

## CLAIM SUMMARY / DETERMINATION

**Claim Number:** J05003-0010  
**Claimant:** IMC Shipping Co. Pte. Ltd., Ayu Navigation Sdn Bhd  
**Type of Claimant:** Corporate  
**Type of Claim:** Limit of Liability  
**Claim Manager:** [REDACTED]  
**Amount Requested:** \$175.00 [REDACTED]

### Incident:

The M/V SELENDANG AYU was on a voyage from Seattle to China when on the morning of December 6, 2004 while operating in adverse heavy weather conditions, the crew shut down the main engine as a result of a casualty to the No. 3 cylinder. The crew initially intended to repair the cylinder by changing the liner but determined to only isolate the cylinder. After some hours spent isolating the cylinder, the crew could not restart the engine. It was then decided to renew the piston rings in the No. 6 cylinder, which required removal of the cylinder head. While attempting to renew the piston rings, the vessel drifted toward Unalaska Island and eventually grounded on December 8 on a rocky shelf on the north shore of Unalaska Island, northeast of Spray Cape. The grounding ruptured the vessel's bottom tanks, releasing approximately 330,000 gallons of bunkers into the waters off Unalaska Island.

### The Claimant and The Claim

#### The Claimants

The Claimants are the OPA responsible parties and their insurers. Ayu Navigation Sdn Bhd was the owner of the vessel and IMC Shipping Co. Pte. Ltd. was the operator of the vessel. Sveriges Angfartygs Assurans Forening (The Swedish Club), the members of the International Group of Protection and indemnity Clubs ("International Group"), and the International Group's re-insurers were their subrogated underwriters

#### The Claim

The Claimants provided correspondence to the National Pollution Funds Center (NPFC) outlining their claims for reimbursement for third-party damage claims, which were paid by the responsible party as a result of the M/V SELENDANG AYU oil spill.<sup>1</sup> Correspondence was also provided from MR & Associates that provided details regarding claims management and cost auditing services in this matter.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See letter dated December 6, 2007 and March 21, 2012 to the NPFC from Keesal, Young, & Logan.

<sup>2</sup> See letter dated November 27, 2007 from MR & Associates to Keesal, Young & Logan

This claim is one of several third-party claims submitted to the NPFC and is identified as J05003-0010. The Claimants seek \$175.00 for a payment that was made for "consultation/remote land valuation". Invoice number 419 and a check were provided as evidence to document the claim.<sup>3</sup>

### **Applicable Law**

Under OPA 90, at 33 USC § 2702(a), responsible parties are liable for removal costs and damages resulting from the discharge of oil into navigable waters and adjoining shorelines, as described in Section 2702(b) of OPA 90.

Under 33 CFR 136.105(a) and 136.105(e)(6), the claimant bears the burden of providing to the NPFC, all evidence, information, and documentation deemed necessary by the Director, NPFC, to support the claim.

Under 136.213 "Authorized Claimants" are (a) A claim for injury to or economic losses resulting from the destruction of, real or personal property may be presented only by a claimant either owning or leasing the property (b) Any claim for loss profits or impairment of earned capacity due to injury to destruction of, or loss of real property must be included as subpart of the claim under this section and must include the proof under 136.233.

Under 136.215 "Proof"

- (a) In addition to the requirements of Subparts A and B of this part, a claimant must establish –
  - (1) An ownership or leasehold interest in the property;
  - (2) That the property was injured or destroyed;
  - (3) The cost of repair or replacement; and
  - (4) The value of the property both before and after the injury occurred
- (b) In addition, for each claim for economic loss resulting from destruction of real or personal property, the claimant must establish –
  - (1) That the property was not available for use and, if it had been, the value of that use;
  - (2) Whether or not substitute property was available and, if used, the costs thereof; and
  - (3) That the economic loss claimed was incurred as a result of the injury to or destruction of the property

Under 136.217 "Compensation Allowable:

- (a) The amount of compensation allowable for damaged property is the lesser of
  - (1) Actual or estimated net cost of repairs necessary to restore the property to substantially the same condition which existed immediately before the damage;
  - (2) The difference between value of the property before and after the damage; or
  - (3) The replacement value.

---

<sup>3</sup> See, Claimant Bates BSB 1 thru 3.

- (b) Compensation for economic loss resulting from the destruction of real or personal property may be allowed in an amount equal to the reasonable costs actually incurred for use of substitute commercial property or, if substitute commercial property was not reasonably available, in an amount equal to the net economic loss which resulted from not having use of the property. When substitute commercial property was reasonably available, but not used, allowable compensation for loss of use is limited to the cost of the substitute commercial property or the property lost, whichever is less. Compensation for loss of use for noncommercial property is not allowable
- (c) Compensation for a claim for loss of profits or impairment of earnings capacity under 136.213(b) is limited to that allowable under 136.235.

Under 33 CFR 136.105(e)(8) The reasonable costs of incurred by the claimant in assessing the damages claimed (are allowable). This includes the reasonable costs of estimating the damages claimed but not attorney's fees or other administrative costs associated with preparation of the claim.

### Analysis

The Claimants seek reimbursement for a \$175.00 payment they allegedly made to Black, Smith, Bethard & Carlson, (Black Smith) LLC on June 29th.<sup>4</sup> The only documentation provided by the Claimants was an invoice for "Consultation and Remote Land and Valuation", along with an alleged check payment. The check provided in the claim documentation appeared to be over typed with a date of 6/29, but no year visible. The Claimants failed to provide documentation to show what lands were valued and if those lands were part of the Selendang Ayu oil spill incident. Additionally, the Claimants failed to provide documentation to show what consultation/valuation services were rendered and the rate of services applied. Therefore, this claim is denied.

If the Claimants were to come back on reconsideration of this claim, they would need to provide: 1) clear proof of payment to Black Smith including the date of the check, 2) rates applied to the costs for Black Smith's services, 3) documentation to prove the actual services provided by Black Smith, including what lands were valued/consulted on, why the work needed to be performed and the dates this work was performed.

This claim is denied.

Claim Supervisor:

Date of Supervisor's review: May 30, 2013

Supervisor Action: *Denial Approved.*

Supervisor's Comments:

---

<sup>4</sup> The check provided as documentation was not clear enough to distinguish the year issued. It also lacked evidence that the check had been collected by Black Smith.