



ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

Shipping Law 2017

5th Edition

A practical cross-border insight into shipping law

Published by Global Legal Group, with contributions from:

Advokatfirman Lindahl KB

Ana Cristina Pimentel & Associados,
Sociedade de Advogados, SP, RL

Arias, Fábrega & Fábrega

Bech-Bruun

BLACK SEA LAW COMPANY

Bloomfield Law Practice

Budidjaja International Lawyers

Clyde & Co LLP

D. L. & F. DE SARAM

Dardani Studio Legale

Dingli & Dingli

Esenyel&Partners Law Firm

Estudio Arca & Paoli Abogados

Fleet Hamburg LLP

FRANCO & ABOGADOS ASOCIADOS

FRANCO, DUARTE, MURILLO,
ARREDONDO

Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP
Goodwell & Co.

Hamdan Alshamsi Lawyers &
Legal Consultants

HFW

Hiratsuka & Co.

Izard Weston

Kegels & Co

Law Offices CHOI & KIM

Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law

LERINS & BCW

LEX NAVICUS CONCORDIA

Liouta & Partners Law Firm

Mulla & Mulla & Craigie Blunt & Caroe
Noble Shipping Law

Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP

Q.E.D INTERLEX CONSULTING SRL

Rosicki, Grudziński & Co.

Sabatino Pizzolante Abogados
Marítimos & Comerciales

Tomasello y Weitz

Van Traa Advocaten N.V.

Vda Vieira de Almeida | Angola
Counsel

Vda Vieira de Almeida | Guilherme
Daniel & Associados

VUKIĆ & PARTNERS

Wikborg Rein Advokatfirma AS





global legal group

Contributing Editor

Ed Mills-Webb,
Clyde & Co LLP

Sales Director

Florjan Osmani

Account Director

Oliver Smith

Sales Support Manager

Paul Mochalski

Sub Editor

Nicholas Catlin

Senior Editors

Suzie Levy, Rachel Williams

Chief Operating Officer

Dror Levy

Group Consulting Editor

Alan Falach

Publisher

Rory Smith

Published by

Global Legal Group Ltd.
59 Tanner Street
London SE1 3PL, UK
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

GLG Cover Design

F&F Studio Design

GLG Cover Image Source

iStockphoto

Printed by

Ashford Colour Press Ltd.
August 2017

Copyright © 2017
Global Legal Group Ltd.
All rights reserved
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-911367-65-9

ISSN 2052-5419

Strategic Partners



General Chapters:

1	Unsafe Ports and the “OCEAN VICTORY”: What is an ‘Abnormal Occurrence’? – Ed Mills-Webb & Mark Tilley, Clyde & Co LLP	1
2	Maritime Liens: Update on Recent Decisions of U.S. Courts Following the Collapse of O.W. Bunker – John R. Keough & George G. Cornell, Clyde & Co US LLP	5
3	Risks in the Offshore Energy Industry in Mexico – Daniel Aranda & Alejandro Gómez-Strozzi, Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP	11
4	Terms and Conditions: The Importance of Clarity and Certainty – Donald Chard, BIMCO	13
5	Updating the Baltic Code – Mark Jackson, The Baltic Exchange	17

