operator of a certain boatyard and marine repair business located at Street, . . 5. On or about ______, 20 _____, the plaintiff delivered the said Yacht ______ to the defendant, , at its said boatyard, and the said defendant accepted the same as a bailee for hire. Under the agreement between the parties, ______ [describe terms of agreement]. 6. [describe acts leading damage] 7. [defendant was negligent as follows]: ______ 8. [allege negligent acts] 9. [alleged damages] 10. As a further direct and proximate result of the foregoing, the plaintiff has incurred extensive damage in the cost of protecting the said yacht in its damaged condition, and in obtaining marine surveys of the damage, in travel and expenses of employees in connection with the protection of the yacht and the plaintiff's rights therein, and long-distance telephone costs. In addition, as a further direct and proximate result of the foregoing, the plaintiff has suffered a loss of the use of the vessel for a period of () months. During this period of time, the plaintiff has been required to continue a skeleton crew on the vessel at a cost in excess of

____.

11. After repair of the above-described damage to the vessel, by the plaintiff, the plaintiff was required to send the said yacht on a series of "checkout runs" in order to determine the seaworthiness of the vessel, at a cost to the plaintiff of

12. As a direct and proximate result of the carelessness and negligence of the defendant(s) [alleges injuries and damages suffered].

[Demand for Judgment] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



and direction of the crane.

88 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-622

FORM No. 1-622 Complaint In Personam Against Stevedore--Damage to Vessel During Loadingn1

[Caption, Jurisdictio	nal Statement and	Allegations Concernin	g Parties] n2
	cident hereinafter o	described was tight, sta	ll is the owner of the vessel, unch, and strong and in all respects seaworthy and
5. On	, 20	, the vessel	was berthed at
it had been engaged	to load and dischar	rge the vessel	engaged in the business of providing stevedoring services; and pursuant to such engagement, he defendant, its agents, servants and employees.
employees, while co	mpleting loading o	perations, carelessly a	the defendant by its agents, servants or and negligently caused the shoreside crane to collide with causing damage to the (or
on the part of those i and negligence of the	n charge of the ves	ssel	ere not caused or contributed to by any fault or negligence, but were caused wholly by, and due solely to, fault as of, in the following l:

A) The defendant was negligent in failing to provide proper and competent employees for the operation

B) The defendant was negligent in failing to take proper and adequate precautions to secure the crane.

C) The defendan	t was negligent in pro	oceeding with steved	loring operations under th	ne circumstances.
the damage, the cost of r incurred as a result of the	repairs, the loss of use e collision, which so	e of the vessel and o nearly as can be esti		
demanded.	_ Donars, no part or v	vinen sum nas occir	para, armough payment u	nercor has been dury
COUNT I				
10. Plaintiff pursuant to			ereto its allegations as set its Complaint.	t forth in Paragraphs
11 On	20 99	t about	the defends	nt, its agents, servants, and
employees failed to prop manner resulting in dam defendant, its agents, ser ————————————————————————————————————	perly perform its enga age to the vessel whe evants or employees, of the control of the control of the control ant's failure to perfor (or otherwise) es necessarily incurre	gement to load the vante the shoreside cran collided with the m its engagement in a costs for marine side as a result of said	vessel of e operated under the direct of of a workmanlike manner, urveys, costs of repairs, lefailure, which so nearly a	in a workmanlike ction and control of the
[Demand for Judgment]	n3			
Dated:				
Attorney for Plaintiff				
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form ac Civ. No. 80-1387 (E.D.N		led in Jugoslavenska	a Plovidba Linijska v. No	rtheast Marine Terminal Co.,
(n2)Footnote 2. See	Form Nos. 1-1 and 1	1-5 supra.		
(n3)Footnote 3. See	Form No. 1-6 supra			



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-623

FORM No. 1-623 Complaint In Personam Against Repairman--Damage to Vessel

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statems	ent and Allegations Concerning P	arties] n1		
	, 20,			
	efendant for the purpose of making			
	ke manner and the vessel			f in
due course after the repairs shou	ald be completed and in first class	working condition		
5. On or about the	day of	, 20	, the vessel	
and by reason of the negligence the plaintiff.	in the sole custody of the defenda and incompetence of the defenda e plaintiff by reason of the premise	nt and without any	fault or negligence on the part of	of
to the sum of \$demanded.	no part of which has bee	n paid although pa	yment thereof has been duly	
[Demand for Judgment] n2				
FOOTNOTES:				
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos.	1-1 and 1-5 <i>supra</i> .			
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form	No. 1-6 supra.			



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-624

FORM No. 1-624 Complaint In Personam Against Repairman--Damage to Yachtn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional St	tatement and	Allegations Concerning Part	ies] n2	
4. Prior to	, 20), defendant agreed and	undertook to effect certai	n work with respect to
the rigging of the yacht		On or about	, 20	, defendant accepted
possession of the yacht an	d performed	certain work with respect to it	s rigging.	
5. On	, 20	, at approximately	o'clock,	plaintiff received the
yacht	from th	e defendant. On that same day	y, at approximately	
o'clock, while sailing in ar	area southw	vest of	, during a gentle breeze,	the mast of the yacht
	collapsed. As	a result of the collapse of the	mast, the yacht	, its
appurtenances and equipment	ent, were se	verely damaged.		
on the part of the plaintiff, responsible, but were caus	ed through tl	and resulting damage, were no or any person or he fault, neglect, lack of care a rvants and employees, in the factors.	r persons for whom the pla and breach of contract on t	uintiff was or is the part of the defendant,
pointed out at the trial of t	his action:			
[allege negligent acts]				
•	-	nas sustained damages in the soft has been duly demanded.	sum of \$, no part of which

[Demand for Judgment] n3

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. From adapted from papers filed in American Railroad Curvelining Corp. v. Seaman Yacht Service, Inc., Civ. No. 81-1623 (E.D.N.Y. 1981).

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-625

FORM No. 1-625 Complaint In Personam Against Marina--Vandalism of Vessel

[Caption, Jurisdictional Stateme	nt and Allegations Co	oncerning Parties] n1	
		defendant owned and operated g and maintaining pleasure yachts	
consideration of payments being	made to defendant plate boat and equipment ar	laintiff and defendant entered into aintiff would be entitled to berth and would be entitled to all ancillate to Marina.	his boat at defendant's Marina, to
6. All conditions precedent requi	red of plaintiff have b	peen performed.	
		Marina under the custody and co in serious damage and pilferage of	
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTIO	N		
		ding the mooring of the	
9. Plaintiff relied on the represent his boat was severely damaged a		[state representation]	to his detriment and, as a result,
10. Defendant breached its contr	act of bailment with p	blain tiff in receiving plaintiff's bo	at in good order and condition

and returning same in a damaged and pilfered condition.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

11. Defendant was negligent in that it provided inadequate security measures to prevent vandalism and pilferage to plaintiff's boat.
12. By reason of the premises, plaintiff has sustained damages in the sum of \$, as nearly as the same can now be estimated no part of which has been paid although duly demanded.
Wherefore plaintiff prays:
a. That process issue against the defendant, and that defendant be cited to appear and answer the allegations of the complaint.
b. That final judgment against the defendant be entered in favor of the plaintiff for the amount found due plaintiff with interest and with costs; and
c. That plaintiff have such other and further relief as may be just.
Attorney for Plaintiff

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Forms Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-626

FORM No. 1-626 Complaint in Personam Against Marina--Sinking of Vessel with Exemplary Damagen1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2
4. On or about
compliance with defendant's instructions, plaintiff left his said vessel secured at a mooring designated by defendant in, in the vicinity of defendant's dock. Defendant provided plaintiff launch service to its dock
after the plaintiff's vessel was moored at defendant's said mooring. At that time, the said vessel was in all respects tight, staunch and seaworthy, and properly secured to the mooring.
5. On or about, 20, defendant, by its agents, advised plaintiff that a cradle designated by plaintiff for use in storing the plaintiff's said vessel was unsuitable and plaintiff contracted for additional consideration, to have defendant modify and use a different cradle available at defendant's facility for an additional charge.
6. On or about, 20, defendant, by its agents, servants and employees, moved plaintiff's vessel from the mooring at which it had been secured to defendant's dock at for the purpose of hauling it and storing it in the modified cradle, as aforesaid.
7. Thereafter, plaintiff's vessel was caused and allowed to drift away from defendant's dock and was grounded on a shoal in the vicinity of defendant's dock where the said vessel apparently filled with water and sank.
8. On or about, 20, defendant, by its agents, servants and employees, attempted to tow plaintiff's vessel off of the shoal and to, and in the process of attempting to do so, plaintiff's

vessel was caused to sink in deep water and was totally lost.

- 9. The loss of plaintiff's vessel was due to the breaches by defendant of its contract to take good care and custody of plaintiff's vessel and to haul and cradle it for storage in a good and workmanlike manner without damage to the said vessel, and deliver it to plaintiff's residence.
- 10. The damage to and loss of plaintiff's said vessel was caused by the gross negligence and willful and wanton recklessness and carelessness of the defendant, its agents, servants and employees, in failing to take good care of plaintiff's vessel, failing to properly moor it and attach it to its dock, in failing to prevent it from breaking loose from its dock, allowing it to drift away and sink in shoal water and in failing to carefully and properly tow it off said shoal, which resulted in the sinking of plaintiff's vessel in deep water, and the total loss thereof.
- 11. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff has suffered the total loss of his vessel and its sails, furnishings and equipment, all in the fair and reasonable value of \$______.
- 12. Defendant, its agents, servants and employees, willfully, maliciously and deliberately attempted to conceal and cover-up their gross, willful and wanton recklessness, negligence, carelessness and misconduct with respect to the handling of plaintiff's vessel and to evade, conceal and cover-up its responsibility for the sinking and loss of said vessel, by making deliberate and intentional lies, prevarications and false statements to plaintiff concerning the status and condition of plaintiff's vessel and its whereabouts on several occasions and by defendant's willful failure to notify or inform plaintiff of the sinking and damage to the plaintiff's vessel, which prevented plaintiff from taking steps on his own behalf to protect the vessel and minimize the loss and damage. This willful misconduct on behalf of defendant also resulted in the refusal to settle and pay plaintiff's claim for loss of the vessel and its equipment. By reason of said deliberate and willful lies, prevarications, misconduct and attempted cover-up, plaintiff claims exemplary damages against defendant in the amount of \$ _______ which should be awarded to plaintiff as a deterrent to defendant and others who may be inclined to engage in such misconduct.

[Demand for Judgment] n3

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Thivierge v. Mooringtime Marine Corp., Civ. No. 80-791 (E.D.N.Y. 1980).

(n2)Footnote 2. See Forms Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-627

FORM No. 1-627 Complaint In Personam by Subrogee of Vessel Owner Against Marina--Damage During Storagen1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegation Concerning Parties] n2

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

6. At all times hereinafter plaintiff to			- ·	•
7. At all times hereinafter of				in the County
8. At all times hereinafter	mentioned, the defend	ants operated, maintained,	, and controlled the said	l boat yard.
9. Some time in the fall of the defendants' boat yard of			eement with the defend	ants for the storage in
10. Thereafter and some ti navigable waters adjacent boat yard.				
11. On or aboutcradle, and blocks, resulting			fell from	its storage position,
12. The damage to vessel		was caused by the negl	ligence of the defendant	ts in storing the vessel

			rovide adequate snoring and blocking
			er and adequate materials in the support of
the vessel, and the defendants	were further guilty of	negligence, all of which	caused the vessel
to sustain damages, without a	ny negligence on the pa	art of plaintiff's subrogor	contributing thereto.
13. On or about	, 20 ,	plaintiff paid	, the sum of \$
und	er the terms of the mari	ne policy of insurance for	or damages sustained to the vessel
nurs	suant to the terms of the	nolicy of insurance and	, by reason thereof, plaintiff was
subrogated to the rights and c			
sublogated to the lights and e	1amis 01	, against defer	idants.
14. As a result of the negliger	nce of the defendants, th	ne plaintiff has been dam	aged in the sum of \$
SECOND CAUSE OF A	ACTION		
15. Plaintiff repeats and realle	eges each and every alle	egation contained in para	agraphs numbered 1 through 11 and 13 with
the same force and effect as is	= -	_	
	_		_
16. Under the agreement for t	he winter storage of the	e vessel, the defendants b	became a bailee of the vessel
17 Defendants breached their	r contract of bailment b	ov failing to redeliver the	vesselto
plaintiff's insured in the cond		-	
18. As a result of the breach of	of contract of bailment of	on the part of defendants	, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of
\$		F	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
THIRD CAUSE OF AC	TION		
20 Plaintiff repeats and realls	arge each and avery alle	agation contained in pars	graphs numbered 1 through 11 and 13 with
the same force and effect as i			
the same force and effect as i	i lierelli set forul at leng	gui and, in addition mere	to, aneges.
20. The damage to the vessel.		was caused by the bre	ach of the storage agreement on the part of
the defendants in failing to st	ore the vessel	was caused by the ore	and proper manner and to maintain it in a
and and and and and and are division	ne tile vessel	III a saie	
_	_	to redeliver the vessel to	plaintiff's subrogor in the condition in
which it was delivered to the	defendants.		
21. As a result of the breach of	of contract on the part of	of the defendants, plaintif	f has been damaged in the sum of \$
[Demand for Judgment] n3			
[Demana jor suagment] 113			
FOOTNOTES:			
(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapte 84-2174 (E.D.N.Y. 1984).	d from papers filed in C	Omaha Indemnity Co. v.	Whaleneck Harbor Marina, Inc., Civ. No.
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form	n Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 <i>supr</i>	ra.	
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form	n No. 1-6 supra.		
*	See 2 Benedict on Adr	miralty, ch. I (Matthew E	Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-628

FORM No. 1-628 Complaint In Personam by Vessel Owner Against Storage Facility--Fire Damage to Vessel

[Caption] n1		
Now comes the plaintiff,against the defendant.	, by his attorneys Corporation states as follows:	and for his complaint
JURISDICTIONAL SUMMAR	Y	
This court has jurisdiction of this mat COUNT I	tter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1333 and I	Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(h).
1. Plaintiff is a citizen of the s	state of and was the ll times mentioned herein.	e owner of the vessel
	Corporation, is a corporation incorp	-
marina and storage facility.	doing business within the State of	as a vesser
	, was at all times, the alter ego of de	
allegations of this complaint.	poration and acted as the corporation in all m	natters relevant to the
	, 20, the plaintiff and the de ne defendants agreed to act as a bailee, storin	
	the period of	

	_, 20, for a sum certain at its storage facility in
5. On or about	, 20, plaintiff delivered and the defendants accepted the
vessel	which was in good order and condition at that time for storage at
	facility for the winter storage.
ucicidant's	racinty for the winter storage.
6. On or about	, 20, it was discovered that the vessel
	had been severely damaged as the result of a fire in the facility in which the
	had been stored by the defendants pursuant to its written storage
	ntiff. The vessel was damaged while in the sole
custody, care and contro	
7. The damage to the ve	ssel was the result of the defendants' willful and/or
	cise reasonable care for the vessel while in its custody or control.
negligent famure to exer	erse reasonable care for the vesser while in its easibility of control.
8. Prior to the expiration	n of the Winter Storage Agreement, plaintiff demanded return of the vessel
_	from the defendants, but the defendants did not return the vessel to the plaintif
	and condition as when delivered to the defendant in, 20
·	
O Defendantle millful en	d/annaliant failm to annais managable and annaithe de baseb of
defendants' contract with	nd/or negligent failure to exercise reasonable care constituted a breach of
defendants contract with	n pramum.
10. The plaintiff has per	formed fully all of his obligations required under the aforementioned contract of
bailment.	sometruly and or mo conganions required and an arctimental contains of
11. Plaintiff brings this	suit for his own benefit and for the benefit of all others who have or may have
_	terest in plaintiff's claim against the defendants.
	fendants' breach of the aforementioned contract, plaintiff has sustained damages
	, none of which has been paid though plaintiff has made
numerous demands for p	payment.
Wherefore, plaintiff pra	ays for judgment against the defendants in the amount of
	_ Dollars (\$), plus interest and cost, and for all other
relief which law may re-	quire.
COUNT II	
1.2 DI : (:cc. II	
_	Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Count I of this complaint as Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Count
II as if more fully stated	nerein.
4. On or about	, 20, plaintiff delivered and the defendants accepted the
vessel	which was in good order and condition at the time for storage at
	facility for the winter storage period.
	, 20, it was discovered that the vessel
	had been severely damaged while in the sole custody, care and control of
defendants-bailees.	

