International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics
Volume 120 No. 5 2018, 1593-1602
ISSN: 1314-3395 (on-line version)
url: http://www.acadpubl.eu/hub/
Special Issue

http://www.acadpubl.eu/hub/

ARREST OF SHIPS UNDER UNCLOS WITH REFERENCE TO INDIAN MARITIME LAW

[1]VAIDURIYA.S

[1]STUDENT,5TH YEAR, BA.BL(HONS),SAVEETHA SCHOOL OF LAW, SAVEETHA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND TECHNICAL SCIENCES,SAVEETHA UNIVERSITY,CHENNAI-77 TAMILNADU,INDIA

[2]Prof.Dr.A.SREELATHA

[2]SAVEETHA SCHOOL OF LAW, SAVEETHA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND TECHNICAL SCIENCES, SAVEETHA UNIVERSITY, SAVEETHA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI -77, TAMILNADU,INDIA.

[1]advocate.riya95@gmail.com , [2]annamanenisreelatha.ssl@saveetha.com

ABSTRACT

The arrest of ships being one of the most controversial concept in the international maritime law there are many conventions which deals with the arrest of ships.This study talks about the most imperative inquiries concerning the brief arrest of seagoing vessels through arrangements given in the current international traditions. The International Convention on Arrest of Ships of 1999 that came into constrain on 14 September, 2011, contrasted with the past Convention of 1952. The fundamental way to deal with the guideline of transitory arrest of vessels stayed unaltered as indicated by the Convention of 1999 contrasted with the 1952 Convention. All things considered, brief arrest of vessels must be affected for oceanic cases. Having as a main priority that the 1999 Convention builds the quantity of oceanic claims in connection to the Convention of 1952, and in a way that specific sea guarantees that were beforehand considered cases for absolutely business relationship, for which leasers had not possessed the capacity to appreciate the assurance identifying with arrest of the ship, are esteemed to be sea claims. Changes were likewise made to one side of re-arrest and numerous arrest of the ship. Tradition of 1999 does not extraordinarily modify the current global controls

as built up by the past Convention, yet endeavors to moreover indicate certain arrangements contained in both the Conventions, regarding their change and modernization.

keywords : Arrest of vessels ,Ship ,International Arrest Conventions, sea assert .

OBJECTIVES :

1. TO study about the arrest of ships
2. To study about the admiralty jurisdiction of the states
3. To analyse the legitimate claims to grant the plaintiff relief

HYPOTHESIS :

H0: arrest of ships is not a recognised feature of maritime law

Ha: arrest of ships is a recognised feature of international maritime commerce and international maritime jurisdiction

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The methodology adopted by the researcher for conducting the proposesd research is Doctrinal Research Method.

INTRODUCTION:

Arrest of seagoing vessels is an issue of impressive significance to the worldwide sending and exchanging group. While the interests of proprietors of vessels and payload lie in guaranteeing that true blue exchanging isn't hindered by the unjustified arrest of a ship, the enthusiasm of petitioners lies in having the capacity to get security for their cases. Arrest implies the confinement of a ship by legal procedure to secure an oceanic case, yet does exclude the seizure of a ship in execution or fulfillment of a judgment. The fundamental goal of the arrest is that the bank who arrestd the ship secures his cases. The last plausibility, which comes from the seizure affected, comprises of the privilege to offer the ship in the requirement technique. Up until now, in the matter of arrest of seagoing vessels two worldwide traditions have been received. Worldwide Convention Relating to the Arrest of Sea-Going Ships of 1952 that came into

constrain on 24 February 1956 and International Convention on Arrest of Ships of 1999 that came into drive on 14 September 2011. Up until this point, just 10 states have confirmed this tradition and these are Albania, Algeria, Benin, Bulgaria, Ecuador, Estonia, Latvia, Liberia, Spain and the Syrian Arab Republic. Be that as it may, Denmark and Norway have joined to the new Arrest Convention thus may confirm it later on[1]. The 1999 Arrest Convention was intended to refresh and address the recognized insufficiencies of the 1952 Arrest Convention and plans to strike a more attractive harmony between the interests of the ship proprietor and petitioner.