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

6	Angola	VdA Vieira de Almeida Angola Counsel: João Afonso Fialho & José Miguel Oliveira	19
7	Australia	HFW: Hazel Brewer & Nic van der Reyden	25
8	Belgium	Kegels & Co: André Kegels	32
9	Brazil	Clyde & Co LLP: Stirling Leech	39
10	Canada	Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP: John W. Bromley & Andrew J. Stainer	45
11	Chile	Tomasello y Weitz: Leslie Tomasello Weitz	50
12	China	Goodwell & Co.: William Lupo & Tan Jie	54
13	Colombia	FRANCO & ABOGADOS ASOCIADOS: Javier Franco	60
14	Croatia	VUKIĆ & PARTNERS: Gordan Stanković	64
15	Denmark	Bech-Bruun: Johannes Grove Nielsen & Birgitte Barfoed	69
16	Dominican Republic	Q.E.D INTERLEX CONSULTING SRL: Luis Lucas Rodríguez Pérez	75
17	France	LERINS & BCW: Laurent Garrabos	80
18	Germany	Fleet Hamburg LLP: Dr. Christoph Hasche	86
19	Greece	Liouta & Partners Law Firm: Marina D. Liouta & Avraam Papadimos	92
20	Hong Kong	Clyde & Co LLP: Matthew Lam & KinCheung Kung	97
21	India	Mulla & Mulla & Craigie Blunt & Caroe: Shardul Thacker	102
22	Indonesia	Budidjaja International Lawyers: Juni Dani & Bama Djokonugroho	109
23	Ireland	Noble Shipping Law: Helen Noble	115
24	Italy	Dardani Studio Legale: Marco Manzone & Lawrence Dardani	120
25	Japan	Hiratsuka & Co.: Makoto Hiratsuka & Yuji Miyazaki	126
26	Korea	Law Offices CHOI & KIM: J. H. Choi & S. W. Park	132
27	Malta	Dingli & Dingli: Dr. Tonio Grech & Dr. Fleur Delia	137
28	Mexico	FRANCO, DUARTE, MURILLO, ARREDONDO: Rafael Murillo	141
29	Mozambique	VdA Vieira de Almeida Guilherme Daniel & Associados: João Afonso Fialho & José Miguel Oliveira	145
30	Netherlands	Van Traa Advocaten N.V.: Vincent Pool & Jolien Kruit	150
31	New Zealand	Izard Weston: John Burton & Emmet Maclaurin	157
32	Nigeria	Bloomfield Law Practice: Adedoyin Afun	162
33	Norway	Wikborg Rein Advokatfirma AS: Gaute Gjelsten & Morten Lund Mathisen	168
34	Panama	Arias, Fábrega & Fábrega: Jorge Loaiza III	174
35	Peru	Estudio Arca & Paoli Abogados: Francisco Arca Patiño & Carla Paoli Consigliere	185
36	Poland	Rosicki, Grudziński & Co.: Maciej Grudziński & Piotr Rosicki	191
37	Portugal	Ana Cristina Pimentel & Associados, Sociedade de Advogados, SP, RL: Ana Cristina Pimentel	197
38	Russia	LEX NAVICUS CONCORDIA: Konstantin Krasnokutskiy	202
39	Singapore	Clyde & Co Clasis Singapore LLP: Gerald Yee & Andrew Gray	208
40	Sri Lanka	D. L. & F. DE SARAM: Jivan Goonetilleke & Savantha De Saram	213

Continued Overleaf →

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.



Country Question and Answer Chapters:

41	Sweden	Advokatfirman Lindahl KB: Philip Tonkin & Elias Himself	219
42	Taiwan	Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law: Daniel T.H. Tsai & James Chang	224
43	Tanzania	Clyde & Co Tanzania LLP: Peter Kasanda & Iain Boyle	229
44	Turkey	Esenyel&Partners Law Firm: Selcuk S. Esenyel	234
45	Ukraine	BLACK SEA LAW COMPANY: Evgeniy Sukachev & Anastasia Sukacheva	239
46	United Arab Emirates	Hamdan Alshamsi Lawyers & Legal Consultants: Dr. Ghandy Abuhawash	244
47	United Kingdom	Clyde & Co LLP: Ed Mills-Webb	248
48	USA	Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP: Peter A. McLaughlan & Anacarolina Estaba	253
49	Venezuela	Sabatino Pizzolante Abogados Marítimos & Comerciales: José Alfredo Sabatino Pizzolante & Iván Darío Sabatino Pizzolante	262

Venezuela

Sabatino Pizzolante Abogados
Marítimos & Comerciales



José Alfredo Sabatino Pizzolante



Iván Darío Sabatino Pizzolante

1 Marine Casualty

1.1 In the event of a collision, grounding or other major casualty, what are the key provisions that will impact upon the liability and response of interested parties? In particular, the relevant law / conventions in force in relation to:

i) Collision

Rules related to collision can be found in Title VI of the Law on Maritime Commerce (The LMC) published in the Official Gazette No. 38,351 dated 6th January 2006, and based on the 1910 Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules of Law with respect to Collisions between Vessels.

Collision is defined by domestic legislation as the violent material contact between two or more vessels, navigating or capable of navigation in aquatic spaces. As prescribed by the Convention, Art. 328 of the LMC states that the collision rules extend to reparation of damages caused by a vessel to another vessel or vessels; or to the property or persons that might be on board these vessels, even if a collision has not actually taken place and these damages are caused by the execution or non-execution of a manoeuvring, or by the non-observance of the law.

