Time Charter: Speed Claim or Off-Hire Claim?

This article (in the same or a different version) previously appeared on:

The Maritime Executive, 13 August, 2021

The Marine Law Box, No. 3, August, 2021

Dr. Arun Kasi

4-5 Gray's Inn Square

Every time charterparty will have a speed-consumption warranty, called performance warranty. In tanker trade, the performance warranty will also include a pumping warranty, but we are concerned here with only speed-consumption aspect. The two very popular forms are NYPE (referring to 1946 version) for dry cargo and SHELLTIME 4 (revised 2003) for tanker. Usually, the forms are extensively modified, and rider clauses added. The warranty, in the case of NYPE form, is about the vessel's performance capability at the time of delivery. In the case of SHELLTIME 4 form, it is a continuing warranty throughout the service.

Where the warranty attaches, as with NYPE, at the time of delivery, proof of the vessel's underperformance during the charter service will often be evidence of the vessel's incapability at the time of delivery (*Didymi Corp v Atlantic Lines and Navigation Co Inc (The "Didymi")* [1988] 2 Lloyd's Rep 108 CA; *Exmar NV v BP Shipping Ltd (The "Gas Enterprise")* [1993] 2 Lloyd's Rep 352 CA; and *Polaris Shipping Co Ltd v Sinoriches Enterprises Co Ltd (The "Ocean Virgo")* [2015] EWHC 3405 (Comm). Additionally, the owner has a duty to maintain the vessel in a thoroughly efficient state throughout the service and the master has a duty to prosecute the voyages with utmost despatch. Hence, in practice, whether the warranty attaches at the time of delivery or throughout service, the vessel must achieve the warranted performance. If not, the owner will be liable for breach of the performance warranty.

In certain circumstances specified in the charterparty the vessel will go off-hire (cl 15 NYPE form and cl 21 SHELLTIME 4 form). One such circumstance is where the vessel's speed, during service, is reduced by defect or breakdown. The scope of the circumstance in SHELTIME 4 form is a little wider that in NYPE form. The two – breach of performance warranty and off-hire – are different. But it is not uncommon for merchants to confuse between the two. The vessel is off-hire only if the under-speed was the result of a defect or breakdown upon the service. If the bottom is fouled at the time of delivery, that is considered to be a defect in the hull of the vessel, which will trigger the off-hire event (*Ocean Glory Compania Naviera SA v A/S PV Christensen (The "Ioanna")* [1985] 2 Lloyd's Rep 164). However, where the bottom fouling develops during the service, there is somewhat contradictory views (*The Ioanna* and *Santa Martha Baay Scheepvaart and Handelsmaatschappij NV v Scanbulk A/S (The "Rijn")* [1981] 2 Lloyd's Rep 267). The vessel goes off-hire only for the period of time lost by the off-hire event (which is called 'net clause') and not for the entire period during which the off-hire event subsists (which is called 'period clause') (*Bulk Ship Union SA v Clipper Bulk Shipping Ltd (The "Pearl C")* [2012] EWHC 2595 (Comm)). For example, by reason of the defect, the vessel completes a voyage in three days, which she would have completed in two days but for the defect. Now the 'net' loss of time is only one day for which the vessel would be off-hire.

One of the key differences in the consequences between a mere breach of performance warranty and off-hire is this. Where the claim is for breach of performance warranty, any fuel saved during the under-speed period will be offset against the underperformance claim sum. If it is an off-hire claim, there is no such set-off, so the fuel saving goes to the benefit of the charterer – a windfall to the charterer (*The "Ioanna"*). For an off-hire claim, no breach by owner need be proved. But underperformance claim is a claim for breach by the owner.

In the case of underperformance, the charterer may deduct the underperformance claim sum as equitable set-off without a need for any contractual provision allowing such set-off, subject only to any contractual limitation (London Arbitration 17/19). In the case of off-hire, the vessel does not earn the hire as a matter of contract and no

hire need be paid for that period. Usually, the contract will also expressly allow deduction. But if the amount deducted goes wrong, the charterer can be in breach that will entitle the owner to withdraw the vessel. There are conflicting views as to whether the owner may withdraw even if the charterer deducted an excessive amount but on reasonable estimate (*Federal Commerce and Navigation Ltd v Molena Alpha Inc and others (The Nanfri, The Benfri, The Lorfri)* [1979] AC 757 HL). The question of right of withdrawal upon such deduction will be the subject of forthcoming article here.

The consequences of making the claim on a wrong basis can be serious. In one arbitration, the charterer deducted from hire the underperformance claim sum as off-hire claim. Subsequently, in arbitration, it switched the basis to performance claim and the deduction justified as 'equitable set-off'. The charterer was allowed to do so (London Arbitration 4/11). In another arbitration, the charterer sought to switch the basis after the six years' time limit had set in, which the tribunal disallowed (London Arbitration 9/18).

In most cases, it will rightly be an underperformance claim rather than an off-hire clause. Charterers, if they desire to deduct on off-hire basis, must exercise caution before doing so.

Dr. Arun Kasi

14 May 2023

Acknowledgements:

Thanks to Mr. Prokopis Krikris (Claim Manager) of Meadway Bulkers, Athens for reviewing a draft of this article and making helpful suggestions.

This article is provided free of charge for information purposes only. Every reasonable effort is made to ensure the contents are accurate and up to date, but no responsibility for its accuracy, or for any consequences of relying on it, is assumed by the authors or by Chambers as a whole. The contents, including any commentaries do not, and are not intended to, amount to legal advice to any person. You are strongly advised to obtain case specific advice from a lawyer; please contact the clerking team at 4-5 Gray's Inn Square (clerks@4-5.co.uk) who will be glad to assist.

© Dr. Arun Kasi