*		greement, plaintiff demanded return of the vessel at defendants did not return the vessel in the same good
	when it had been delivered	d to the defendants-bailees on or about
7. Damage to the vessel to exercise reasonable c	l care for the bailed property	was due solely to defendants-bailees' negligent failure y.
8. Plaintiff did not coma aforementioned damage		e which contributed in any manner to the
_	uit for his own benefit and st in plaintiff's claim agair	d for the benefit of all others who may have or may not the defendants.
	_ plaintiff has sustained d	exercise reasonable care as the bailee of the vessel lamages in the amount of \$ bugh plaintiff has made numerous demands for payment.
none of which has been	para by defendants, armo	rugh planterr has made numerous demands for payment.
		the defendants in the amount of), plus interest and costs and for all other
relief which the law ma		
COUNT III		
1-3. Plaintiff re-alleges stated herein.	Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Co	ount I as Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Count III as if more fully
		_, the plaintiff delivered the vessel
		er and condition at that time, to defendants for storage at
	facility for t	-
		_, it was discovered that the vessel
including the failure to		aged solely as a result of defendants' negligent conduct the structure for the storage of the vessel the weight of snow.
6. Plaintiff has not com the vessel		nce which contributed to the aforementioned damage to
		has sustained damages in the amount of \$ n paid by defendants though plaintiff has made
numerous demands.		
•	uit for his own benefit and tiff's claim against defend	d for the benefit of all others who have or may hereafter lants.
		the defendants in the amount of), plus interest and cost for all other relief
which the law may requ	iire.	

Attorneys	for	Plaintiff	

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-629

FORM No. 1-629 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--Damage to Submarine Cables

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1 4. Plaintiffs are the owners of certain submarine cables extending under the waters of the _____ River from _______ to ______, in the vicinity of a certain railroad bridge crossing the said ______ River owned and operated by ______ Railroad Company. 5. On or about ______, 20 _____, defendant ______ operating three vessels in the vicinity of the said bridge which said vessels were proceeding in the easterly direction through the south channel of the said bridge. 6. The said vessels being operated by defendant, _____ at the said time and place, were the tug owned by defendant ______ the barge _____ owned by the defendant ______, and the tug ______ owned by the defendant 7. At or about the said time and place, defendant ______ was the owner and operator of a certain self-propelled vessel. 8. On or about , 20 , the submarine cables owned by plaintiffs were damaged and destroyed by the careless and negligent actions of the defendants in the ownership and in the manner and method of operation of the various vessels which were in the vicinity of the bridge and were in the process of moving in an easterly direction through the south channel of the open bridge.

9. The damage to the submarine cables of plaintiff,	to the extent of \$
and the damage to the submarine cables of plaintiff,	_, to the extent of \$
was caused by the result of the carelessness, reckle	ssness and negligence of the defendants.
[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment and Verification] n2	
FOOTNOTES:	
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1, 1-2 and 1-5, supra.	
(n2)Footnote 2. See Forms Nos. 1-3, 1-6, 1-11 and 1-12, supra.	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-630

FORM No. 1-630 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--Damage to Seismic Cablen1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2

4. On or about	, 20	, at approximately _		the vessel
W	vas underway approx	imately 5 miles off the	coast of	,
	The vessel was on a	course of approximately	у	true and was towing a
seismic recording cable ap	proximately	feet le	ong. At the end of	of the cable there were two large
red buoys and following th	e red buoys on the sa	ame course and at the s	ame speed was th	ne vessel
A	At about	the capta	in of the vessel _	observed
several shrimp boats in the	area, one of which v	was the vessel		and was approximately
n	niles on the starboard	l bow of the vessel		Another of the shrimp
boats was the vessel	v	which was	mile	es or more on the starboard
quarter of the vessel	·	The captain of the vess	el	observed that the
vessel	and the vessel		_ were on course	es which would bring them into
collision with the seismic of	able being towed by	the vessel	, wl	nereupon he sounded warning
signals and took evasive ac	tion in an effort to k	eep the cable out of the	way of the said	two vessels. Meanwhile, the
vessel	went along side	e the vessel	an	d advised those in charge of the
navigation of the vessel		that the cable lay ahe	ead of them. Botl	n the vessel
a	nd the vessel	igno	red the warnings	given to them, proceeded on
their courses without takin	g any action to avoid	the cable, and the vess	sel	struck the cable abou
fe	eet astern of the vess	el	, and the ves	sel
struck the cable about		feet astern of the vesse	el	, and in the area of the
tail buoy.				

5. The collision aforesaid was not caused by or contributed to by any fault or neglect of the vessel

or the vessel	, but solely was the fault of the vessel
	, and each of them, and those in charge of them in the
following among other particulars to be shown at the time of	f trial hereof:
(a) They were not in charge of competent pilots;	
(b) Their pilots were careless and inattentive to their	duties;
(c) They failed to maintain proper lookouts;	
(d) They failed to keep out of the way of the vessel and their tow;	and the vessel
(e) They failed to sound and/or display proper and ti	imely signals;
(f) They failed to stop and reverse their engines whe apparent;	en danger of collision was or should have been
(g) And in other particulars to be shown at the time	of trial.
6. As a result of the collision aforesaid, approximately feet of cable we	
and/or the vessel	, but at the time of filing of this complaint plaintiff
is not able to determine exactly the extent of damage to the lost.	
7. Plaintiff also is unable to determine the full extent of its of incidental repairs, and other damages, but the damages amo calculated at the present time.	• • •
[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment and Verification	n] n3
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers used in Duque of 2068 A.M.C. 2284 (5th Cir. 1968), courtesy of Ross, Grigg	
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1, 1-2 and 1-5 supra.	
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6, 1-10, 1-11 and	d 1-12 <i>supra</i> .
* See 2 Renedict on Admiralty	ch I (Matthew Bender 7th ed.)



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-631

FORM No. 1-631 Complaint In Intervention Against Bridge Owner In Personam and Vessel Owner In Rem and In Personam-Damage to Submarine Electrical Service Linen1

[Caption] n2

1. This is an admiralty and maritime claim within within the meaning of $Rule\ 9(h)$ of the Federal F maritime law and under the provisions of the Ex	Rules of Civil Procedure, be	being brought by virtue of the general	nd
2. Complainant in intervention,	is a	duly authorized and qualified	to
do and doing business in the State of	with its prin	ncipal office in, a	ınd
engaged primarily in the business of generating,	transmitting, distributing a	and selling electricity for power, lighting,	
heating and other such uses in the State of	•		
3. At all material times hereinafter mentioned, th	ne vessel	, defendant in intervention, was a	
and documented vessel	l of the United States of	feet in length, feet	in
beam and feet in draft bearing Official No	with it	its home port in and is or will be during the	e
pendency of this action within the jurisdiction of	f this Court.		
4. At all material times hereinafter mentioned, do resident of and was and			
5. At all material times hereinafter mentioned, do	efendant in intervention.	was the liability	
insurer of the vessel an			
this State pursuant to .			

	s hereinafter mentioned, defend	-	• •	
was an agency of the	State of	capable of suing	and being sued and	l was the owner and operator
of a bridge over	near	.		
	s hereinafter mentioned, compl d the bridge over			
8. At	a.m. on	, 20	, the vessel	entered
the passageway of the	bridge over	near	,	,
and in so doing came	into contact and collided with t	hat bridge, the elect	trical distribution sy	ystem and in particular with
a	on the underside of the br	ridge.		
9. The cause of the co	llision was the negligence of th	e operator of the		Bridge, acting in the
course and scope of h	is employment with the Depart	ment of Highways,	State of	, in failing to
	n manner consistent with pruder			
being asleep on the jo	b and failing to open the bridge	after proper whistl	e signals had been	given by the vessel
	the cause of the collision was d		•	
	was no			ne 10110 wing paraeutation
b. The vessel	failed	to maintain a prope	er lookout.	
c. The vessel _ collision becan	failed me apparent.	to stop her engines	and reverse when t	he danger of a
estimated at this time	remises and as a result of the sate to be \$ distribution system of the	_ which complaina	nt in intervention w	_
[Prayer for Process, 1	Demand for Judgment and Veri	fication] n3		
1 1	adapted from papers used in F tesy of George & George, Ltd.	•	•	pp. 446, 2074 A.M.C. 2274
(n2)Footnote 2.	See Form No. 1-1 supra.			
(n3)Footnote 3.	See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6, 1-11 ar	nd 1-12, <i>supra</i> .		
	* See 2 Benedict on Adr	miralty, ch. I (Matth	ew Bender 7th ed.)	



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-632

FORM No. 1-632 Complaint--Damages Caused by Flooding from River--Class Actionn1

[Caption] n2			
CONSOLIDAT	ED CLASS ACTION COM	IPLAINT	
		plaintiffs], suing on behalf of thems against the defendants,	•
		, a Municipal Co	
NATURE OF T	HE CASE		
defendants' conduct in	n connection with the dama	rous persons and businesses of actua	l system located in
		bridge (the "Tunnel"). On	
		ontinuing torrent of water from the	
•	· ·	nis damage to the Tunnel or otherwi	÷
		I in the river water inundating many of emergency situations, evacuation	
electrical and other ut		ses resulting therefrom beginning o	
PARTIES			
2. This action is brough	ght by the following plainti	ffs:	
[identify each plaintif	[]		

3. The defendants in this action are:
[identify each defendant]
CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS
4. Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action pursuant to the Code of Civil Procedure [cite statute], on behalf of themselves and all other persons and entities who sustained damage as a result of the breach of the Tunnel as stated above (the "Class").
5. The members of the Class are numerous; there are tens of thousands of individuals, in excess of 200 buildings, and thousands of businesses, whose property was damaged, whose business was interrupted or stopped, who lost wages, tips, commissions and business opportunities or who were otherwise damaged. While plaintiffs believe that the number of members of the Class is in the tens of thousands, the identity of each member of the Class is not presently known to plaintiffs, but can be readily ascertained. Joinder of all members is, therefore, impracticable.
6. The claims of the Class involve common questions of both law or fact which predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class members. Among the questions of law and fact common to the Class are:
a. Whether the defendants were negligent.
b. Whether the conduct of the defendants was wilful and wanton and showed an utter indifference to or conscious disregard for the safety of others or their property.
c. Whether the contract between [city] and [dredge owner] created third-party beneficiary rights in plaintiffs and the Class.
d. Whether defendant [city] breached its duty to exercise ordinary care to maintain the Tunnel in a reasonably safe condition.
e. Whether the defendants owed plaintiffs and the Class an extracontractual duty to maintain the Tunnel in a reasonably safe condition.
f. Whether the pile driving activities at the bridge constituted an abnormally dangerous activity.
g. Whether the pile driving activities at the bridge constituted an ultrahazardous activity.
h. Whether plaintiffs and the Class have suffered compensable damages and the extent of such damages.
7. Plaintiffs and their counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiffs have retained counsel who are competent and experienced in class action litigation and intent to prosecute this action

8. This class action is an appropriate method to adjudicate this controversy and there will not be any difficulties with the

vigorously.

prosecution of this class action.

			nip and responsibility for the Tunnel in
	from its then bankrupt owr		
		ground freight trans	sportation system for much of the
downtown district of	[city].		
10. Since approximately		ſ	cityl knew that the Tunnel crossed under
the	river in different locations an	d that it was connec	city] knew that the Tunnel crossed under ted to a number of downtown building.
These downtown buildings	are predominantly multi-story	and contain comme	cial activities.
11 Since the mid-	'c	's [city'	s] primary activity in the Tunnel has been
			on companies amounting to revenue of
	(\$1,000,000.00) dollars in		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
			lia, remove and replace piling clusters at
five	River bridges, including the		bridge (the "Contract").
13. The original pilings to be to the underground freight		at the	bridge were in close proximity
1/1 Roth parties to the Cont	ract knew or should have know	n of the existence a	nd location of the Tunnel at the
<u> </u>			t could result in damage to the Tunnel.
	rage, and that the work require	a under the contrac	t court result in damage to the Tumen
15	_[dredge owner] knew or shou	ıld have known that	the Tunnel was connected to a number of
			tion lines and equipment serving
	ity] and the downtown district		
16	_[dredge owner] installed new	pilings in a location	n other than that originally designated in
its Contract with	[city] and failed	to remove all the p	ilings contracted to be removed.
17. About	. 20	(dred	ge owner) claimed it fully completed
performance of the construc	ction work under its Contract w	rith	[city].
F			[549]].
18	_[dredge owner], in pounding	and driving the pilit	ngs into the riverbed, caused one or more
of the following conditions:	:		
a an actual hala or l	brough of the Tunnel well with	the piling or pilings	physically breaking the Tunnel
wall.	reach of the Tunner wan with	the pinng or pinngs	physically breaking the Tullier
wan.			
b. a weakening of the	e Tunnel wall creating cracks	or weakness in the s	tructural integrity of the Tunnel.
c. a compacting of t	he earth around the Tunnel wal	ls creating excessive	e pressure on the Tunnel.
d. such other events	which proximately caused the	Tunnel wall to parti	ally collapse or break.
19. On information and beli	ief,[c	ity] never finally ins	spected the work at the
			/or [dredge
owner] filed with the appro	priate	authorities a report	or reports that all existing wood pilings at

the	bridge were	removed as part of the construction when in fact they were not.	
21. In	. 20	, a cable television crew using the Tunnel discovered a breach of the Tun	nnel
at the			
			nel by
said cable television	crew.		
23. Inthe Tunnel and photo		, [city] employees inspected the damaged portion.	on of
24. By earlyadvocating immediat		, inspectors and supervisors within [city] el.	were
		two prior occasions, [city] acted, or knew that one Tunnel's integrity in order to avoid the type of catastrophe and damage	
26. By or physically attempt	, 20 ed to repair the dam	, neither [city] nor any other defendant had repage to the Tunnel at the bridge.	paired
the Tunnel resulted in and, on information a individuals affected a	n a local emergency and belief, approxim and caused damages	River rushed into the underground Tunnel. This breach and the mid-day evacuation of numerous buildings in the downtown distrately persons. The event threatened the safety of in the many millions of dollars. The area was also declared a federal disal and a state disaster area by the Governor of the State of	rict f all
the	bridge, and	nd the Class were caused by the violation and partial collapse of the Tunispecifically, in the immediate vicinity of the pilings installed by and related conduct of the defendants.	nel at
they conducted their sustained injury to th	business, or in which eir property; lost rev	the Class were forced to evacuate the buildings which they owned, in which they were employed as a result of this sudden and calamitous event and enues, sales, profits and good will; suffered lost wages, tips and commiss oximately caused by the complained of conduct.	
30. As a result of the	defendants' conduct	, each of the plaintiffs was damaged:	
[describe damage for	each plaintiff]		
COUNT I WIL	FUL AND WANTO	N CONDUCT	
(Dredge Owner)			

1-23. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-8, 12-20, 22 and 28-32 of the general allegations above as if fully set forth herein.