Legal actions for the recovery of damages arising from a collision must be brought within two years of the date of the casualty. In the case of joint liability among the vessels, or among the parties in a convoy, the time-bar for legal actions to exercise the right of recourse by reason of sums paid in excess of those that are payable is one year, to be counted from the date of payment.

ii) Pollution

Venezuela is a signatory to the 1969 International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage Convention, as amended in 1976 and 1984, published in the Official Extraordinary Gazette No. 4,340 dated 28th November 1991, as well as the 1992 Protocol published in Official Gazette No. 36,457 dated 20th May 1998, and so liability of ship owners for oil pollution is governed by said provisions. Consequently, ship owners are strictly liable for damages resulting from an oil spill, unless such damage has been caused by the events referred to in the Convention. Ship owners, however, are entitled to limit liability in accordance with the Convention, following the procedural rules prescribed by the LMC (Art. 74).

iii) Salvage / general average

The main provisions of the 1989 International Convention on Salvage are incorporated within domestic legislation, enacted in the LMC. A salvage operation means any act or activity undertaken to

assist a vessel or any other property in danger in navigable waters or in any other waters whatsoever (Art. 336). Salvage operations which have had a useful result shall give rise to the right to a reward. Unless otherwise agreed, if the salvage operations have had no useful result, no payment is due. Insofar as the criteria for fixing the reward, domestic provisions follow Art. 13 of the Convention.

Any action relating to payment under domestic provisions shall be time-barred within a period of two years, to be counted as from the day on which the salvage operations are terminated. The person against whom a claim is made may at any time during the running of the limitation period interrupt it by means of a declaration to the claimant, although interruption is allowed only once.

On the other hand, general average is also governed by the provisions of the LMC according to which the acts and contributions will be subject to the agreements between the parties, or in any case to the rules and international practices if they are more recent; however, for the purposes of qualification, liquidation and distribution, the parties may freely agree on the application of national or international rules, uses or practices. It follows that the York Antwerp Rules are admitted (Art. 368).

In the case of declaration of general average, the consignee that must contribute to its payment shall sign, before receiving the cargo, a compromise of average making a deposit in cash or submitting a guarantee to the satisfaction of the carrier, actual carrier or their representative to guarantee the payment of the respective contribution, or to guarantee the consignee the reserves he may consider appropriate. In the absence of a deposit or guarantee, the carrier, actual carrier or their representative may request the embargo of the cargo pursuant to a sea protest filed with the authority (Art. 371).

With regard to a time limit, as prescribed by Art. 369, in those cases where a general average compromise is not signed, any party alleging a legitimate interest in the voyage may exercise an action in order to obtain payment of respective contributions within a period of one year, counted from the time of the occurrence of the event. Besides, in those cases where a general average compromise has been signed, the liquidation will be practised. In case of disagreement or non-compliance with what has been decided in the liquidation, the parties may refer to the judiciary, in which case the matter will be decided according to the Brief Procedure as stated in the Civil Procedural Code. This action will be decided on within two years, to be counted from the manifestation of disagreement, or the verification of the non-compliance, whichever occurs first (Art. 370).

iv) Wreck removal

This matter is covered by Art. 92 of the Law on Merchant Marine and Related Activities (The LMMRA), last amendment published in Official Extraordinary Gazette No. 6,153 of 18th November 2014.

Thus, the obstruction of a navigation channel due to grounding of a vessel, collision of two or more ships, collision between a ship and a fixed object, sinking of a vessel as a result of the former, among other causes, will impose upon the ship owner the following obligations: notification of the incident to the Port Captaincy; marking the place where the danger to navigation is (such mark should be appropriate and maintained); surveillance of the area and ensuring that the other ships are warned of the danger in the area in case the wreck has not been located; removal of the vessel with its remains expeditiously and diligently, in the period agreed by the aquatic authority and the ship owner or his representative – in the event no agreement is reached, the aquatic authority will set such time period; and to reimburse expenses incurred by a third party for the marking of danger, surveillance of the area and removal of the wreck.

(v) Limitation of liability

The LMC has incorporated the provisions of the 1976 Convention on Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims. Consequently, in Art. 41, the right for ship owners to contractually limit liability is recognised. Unless prohibited by the law, ship owners may limit liability in the same manner as listed in Art. 2 of the Convention.

Limitation figures strictly follow the general limits prescribed by Art. 6 of the Convention, including those for loss of life or personal injury to passengers of a ship. Insurers of claims subject to limitation shall be entitled to limit liability pursuant to these legal provisions, in the same way as is assured under Art. 49.