RESEARCH QUESTION :

Whether the admiralty jurisdiction extends over the issues in the international waters ?

P: jurisdiction in arresting a ship in the international waters

I: Wrongful arrest , illegitimate claims .

C: international maritime law and Indian maritime law

O: Reducing the issues in the admiralty jurisdiction regarding the arrest of ships

4. To know about the procedural aspects of the arrest of ships
5. To examine the aspects of the wrongfull arrest

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES RELATING TO THE ARREST OF SEA-GOING SHIPS OF 1952

Determining the number and sorts of sea liens The fundamental beginning guideline is that vessels might be just be arrested in regard of securing oceanic cases[2]. The Convention expressly records in its first Article which claims are viewed as sea claims. Further, the Convention underscores that sea claims are viewed as those ones emerging out of one of the accompanying causes: (a) harm caused by any ship either in impact or something else; (b) death toll or individual damage caused by any ship or happening regarding the activity of any ship; (c) rescue; (d) understanding identifying with the utilization or contract of any ship whether by charterparty or something else; (e) assention identifying with the carriage of merchandise in any ship whether

[1] Saint Vincent and grendins V. Guinea (MV Saiga case)

[2] Berlingieri, F., (2000), Arrest of ships, A commentary on the 1952 and 1999 Arrest Conventions, third edition, London, Hong Kong.

by charterparty or something else; (f) loss of or harm to products incorporating stuff conveyed in any ship; (g) general normal; (h) bottomry; (I) towage; (j) pilotage; (k) merchandise or materials wherever provided to a ship for her task or support; (1) development, repair or gear of any ship or dock charges and levy; (m) wages of Masters, Officers, or team; (n) Master's payment, including distributions made by shippers, charterers or operator in the interest of a ship or her proprietor; (o) debate with regards to the title to or responsibility for transport; (p) question between co-proprietors of any ship with regards to the possession, ownership, business, or profit of that ship; (q) the home loan or hypothecation of any ship. Indeed, even before the Convention came into constrain there was no question in enactment and court routine with regards to certain oceanic nations that the vessels may just be arrestd for sea claims. In any case, when it is expected to figure out what is viewed as a sea guarantee, there are fundamentally two methodologies. One is that such claims are unequivocally specified and that out of that count there are no different cases, it is supposed shut rundown of oceanic cases[3]. Another approach isn't to count the cases, that is, notwithstanding potentially listed cases, courts can likewise perceive different cases as oceanic ones. This approach is known as open-finished rundown of sea claims.

PROCEDURE FOR ARREST OF A VESSEL :

Any domestic of foreign ship may be arrested in the jurisdiction of the authority of a Court or an appropriate judicial authority in respect of any claim only and essentially no other claim. In its esteemed a claimant may ask for a ship arrest for a particular claim. A ship within the same jurisdictions cannot be arrested more than once by the same claimant.

One may apply for a ship arrest after ensuring that the Claim Form has been issued. The application and an affidavit that must follow should contain the followings:

- the nature of the claim or counterclaim
- that the claim has not been gratified or fulfilled
- the name of the ship if the claim arises of a ship concerned

[3] David freestone ,Richard branes and David ONG, “The law of the sea”, oxford universityØ press , New York, 2009.

· the nature of the property to be arrested, which must include the name and port of registry and the ownership of the ship

· the amount of security sought, that any relevant notices to the consul have been given

If the authority finds it is right to arrest, the ship becomes a security for the determined compensating costs and an object to be sold to satisfy the claim. However this hardly takes place as the owner manages to satisfy the requirement for security by offering a letter of undertaking[4].