24	[areage owner] owed to plaintills and the Class the following duties, both ordinary and
	ntractual based upon the work and the Tunnel:
	a. the duty to conduct the bridge construction with reasonable care and in accordance with the standards observed by contractors carrying out such projects; and
	b. the duty to accurately report to governmental authorities about the work performed under the Contract, including both during and after construction completion.
	se duties were owed to the public and specifically to those parties likely to be adversely affected by a break in of the Tunnel system in a location such as concerned here.
26	[dredge owner] breached these duties, failed to exercise ordinary care in the performance
of its we	ork, and showed an utter indifference to, and conscious disregard for the safety, life, property and interests of s and the Class by:
	a. failing to consult or confer with knowledgeable authorities and to refer to
	b. failing to take adequate safeguards against a breach of the Tunnel by the
	c. failing to file with the appropriate State of authorities accurate reports about the work that was performed under the Contract.
	a direct and proximate result of the wilful and wanton conduct of [dredge owner], the was damaged and plaintiffs and the Class have suffered the following types of damages:
;	a. damage to real and personal property;
1	b. loss of income, sales and profits;
(c. additional unnecessary payroll expenses;
(d. loss of wages, tips, earnings and commissions; and
(e. other expenses proximately caused by defendant's conduct.
	precise amount of such loss and damage to plaintiffs and the Class is not known to plaintiffs at this time, but is estimate those damages to be far in excess of one million (\$1,000,000.00) dollars.
29. At a	ll times relevant, plaintiffs and the Class were free from any negligence on their part.
Wheref	Fore, plaintiffs request this Court to enter the following orders:
A. That	this action be declared and maintained as a class action pursuant to Section of the Code of Civil Procedure;

B. That judgment be entered for plaintiffs and the Class against amount of their loss and damage;	[dredge owner] in the full
C. That following a finding of strict liability, a special master be appointed by t determining damages;	his Court to assist the Court in
D. That an order be entered awarding the special master, plaintiffs and the Clas expenses of litigation and costs of suit; and	s their reasonable attorneys' fees,
E. That the Court award such other relief as the Court may consider appropriate	e and just.
COUNT II NEGLIGENCE	
(Dredge Owner)	
1-23. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in paragraph forth herein.	graphs 1-23 of Count I as if fully set
24 [dredge owner] owed to plaintiffs and the Class the extracontractual based upon the work and the Tunnel:	ne following duties, both ordinary and
a. the duty to conduct the bridge construction accordance with the standards observed by contractors carrying out such	
b. the duty to accurately report to governmental authorities about the woincluding both during and after construction completion.	ork performed under the Contract,
25. These duties were owed to the public and specifically to those parties likely the following orders:	to be adversely affected by a break in
A. That this action be declared and maintained as a class action pursuant to Sec Code of Civil Procedure;	tion of the
B. That judgment be entered for plaintiffs and the Class againstamount of their loss and damage;	[dredge owner] in the full
C. That following a finding of strict liability, a special master be appointed by t determining damages;	his Court to assist the Court in
D. That an order be entered awarding the special master, plaintiffs and the Clas expenses of litigation and costs of suit; and	s their reasonable attorneys' fees,
E. That the Court award such other relief as the Court may consider appropriate	e and just.
COUNT III WILFUL AND WANTON CONDUCT	
(City)	

1-26. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-12, 15-16 and 21-32 of the general allegations above as if fully set forth herein.
27. The [city] owed to plaintiffs and the Class the following duties, both ordinary and
extracontractual based upon the work and the Tunnel:
a. the duty to exercise ordinary care to inspect, maintain and protect its property, and specifically, the Tunnel in a reasonably safe condition;
b. the duty to promptly repair the known dangerous condition created by the breached Tunnel; and
c. the duty to warn plaintiffs and the Class about the dangerous condition of the Tunnel when it became known to the [city].
28. The [city] breached its duty, failed to exercise ordinary care to maintain the Tunnel in a reasonably safe manner and showed an utter indifference to, and conscious disregard for the safety, life, property and interests of plaintiffs and the Class by:
a. failing to repair the damage to the breached Tunnel when it became known to the city; and
b. failing to warn plaintiffs and the Class about the dangerous condition when it became known to the city; and
29. As a direct and proximate result of the wilful and wanton conduct of the city, the Tunnel was damaged and plaintiffs and the Class have suffered the following types of damages:
a. damage to real and personal property;
b. loss of income, sales and profits;
c. additional unnecessary payroll expenses;
d. loss of wages, tips, earnings and commissions; and
e. other expenses proximately caused by defendant's conduct.
30. The precise amount of such loss and damage to plaintiffs and the Class is not known to plaintiffs at this time, but blaintiffs estimate those damages to be far in excess of one million (\$1,000,000.00) dollars.
31. At all times relevant, plaintiffs and the Class were free from any negligence on their part.
Wherefore, plaintiffs request this Court to enter the following orders:
A. That this action be declared and maintained as a class action pursuant to Section of the Code of Civil Procedure;

B. That judgment be entered for plaintiffs and the Class against their loss and damage;	[city] in the full amount of
C. That following a finding of strict liability, a special master be appointed by this Codetermining damages;	urt to assist the Court in
D. That an order be entered awarding the special master, plaintiffs and the Class their expenses of litigation and costs of suit; and	reasonable attorneys' fees,
E. That the Court award such other relief as the Court may consider appropriate and ju	ust.
COUNT IV NEGLIGENCE	
(City)	
1-26. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in paragraphs herein.	1-26 Count III as if fully set forth
27. The [city] obtained insurance for the work and was an action policy of [dredge owner]. A copy of the insurance certificate	
28. The [city] owed to plaintiffs and the Class the following extracontractual, based upon the work and the Tunnel:	duties, both ordinary and
a. the duty to exercise ordinary care to inspect, maintain and protect its proper Tunnel in a reasonably safe condition;	ty, and specifically, the
b. the duty to promptly repair the known dangerous condition created by the b	reached Tunnel; and
c. the duty to warn plaintiffs and the Class about the dangerous condition of the known to the [city].	e Tunnel when it became
29. The [city] breached its duties by:	
a. failing to inform and advise [dredge owner] about of the Tunnel;	the existence and location
b. failing to adequately contract for, supervise and monitor the placement of the	ne pilings;
c. failing to regulate and/or provide for safeguards in the Contract to limit the event of a breach of the Tunnel;	potential damage in the
d. failing to maintain the Tunnel in a reasonably safe condition; and	
e. failing to take such other reasonable, responsible and competent actions nec safety, lives, property and interests of plaintiffs and the Class.	essary to safeguard the

30. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent conduct of, the Tunnel was damaged and plaintiffs and the Class

have suffered the following types of damages:	
a. damage to real and personal property;	
b. loss of income, sales and profits;	
c. additional unnecessary payroll expenses;	
d. loss of wages, tips, earnings and commissions; and	
e. other expenses proximately caused by defendant's conduct.	
31. The precise amount of such loss and damage to plaintiffs and the Class is not know plaintiffs estimate those damages to be far in excess of one million (\$1,000,000.00) do	=
32. At all times relevant, plaintiffs and the Class were free from any negligence on the	eir part.
Wherefore, plaintiffs request this Court to enter the following orders:	
A. That this action be declared and maintained as a class action pursuant to Section Code of Civil Procedure;	of the
B. That judgment be entered for plaintiffs and the Class against their loss and damage;	[city] in the full amount of
C. That following a finding of strict liability, a special master be appointed by this Co determining damages;	urt to assist the Court in
D. That an order be entered awarding the special master, plaintiffs and the Class their expenses of litigation and costs of suit; and	reasonable attorneys' fees,
E. That the Court award such other relief as the Court may consider appropriate and ju	ıst.
COUNT V THIRD PARTY BENEFICIARY CLAIM	
([city] and[dredge owner])	
1-23. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in paragraph general allegations above as if fully set forth herein.	1-10, 12, 15-21 and 23-32 of the
24. Plaintiffs and the Class are third-party beneficiaries of the Contract.	
25. There is a contractual duty to act with reasonable care in the performance of the coabove stated contractual relationship.	onstruction operation from the
26. The [city] and [dredge owner] act with reasonable care under the circumstances.	breached these duties by failing to

following types of damages:
a. damage to real and personal property;
b. loss of income, sales and profits;
c. additional unnecessary payroll expenses;
d. loss of wages, tips, earnings and commissions; and
e. other expenses proximately caused by defendant's conduct.
28. The precise amount of such loss and damage to plaintiffs and the Class is not known to plaintiffs at this time, but plaintiffs estimate those damages to be far in excess of one million (\$1,000,000.00) dollars.
29. At all times relevant, plaintiffs and the Class were free from any negligence on their part.
Wherefore, plaintiffs request this Court to enter the following orders:
A. That this action be declared and maintained as a class action pursuant to Section of the Code of Civil Procedure;
B. That judgment be entered for plaintiffs and the Class against [city] and [dredge owner] in the full amount of their loss and damage;
C. That following a finding of strict liability, a special master be appointed by this Court to assist the Court in determining damages;
D. That an order be entered awarding the special master, plaintiffs and the Class their reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses of litigation and costs of suit; and
E. That the Court award such other relief as the Court may consider appropriate and just.
COUNT VI GUARANTEE
[dredge owner]
1-23. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in paragraph 1-8, 12-21 and 28-32 of the general allegations above as if fully set forth herein.
24. Plaintiffs and the Class are third-party beneficiaries of the guarantee provided to the [city] by [dredge owner] covering its material and workmanship. A copy of the guarantee is attached hereto as Exhibit "C" and made a part hereof.
25. The precise amount of such loss and damage to plaintiffs and the Class is not known to plaintiffs at this time, but plaintiffs estimate those damages to be far in excess of one million (\$1,000,000.00) dollars.

26. At all times relevant for any of the actions cannot be actions of the actions cannot be actions of the action of th		ss were free from any negligen	ce on their part and were not responsible
Wherefore, plaintiffs r	equest this Court to ente	er the following orders:	
	leclared and maintained Code of Civil Procedu		ection of the
B. That judgment be en amount of their loss and	_	the Class against	[dredge owner] in the full
C. That following a find determining damages;	ding of strict liability, a	special master be appointed by	y this Court to assist the Court in
D. That an order be ent expenses of litigation a		al master, plaintiffs and the Cla	ass their reasonable attorneys' fees,
E. That the Court award	d such other relief as the	Court may consider appropria	ate and just.
COUNT VII ABN	ORMALLY DANGER	OUS ACTIVITY	
([<i>city</i>] and	[dredge owner]	
1-25. Plaintiffs repeat allegations above as if	_	very allegation contained in par	ragraph 1-20 and 28-32 of the general
activity. The carrying of	on of pile driving activiti	es in the river in close proximi	k constituted an abnormally dangerous ity to an extensive underground structure with the utmost degree of care.
27. The creation and m inherently dangerous co		nder a riverbed is an unnatural	condition of land and constitutes an
by the		[city]	and conditions, the Tunnel was breached and [dredge
		of harm expected given the da red the following types of dam	ngerous condition of the land and activity nages:
a. damage to rea	al and personal property	;	
b. loss of incom	ne, sales and profits;		
c. additional un	necessary payroll expens	ses;	
d. loss of wages	s, tips, earnings and com	missions; and	
e. other expense	es proximately caused by	y defendant's conduct.	

30. The precise amount of such loss and damage to plaintiffs and the Class is not known to plaintiffs at this time, but plaintiffs estimate those damages to be far in excess of one million (\$1,000,000.00) dollars.
31. At all times relevant, plaintiffs and the Class were free from any negligence on their part.
Wherefore, plaintiffs request this Court to enter the following orders:
A. That this action be declared and maintained as a class action pursuant to Section of the Code of Civil Procedure;
B. That judgment be entered for plaintiffs and the Class against the [city] and [dredge owner] in the full amount of their loss and damage;
C. That following a finding of strict liability, a special master be appointed by this Court to assist the Court in determining damages;
D. That an order be entered awarding the special master, plaintiffs and the Class their reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses of litigation and costs of suit; and
E. That the Court award such other relief as the Court may consider appropriate and just.
COUNT VIII ULTRA-HAZARDOUS ACTIVITY
([city] and[dredge owner])
1-25. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-25 of Count VII as if fully set forth herein.
26. Defendants' activities in relation to their excavation and construction work constituted an ultra-hazardous activity or enterprise. The carrying on of pile driving activities in the river in close proximity to an extensive underground structure such as the Tunnel necessarily involved an enormous risk of harm to plaintiffs and the Class which could not be eliminated by the exercise of the utmost care.
27. The creation and maintenance of a tunnel under a riverbed is an unnatural condition of land and constitutes an ultra-hazardous condition.
28. As a direct and proximate result of these ultra-hazardous activities and conditions, the Tunnel was breached by the
strictly liable for the resulting damages.
29. Plaintiffs and the Class sustained the types of harm expected given the ultra-hazardous condition of the land and the activity. Specifically, plaintiffs and the Class have suffered the following types of damages:
a. damage to real and personal property;
b. loss of income, sales and profits;
c. additional unnecessary payroll expenses;

1	1	c		. •		1		1
d	locc.	∩t.	Wages	fine	earnings	and	commissions:	and
u.	1000	$\mathbf{o}_{\mathbf{i}}$	wages.	upo.	Carmings	ana	COMMISSIONS.	ana

e. other [6expenses proximately caused by defendant's conduct.

30. The precise amount of such loss and damage to plaintiffs and the Class is not known to plaintiffs at this time, but plaintiffs estimate those damages to be far in excess of one million (\$1,000,000.00) dollars.

31	. At all times	relevant.	plaintiffs	and the	Class v	were free	from an	y negligence	on their i	nart
	. I It wil tillion	i oro i arre,	pidilitii	and the	CIUDD	,, сте ттее	II OIII aii	, megingenee	OII tile II	pui

Wherefore, plaintiffs request this Court to enter the following orders:

he
h

FOOTNOTES:

Attorneys for CLASS

(n1)Footnote 1. This Form is taken from the lawsuits filed in the Chicago Flood Litigation arising out of the flooding of the Chicago Tunnel System on April 13, 1992.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

* See 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. I (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-633

FORM No. 1-633 Vessel Damage - - Contact With Bridge

local custom and practice.

		[vessel] was in complian fety in the navigation of the	
7. On	, 20, at	hours, the	[vessel]
		and discharged her c	
	Said discharge was complete	ed at hours.	_
8 Δt	hours the	[vessel] left the dock of	
		operated by the defendant	
		on the River to	, - 110
9. As the	 [vessel] approached	I the Bridge the	draw of the bridge was
open and all traffic lig	ghts were green indicating that it	was safe for the	to proceed.
10. As the	[vessel] passed un	der the draw of the	Bridge, the draw of
		and prior to the time the [vessel] causing extensive physical d	
was at a safe distance man, maintain, operat	away from the Bridge, thete and repair said bridge. As a res	[vessel] had passed con was negligent and bre sult of the negligence of the naged causing loss to the plaintiff in excess	eached its duty to safely, the
_	n due and proper notice to the attached hereto as Exhibit A.	pursuant to	A
Wherefore, plaintiff	, respect	fully request this court for judgment again plus interests, costs and s	nst defendant uch other further relief
as the court deems just		,	
[name of party] By:			
[attorney]			
FOOTNOTES:			
(n1)Footnote 1. See 1	Form No. 1-1 <i>supra</i> .		

* See 2 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. I (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
PROPERTY DAMAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-660

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-660RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS REPAIRS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-661

FORM No. 1-661 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--Repairs

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties	s] n1
4. At or during the period between, 20	
plaintiff upon the order and request of defendant, furnished at	,
certain material, services, repairs, and supplies to the said vessel of rea	sonable value of approximately \$
·	
5. Despite numerous requests to do so, the said defendant, has failed, neglected and refused to pay any	
and owing to plaintiff on account thereof, plus accrued service charges	
same can now be estimated.	, as hearry as the
[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment and Verification] n2	
FOOTNOTES:	
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1, 1-2 and 1-5 supra.	
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6, 1-10, 1-11 and 1-12 supr	ra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
REPAIRS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-662

FORM No. 1-662 Complaint In Rem and In Personam by Assignee of Claim--Repairs

4. At all times herein mentioned _______ and ______ were, and now are, doing business at the port of _______, as a _______ [describe business entity], under the firm name of _______.

5. During the month of _______, 20 _____, at the port of _______, said _______, at the instance and request of the master of said vessel, certain repairs to the sails of said vessel, of the reasonable and agreed value of \$______.

6. Although demand has been made upon said vessel, her master and owners, for the payment of said sum of \$______, no part thereof has been paid.

7. Thereafter, and prior to the commencement of this action, said claim against said vessel _______, together with the maritime lien against said vessel _______ arising out of said claim and held by said _______, were duly assigned by said _______ to plaintiff, and that plaintiff is the present owner and holder of the same.