(vi) The limitation fund

According to Art. 52 of the LMC, ship owners, charterers, insurers, salvors and in general any person who considers that they have a right to limit their responsibility may appear before the maritime court and request to start a proceeding to constitute the limitation fund, verify and liquidate the credits and distribute them in the form and terms prescribed by law. Said request for limitation and constitution of the fund may be asked for at any stage of the court proceedings.

The petition for opening the limitation procedure must indicate the fact giving rise to the damages for which the request is made, the maximum amount of the limitation fund calculated according to the law, the list of the creditors known by the petitioner with indication of their domiciles, definite or provisional amount of their credit and its nature and all the documents that justify the calculation of the amount of the fund.

Pursuant to Art. 56, after examining whether the amount of the limitation fund calculated by the petitioner is correct, the court will declare the limitation procedure initiated and also appoint a liquidator. The court will pronounce upon the modes offered for the fund ordering its constitution; it will also set up the amount that the petitioner shall submit to the court to guarantee the costs of the procedure, calculated in a provisional way, so that it includes the value of the necessary studies and the payment of the liquidator, fixed by the court's previous agreement with the petitioner, which shall not be higher than 10% of the value of the fund. The fund will only be constituted in cash money, in financial instruments or in securities issued or guaranteed by the Republic. Once the limitation fund is constituted, any ship or other property of the petitioner in connection to credits to which the limitation of liability is invoked will be suspended.

As required by Art. 61, all existing claims, actions or procedures or those that may be eventually instituted against the petitioner, in respect of which he may limit his responsibility, will be accumulated to the procedure for limitation.

Following the order of the court for the constitution of the limitation fund, the creditors will be notified within the following 30 days, being able to make opposition to the limitation of liability. In the meantime, the liquidator will submit the list of creditors with the right to participate in the distribution of the fund, to be effected

within 30 days after publication of the list, based on the rules on the privileges prescribed by the law. Those credits whose opposition has not been resolved will be subject to the reserves made by the liquidator, who will proceed to distributing the rest of the fund.

1.2 What are the authorities' powers of investigation / casualty response in the event of a collision, grounding or other major casualty?

The authority vested with broader powers for the investigation of casualties is the National Institute of Aquatic Spaces (INEA) and the Port Captaincies as its local branches. In case of casualties the Master, through his agent, is obliged to make formal notification of the incident to the Port Captaincy within 24 hours of arrival, as prescribed by Art. 87 of the LMMRA. Although the aquatic authority has the obligation to notify the casualty to other competent authorities that may have interest in the incident, the investigation in the maritime field will be carried out by the Port Captaincy, which in case of a casualty will appoint an Investigation Committee in charge of preparing a formal report.

2 Cargo Claims

2.1 What are the international conventions and national laws relevant to marine cargo claims?

When dealing with the provisions for the carriage of goods by water, contained in Chapter III, Title V, the LMC adopts a mixed regime (i.e. Hague-Visby/Hamburg rules) for its regulation. Art. 199 makes it clear that these provisions shall apply whatever the nationality of the ship, carrier, actual carrier, shipper, consignee or any other interested person might be. Nevertheless, according to Art. 201, these provisions do not apply to charter-parties, unless a bill of lading is issued pursuant to a charter-party and it governs the relationship between the carrier and the holder of the bill of lading (which is not the charterer). It follows that any shipment to or from Venezuela under liner traffic will be subject to the provisions of Chapter III in terms of the liability regime, exoneration and limitation of liability, time-bar, etc., irrespective of the nationality of the ship.

Insofar as the period of responsibility is concerned, Art. 202 states that it covers the period during which the goods are under the custody of the carrier at the port of loading, during the actual carriage, and at the port of discharge. Goods are deemed to be under the custody of the carrier from the moment he receives the goods from the shipper or the person acting on his behalf, or from any other competent authority through a document issued to such effect, until that time when he has delivered the goods: 1) to the consignee – in cases when the consignee does not receive the goods from the carrier, the carrier shall make them available to the consignee pursuant to contract, law or common commercial practice at the port of discharge; or 2) to an authority or a third party to whom goods must be delivered, pursuant to contract, law or common commercial practice at the port of discharge (Art. 203).