Incidentally arrest of the ship as a strategy for securing oceanic cases Definition of the arrest of the ship, as stipulated in Article 1 of the Convention, is that "arrest" implies the confinement of a ship by legal procedure to secure a sea assert, yet does exclude the seizure of a ship in execution or fulfillment of a judgment. This kind of arrest of the ship in the hypothesis of the Continental Maritime Law is known as the moderate ship arrest, while arrest of the ship based on an enforceable court choice is known as the court arrest. (2) Temporarily arrest of the ship is exclusively identified with sea asserts and must be articulated by the court. This does not influence any rights or powers vested in any legislature, that is any open specialist, or in any dock or harbor expert, under any worldwide tradition or under any residential laws or controls, to confine or generally keep from cruising any ship inside their ward. Arrest is the safety effort that is stipulated for a lender of sea cases and its premise speaks to an individual commitment of the borrower - the proprietor of the ship being referred to under specific conditions, and the charterer, or other individual in charge of the claim against that ship, however isn't its proprietor[5]. This association between the oceanic case and the element in charge of its settlement is reflected in the lawful probability that the Convention gives to a loan boss, that for the case emerged out against the ship of the indebted person, the leaser may arrest some other ship possessed by him, thought to be the ship of a similar proprietor if every one of its parts have a place with a similar individual. The special case to this comprehensively settled appropriate to grab another ship having a place with a similar proprietor is made in three cases: question with regards to the title to or responsibility for dispatch, joint possession, ownership and in connection

[4] Bolanča, D., (1996), Privremene mjere kao mjere osiguranja u hrvatskom pomorskom zakonodavstvu, Pravni vjesnik 12(1-4), pp. 96-105.

[5] Robin Warner and Stuart Kaye, “Routledge Handbook of Maritie Regulation andØ Enforcement”,New York,2016.

to the privileges of lenders under the home loan or hypothecation of any ship. The lender in such cases can exclusively arrest the ship against which the particular claim emerged out.(3) Possibility of capturing another ship having a place with a similar proprietor, i.e. renter or charterer, contingent upon who is by and by at risk for certain oceanic case, is referred to in legitimate hypothesis as a "sister deliver arrest." This privilege to grab another ship is perceived today in relatively every state, except way to deal with the issue contrasts from state to state[6]. A few states, such as, the United Kingdom, enabled the likelihood to grab another ship having a place with a similar proprietor after selection of the 1952 Convention. The United Kingdom practiced this privilege by the Law of 1956, as the writing calls attention to, to consent English law in this issue with mainland law nations[7]. The likelihood to grab another ship having a place with a similar proprietor was affirmed by the Supreme Court Act of 1981.(4) Another issue that emerges regarding the "sister deliver" statement is the issue of the personality of the ship proprietor. It might be, indeed, debatable whether in deciding the character just the proprietor indicated on a ship's endorsement of registry issued by an Administration (enlisted proprietor) is perceived, or the assurance procedure goes more remote than that, and figures out who the valuable proprietor (French, véritable propriétaire) is. Most states permit assurance of the useful proprietor and join the privileges of the "sister deliver" condition to him.(5) The Convention gives a method for demonstrating the presence of an oceanic claim and legitimacy of a sea assert, which would be reason enough to grab the ship. This arrangement was left to national enactment. As per our law and the laws of most different states, the court might permit the arrest of the ship if the lender makes his case conceivable. Extra obligation, as per our law, is that a bank needs to legitimize the arrest affected by documenting a claim with the skillful court not later than 15 days after allowed arrest of the ship.(6) Arrest of the ship as per the Convention and the enactment of the nations that acknowledge the Convention is of a transitory character. The principle goal of the arrest is that the loan boss who arrestd the ship secures his cases[8]. The lender in such cases can exclusively arrest the ship against which the particular claim emerged out.(3) Possibility of capturing another ship having a place with a similar proprietor, i.e. renter or charterer, contingent upon who is by and by at risk for certain oceanic case, is referred to in

[6] MV MONTENEGRO ARREST
[7] MV Elisabeth vs harwan
[8] Elizabeth R.DeSombre“ Flagging Standards” , The MIT Press,Cambridge,Massachusetts London ,England 2006

legitimate hypothesis as a "sister deliver arrest." This privilege to grab another ship is perceived today in relatively every state, except way to deal with the issue contrasts from state to state.The last plausibility, which originates from the seizure affected, comprises of the privilege to offer the ship in the authorization methodology. In any case, the proprietor of the ship, or other individual who utilizes the ship, may discharge the ship from the arrest affected, either by paying the obligation or by giving a fitting certification to lenders' cases. Outside vessels can't be arrestd and seized for authorization amid a blameless section through the regional ocean or interior waters, where a worldwide or intergovernmental administration of route is in drive[9].