[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment and Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1, 1-2 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6 and 1-10 through 1-13 supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
REPAIRS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-663

FORM No. 1-663 Complaint In Personam Against Insurer and Boatyard--Delay of Repairs

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

4. The plaintiff was, from _______, 20 _____, and through the date of filing of the original complaint herein, the ________, Official Number ______. The defendant, ______ Insurance Company, entered into a contract of insurance, Number ______, with the plaintiff on ______, 20 _____, to insure the said vessel ______ for _____ year(s) for the sum of ______ Dollars (\$); a copy of said contract of insurance is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit A The said insurance was payable to plaintiff and ______, which said company then held a preferred ship mortgage on the said vessel ______ in the approximate amount of _____ Dollars, (\$ ______). 5. The said insurance policy provided that in the event of loss or damage, the underwriters should be notified so that they might appoint their own surveyor; further, that the underwriters would be entitled to decide the port to which a damaged vessel should proceed for docking and repairing, and further, that the underwriters should also have a right of veto in connection with the place of repair or repairing firm proposed, and that the underwriters might take or might require to be taken tenders for the repair of such damage. 6. While the said vessel ______ insured as aforesaid by the defendant, _____ Insurance Company on or about _______, 20 ______, the said vessel departed on a voyage within the territorial limits of the State of ______; on or about ______, 20 _____, the said vessel, through no fault of the plaintiff, drifted and ran aground on a beach near ______, _____. The beaching was reported promptly to defendant ______ Marine Surveyor,

Marine Adjuster and agent of the defendant-insurance company. On or about ______, 20 _____, the

said, agent of the defendant-insurance co	
operations; the defendant entered into a c	contract with a commercial salvage firm to deliver the
said vessel to a marine railway at the Port of	; the said vessel was so delivered and placed on
Marine Railway at	
, 20, the said	, agent of the defendant-insurance company, took
complete charge and control of salvage operations; the defendant	entered into a contract with a
commercial salvage firm to deliver the said vessel to a marine rail	way at the Port of,
; the said vessel was so delivered and pla	ced on Marine Railway at
, on or about	, 20, where it remained
until, 20, undergoing hull repairs	under a contract made by the said defendant,
, with the said Marine Railway.	
7. While the said vessel was on the said	
, agent of the defendant-insurance compa	ny, made a verbal contract with the defendant,
, to repair the engine and accessories of the	
, employed an incompetent mechanic to e	
properly done and were never completed. A reasonable time to complete time time to complete time to complete time time time time time time time t	
but the said engine repair work was commenced on	
operated in a satisfactory manner at any time to the date of the filling	
continuation of the employment of the aforesaid incompetent med	
, agent of the defendant-insurance compa	
, that plaintiff had no choice in the matter	
defendants, jointly and severally, through their agents and employ	
engine and accessories, and denied to plaintiff any and all control	over the said repairs, and denied plaintiff access to the
said vessel.	
8. It was the duty of the defendant, Yach	at Storage Company, to complete the said engine and
accessory repairs to the said vessel withi	
, through inattention, carelessness, neglection	ct, and improper mechanical work, caused the vessel
to be laid up, causing damage and loss to plaintiff.	
9. It was the duty of the defendant, Insur	
, having elected to assume control and dis	
to expedite the said repairs and/or pay the losses sustained by the p	
performance of their duties they elected to assume, and failed in the	
loss to the plaintiff. It was the duty of defendant,	
	es and occupying an authoritative and advantageous
position, to deal fairly with the insured plaintiff, but the defendant	
through its agents, coerced, threatened, abused, and took advantag	ge of the helpless condition of the plaintiff, causing
damage and loss to the plaintiff.	
10. Because of defendant-insurance company's assumption of con-	trol of the said vessel, and the incompetence or
negligence of the Yacht Storage compan	y, the plaintiff was denied the use of his said vessel
for operations from	. 20 . a reasonable date for completion of
the aforesaid repairs to engine and accessories, to the present date.	
defendants, their agents, and employees, that the vessel would soo	•
other business interests and to his business affairs.	,
11. As the result of the assumption of control over said vessel by t	he defendant-insurance company and its agent,
defendant, and because of the inattention	

Yacht Storage Compar	ny, plaintiff was unable to meet mortgage payments on the said vessel
·	
•	nd travel in the interests of preserving his rights in and to the said vessel nse, being hindered by the acts or omissions of the defendant-insurance
	, and because of the neglect, inattention, and
indifference of the defendant	Yacht Storage Company, its agents or employees.
13. The plaintiff proffered his personal time and repairs to the said vessel	I services and did everything possible to help expedite the aforesaid
	, immediately prior to the beaching was \$; the
	nittent, improper, and careless repairs, or lack of repairs, made to the
15. As a direct and proximate result of the carelo <i>suffered</i>].	essness and negligence of the defendant(s) [allege injuries and damages
[Demand for Judgment] n2	
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 <i>sup</i>	ra.
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 supra.	

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS REPAIRS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-664

FORM No. 1-664 Complaint In Personam--Shipyard and Breach of Contract and Breach of Warrantyn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

4. On or about, 20, plaintiff delivered to the defendant a propeller for reconditioning,
which services were performed by defendant at a cost of \$
5. Upon the completion of the reconditioning of said propeller, it was delivered to Shipyard, at
where it was installed upon the vessel some time between
, 20, when the vessel was placed on dry-dock, and, 20,
when the vessel underwent a sea trial.
6. During said sea trial, on or about, 20, the vessel experienced vibration in the propeller, which required said vessel to discontinue the sea trial, return to
Shipyard, and undergo repairs to the propeller.
7. The damage to the propeller was caused without fault on plaintiff's part and was due solely to the careless, negligent, unskilled, and unworkmanlike manner in which defendant reconditioned the propeller.
8. As a result thereof, plaintiff has sustained damage in the amount of \$, as nearly as can now be ascertained, no part of which has been paid although duly demanded.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

9. Plaintiff entered into a contract and agreement with defendant to recondition the propeller on the vessel

for which work plaintiff agreed to pay to defendant the cost thereof.
10. Plaintiff entered into said contract with defendant relying upon an implied warranty by defendant that said reconditioning work would be done in a careful, skillful, and workmanlike manner.
11. Defendant failed to perform said reconditioning work and repair work, as provided for in the contract, in a careful skillful, and workmanlike manner, as heretofore alleged, and thereby breached-the warranty entered into with plaintif
12. Plaintiff has duly performed all of the conditions of said contract on its part to be performed and, as a result of the breach of warranty on the part of defendant, plaintiff has suffered the injuries heretofore alleged.
13. By reason thereof, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of \$ as nearly as can now be ascertained, no part of which has been paid although duly demanded.
[Demand for Judgment] n3
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Red Star Towing and Transportation Co. v. Godfrey Propeller Adjusting Corp., Civ. No. 84-2551 (E.D.N.Y. 1984).
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS REPAIRS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-665

FORM No. 1-665 Complaint In Personam Against Boatyard--Negligent Performance of Repairs to a Yachtn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2

A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

-			owner and operator of the Yachngaged in the business of vessel	
			at all times hereinafter mentione as located at	
and	to acquire and ins	stall two custom b	engaged the defendant to condubuilt aluminum fuel tanks aboard emoved from the Yacht	d said vessel, which
additional repair work to be dethe proper repairs and tank ins	one, defendant br tallations require ing the Yacht	reached its agreemed to be made, by	for the fuel tanks nent with the plaintiff by neglec failing to furnish the custom bu to the plaintiff in	ting and failing to make ilt fuel tanks required to
			d, neglected, and refused, and c n its improper work performed of	
9. As a result of the foregoing	, plaintiff has bee	en damaged in the	amount of \$	

A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

10. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 8 of this Complaint wiif set forth fully herein at length.	ith the same force and effect as
11. By reason of defendant's failure to return the Yacht	tiff in a seaworthy condition, I has suffered damages and lost
A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION	
12. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 5 of this Complaint wi if set forth fully herein at length.	ith the same force and effect as
13. Upon information and belief, on or about	ages by reason of the gence on the part of plaintiff
14. As a result of defendant's carelessness and negligence, plaintiff's vessel sustained seri damage to its hull and center beam and the collapse of its inner deck.	ous damages, including
15. Although plaintiff has demanded that defendant repair the damages sustained by the Y, defendant has refused and continues to refuse to make the nece	
16. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff has sustained damages in the amount of \$	
[Demand for Judgment] n3	
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Stan Fay, Inc. v. Star Island Yacht Cl. (E.D.N.Y. 1984).	ub, Inc., Civ. No. 84-3418
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.	
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.	
* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admira	lty, §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender

7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
REPAIRS *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-666

FORM No. 1-666 Complaint--Improper Ship Repairs to Chartered Vessel

in due course after the repairs should be completed and in first-class working condition.

1. This is a case of Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction as hereinafter more fully appears, and is an Admiralty or Maritime claim within the meaning of Rule 9(h).

2. At all times hereinafter mentioned, the plaintiff, ________, was a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of _______, with an office and principal place of business at _______.

3. Upon information and belief, at all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendant, _______, was and still is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _______ with an office and principal place of business at ______.

4. At all times relevant hereto, the plaintiff, _______, owned a vessel, named, ______.

5. At all times relevant hereto, the defendant, ______ engaged in the business of ship and/or boat repairing at its location in ______.

6. On or about the month of _______ 20 _____, the plaintiff placed the vessel, ________.

"_________ "in the care and the custody of the defendant for the purpose of making sundry and certain repairs thereto. These repairs were to be made in a workmanlike manner and the yacht was to be returned to the plaintiff

	ant hereto, the defendant agreed to, into a first-class working c	to perform repairs and to upgrade the vendition	vessel,
	, into a first-class working c	condition.	
8. The vessel,	, owned by th	ne plaintiff, was engaged in the busines regions off the coast of the Unit	ss of chartering in the ed States.
		months, the vessel, t, who was allegedly completing repair	
		done by the defendant throughout the pstimated in excess ofbeen duly paid by the plaintiff.	
	vant hereto,	was the principal officer of	, and the
12. In addition to repvessel,	pairs to the, for an additional	the defendant, (\$, agreed to paint the) Dollars.
manner, resulting in 14. The repair and u done in an unseaman	the loss of charter to the plaintif pgrading work performed by nlike and unworkmanlike manne	e plain tiff and was done in an unsatisfate of (\$ pursuant to context, was faulty and defective, which resure off the coast of) Dollars. tract with the plaintiff was ilted in the vessel,
into port.	, sustaining serious damage	on the coast of	and having to be to wea
		, because of the negligence on the p ts of water and damaging almost all sy	
any fault, neglect or person or persons fo breach of contract or	want of care on the part of the part whom the plaintiff was or is re-	, and the subsequer laintiff,, or it sponsible, but was caused by the fault,, its agents, servan ding of the vessel.	s principal officer, or any neglect, lack of care and
17. Subsequently, the became a virtual total	ne vessel, al loss, causing the plaintiff,	, could not maintain her schedule of, to cease as a via	charters and the vessel ble business.
18. The estimated re		, is estimated a	t
19. The contract ent	ered into by the plaintiff and the	defendant was entered into in the State	e of
	early as plaintiff can now ascertain	t of the improper repairs done by the d in, to the sum of has been paid, although payment there	(\$

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

22. As previously mentioned, th	e vessel,, was	engaged in the business of being chartered in	
		Sea. As a result of the loss of the vessel,	
	e negligence and fault of the defendant l	nerein, the plaintiff has lost all revenue from said	
chartering.			
•	-	ering of the vessel,, as	
nearly as plaintiff can now ascer	rtain, is in the sum in excess of	(\$)	
Dollars per year and business lo	ss is estimated at an excess of	(\$)	
Dollars as of this date.			
Wherefore, plaintiff demands ju	udgment against the defendant in the sur	n of(\$	
) Dolla	rs for the first cause of action, and (\$) Dollars as and for the	
second cause of action in addition	on to interest, costs and attorneys fees.		
Dated:			
Attorney for Plaintiff			

^{*} See 1 Benedict on Admiralty, ch. XII (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty, §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SALVAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-667

FORM No. 1-667 Complaint In Rem by Owner on Behalf of All Concerned--Salvage

Capnon ana Jurisaictione	u Statementj ni		
	ter mentioned the plaintiff f the State of		d is a corporation organized under wner of the vessel
3. The vesseldistrict.	[salvaged vessel] is	s within the port of	and within this
	is a and upwards and is engaged in the		essel is of the value of about \$ petroleum products for her owner,
			, an experienced master, and
5. The vessel	left	, at	on
, ·	20, in ballast, bound for t	here to take on a cargo of _	, the
	urgently needed by it. While sh		
A.M. on, those in		_, those in charge of the ves	sel sighted a vessel about five
miles distant which, when	distant which, when the vessel had approached within about one and one-half mil		about one and one-half miles,
proved to be a dismasted s	hip flying signals of distress and	with her colors at half mas	t. In response to the signals of
distress the course of the v	esselv	was thereupon immediately	changed, and, upon nearer
approach, it was discovere	d that the vessel was the	She was	lying dismasted and adrift in an
apparently helpless conditi	on in the trough of the sea in ab	out latitude	, longitude
	It was ascertained that the ship h	nad been in this helpless con	dition since early morning of the

previous day, when l	her rigging had been carried off i	in a topsail gale. The vessel	approached
		sked the master of the	
		begged for assistance and that the	
taken in tow. To this	the master of the vessel	assented and proceed	ed to endeavor to make fast
		me was very rough and a high sea was i	
		required a high degree of	
		as no success, but, with persistent and c	
		o'clock in the afternoon of	
		in tow and proceed to	
		able refuge and over two hundred miles	
		ment, consisting of	
until about	P.M. when the v	valuable 10" hawser of the	parted at the
		spite of the utmost care used by the	
		he weather was too rough to attempt to	
	=	A.M. on the net morning, a	
		in tow at about	
		, 20, the	
		Light Ship, and at	
received a pilot from	the port of	and proceeded into	Harbor with the
		finally anchored off quarantine at about	
afternoon.		1	
6. The plaintiff alleg	es upon information and belief, t	that the value of the	in the condition in
		ted to the sum of \$	
cargo, consisting of	, amoun	nted to \$, all of	f which was fully saved by
reason of the salvage	e services rendered.		
		was greatly delaye	
		xtra quantity of fuel, and sustained dama	
amount as yet unkno and freight.	own to the plaintiff, but which the	ey ask to recover as expenses from the s	ailing ship and her cargo
and freight.			
8. The vessel	at the time that	at the came to	her rescue was in an utterly
		ent danger of becoming a total loss. She	
•		vessel and were prevented only by the	
		have made the launching of the boats at	
		f extricating the vessel from this situation	
0.1	2	rs were, with danger to their own exceed	1
_		of or injury to the	
		to the respective owners. The plaintiff,	
		nt, by reason of the services so performe	
•		ship are justly entitled to a meet and co	
services.	aring and to ring the said saining	simp are justry contributes to a most and co	imperent survage for such
9. The amount of jus	st compensation claimed for these	e just meritorious salvage services is \$ _	
[Prayer for Process	and Verification] n2		

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-10, 1-11 and 1-12, supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 161 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 51, 52 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 3 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 21, 33, 45, 66 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
SALVAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-668

FORM No. 1-668 Complaint In Rem by Owner on Behalf of All Concerned--Salvage

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

master could see them with sufficient clearness to ascertain the nature of the vessels.

4. The vessel ______ is a ______ built in 20 _____. She is ______ feet long, _____ feet wide and ______ feet deep. Her gross registered tonnage is ______ tons and her net is ______ . Her under deck tonnage is ______ and her engines develop an indicated horsepower of ______. Her value at the time of the salvage services hereinafter mentioned was approximately _____.

5. At the time of the salvage services hereinafter mentioned, the crew of the vessel ______ consisted of her _____.

6. The barges ______, ____, _____, _____, _____, _____, _____, and ______ are dock barges of the type customarily used in ______ Harbor for the carriage of _______, and were, as far as the plaintiff has any information, approximately _______ feet long, ______ feet wide and ________ to _________ feet deep. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the approximate value of each of the aforesaid barges at the time the services referred to herein were rendered was from \$ ______ to \$

7. On the evening of ______, 20 ____ at about ________ o'clock, the vessel _______ while proceeding down the River sighted a fleet of barges which afterwards proved to be the fuel barges referred to herein, drifting in a direction from the ________ to the _______. The night was dark and because of the poor light shown by the six barges, the vessel was close upon them before her

8. The vessel	altered her course	e and went alongside the fuel ba	rges, which proved to be
drifting, although made fast t	o one another. The persons	on board the barges stated to th	e master of the vessel
tha	t they had drifted away from	n their moorings off	and requested that
the master of the vessel	tow the	em to the stakeboat.	
from the	to the	ated the fuel barges they were ab and were in the changed tide under the influence of a s	nel for vessels passing up and
		the course of vessels rounding	<u> </u>
The barges, being thus forced at the south end of Island or the six barges, the vessel north side of the services rendered by the vess fact that the harbor was full of	d toward the took t those took t The six barge sel of floating Ice which interfer	shore, were also in depicts. In accordance with the rethem in tow and proceeded with es were then made fast and left in were hindered and impeded an	anger of colliding with the piers request of the persons on board a them to the stakeboat at the n safety at the stakeboard. The d rendered more difficult by the es, and made it necessary for the
		over a perionses through the ice for a distance	
to be the was proceeding out to sea an	, were seen a short dist d apparently had not sighted b blasts in answer to which t	p the fuel barges, the lights of a tance away, heading almost dired the barges until the vessel the vessel changed her course just the fleet.	ectly for the barges. The vessel blew an
of merit. They were furnished	d promptly, efficiently and s in the harbor, and resulted i	and the plaintiff were satisfied and under conditions with taking the six barges from the ce of safety without damage.	which were rendered difficult
10. By reason of the premise	s the plaintiff is entitled to a	a liberal salvage award.	
There has not been any paym	ent for these services to the	plaintiff.	
[Prayer for Process and Ver	fication] n2		
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form N	os. 1-1 and 1-2 <i>supra</i> .		
(n2)Footnote 2. See For	m Nos. 1-3, 1-11 and 1-12 s	supra.	