2.2 What are the key principles applicable to cargo claims brought against the carrier?

The carrier will be able to exonerate and limit liability in certain cases. The events giving rise to exoneration from liability are found in Art. 206, matching the content of Art. 4 of the Hague-Visby Rules. Limitation of liability is found in Art. 211 of the LMC, according to which the liability of the carrier or the ship in respect of losses or

damage to goods shall in no case exceed the limit of 666.67 units of account per package or per any other unit of cargo transported, or 2.50 units of account per kilogram of gross weight of goods lost or damaged, whichever is the higher, unless the shipper has declared before shipment the nature and value of merchandise and such declaration has been incorporated to the bill of lading and such declaration has not been an administrative imposition on the country of loading or discharge. Liability of the carrier for delay in delivery shall be limited in similar terms to those set out in the Hamburg Rules. The loss of the right to limit liability is regulated by Art. 218 stating that the carrier, his employees, agents and port operators nominated by the carrier may not invoke the limitation of liability, as provided in Chapter III, if it is proved that the loss, damage or delay in delivery resulted from an act or omission with the intent to cause such loss, damage or delay or gross negligence.

As per Art. 253 of the LMC, all actions derived from the contract of carriage of goods by water lapse after one year, counted from date of delivery of the merchandise by carrier to the consignee, or the date when the merchandise should have been delivered.

2.3 In what circumstances may the carrier establish claims against the shipper relating to misdeclaration of cargo?

In light of the LMC, the shipper, its servant or agent are not liable for losses sustained by the carrier or the actual carrier, or for damage sustained by the ship, unless such loss or damage was caused by their fault (Art. 229).

As required by Art. 230, if the goods are dangerous the shipper must mark or label the goods as such in a suitable manner. Where the shipper hands over dangerous goods to the carrier or an actual carrier, as the case may be, he must inform him of the dangerous nature of the goods and, if necessary, of the precautions to be taken. If the shipper fails to do so and such carrier or actual carrier does not otherwise have knowledge of their dangerous nature then the shipper is liable to the carrier and any actual carrier for the loss resulting from the shipment of such goods, and the goods may at any time be unloaded, destroyed or rendered innocuous, as the circumstances may require, without payment of compensation.

3 Passenger Claims

3.1 What are the key provisions applicable to the resolution of maritime passenger claims?

The LMC has incorporated the provisions of the Athens Convention in its Chapter V, governing the contract for carriage of passengers.

Indemnity paid by the carrier in cases of death or personal injury to a passenger shall not exceed the amount of 46,666 special drawing rights (Art. 298). The limits of liability both for contractual and non-contractual liability of the carrier in respect of loss or damages suffered by the luggage shall not exceed the following limits: 1) per item of cabin luggage, 833 special drawing rights per passenger, per voyage; 2) per vehicle, including luggage being carried inside the vehicle or on top of it, 3,333 special drawing rights per vehicle, per voyage; and 3) per item of luggage, different from that mentioned above, 1,200 special drawing rights per passenger, per voyage. Contractual and non-contractual liability of the carriers in those cases covered by Arts 286 and 288 of the law shall not exceed 3,000 special drawing rights per passenger.

A time-bar is set up by Art. 308, under which the right to exercise any action for damages due to death or personal injury or for the

loss or damage to luggage or to cabin luggage shall expire after two years have elapsed: 1) in case of personal injury, from the date when passengers disembarked; 2) in case of death or disappearance of the passenger occurring during the carriage, from the date that the passenger should have disembarked; 3) in case of personal injury occurring during the carriage which becomes the cause of death after the passenger disembarks, from the date of death, as long as this lapse does not exceed three years counted from the date passengers disembarked; and 4) in case loss or damages occurred to the luggage or cabin luggage, from the date of disembarking or from the date when disembarkation should have occurred, if this is a later date.

4 Arrest and Security

4.1 What are the options available to a party seeking to obtain security for a maritime claim against a vessel owner and the applicable procedure?

Provisions related to the arrest of ships in Venezuela have significantly improved with the enactment of the LMC, to a great extent incorporating the 1999 International Convention of Arrest of Ships. Art. 93 contains the list of maritime claims giving rise to the arrest of a ship, similar to the one prescribed by the Convention.

The governing provisions allow the arrest of the ship in respect of which the maritime claim arose, as well as the arrest of a sister ship. As per Art. 97 of the LMC, the court shall grant the arrest for a maritime claim when this is founded in a public document or a private one recognised by the other party, accepted invoices, charter-parties, bills of lading or any other document proving the existence of said maritime claim, otherwise, the court as a condition to granting the arrest of the ship may request from the claimant the submission of a guarantee in the amount and subject to the conditions determined by the court. The defendant, however, may oppose the arrest or request the lifting of it, if in the opinion of the court sufficient security has been provided, save in cases in which the ship has been arrested for any dispute as to the possession of the ship or any dispute resulting from a contract of sale.