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESSTIONS :

Our nation approved the 1952 Convention. Amid confirmation, it utilized the privilege to enter a reservation not to apply the arrangements of the Convention, but rather its own particular right with regards to debate about responsibility for deliver. It was then justifiable considering the alleged state (open) responsibility for in that period. Nonetheless, that reason isn't substantial any more. In the rest of the part, the Convention was confirmed without reservations, which incorporated its usage overall, with no extra changes or alterations. The privilege to arrest the ship is consolidated in our law is still in the Law on Maritime and Inland Navigation, which speaks to a positive bit of enactment in Montenegro. Despite the fact that Montenegro, following its freedom, began making another oceanic legitimate system in a way that specific zones of the Law on Maritime and Inland Navigation are to be isolated and controlled by extraordinary laws, another enactment in this issue has not been received yet. Furthermore, we trust that, despite the fact that Montenegro has not endorsed the 1999 Convention, it is helpful to consider and to acknowledge an answer which that Convention gives as the insurance of ship proprietors from over the top cases of loan bosses amid the arrest of vessels.

[9] Natalie klein, “Dispute settlement in the UN convention on the law of the sea”, CambridgeØ University Press, New York,2005.

REFERENCES:

1. Berlingieri, F., (2000), Arrest of ships, A commentary on the 1952 and 1999 Arrest Conventions, third edition, London, Hong Kong.
2. Bolanča, D., (1996), Privremene mjere kao mjere osiguranja u hrvatskom pomorskom zakonodavstvu, Pravni vjesnik 12(1-4), pp. 96-105.
3. MV MONTENEGRO arrest
4. MV Elisabeth vs harwan
5. CORFU CHANNEL CASE
6. MV SAIGA CASE
7. Elizabeth R.DeSombre“ Flagging Standards” , The MIT Press,Cambridge,Massachusetts London ,England 2006
8. David freestone ,Richard branes and David ONG, “The law of the sea”, oxford universityØ press , New York, 2009.
9. Martin Davies , “Jurisdiction and forum selection in international maritime law”,Kluwer LawØ International, The Hague,Netherlands, 2005.
10. Natalie klein, “Dispute settlement in the UN convention on the law of the sea”, CambridgeØ University Press, New York,2005.
11. Douglas Guilfoyle, “Shipping interdiction and the law of the sea”, Cambridge UniversityØ Press, New York, 2009.
12. Dr. Satyendra kumar sharma, “TAXMANN’S, Law of sea and exclusive economic zone”,Ø Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd,2008.
13. O.P.Sharma, “The International Law of the sea, India and the UN convention of 1982,Ø Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2009.
14. Robin Warner and Stuart Kaye, “Routledge Handbook of Maritie Regulation andØ Enforcement”,New York,2016.
15. Saint Vincent and grendins V. Guinea (MV Saiga case)
16. Italian republic V. Republic of India, (Enrica lexie case)
17. Kingdom of Netherlands V. Russian Federation (Artic sunrise case)
18. Japan V. Russian Federation
19. Mobarak Ali Ahamed V. State of Bombay
20. Saint Vincent and grendins V. Guinea (Juno Trader case)

21. Dr.Lakshmi T and Rajeshkumar S "In Vitro Evaluation of Anticariogenic Activity of Acacia Catechu against Selected Microbes", International Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Science & Technology, Volume No. 3 , Issue No. 3, P.No 20-25, March 2018.

22.Trishala A , Lakshmi T and Rajeshkumar S," Physicochemical profile of Acacia catechu bark extract –An In vitro study", International Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Science & Technology, Volume No. 3 , Issue No. 4, P.No 26-30, April 2018.