^{*} See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 161 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 51, 52 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 3 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 21, 33, 45, 66 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SALVAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-669

FORM No. 1-669 Complaint In Personam by Master on Behalf of All Concerned Against Vessel Owner--Salvage

[Caption, Jurisdiction	nal Statement, and Allegations Conce	erning Parties] n1		
4 On the	day of	20	plaintiff being at sea, and how	nd to the
nort of	, in the said vessel	, 20	observed a vessel with a signal c	of distress
	ely made for the vessel and discovere			
	as the vessel	_		-
	d, by force of the wind and tide, work			
	ssistance, and said master asked plair			t Hout at
got out hawsers to said water succeeded in he bound to sea, and desi	consented to render such assistance and vessel, and by constant heaving, preaving her off without injury. Therewirous of not being delayed, and that he who would pay him his reasonab	revented her work pon the master of ne would give pla	cing further up into the sand, and at the vessel informed plaintiff that h intiff a letter to his owner, the defe	t high he was endant,
	ning him that plaintiff had rendered t	•	1 2 1	
	consented to allow the said vessel to j, he presented said letter to said o		<u>*</u>	d his
	had been periled in rendering such a, if paid without delay or trouble		-	rmed, said
vessel and cargo were	e worth the sum of \$, and the	said sum of \$	was
an inadequate salvage	compensation, but said owner refuse	ed to pay the sam	e, or to pay any more than \$	

[Demand for Judgment] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-6 supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 161 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 51, 52 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 3 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 21, 33, 45, 66 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SALVAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-670

FORM No. 1-670 Complaint In Rem by Seaman on Behalf of All Concerned--Salvage

[Caption and Jurisdictional Statement] n1

the vessel	·		
	, on a passage from		
being tight, staunch, and	well found, and manned with a crew of abo	out me	en, on or about the
	day of, 20	, on the high seas, fell in with t	he wreck of the
vessel	, about mil	es from the port of	, said
A fter the discovery of	said wreck, a boat was lowered from the ve	accal	and a heat's aware
sent on board to take poss	session of the said wreck so abandoned, and	d after considerable exertion the	ey made fast to the
sent on board to take poss said vessel	session of the said wreck so abandoned, and with hawsers, and altering the control with hawsers.	d after considerable exertion the course of the said	ey made fast to the,
sent on board to take poss said vessel proceeded to the port of _	session of the said wreck so abandoned, and with hawsers, and altering the c with the said vesse	d after considerable exertion the course of the saidel and cargo on tow, and contin	ey made fast to the ued to tow her for
sent on board to take poss said vessel proceeded to the port of _ about	session of the said wreck so abandoned, and with hawsers, and altering the control with hawsers.	d after considerable exertion the course of the saidel and cargo on tow, and continut of,	ey made fast to the, nued to tow her for and in perfect safety,

6. Plaintiff was on board said vessel	at the time of saving said vessel, and assisted in saving
her and her cargo.	
7. By reason of the service so performed, the plaintiff and	the others of the crew of the vessel
are justly entitled to salvage for such service, and to so mudoing and performing the like service, with all charges and	uch as has been and is usually allotted by this court to persons d expenses attending the same.
[Prayer for Process and Verification] n2	
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form No. 1-1 <i>supra</i> .	
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-10 and 1-12 su	upra.

^{*} See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 161 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 51, 52 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 3 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 21, 33, 45, 66 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SALVAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-671

FORM No. 1-671 Complaint In Rem by Salvage Company Against Cargo--Salvage

(Where Salvage of Vessel Has Been Subject of Settlement or Sued for by a Separate Complaint)	
[Caption and Jurisdictional Statement] n1	
2. At all the times herein mentioned plaintiff was and now is a corporation duly organized and existing	
of the State of, having its principal place of business at	,
, and chartered owner in possession of the vessel	
which is a powerful steel vessel of gross tons, and at mentioned was efficiently manned and specially equipped and supplied with wrecking appliances used salvage work.	
3. Plaintiff and the corporations and organizations of which it is the successor, have for a long time mai extensive equipment for the purpose of salving vessels and their cargoes in an waters, such equipment including vessels built for and especially adapted for	nd
business.	
4. Said cargo of ex the vessel is now, or during the c process hereunder will be, within this district and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court.	currency of
5. The aforesaid cargo of, at the time the services hereinafter mentioned were and now are worth, as plaintiff is informed and believes, upwards of \$	

6. On or about _______, 20 ______, the vessel ________, a steel cargo vessel of

	gross tons,		net tons register,	feet	long, and
	feet beam, laden v	with a large and	valuable cargo of	of which	ch the
				from	
				f	
			nmenced to take water in		
7. About	P.M.,		, 20	, the vessel	
	, with a salvage cre	ew and fully eq	uipped with wrecking ed	uipment in charge of an ex	perienced
				valuable cargo, was agrou	
				, left	
proceeded to the		The vessel	arr	ived at	
				s found to be hard aground	
from			feet of water in cargo he	olds and lying broadside on	a reef
				ss and all of her cargo was	
	_	-	_	was reached by which plain	_
				freight on the usual "no cu	
	vage services to the		and her cargo and	i fieight on the usual ho ct	ne, no
pay" basis.					
0. 11	de estre estre estre			C	1. C 11
				mps for installation and ma	
				g of	
				and night in conjunction w	
				d and jettisoned to facilitate	
-	amaged cargo heretofor	e mentioned wa	as lightened into	and place	ed safely
in a warehouse.					
On the evening of		the	[salvaga	d vessel] was floated and to	wad
	where			i vesseij was noated and to	wcu
salely into	where	remaining carg	o was discharged.		
				go while the vessel was str	
severe weather was	encountered and the ver	ssel	and her ci	ew were subjected to great	dangers
and exposure. Gases	were generated in the	holds of the ves	sel	notwithstanding which	h the crew
of the vessel	went	down into the	holds and subjected then	nselves to great danger.	
9. The service rende	red by the vessel		, her master and crev	v, was a salvage service of	a high
				ne peril and but for the serv	
			_	both	
and cargo would have		in conjunc	tion with the vesser	, ootii	VCSSCI
and cargo would have	ve been a total loss.				
The service was pro-	mpt, efficient and succe	essful, requiring	g a high degree of skill o	n the part of the masters and	d crews of
the vessels	and		, involving not o	nly considerable hardship b	out also
great risk to the vess	sel	and	, thei	r equipment and crew. The	service
was long and arduou equipment.	us and in performing sa	me, and plaintif	f incurred heavy expens	nly considerable hardship to r equipment and crew. The es and charges for fuel and	
Wherefore plaintiff	prays:				
	ue form of law, according ction may issue against			rable Court in causes of ad	miralty

2. That all persons having any claim or interest therein may be cited to appear and answer on oath all and singular the

matters aforesaid;

- 3. That this Honorable Court may be pleased to decree to plaintiff a liberal salvage award in the premises and that the said [*cargo*] may be condemned and sold to pay the same; and
- 4. That plaintiff may have such other and further relief in the premises as may be just.

[Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-11 and 1-12 supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 161 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 51, 52 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 3 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 21, 33, 45, 66 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SALVAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-672

FORM No. 1-672 Complaint Against United States (Suits in Admiralty Act)--Salvage

[Caption] n1

•	Act, 46 <i>U.S.C.</i> §§ 741-752, s in rem and desires also to	and plaintiff elects to have this suit proseek relief in personam.	oceed in accordance with the
2. At all the times h	erein mentioned, plaintiff w	vas and now is a corporation duly orga	nized and existing under the laws
of	with its principal p	place of business in	, and owner of the vessel
	, and bailee of the carg	go laden thereon.	
3. Upon information	n and belief, the vessel	is a	of tons gross,
	tons net register,	feet long and	feet beam
and at the time of th	ne service hereinafter mentio	oned was laden with a valuable cargo a	and proceeding on a voyage from
	to	The vessel	was worth, with her cargo
	about \$		
		dant was and still is a sovereign power	
	, a	of tons gross, tons net register,	feet long
and	feet beam.		
		e times hereinafter mentioned was and is action will be within the territorial ju	=
6. At the time of the	e service hereinafter describ	ed, the vessel	_ was laden with a large and

1. This is a case of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, as hereinafter more fully appears. This action arises under the

	yage to		th with her cargo	and freight money	as plaintiff is
informed and believes	, upwards of \$	·			
7. On or about	, 20	, the vessel		, in the prosecutio	n of her
voyage to	became tota	ally disabled by reaso	n of having strip	ped her turbine gear	ing. She was
	epairs at sea as would ena				
	itude				
	's calls for assistance v				he morning of
	and the vessel				
assistance and would a	arrive about	p.m. The	vessel	kep	t in
	ne vessel				
	that towing hawsers w				
	's arrival. The vessel _				
	p.m. The sea was cho				el
	immediately lowered				
	nawsers. Two wire towing				
	commenced to				
	kept a constant watch				wsers and
during the night was c	ompelled to stop to adjus	t the hawsers. Change	es of speed were	made as required an	d at
	a.m				
taken aboard both vess	sels. The vessel	towe	d the vessel		to a safe
	and cast				
merit. The vessel peril of being carried a efficient and successfu	d by the vessel was was ashore by the seas and coal, requiring a high degree and involving also gree boat to take towing have	totally disabled and, ast in draughts and be e of skill on the part o eat risk to the officers	drifting helplessle coming a total lo f the master and and crew of the	ly along a rocky coa oss. The service was crew of the vessel vessel	st, was in great prompt,
fuel and supplies and, equipment including d	, by reas notwithstanding the skill amage resulting from the	and diligence exercise loosening of her mai	ed in rendering t nmast.	he service, sustained	l damage to
and that this Court wil	rays that defendant may be a decree awarding, and damages sustained premises as may be just	g liberaL salvage to pled, together with inter	laintiff and the m	aster and crew of th	e vessel
and further feller ill till	e premises as may be just	L•			
[Verification] n2					
FOOTNOTES:					
(n1)Footnote 1. See F	orm No. 1-1 supra.				
(n2)Footnote 2. S	Lee Form Nos. 1-10, 1-11	and 1-12 supra.			

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 161 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 51, 52 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 3 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 21, 33, 45, 66 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SALVAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty Form 1-683

Form 1-683 Complaint -- Preferred Ship Mortgage

COMES NOW Plaintiff [FINANCIAL INSTITUTION], and for its causes of action against the Defendant vessel, M/V [VESSEL NAME], Official No. [OFFICIAL NUMBER], her engines, masts, anchors, cables, chains, rigging, tackle, apparel, furniture, and all necessaries thereto appertaining, (hereafter collectively referred to as the "VESSEL"), *in rem*, and against Defendants [VESSEL OWNERS], *in personam*, alleges as follows:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 1. This is a case of admiralty jurisdiction as hereinafter more fully appears, and is an admiralty and maritime claim within the meaning of *Rule 9(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 46 U.S.C. § 31325, 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and 28 U.S.C. § 1333.
- 2. Plaintiff [FINANCIAL INSTITUTION] (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff") is a [STATE] corporation, with an office in [PLACE OF BUSINESS]. Plaintiff is, among other things engaged in the business of marine financing.
- 3. The VESSEL is a [VESSEL PARTICULARS], identified by Hull Identification Number [HULL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER], equipped with two marine engines, identified by serial numbers [ENGINE NUMEBRS], and is registered with the United States Coast Guard, Official No. [OFFICIAL NUMBER]. She is now located in [LOCATION OF VESSEL], within the jurisdiction of this Court.
- 4. Defendants, *in personam*, [VESSEL OWNERS] (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Owners") are individuals and residents of the State of California.
- 5. On or about [DATE], the [VESSEL OWNERS] executed a Promissory Note Secured by a Mortgage (the "Note") under which Plaintiff extended credit to [VESSEL OWNERS], and the [VESSEL OWNERS] agreed to pay Plaintiff, the total sum of [MORTGAGE AMOUNT], together with interest and other costs and expenses. A true and correct copy

of the Promissory Note is attached hereto as Exhibit "A". Under the Note and in consideration of Plaintiff's extension of credit to them, the [VESSEL OWNERS] granted Plaintiff a security interest in the VESSEL.

- 6. On [DATE], the [VESSEL OWNERS] as sole owners of the VESSEL, executed and delivered to Plaintiff a First Preferred Ship Mortgage on the VESSEL securing payment of the total amount financed under the Agreement (the "Mortgage"). A copy of the Mortgage is attached hereto as Exhibit "B".
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that the Mortgage was duly filed with the United States Coast Guard in substantial compliance with 46 U.S.C. § 31321 on [DATE] at [TIME], and that all things required to be done by the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920, as amended and recodified, (46 U.S.C., Chapter 313) in order to give the Mortgage the status of a First Preferred Ship Mortgage on the VESSEL were done or caused to be done and that the Mortgage was recorded in Book Number [BOOK NUMBER AND PAGE].
- 8. The [VESSEL OWNERS] have defaulted on the Mortgage. Specifically, the [VESSEL OWNERS] have been late with payments, and have allowed claims of lien to be asserted against the VESSEL, among other defaults.
- 9. By reason of the foregoing, there is now due and owing by the [VESSEL OWNERS] to Plaintiff under the Note and Mortgage the sum of [AMOUNT OWED], plus interest, commencing on [DATE], to the date of satisfaction, plus, among other costs, late fees, costs of retaking and sale, reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and such other sums as the court may award.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Action *in rem* to Foreclose Preferred Ship Mortgage Pursuant to 46 U.S.C. § 31325(b)(1))

- 10. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 9 of this Verified Complaint.
- 11. By reason of the [VESSEL OWNERS]' default under the Note and Mortgage, Plaintiff is entitled to immediate foreclosure of the Mortgage and to recovery of all sums due thereunder.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Action in personam For Mortgage Indebtedness Pursuant to 46 U.S.C. § 31325(b)(2))

- 12. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 11 of this Verified Complaint.
- 13. By reason of [VESSEL OWNERS]' default under the Note and Mortgage, the [VESSEL OWNERS] are now indebted to Plaintiff in the amount of [AMOUNT] plus interest commencing on [DATE], plus costs of retaking and sale, late fees, reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and such other sums as the court may award.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Action in personam For Mortgage Indebtedness Pursuant to 46 U.S.C. § 31325(b)(2)(A))

- 14. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 13 of this Verified Complaint.
- 15. On or about [DATE], the [VESSEL OWNERS] executed an unconditional Promissory Note (the "Note") in favor of Plaintiff in which the [VESSEL OWNERS] guaranteed payment of all installments under the Note when due and, upon acceleration, the entire unpaid balance thereof. A default has, therefore, occurred under the Note and continues to occur.
- 16. The [VESSEL OWNERS] have failed to pay the installments under the Note when due and, upon acceleration, the

entire unpaid balance thereof. A default has, therefore, occurred under the Note and continues to occur.

- 17. By reason of the [VESSEL OWNERS]' default under the Note, Plaintiff is entitled to recovery of all sums due under the Note.
- 18. By reason of the foregoing, there is due and owing by the [VESSEL OWNERS] to Plaintiff under the Note the sum of [AMOUNT] plus interest commencing on [DATE], plus among other costs, late fees, costs of retaking and sale, reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and such other sums as the court may award.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF [FINANCIAL INSTITUTION] demands judgment as follows:

A. On the First Cause of Action against the VESSEL:

- 1. That process *in rem* and a warrant of arrest be issued in due form of law in accordance with the practice of this Honorable Court in cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction against the Vessel M/V [VESSEL NAME], Official No. [OFFICIAL NUMBER], her engines, masts, anchors, cables, chains, rigging, tackle, apparel, furniture, and all necessaries thereto appertaining, with notice to all persons claiming an interest therein to appear in answer to this Verified Complaint;
- 2. That the mortgage be declared a valid and subsisting lien upon the VESSEL, her engines, masts, anchors, cables, chains, rigging, tackle, apparel, furniture, and all necessaries thereto appertaining, prior and superior to the interests, liens, and claims of all persons whatsoever, except such persons as may hold preferred maritime liens on the VESSEL;
- 3. That this Honorable Court shall direct the manner in which the actual notice of the commencement of this suit shall be given by Plaintiff under 46 U.S.C. § 31325;
- 4. That the VESSEL, her engines, masts, anchors, cables, rigging, tackle, apparel, furniture, and all necessaries thereto appertaining be condemned and sold by order of this Honorable Court, and applied toward the amounts required to be paid by the [VESSEL OWNERS] under the Note and Mortgage, including without limitation, [AMOUNT], plus interest commencing on [DATE], plus costs of retaking and sale, late fees, reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and all sums allowed by the court;
- 5. That judgment be entered in favor of Plaintiff against the [VESSEL OWNERS] for the full amount of mortgage indebtedness or for any deficiency owed after the sale of the VESSEL and distribution of the proceeds thereof, and
- 6. That it be decreed that any and all persons claiming any interest in the VESSEL arising prior to the sale are thereafter barred and foreclosed of and from all right, equity of redemption, and claim of, in, or to the VESSEL, and every part thereof, by reason of any such interest.
- B. On the Second Cause of Action against the [VESSEL OWNERS]:

That judgment be entered against [VESSEL OWNERS] in the amount of [AMOUNT], plus interest commencing on [DATE], plus costs of retaking and sale, late fees, reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and all other sums allowed by the court.