4.2 Is it possible for a bunker supplier (whether physical and/or contractual) to arrest a vessel for a claim relating to bunkers supplied by them to that vessel?

Bunker supply is within the list of maritime claims as prescribed by Art. 93 of the LMC, and so gives rise to an arrest. It follows that the claimant may request from the maritime court a precautionary measure of prohibition from sailing. The court should agree on the petition without mayor formality, provided antecedents are submitted from which it can be inferred presumption of the right that is claimed. If these antecedents are not sufficient, the court may request a guarantee to decree this precautionary measure.

4.3 Where security is sought from a party other than the vessel owner (or demise charterer) for a maritime claim, including exercise of liens over cargo, what options are available?

Following a ruling by the Supreme Court of Justice in 2004, it has been held that the arrest or preventive embargo should only proceed in the event of maritime claims as listed by the law. In case of credits different from those regarded as maritime claims, a "prohibition from sailing" is available pursuant the rules of the Code for Civil Procedure.

Based on Art. 259 of the LMC, in order to guarantee the payment of freight, use of containers, demurrage, contribution to general average and signature of the bond, the carrier, through an order of the maritime court, may place the goods in the hands of a third party (warehouse), provided the carrier guarantees the corresponding fiscal credit and in the absence of anyone claiming the goods, they will be taken to court auction.

4.4 In relation to maritime claims, what form of security is acceptable; for example, bank guarantee, P&I letter of undertaking.

As previously mentioned, Art. 97 of the LMC states that the court as a condition to grant the arrest of the ship may request from the claimant the submission of a guarantee in the amount and subject to the conditions determined by the former, for the claimant to answer for the damages that may be caused as a consequence of the arrest. Usually, this guarantee may take the shape of a bank guarantee or bond equivalent to 30% of the claim amount as the maximum legal costs, plus double the said claim amount. The lifting of the arrest as well as any other embargo measure granted by the court will be subject to the submission of a bank guarantee. A letter of undertaking issued by a reputable Protection and Indemnity (P&I) Club can be only used if acceptable by claimants.

5 Evidence

5.1 What steps can be taken (and when) to preserve or obtain access to evidence in relation to maritime claims including any available procedures for the preservation of physical evidence, examination of witnesses or pre-action disclosure?

As allowed by Art. 16 of the Law on Maritime Procedure (LMP) published in the Official Extraordinary Gazette No. 5,554, dated 13th November 2001, even before the claim is brought, any interested party may request a judicial inspection from the court in order to certify the state of persons, things, sites or documents. This is also established by the provisions of the Code for Civil Procedure. To achieve this, those persons to whom such proof will be opposed shall be summoned in advance, except in cases where, by reason of urgency, this is not possible, and in such cases those persons will be assigned a court-appointed defence counsel who will attend to the inspection.

5.2 What are the general disclosure obligations in court proceedings?

Maritime procedural rules incorporate the so-called “discovery”. As per Art. 9 of the LMP, after answering the claim, and once precedent matters presented by the defendant have been amended or decided, any of the parties may request, within a period of five days, that the court orders the other party: 1) to exhibit documents, records or registers under the other party’s control or custody, related to the subject claim, or to allow for these documents, records or registers to be reproduced by any means; and 2) to allow access to a ship, pier, dry dock, warehouse, facility or port area, in order to perform an inspection of ships, merchandise or any other object or document; or in order to measure, photograph or reproduce them. As per Art. 10, the judge shall request the required parties to exhibit documents, recordings or registers, and allow access to the ship, pier or other

area, requiring compliance with court orders within a period of 20 court days following the issuance date of the order. This period may be extended pursuant to an agreement by the parties or because of a justified cause, as decided by the court. Within the first five days of said period, the requested party may oppose the totality or part of the contents of order, alleging illegality, impertinence or reason of public order. The judge shall resolve in respect of allegations within a period of no more than three court days. Opposition shall suspend the term of compliance. When opposition is decided upon, the period shall continue in respect of those initial elements requested and admitted.

6 Procedure

6.1 Describe the typical procedure and timescale applicable to maritime claims conducted through: i) national courts (including any specialised maritime or commercial courts); ii) arbitration (including specialist arbitral bodies); and iii) mediation / alternative dispute resolution.

Claims are litigated in the maritime courts and governed by the procedural rules introduced with the enactment of the LMP, the main features of which are now oral proceedings and abbreviation. Ordinary procedure before the First Instance Maritime Court, in general terms, is as follows: the claim will be brought in a written manner, also attaching any proof documentation and the name of the witnesses to participate in the oral hearing; and the answer to the claim or submission of precedent matters will take place within the following 20 court days as from the date the writ has been served. The plaintiff is allowed to amend the claim and the defendant may amend the answer to the claim; in any case, after the claim is amended or once the answer to the claim is put into effect, the court will schedule any of the following five court days for the preliminary oral hearing. At any opportunity prior to the oral hearing, the parties may promote any witness, judicial inspection, expertise or recognition, as long as they justify the urgency for such procedure by virtue of the imminent danger or disappearance of evidence. Under this supposition, the judge shall schedule a time which may not be in less than two court days, and the other party must be notified in advance. After initial steps have been complied with, the court will schedule any of the following 30 calendar days for the oral hearing to take place, and the hearing may be extended by another day or couple of days to complete the matter, in which case the judge will proceed to give judgment. Appeal is heard by the Superior Maritime Court and eventually cassation (if any) will be heard by the Supreme Court of Justice.

6.2 Highlight any notable pros and cons related to your jurisdiction that any potential party should bear in mind.

Generally speaking, maritime proceedings develop smoothly. The LMP allows the use of the electronic Power of Attorney. For the purposes of submittal and admission of a lawsuit or any other petition, representation of the plaintiff may be proved by written or electronic means, provided it is accompanied by a guarantee; however, this must be later replaced by the formally granted POA. All supporting documentation must be submitted in original, duly notarised form with the Apostille formalities as per the 1961 Hague Convention and translated into Spanish by a public interpreter.

7 Foreign Judgments and Awards

7.1 Summarise the key provisions and applicable procedures affecting the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments.

The Code for Civil Procedure contains the provisions for the execution of foreign judgments and provides that, in any case, the exequatur of the Supreme Court of Justice for its enforcement is required; however, such exequatur may be denied in the cases specified in the procedural rules.

7.2 Summarise the key provisions and applicable procedures affecting the recognition and enforcement of arbitration awards.

Venezuela is signatory to the Convention for the Recognition and Execution of Foreign Arbitration Awards (New York Convention), published in the Official Extraordinary Gazette No. 4,284 dated 29th December 1994. Therefore, foreign arbitration awards are enforceable provided requisites of Art. IV of the Convention are met, in which case the execution will follow the rules prescribed by the Code for Civil Procedure for the compulsory execution of sentences. In addition to the domestic application of the New York Convention, Venezuela has also enacted the Law for Commercial Arbitration published in the Official Extraordinary Gazette No. 36,430 dated 7th April 1998, based on the Model Law for International Commercial Arbitration by UNCITRAL, whose Art. 48 prescribes that the final arbitration award, wherever it is issued, shall be recognised by ordinary justice as entailing and non-appealable, and on presentation of written petition to the competent Court of First Instance, shall be executed obligatorily by such court with no requirement of an exequatur.

8 Updates and Developments

8.1 Describe any other issues not considered above that may be worthy of note, together with any current trends or likely future developments that may be of interest.

In recent years, the shipping industry in Venezuela has seen a trend towards the criminalisation of seafarers in drug-related cases, resulting in the conviction of seafarers and the retention of ships.

It is worth pointing out that such cases are outside the scope of the maritime jurisdiction, as they are exclusively dealt with by the criminal courts and the investigation is vested with the Prosecutor's office, for which reason it is advisable to use a team of shipping and criminal lawyers to discuss strategies and an effective approach.

The current exchange control regime continues to be an important obstacle for the country's international trade, affecting the regular flow of goods throughout the ports. Presently, the ports have experienced an important reduction in cargo volumes, backed by a punitive newly enacted customs law imposing huge fines to importers and shipping lines. The decline in oil prices has meant that the State has been obliged to look for other sources of foreign currency, for which reason port tariffs in commercial ports, as well as pilotage and towage, are nowadays payable in US dollars, with the resulting increase in costs. The former obliges carriers to review their tariffs and services, in order to cope with such an adverse economic environment. Even so, the oceanic fishing fleet is receiving funding from the government through the newly created Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture, in an effort to double the fishing production for the present year. Despite the difficult times the country is going through, the main container shipping lines are committed to stay and service the main routes to and from the country. On the other hand, Executive Decree No. 769 assigning to the national shipping line Venavega the performance of cargo transportation for the various public agencies, with the support of the cargo reservation provisions prescribed by the 2014 amendments to the General Law on Merchant Marine and Related Activities, has had very little impact on the sector.