C. On the Third Cause of Action against the [DATE]:

That judgment be entered against [DATE] in the amount of [AMOUNT], plus interest commencing on [DATE], plus costs of retaking and sale, late fees, reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and all other sums allowed by the court.

D. On all	causes of	f action:
-----------	-----------	-----------

That this Court award such other and further relief as is just and proper.

VERIFICATION

I, [BANK OFFICER], declare:

- 1. I am the Recovery Manager for Plaintiff, [FINANCIAL INSTITUTION], and am authorized to make this verification on its behalf.
- 2. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The facts stated in the complaint are true. As to those facts stated upon information and belief, I believe such facts to be true.

Executed this [DATE] at [PLACE].

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

[BANK OFFICER]

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 161 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 51, 52 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.); 3 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 21, 33, 45, 66 (Matthe Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SALVAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-693

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-693RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS STEVEDORES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-694

FORM No. 1-694 Complaint In Rem--Stevedoring Services

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

	•		-0	
				, inclusive,
at the port of				
stevedoring and necessary therewith. The items of su and the dates when render Exhibit 1. For said work,	r incidental services, and ach labor, services and red or incurred, are set labor and services, the tomary rates obtaining, labor and services sh	nd paid or incurred of expenses, amountin forth in Schedule "A agents of the said vog in the port ofould all be rendered	certain expenses on her b g in all to the sum of \$ _ A" attached hereto and in essel promised and agree for s	ncorporated herein as ed with plaintiff to pay to similar work, and promised
5. The said charges made amount and in accordance were necessary for the sai	with the prevailing ra			nses are reasonable in Such services and expenses
6. By reason of the premisowners the sum of \$				and her law and the Acts of
				,,
7. Payment of the said sur			•	iff of the vessel paid. The said sum remains

wholly due, unpaid and owing from the vessel	and her owners to plaintiff.
[Prayer for Process and Verification] n2	

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-2 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-11 and 1-12 supra.

* See 2 Benedict on Admiralty, § 37 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.). For stevedore injury or death, see Form Nos. 1-372 through 1-379 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS STEVEDORES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-695

FORM No. 1-695 Complaint in Intervention In Rem and In Personam by Stevedore--Failure of Vessel to Vacate Berth

[Caption] n1		
	nes hereinafter mentioned was a corporation and engaged in the but	n organized and existing under and by virtue of siness of stevedore and terminal operator.
	entioned intervenor was and still is stevedo	
3. On or about	, 20, the vessel ad cargo operations in connection with said	was berthed at Pier
	aid cargo operations, the vessel although demand was o	failed, neglected and/or refused to duly made that said berth be vacated.
	ly at Pier and by a maged by being deprived of its berth space.	reason of its refusal to vacate, intervenor has
	was attached by the United States Marshal d the said vessel is presently under attachme	for the District of ent under the custody of the United States
7. By reason of the premises	s there is due intervenor the sum of \$	per day as of

hours,	, 20	, for wharfage.
8. The berth presently occupied by the vessel		is scheduled to be occupied by two vessels on or
about, 20, and the fa	ailure of the vess	sel to vacate the berth as
demanded will cause intervenor to sustain damages	in the sum of \$ _	·
[Prayer for Process, Demand for Judgment and Ver	rification] n2	
FOOTNOTES:		
(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.		
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6, 1-11 a	and 1-12, supra.	
* See 2 Benedict on Admiralty, § 37 (Matthew Be	ender 7th ed.). F	For stevedore injury or death, see Form Nos. 1-372

through 1-379 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS STEVEDORES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-696

FORM No. 1-696 Intervening Complaint--Failure to Pay for Stevedoring and Terminal Services

[Caption] n1	
Intervening plaintiffs,, and	Corporation of,
by their attorneys,, complaining of	
1. This is an action within the Admiralty and Maritime jurisd within the meaning of $Rule\ 9(h)$ of the Federal Rules of Civil	
2. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff	, was and is a corporation organized and existing under
and by virtue of the laws of the State of	, qualified to do business in the State of
, with an office and principal place of	of business in,
3. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff Corporation of	
existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State ofbusiness in	with an office and principal place of
4. Upon information and belief, at all times relevant hereto d	
organized and existing under the laws of the State of	
business in,	
(hereinafter the "Vessel"). The Ves	sel is registered and documented under the laws of the
United States.	
5. Upon information and belief, the Vessel is now, or during	the pendency of this action will be, within the jurisdiction

of this Court.					
6. Between	, 20	and		, 20	inclusive, at the ports of request of
and		,	at the special	instance and i	request of
and/or its agents, plaintiffs perfor	med and re	ndered certa	in stevedorir	ıg, terminal, tr	rucking and/or other miscellaneous
services for					
			_		
7. For the said stevedoring and te	rminal serv	ices rendere	d in Baltimo	re,	promised to pay the
rates agreed upon between					
rendered in	,		prom	ised to pay the	e rates agreed upon between
rendered in and		i	n a contract d	lated	, 20, as
amended from time to time. The	charges ma	de by plaint	iffs for the sa	id stevedoring	g and/or terminal services were
	-			_	nd customary rates in the ports of
					evedoring and terminal services and
expenses were necessary for the	operation of	f the Vessel.			
8. By reason of the premises, then	re is justly o	due and owin	ng to plaintif	s from	and the Vessel
					general maritime law and 46 U.S.C.
31301 et seq. , plaintiffs have a m					
9. Payment of the sum of \$					
and the	Vessel but	has been ref	fused and no	part thereof ha	as been paid.
Wherefore, plaintiffs pray:					
1. That process in due form of law appear and answer all and singular					, citing it personally to
2. That process in due form of lav jurisdiction may issue against the Certain Admiralty and Maritime any interest therein be cited to ap	Vessel, he Claims of the	r engines, et he Federal R	c., in rem, pu Rules of Civil	rsuant to Rule Procedure, an	e a of the Supplemental Rules for and that all persons having or claimin
3 That this Court shall pronounce	a judament	in favor of	each of the n	aintiffe agains	st and the
Vessel for its damages as aforesa			_	_	
vessel for its damages as aforesa	iu, willi illu	erest and cos	sts and the di	soursements o	it tills action,
4. That the said Vessel, her engin	es, tackle, a	appurtenance	es etc. may b	e condemned	and sold to pay such judgment;
5. That this Court may grant to plotted:	laintiffs suc	h other and	further relief	as may be jus	t and proper.
Attorney for Plaintiffs					
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form No. 1-	-1 supra.				

* See 2 Benedict on Admiralty, § 37 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.). For stevedore injury or death, see Form Nos. 1-372 through 1-379 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS STEVEDORES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-697

FORM No. 1-697 Complaint (Counterclaim) Against Stevedore Alleging Improper Dischargen1

[Caption, Jurisdictional St	itement and Allegations Concerning F	'arties] n2	
4. On or about	, 20, the vessel	called at	
fo	or the purpose of discharging cargo.		
5. Plaintiff,	, was hired to discharge carg	go from the vessel	·
	discharged from the vessel		
were	, which were carried from	to	pursuant
to Bills of Lading Nos	and from	to	
pursuant to Bills of Lading	Nos		
7. Prior to the discharge of	the aforesaid cargo of	[cargo] plaintiff,	,
was informed of the manne	er in which the cargo had been stowed	aboard the vessel	so that such
[0	cargo] could be sorted and applied to t	heir corresponding Bills of Lading.	
8. Contrary to said instruct	ons, plaintiff,	_, discharged the cargo in such a mar	nner that sorting
was required in the termina	l warehouse.		
9. In performing the said di	scharge in an improper and negligent	manner, plaintiff,	, caused
additional sorting to be per	formed by, tl	he terminal operator. Said terminal op	perator has
	dant and claimant in the amount of \$_		
10. Despite demand for pay	ment thereof of plaintiff,	, said debt remains outst	anding.

[Demand for Judgment] n3

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Delaware Operating Company v. MV Terrie U, Civ. No. 80-2457 (E.D.N.Y. 1980).

- (n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.
- (n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.
- * See 2 Benedict on Admiralty, § 37 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.). For stevedore injury or death, see Form Nos. 1-372 through 1-379 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS STEVEDORES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-698

FORM No. 1-698 Complaint In Personam Against Stevedore--Damage to Cargo After Discharge from Vesseln1

4. On or about	, 20	, at the Port of	,	a cargo of
of which the				
in good orde	er and cond	ition for ocean carriage	to the Port of	·
5. Said cargo was accepted by the ves attached hereto as Exhibit 1.)	ssel	and a	clean bill of lading	was issued. (Bill of Lading
6. The cargo were placed in container	Nos	an	d	·
7. On or about, still in good				
by the Defendant at the		Marine Terminal in		·
8. Upon information and belief, conta	iners Nos		and	were discharged
by the defendant in a safe and pruden and by virtu				
container No.				
overturn, thereby severely damaging	the plaintiff	's cargo.		

- 10. The plaintiff was the purchaser, consignee, and owner of said shipment and brings this action on its own behalf and as an agent and trustee on behalf of, and for the interest of, all parties who may be or become interested in said shipment, as their respective interests may appear, and plaintiff is entitled to maintain this action.
- 11. All conditions precedent are required of the plaintiff and its predecessors in interest in said shipment have been performed.

[Demand for Judgment] n3

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in B. Elliott (Canada) Ltd. v. John T. Clark & Son of Maryland, Inc., 704 F.2d 1305 (4th Cir. 1983), furnished through the courtesy of H. John Bremermann III, Esq., Lord, Whip, Coughlan & Green, Baltimore, Maryland.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.

* See 2 Benedict on Admiralty, § 37 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.). For stevedore injury or death, see Form Nos. 1-372 through 1-379 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
STEVEDORES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-719

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-719RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SUPPLIES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-720

FORM No. 1-720 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--Supplies

[Captain, Jurisdictional Statement,	and Allegation.	s Concerning Parties] n1	
request of the master of the vessel _ furnished and delivered to the said which were necessary for the use of , and the sa	vessel the provi	[or other duly acc sions and stores contained i the value whereof amounte	
reasonable market prices.			
		= -	but have hitherto wholly neglected and interest, is now justly due and owing to
[Prayer for Process, Demand for Ju	dgment and Ve	erification] n2	
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form Nos. 1-1	and 1-5 supra.		
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos.	1-3, 1-6, 1-10	through 1-13 supra.	
* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 7	720 (Matthew I	Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict	on Admiralty §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender

7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SUPPLIES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-721

FORM No. 1-721 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--Supplies, With Assertions Under Federal Maritime Lien Actn1

[Supplement Form No. 1-186, supra, by adding the	e following:]	
6. The fuel so provided to the vessel	and defendant	Lines constitutes
a necessary within the meaning of 46 U.S.C. § 313		
7. By reason of the premises, plaintiff is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs.	damages in the amount of \$	plus interest,
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in No. 84-289 (E.D.N.Y. 1984).	n BP North America Trading Inc. v. Con	stellation Lines S.A., Civ.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 720 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SUPPLIES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-722

FORM No. 1-722 Complaint In Rem--Supplies, With Assertions Under Federal Lien Statuten1

This is a case of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, as hereinafter more fully appears, within the meaning of *Rule* 9(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
 At all times hereinafter mentioned, plaintiff was and still is a _______ corporation with an office and

place of business at		·
3. Upon information and belief, the vessel pendency of this action within this District and version within the persion within the persion within the persion within the persion with the persion within the persion within the persion within the persion with the persion within the persion		_
4. On or about, 20 engine stores and/or lubricants to the vessel	•	
5. Said fuel oil, engine stores and/or lubricants h	nave not been paid for, although duly deman-	ded.

6. Pursuant to 46 U.S.C. § 31342 plaintiff is entitled to assert and foreclose a maritime lien on the vessel ______ in the amount of \$ ______.

Wherefore, plaintiff prays that:

[Caption] n2

1. Process be issued in rem according to the practices of this Honorable Court in cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction against the vessel ______, her engines, tackle, and other appurtenances, and that all

persons claiming any right or interest in her, be cited to file claim, appear and answer;
2. Plaintiff's claim be adjudged a preferred maritime lien on said vessel in the amount of \$;
3. Said vessel be condemned or sold to satisfy said lien, with interest and costs;
4. Plaintiff be granted such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Dated:
Attorney for Plaintiff

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Gulf Trading & Transportation Co. v. M/V Tento, 694 F.2d 1201 (9th Cir. 1982), furnished through the courtesy of Eric Danoff, Esq., Graham & James, San Francisco, California.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 720 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SUPPLIES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-723

FORM No. 1-723 Complaint--Supplies and Repairs, With Assertion Under Federal Lien Statute

[Caption] n1				
	, through his at respectfully alleges as follo		, complaining of	the defendant,
	alty and Maritime jurisdiction aritime lien pursuant to 46		ully appears, within the m	neaning of Rule
	offer mentioned, the plaintif		ent of	, County of
3. That the said plaintiff is and descriptions.	engaged, among other thin	gs, in the furnishing of s	supplies and repairs to ves	ssels of all kinds
owned by	and belief, the defendant verall and is under ithin the jurisdiction of the	regi	istry and is, and will be d	
	, 20			
boat was entrusted by the repairs to the said boat, an	owner, and who had author d furnished certain material which said work was done, a	ity for said purpose, the j s, all of which were necessity	plaintiff did certain work	in the nature of

6. That the plaintiff de	livered to the owner his	s bills for work done and materials supplied	(Exhibit 1) [omitted].
-	sent charges which are	fair and reasonable for the work done and n	naterials supplied to the said
8. That the said owner	accepted said bills.		
		the sum of \$, leaverest from, 20	_
for the necessary work	and materials supplied	re alleges, that he has a lien against the said to said vessel and therefore files this comparest the defendant in the sum of	laint to enforce his lien.
), plus interest from	
	er and further relief as t	to this Court seems just, equitable and prope	
Attorney for Plaintiff			
1100011109 101 1 1011111111			

^{*} See 1 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 720 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
SUPPLIES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-724

FORM No. 1-724 Complaint in Rem--Supplies

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 720 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3 and 1-10 through 1-13 supra.



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SUPPLIES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-725

FORM No. 1-725 Complaint In Rem by Several Suppliers

[Caption] n1			
Plaintiffs, alle	by ge upon information and beli	, their attorney, for	their complaint against defendant
FIRST CAUSE OF ACT	TION ON BEHALF OF THE	E PLAINTIFF	(SHIP REPAIRER)
1. This is a case of admiralty maritime claim within the me	· ·	hereinafter more fully a	ppears, and this is an admiralty and
2. Plaintiff,Stre	[ship repairer] is a _	and at all times hereinal	corporation with offices at ter mentioned was in the business of
			servicing of seagoing vessels.
3. The vesselhereunder will be, within this			s, or during the pendency of process Court.
4. Between the period	, 20	up to and including	
plaintiff,	, performed certain wor	k, labor and services to the	ne vessel in
11 0 0		• •	el, including but not limited to her
			eumatic crane pursuant to written
agreements with the owners,	, an	d with their domestic age	ents,, as
			, on the said vessel while
the said vessel was berthed at	a pier in the Port of	The ag	greed total price for the said work,

labor and services and the reasonable value of said services	amounted to the sum of \$
5. By reason of said work, labor and services, plaintiff, against the vessel	Ship Repairs, Inc., has a maritime lien
6. By reason of the premises the vessel	was and is obligated to the plaintiff.
, in the sum of \$	
, leaving a balance due and owing t	
, together with interest thereon and	costs.
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION ON BEHALF OF PLACO.]	AINTIFF [MARINE SUPPLY
7. [allegation as in paragraph # 1]	
8. Plaintiff, [Marine Supply Co.], i	s a corporation with offices at
Street,,	ipplying and furnishing all of the items and provisions
9. [allegation as in paragraph #3]	
10. Between the period, 20	up to and including, 20, the
plaintiff, [Marine Supply Co.], sup	
, including but not limited to	
was berthed at a pier in the Port of	
, and with their domestic agents,	
reasonable value of the material and services and provisions	supplied to the vessel amount to \$
11. By reason of the furnishing of the said materials and serva maritime lien against the vessel	vices and provisions, plaintiff,, has
12. [allegation as in paragraph #6]	
Wherefore, plaintiffs,[ship repair	er] and [Marine Supply Co.] pray
that process in rem according to the practices of this Honora	ble Court in causes of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction,
may issue against the vessel, her en	
any right, title or interest in said vessel may be summoned to	
matters aforesaid, and that this Honorable Court may be plea	
repairer], recover the balance due for their work, labor and s	services furnished to the vessel in
the sum of \$ with interest and costs Supply Co.], recover the sum of \$ provisions supplied to the vessel, a	s, and that the plaintiff,[Marine
Supply Co.], recover the sum of \$	as the balance remaining for their materials and services and
provisions supplied to the vessel, a	nd that the vessel, her engines,
boilers, tackle, etc. may be condemned and sold to satisfy sa	and decree, and that plaintiffs have such other and further
relief as may be just and proper.	
Attorney for Plaintiffs	

[Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-11 and 1-12 supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 720 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SUPPLIES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-726

FORM No. 1-726 Complaint In Rem and In Personam Against Foreign State Shipowner--Suppliesn1

[Caption and Jurisdictional	Statement] n2		
COUNT I			
organized and existing under business at	entioned the Plaintiff,, the laws of one of the states of the, and at all times hereinafter shing all of the items and provision	United States with an offic mentioned was engaged in	the business of a ship
	, owned by cy of process hereunder will be, wit		
, 20	encing on or about December, plaintiff, furnished to the verized agents, various and sundry su	essel	, at the request of her
	set forth in the documents denoted		<u> </u>
the vessel	ich were acknowledged and agreed The total price and reasonal amount to \$	ble value of said supplies, p	provisions, and materials
	id provisions, supplies, and materia	_	, has a maritime

6. By reason of the above pre	mises the vessel	was and is obligated	I to the plaintiff,
, in t	he sum of \$	together with interest the	ereon and costs, no party of
which has been paid to plaint			
COUNT II			
		is an agency or instrum	
within the meaning of 28 U.S	.C. § 1603(b), having its pri	incipal place of business at	, and is the
		n is invoked pursuant to the provisi	ons of the Foreign
Sovereign Immunities Act, 2	8 U.S.C. §§ 1330;1391(f)(2)	; and 1602-1611.	
8. Plaintiff,	, repeats and reallego	es each and every allegation set for	rth in paragraphs 2 through 6
herein.			
9. By reason of furnishing sa	d supplies, provisions and n	materials to the vessel	, defendant
was	and is obligated to Plaintiff	f,, in the s	sum of \$
toge	ether with interest thereon ar	nd costs, no part of which has been	paid to Plaintiff, although
due demand has been made the			
[Prayer for Process, Deman	d for Judgment and Verifica	etion] n3	
FOOTNOTES:			
(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapte	d from papers used in Atlan	ntic Steamers Supply Co. v. The Ve	essel M.V. Raseltin, Civ. No.
81-2005 (E.D.N.Y. 1981).	• •		
(n2)Footnote 2. See For	m No. 1-1 supra.		
(n3)Footnote 3. See For	m Nos. 1-3, 1-6 and 1-10 thr	rough 1-13 supra.	
* See 1 Benedict on Admira	lty §§ 720 (Matthew Bender	r 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty	§§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender

7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SUPPLIES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-727

FORM No. 1-727 Complaint In Personam--Breach of Ship Supplier's Agency Agreementn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Sta	atement and Alle	gation Concerning Par	rties] n2
	g of necessaries to	o the vessels that plaint	, at various times contracted with tiff managed. Defendant, in turn, arranged with
6. During 20 through supplying of vessels that pl	_	=	to defendant as fees for the
_	iff can now asce		all of those necessaries for which plaintiff has paid nat have not been paid by defendant and the amounts
[set forth suppliers and am	ounts owed]		
The total of the amounts ou	utstanding is \$		
may be entitled to maritime h	e liens against the as already obtain on account of nor	ose vessels. One of the ned the arrest of a vesse n-payment by defendan	n foreign commerce. Therefore, the suppliers thereof suppliers referred to in Paragraph 7, above, all managed by plaintiff, the vessel at for necessaries supplied to that vessel. It is possible
			iff, plaintiff may have to pay a second time for those

9. As nearly as can now be determined, plaintiff will be required	to pay in excess of \$ in legal
fees and expenses to effect the release of the vesselsuppliers.	and to defend against the claims of
[Demand for Judgment] n3	
FOOTNOTES:	
(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Skaarup Ship	Management Corp. v. Span Steamship Supply Co.,
Civ. No. 84-365 (E.D.N.Y. 1984).	
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.	
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.	

^{*} See 1 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 720 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
SUPPLIES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty Form 3-731

Form 3-731 Complaint -- Breach of Charter Party (With Request for Issuance of Process of Attachment)

Plaintiff PLAINTIFF NAME] (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff"), by and through its attorneys, [FIRM NAME], and for its verified complaint against defendant [DEFENDANT NAME] (hereinafter "Defendant"), alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This is a case of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction as hereinafter more fully appears and is a maritime claim within the meaning of *Rule 9 (h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*. This court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 *U.S.C.* 1333.

PARTIES

- 2. At all material times herein, [PLAINTIFF NAME] was and is a business entity organized and existing under the laws of [COUNTRY] with its principal place of business in [PLACE OF BUSINESS].
- 3. Plaintiff [PLAINTIFF NAME] is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that at all material times herein, defendant [DEFENDANT NAME] was and is a business entity organized and existing under the laws of Russia.
- 4. Plaintiff [PLAINTIFF NAME] is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the M/V [VESSEL NAME], a [FLAG STATE] flagged tween decker of approximately 17,850 gross tons, is currently owned by [DEFENDANT NAME], and is now within this district or will be during the pendency of this action.

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

5. On or about [DATE], [DEFENDANT NAME]entered into an agreement to time charter the M/V [VESSEL NAME] to [PLAINTIFF NAME] to carry a cargo of [TYPE OF CARGO] from [PORT OF LOADING] to [PORT OF

DISCHARGE]. A true and correct copy of the charter party is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and is incorporated by reference.

- 6. Delivery of the vessel to [PLAINTIFF NAME] was to take place at the [PLACE OF DELIVERY] on [DATE] at which time the vessel was to be "ready to receive cargo with clean swept holds and tight, staunch, strong and in every way fitted for ordinary cargo service."
- 7. [DEFENDANT NAME] promised [PLAINTIFF NAME] that it was "obligated to deliver and keep the vessel, her Crew and anything pertaining thereto supplied with up to date and complete certificates, approvals and equipment enabling the vessel and her crew to carry the cargoes as directed." [DEFENDANT NAME] also promised [PLAINTIFF NAME] that the vessel was entered with the [INSURER] for protection and indemnity coverage.
- 8. [DEFENDANT NAME] promised [PLAINTIFF NAME] that the "[v]essel's cargo gear and all other equipment...shall comply with the regulations of the countries to which the vessel may trade.
- 9. [DEFENDANT NAME] promised [PLAINTIFF NAME] that it would "immediately notify [[PLAINTIFF NAME] of the ship's delay and reasons therefore" in failing to arrive at the designated place and time of delivery. In the event of a delay in delivery, the charter party allows [PLAINTIFF NAME] to "extend the canceling date or cancel the vessel."
- 10. [DEFENDANT NAME] promised [PLAINTIFF NAME] that upon delivery the holds and hatches of the vessel were "to be thoroughly clean, dry, free of loose rust, loose rust scale, cargo residue and free of odor injurious to cargo in order to pass Cleanliness Survey, as required. Any time lost by vessel not being clean and ready as per above, to be for Owners' account and vessel to be off-hire from time of rejection."
- 11. The M/V [VESSEL NAME] did not arrive at the [PORT OF DELIVERY] until [DATE]. Upon arrival she was inspected by boarding officers from the Marine Safety Office of the United States Coast Guard. The investigation revealed that the Loadline, Safety Construction, Safety Equipment, and Safety Radio Certificates required under the laws of the United States, and warranted in Clause 29 of the Charter Party were expired.
- 12. The United States Coast Guard investigators also discovered "excessive fuel oil and lube oil leaks in way of main engine into the bilge." Their investigation also revealed numerous soft patches in the engine room salt water cooling system. Furthermore, Coast Guard officials found that the portside lifeboat falls could not be released and that the life ring buoy water lights were totally inoperative. Moreover, the crew hired by owners to operate the vessel were unable to show proficiency in conducting required lifeboat drills. As a result of these serious structural and safety deficiencies, the Coast Guard Marine Safety Office issued a Captain of the Port Order detaining the vessel at anchorage and forbidding her to sail without correction of her violations.
- 13. On [DATE], [SURVEYOR NAME], a marine surveyor representing both [DEFENDANT NAME] and [PLAINTIFF NAME] performed a complete survey of the vessel at anchorage. The survey revealed that the cargo gear suffered from broken strands and rusting, with indentations in the cross trees and heels. The surveyor also reported that the vessel suffers from missing side battens, bent hatch access covers, bent hatch access covers, bent hatch coaming stiffeners, distorted airpipe guards, missing paint locker doors, corroded and wasted hatch cover security bars, bent and sheared off ballast pipe guards, bent and distorted after ballast pipe and valve spindle guard plates, corroded and wasted deck plating, corrugation plating doors sheared from their hinges, bent and distorted forward roller pipes, loose rust on the Number 3 tank top, and sheared off ventilation doors among several dozen deficiencies. The surveyor also performed a hose test on or after hatch covers which revealed several leaks. A hose test was not performed on the forward hatch covers because they were inoperative due to a hydraulic system failure.
- 14. At the time that the [DEFENDANT NAME] entered into the charter party with [PLAINTIFF NAME], it was fully award of the unseaworthiness of the M/V [VESSEL NAME]. [PLAINTIFF NAME] would never have entered into the

charter party had it been aware of the actual condition of the vessel. [DEFENDANT NAME] misrepresented the condition of the vessel. [DEFENDANT NAME] misrepresented the condition of the vessel and fraudulently induced [PLAINTIFF NAME] to enter into the charter party.

- 15. The failure of [DEFENDANT NAME] to provide a seaworthy vessel to [PLAINTIFF NAME] to transport its cargo of [TYPE OF CARGO] represents a breach of the charter party. As a result, [PLAINTIFF NAME] has been forced to hire a replacement vessel at greater cost resulting in damages in the amount of [AMOUNT].
- 16. [PLAINTIFF NAME] is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that [DEFENDANT NAME] cannot be found within the district in that it does not have an agent for service of process within and does not have sufficient contacts within the jurisdiction to subject it to the *in personam* jurisdiction of the court. However, [DEFENDANT NAME] has goods, chattels, or credits and effects within the district, to wit: the M/V [VESSEL NAME].
- 17. Because [DEFENDANT NAME] can not be found within the district but has goods within the district, [PLAINTIFF NAME] seeks jurisdiction over [DEFENDANT NAME] by attaching its goods, chattels, credits and effects within this district pursuant to Supplemental Admiralty Rule B of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 14. The charter party between [DEFENDANT NAME] and [PLAINTIFF NAME] relating to the M/V [VESSEL NAME] includes a London arbitration provision. [PLAINTIFF NAME] reserves its right to arbitrate its claims against [DEFENDANT NAME] in London in accordance with the terms of the charter party, but nonetheless, is entitled to attachment and security within this district.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff [PLAINTIFF NAME] prays as follows:

- 1. That process in due form of law according to the practice of this court may be used against the defendant [DEFENDANT NAME] and that the defendant be cited to appear and answer the allegation herein;
- 2. That all goods, chattels, credits and effects belonging to defendant [DEFENDANT NAME] within this district or will be within this district, be attached pursuant to Supplemental Admiralty Rule B, Fed. R. Civ. P.;
- 3. That all persons claiming any interest to said property attached may be cited to appear and answer the matters aforesaid;
- 4. That the property attached be condemned and sold to satisfy plaintiff [PLAINTIFF NAME]'s claim against defendant [DEFENDANT NAME] with interest thereon, attorney's fees and costs and the expenses and costs of attachment;
- 5. That judgment be entered in favor of plaintiff [PLAINTIFF NAME] against defendant [DEFENDANT NAME] in the amount of [AMOUNT] plus interest, attorney's fees and costs and expenses and costs of attachment; and
- 6. That this court grant plaintiff [PLAINTIFF NAME] such each other and further relief which it may deem appropriate.
- * See 1 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 720 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 33-39 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS SUPPLIES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-738

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-738RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS TOWAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-739

FORM No. 1-739 Complaint In Rem--Towage

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

4. At various times from a	and including the	day of	, 20	, to and
	day of			
	ns in charge of the vessel			
	assistance to the vessel			
places set forth in the sch	edule attached hereto and incorpo	orated herein as Scheo	dule A.	
towage services so render	plaintiff and the owner of the vested by plaintiff's tug boats to the vested item of service in the aforesaid	essel	, the several sums	of money
,	the said sum of \$ but the said owner has at all time with interest thereon, is now due	es refused to pay the s	same, and the said sum of \$	
[Prayer for Process and V	Verification] n2			
ECOTNOTES.				

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-2 supra.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-10, 1-11 and 1-12 supra.

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 231 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty § 37 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
TOWAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty Form No.1-740

Form No.1-740 Complaint In Rem--Towage

* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 231 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty § 37 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS TOWAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-741

FORM No. 1-741 Complaint In Rem--Towage

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and A	Allegations Conc	erning Parties] n1	
4. During the month ofand standing i	, 20	, the vessel	, being in the port of and about her business, the plaintiff, at the
	ne orders of the p	ersons to whom the perform the service	e management of the vessel at that port was
	interest. The plai	ntiff duly demande	oners are indebted to the plaintiff in the total and payment but same was refused and that
6. The plaintiff claims a maritime lien as tackle, apparel and furniture under and be general maritime law.	-		
[Prayer for Process and Verification] n2	2		
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> Form Nos. 1-1 and	1-2 supra.		
(n2)Footnote 2. <i>See</i> Form Nos. 1-3 * <i>See</i> 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 231 (-	ct on Admiralty § 37 (Matthew Bender 7th

ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
TOWAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-742

FORM No. 1-742 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--Damage to Barge Tow and Cargo

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n1

4. The defendant	, having a	agreed to tow plaintiff's barg	e	with cargo
	to			
	, 20, those in charge			
	, a tank barge, seaworthy a			
	in her tanks, on the			
extending a considerab	ole distance forward of the	's bov	v and left	······································
	in			
was good and the barge	e drew	forward and	feet	aft.
5. At about	P.M. on	, 20	, the	got off
	shaking			
	Point. By working her eng	gines, the	freed the	
	about	P.M. and at about		P.M. with the
	made fast on the tug's port	side with her bow extending	g a considerable d	istance forward of the
tug's bow, the	proceeded o	on.		
6. At about	A.M. on	, 20	, when the flotil	la was in the vicinity
	Point approaching the v			
	intered. The tug continued on			
	akes of ice which caused her			
nearing	City the ice field v	was cleared, and no other ice	was seen.	

		_ was pulled off the strand off		
_	=	ice field and after the ice field was cleared, the		
	_	tage under control until about		leakage
		pumps could not con		
		and she w	ith her cargo and the crew's person	al effects
became a	total loss.			
8. The sir	iking and loss of the	and her cargo a	nd the crew's personal effects were	not caused or
		e on the part of the		
caused so	lely by fault and negligen	ce on the part of the defendant and it	ts tug and	those in
charge of	her in the following respe	cts among others:		
a.	The	was manned with incompetent	persons with the privity and knowle	edge
	the defendant.		· •	
b.	The	got off her course and stranded	the on a l	nard
bo	ottom in the vicinity of	Point.		
c.	When those in charge of t	heencoun	tered the ice field in the vicinity of	
	Po		·	
d.	The	with the barge alongside, her be	ow extending a considerable distance	ce
		oceeded through the ice too fast.	yn enionemg a constactacte enstant	
e.	While proceeding through	the ice field, the	failed to protect her tow fro	m the
ic			•	
f.	While proceeding through	the ice field, the	failed to take her tow on sho	ort
ha	wsers.			
g.	And in other ways to be p	ointed out at the trial.		
		s of thean		ed damages
in the app	proximate sum of	with interest from 2	20	
[Prayer fo	or Process, Demand for Ji	udgment and Verification] n2		
FOOTNO	OTES:			
(n1)Footr	note 1. See Form Nos. 1-1	, 1-2 and 1-5 <i>supra</i> .		
(n2)F	Footnote 2. See Form Nos	. 1-3, 1-5, 1-10, 1-11 and 1-12 supre	ı.	
* See 1	Benedict on Admiralty §	231 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Be	nedict on Admiralty § 37 (Matthew	Bender 7th

ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS TOWAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-743

FORM No. 1-743 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--Damage to Barge Tow

[Caption and Jurisdictional Statement] n1

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

2. At all times hereinafter mentioned, plaintiffs were and still a place of business within this jurisdiction, and were the operator which was in all respects tight, staun	or and owner respectively of	
3. At all times hereinafter mentioned, the tugs during the pendency of this action will be within this District a		
4. At all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendant, office and principal place of business at tug		
5. At all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendant,	, was the ow	ner of the tug
6. At all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendant,	, was the ope	erator of the tug
7. At all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendant,	, was the ow	ner of the tug
8. On or about . 20 pursuant to	o agreement between the pla	intiffs and the defendants, the

Barge No.	was being towed by the tug	with the tug
	assisting.	
	, 20, while the Barge No e was caused to ground and strike bottom causing	
	ding and striking bottom was caused by the negling and and ereto.	-
•	mises aforesaid, the plaintiff sustained damages in aid although duly demanded.	n the sum of \$, no
12. Plaintiffs repeat and and effect as if set forth a13. In undertaking to tow	reallege each and every allegation contained in pa	endants warranted that they would perform
14. The defendants failed	I to tow the Barge No i eached this warranty, all to plaintiffs' damage in the	n a careful, safe, prudent and workmanlike
[Prayer for Process, Den	nand for Judgment and Verification] n2	
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. <i>See</i> For	m No. 1-1 <i>supra</i> .	
(n2)Footnote 2. See	Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6 and 1-11 through 1-13 supra	
* See 1 Benedict on A	dmiralty § 231 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Bene ed.).	dict on Admiralty § 37 (Matthew Bender 7th



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS TOWAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-744

FORM No. 1-744 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--by Barge Tow by Collision with Bridgen1

[Caption, Jurisdiction	aal Statement and Allegatio	ons Concerning Pa	rties] n2	
6. On or about	, 20	, the	barge was in	tow of and under the sole
	of the tug			
7. While so engaged,	the tug	proceeded to	hrough the	draw of the
· 	Bridge in the Port of		, more particularly in	the waters of the lower
· 	Bay, and caused the ba	irge	to strike said br	idge, resulting in damage
to the barge	and loss ar	nd injury to its own	ners.	
8. Plaintiffs repeat an length herein.	d re-allege each and every	allegation containe	ed in paragraphs 1 through	7 above as if set forth at
-	ed to in paragraphs 6 and 7	-	and proximately by the ne	gligence and lack of
•	red to in paragraphs 6 and and		t any fault or negligence or e.	the part of
11. By reason of the p	oremises	and	have su	stained damage and injury
in the amount of \$	in th	ne nature of repairs	s and loss of use of the vess	sel.

12. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation contained in paragraph 1 through 7 above as if set forth a length herein.	ıt
13. Defendants, by allowing the barge to strike the bridge and to sustain damages as a resulthereof, breached their contractual obligations, including, but not limited to, the warranty of workmanlike service to plaintiffs.	.t
14. By reason of the premises, plaintiffs have sustained additional damage in their efforts to be made whole, includin but not limited to, attorneys' fees in connection with this suit, and thereby have been further damaged in the amount of the proximate result of defendants' breach of the proximate result of the prox	of \$
the warranty of workmanlike service.	
[Prayer for Relief, Demand for Judgment and Verification] n3	
FOOTNOTES:	
(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Bouchard Transportation Co. v. McAllister Brothers, Inc., Civ. N 83-208 (E.D.N.Y. 1983)	o.
(n2)Footnote 2. See Forms Nos. 1-1, 1-2 and 1-5 supra.	
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-6, and 1-10 through 1-13 supra.	
* See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 231 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty § 37 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.)	th

ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS TOWAGE *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-766

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-766RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms **CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS** WAGES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-767

FORM No. 1-767 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--Wages and Repatriationn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

5. Plaintiffs herein joined the said vessel as members of the crew thereof and fully performed their duties as such crew members and accrued earned wages.
6. The defendant failed, refused, and neglected to make payment of the full wages due to said plaintiffs, said wages, upon information and belief, being in excess of \$
7. Demand for said wages was made upon the owners and payment of same was wrongfully and improperly refused.
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
8. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1 through 7 of this complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
9. By reason of the premises aforesaid, there became due and owing to plaintiffs certain sums for repatriation expenses in an amount in excess of \$, none of which has been paid although duly demanded.
THIRD CALISE OF ACTION

10. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1 through 9 of this complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

11. By reason of the refusal and neglect to pay wages when same became due and owing, plaintiffs are entitled to two days pay for each and every day during which payment is delayed in an amount believed now to be in excess of \$

[Prayer for Process and Verification] n3

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers files in Kulatunga v. M/V Agapi, Civ. No. 81-434 (E.D.N.Y. 1981).

(n2)Footnote 2. See Forms Nos. 1-1 and 1-7 supra.

(n3)Footnote 3. See Form Nos. 1-3, 1-10 and 1-12 supra.

* See 2 Benedict on Admiralty § 33 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 3 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 32, 52 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS WAGES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-768

FORM No. 1-768 Complaint In Rem and In Personam--Enforcement of Maritime Lien for Wages and Expensesn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2

5. That, according to plaintiff's knowledge and belief, during ______ the defendant entered into a contract for the sale of the vessel _____ with _____a corporation owned by ______, following which the defendant received a substantial sum of money from ______ as partial compensation pursuant to the sales contract. 6. That on or prior to _______, 20 _____, the plaintiff entered into an agreement with ______ to act as seaman performing the duties of a ______ aboard the vessel _____ on a contemplated voyage from _____ sale to not having been completed at that time, the plaintiff was requested by _____, with the knowledge and consent of the defendant, to proceed to _____ from his home in ______, to assist in preparing the vessel for the contemplated voyage and to watch and maintain the vessel, her engines, tackle and apparel, check her moorings, etc., and to perform the duties of a shipkeeper until such time as the vessel was in full readiness for the voyage. 7. That plaintiff commenced his duties aboard the vessel ______ on ______, 20 _____, at the Port of ______ and has and continues to reside aboard the vessel carrying out the duties for which he was originally engaged and, in addition, performing certain other duties requested by the defendant. 8. That plaintiff had a verbal agreement with ______ for the payment of wages in the sum of

and subsistence, all of which defendant, _____, was aware of and had agreed to pay but that to date

plaintiff has not been paid for the	services which he ha	as rendered and there	is due and owing	g him through
, 20	, the sum of	D	ollars (\$) plus
transportation of approximately _		Dollars (\$		_), together with sundry
amounts advanced for the vessel penalties and interest.	and for plaintiff's ma	intenance, amounts to	be earned by pl	aintiff in the future,
9. That the vessel	is now in t	he Port of	, r	noored at Dock
, within			,	
10. That the plaintiff has a lien as subsistence, cash advances and tr		for payment of his w	ages, including p	enalties and interest,
[Prayer for Process, Demand for	· Judgment and Verifi	cation] n3		
FOOTNOTES:				
(n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted fr furnished through the courtesy of	1 1			**
(n2)Footnote 2. See Forms 1	Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 <i>supr</i>	ra.		
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form N	os. 1-3, 1-6, 1-11 and	1 1-12 <i>supra</i> .		
* See 2 Benedict on Admiralty §	33 (Matthew Bender	7th ed.); 3 Benedict	on Admiralty §§	32, 52 (Matthew Bender 7th

ed.).



members and accrued earned wages.

140 of 144 DOCUMENTS

Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS WAGES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-769

FORM No. 1-769 Complaint in Rem and In Personam--Wrongful Refusal of Wages

[Caption] n1		
FIRST CAUSE	OF ACTION	
	complaining of defendants, by their attorney respectfully allege as follows:	/S,
1. This is an action vand by virtue of the	rithin the Court's Admiralty and Maritime jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of this Court and Maritime jurisdiction of the District Courts of the United States and the hin the meaning of <i>Rule 9(h)</i> of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.	
2. Upon information	and belief, at all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendants were and still are foreign corporations engaged in the vessel owning business, w of	
_	and belief, at all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendants owned, operated and controlled the vessel	, and
	and belief, at all times hereinafter mentioned, the vessel is a Registry, and is at present within or during the pendency of this action will be w	
	nich this action was commenced. ined the said vessel as members of the crew thereof and fully performed their duties	as such crew

6. The defendants failed, refused and neglected to make upon information and belief being in excess of \$		o said plaintiffs, said wages
7. Demand for said wages was made upon the owners an	nd payment of same was wrongfu	ally and improperly refused.
8. All and singular the foregoing matters are true and wi States and this Honorable Court, and the defendants sho matters aforesaid, and this Honorable Court be pleased	ould be compelled to answer upor	an oath, all and singular the
SECOND SEPARATE AND DISTINCT CAUSE	OF ACTION	
9. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegations same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.	on set forth in paragraphs 1 throug	gh 8 of this Complaint with the
10. By reason of the premises aforesaid, there became d amount in excess of \$, none of	-	
THIRD SEPARATE AND DISTINCT CAUSE OF	F ACTION	
11. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and ever allegation the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.	on set forth in paragraphs 1 throug	gh 10 of this Complaint with
12. By reason of the refusal and neglect to pay wages w plaintiffs are entitled to penalty wages and to two days pan amount believed now to be in excess of \$	pay for each and every day during	
Wherefore, plaintiffs pray:		
1. That a warrant of arrest be issued against the said ves appurtenances, etc. and that all persons claiming any rig and singular the matters aforesaid;	sel,, he tht, title or interest therein may be	r boilers, engines, tackle, e cited to appear and answer all
2. That citation may issue against defendants answer all and singular the matters aforesaid;	, and	, to appear and
3. That this Honorable Court may enter judgment for platogether with interest, costs and counsel fees;		ms set forth as aforesaid
4. That the said vessel, her boilers, engines, tackle, appu	artenances, etc. may be condemne	ed and sold to pay the same;
5. That plaintiffs may have judgment against the defend transportation as aforesaid together with interest, costs a		es, penalty wages and
6. That this Honorable Court may direct such other and to receive.	further relief as in law and justice	e the plaintiffs may be entitled
Dated:		
Attorney for Plaintiff		

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See Form No. 1-1 supra.

* See 2 Benedict on Admiralty § 33 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 3 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 32, 52 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS WAGES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-770

FORM No. 1-770 Complaint In Personam--Unlawful Dischargen1

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2
4. On or about, 20, plaintiff joined the said vessel as a member of the crew in the capacity of and signed articles for a foreign voyage at the rate of \$ per month, together with overtime, fund, bonus and allowance.
5. On or after, 20, while under said foreign articles, and before one month's wages were earned, plaintiff was discharged from the crew of the said vessel without cause or without any fault on his part.
6, 20, the United States Coast Guard, investigating the discharge of the plaintiff from the said vessel, found that the discharge was without justification.
Wherefore the plaintiff demands judgment against the defendant for his wages to the end of the voyage, and for such other and further relief as may be just, together with interest, costs, damages and attorney fees.
Attorney for Plaintiff
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers used in Mackensworth v. American Trading Transp. Co., Inc., 367 F. Supp. 373, 2074 A.M.C. 237 (E.D. Pa. 1973), courtesy of Cohen and Lore, Philadelphia, Pa.

^{*} See 2 Benedict on Admiralty § 33 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 3 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 32, 52 (Matthew Bender 7th

ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS WAGES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-771

FORM No. 1-771 Complaint (Counterclaim) Against Master Alleging Damages to Vessel and Abuse of Processn1

[Caption, Jurisdictional Statement and Allegations Concerning Parties] n2

FIRST SEPARATE AND DISTINCT COUNTERCLAIM

4. The vessel	, while under the command o	f the plaintiff, sailed throu	ugh the passage between
and		•	
5. There are two channels between	and	, th	e
Channel and the	Channel. The	Channel is	preferred over the
Channel, bec	ause of the narrowness and sl	narp curve of the	Channel.
The Coast Guard advises mariners to n Channel only	avigate low-powered vessels		
6. The information concerning the pass	age between	and	, set forth in
Paragraph 5 herein, was expressly commencement of the voyage. Plaintif	-		prior to the
7. Plaintiff imprudently ignored the ser	ious dangers attendant on na	vigating the	Channel at a
time other than at slack water and took such time.	the vessel	through	Channel at
8. As a result of the perilous situation i	n C	hannel and the presence of	of other vessels in the
vicinity, the vessel	was washed into chann	el buoy #	and damaged
below the water line.			

9. The defendant, upon being informed of the collision of the vessel	with the buoy, instructed
plaintiff to immediately inform the Coast Guard Marine Inspection Office at	and to have
inspectors come to the vessel to approve repairs, and to immediately begin shifting ball heeled over to make repairs.	last so that the vessel could be
10. Plaintiff did not follow the instructions given him by the defendant, with the result before the vessel could be repaired.	that further delays were incurred
11. By reason of the plaintiff's negligent seamanship and failure to follow proper order the sum of \$, as set forth in the schedule annexed hereto as E	
SECOND SEPARATE AND DISTINCT COUNTERCLAIM	
12. Defendant repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.	1 through 11 inclusive, with the
13. That on, 20, defendant paid the plaintiff	
date, severance pay, leave pay, and travel expenses, which was all that was owed to plate and accepted by plaintiff.	aintiff and which sum was agreed
14. Thereafter and on or about, 20, plaintiff caused a s	ummons to be issued out of the
United States District Court for the District of	
attachment against the vessel, property of the defendant, to be	e issued out of the Court to the
U.S. Marshall commanding him to attach property of defendant.	
15. Thereafter on or about	orporate officer of defendant was ge of all the facts and without and detain property of defendant, and by virtue of the order of
16. By reason of the foregoing, defendant has been wrongfully deprived of its property sum of \$	and has been damaged in the
17. Defendant also claims punitive damages in the sum of \$ f process.	or plaintiff's willful abuse of
[Demand for Judgment] n3	
FOOTNOTES: (n1)Footnote 1. Form adapted from papers filed in Miller v. Young America Marine E 80-1797 (E.D.N.Y. 1980).	Educational Society, Inc., Civ. No.
(n2)Footnote 2. See Form Nos. 1-1 and 1-5 supra.	
(n3)Footnote 3. See Form No. 1-6 supra.	

* See 2 Benedict on Admiralty § 33 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 3 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 32, 52 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.).



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS WAGES *

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-792

RESERVED

FORM No. 1-792RESERVED



Benedict on Admiralty

Copyright 2011, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 4: Practice and Procedure: Forms
CHAPTER I COMPLAINTS
WHARFAGE

4-I Benedict on Admiralty FORM No. 1-793

FORM No. 1-793 Complaint In Rem--Wharfage

[Caption and Jurisdictional S	tatement] n1			
2. Plaintiffs				
mior or wherf known as Pior				
pier or wharf known as Pier _ and still are entitled to recove				, and were
3. The vessel will be, within the jurisdiction		l and furniture, no	ow are, or during the	pendency of this action
4. On the came alongside and moored a, 20_	at plaintiff's wharf, where she	e remained until th	, the vessel ne	day of
5. The fair and reasonable varates of the city [or the agree the master of vessel], is the ra	d price and charge for the us	se of said wharf as a day, or, in a	s fixed by agreement all, the sum of \$	between plaintiffs and
which, nevertheless, the own	er and the master of said vess	sel have refused to	o pay.	
6. Plaintiffs are also the owned store				
equipment] and of the vessel				ive for such storage the
sum of \$, which her owner and i	master have refuse	ed to pay.	

[Prayer for Process and Verification] n2

FOOTNOTES:

(n1)Footnote 1. See 1 Benedict on Admiralty § 213 (Matthew Bender 7th ed.); 2 Benedict on Admiralty §§ 38, 48.

(n2)Footnote 2. See Form No. 1-1 supra.