Although important projects such as the Puerto Cabello container terminal, under construction by China Harbour Engineering Company, are currently suspended due to lack of funding, the expansion and modernisation of the port of La Guaira by the Portuguese Teixeira Duarte Consortium has been completed, as well as the container terminal operated by the said consortium. In the meantime, the major public ports have been placed under military control by the National Executive, appointing a military official in each one as a "single authority", all of them under the supervision of the Single Authority of the National Port System, sitting in Caracas, the former pursuant to Decree No. 2,382 published in the Official Extraordinary Gazette No. 6,242 dated 22nd July 2016. Although some sectors of the maritime community have seen this as a "militarisation", it is fair to say that the presence of military personnel is not affecting or preventing the operations within the port areas.



**José Alfredo Sabatino
Pizzolante**

Sabatino Pizzolante Abogados
Marítimos & Comerciales
Centro Comercial "Las Valentinas"
Nivel 2, Oficinas 12/13, Calle Puerto Cabello
Puerto Cabello 2050
Venezuela

Tel: +58 242 361 8159 / 4453

Fax: +58 412 421 0545

Email: jose.sabatino@sabatinop.com

URL: www.sabatinop.com

José Alfredo Sabatino Pizzolante holds a Law Degree from the University of Carabobo (Venezuela). He studied at the University of Wales, College of Cardiff, where he obtained an M.Sc. in Port and Shipping Administration, as well as an LL.M. in Maritime Law. He is currently a Partner with Sabatino Pizzolante Abogados Marítimos & Comerciales, Managing Director of Globalpandi, S.A. (P&I Correspondents) and a Professor at the Universidad Experimental Marítima del Caribe (Caracas). He is also a Legal Advisor to the Venezuelan Shipping Association, Vice-President of the Venezuelan Association of Maritime Law, Executive Vice-President of the Venezuelan Association of Port Law, and a Titular Member of the Comité Maritime International (CMI) and the Iberoamerican Institute of Maritime Law. He has written extensively on the subject of Venezuelan maritime law, attending many international seminars and conferences as a speaker.



**Iván Darío Sabatino
Pizzolante**

Sabatino Pizzolante Abogados
Marítimos & Comerciales
Centro Comercial "Las Valentinas"
Nivel 2, Oficinas 12/13, Calle Puerto Cabello
Puerto Cabello 2050
Venezuela

Tel: +58 242 361 8159 / 4453

Fax: +58 412 421 0545

Email: ivan.sabatino@sabatinop.com

URL: www.sabatinop.com

Iván Darío Sabatino Pizzolante is a lawyer who graduated from the Universidad de Carabobo (Venezuela), with a specialisation in Maritime Law from the School for Superior Studies of Merchant Shipping, Caracas, Venezuela. He followed a course specialising in International Maritime Law at the Spanish Maritime Institute (IME) and Universidad Pontificia de Comillas, Spain, and later gained a specialisation in Commercial Arbitration from the Universidad Católica Andrés Bello (UCAB), Caracas. He is a Partner at Sabatino Pizzolante Abogados Marítimos & Comerciales and General Director of the firm Globalpandi, S.A. (P&I Correspondents). He is a member of the Venezuelan Association of Maritime Law and the Iberoamerican Institute of Maritime Law. He is a former consultant to the National Institute of Aquatic and Insular Spaces (INEA). He is currently a Director of the Chamber of Commerce of Puerto Cabello and Alternate Director of the Venezuelan Association of Maritime Law.



SABATINO PIZZOLANTE

ABOGADOS MARÍTIMOS & COMERCIALES

Established four decades ago, Sabatino Pizzolante Abogados Marítimos & Comerciales is one of the leading law firms in maritime and port affairs throughout the country. Although situated in Puerto Cabello, the second-largest city within the state of Carabobo, the firm has correspondents in all other major Venezuelan ports, among them La Guaira, Maracaibo, Guanta, Puerto Ordaz and Caracas, offering assistance in the field of commercial and business, labour, tax, administrative and customs law, as well as litigation in the context of international trade.

In the maritime field, services are not restricted to maritime and port law, but through Associated Maritime Consultants, C.A., its sister company, they extend to the areas of managing and technical consultancy comprising, among others, construction, sale and purchase agreements, vessel registration and documentation, naval mortgages, charterparty and bill of lading disputes, marine pollution, salvage, towage and collisions, port and terminal management consultancy, port operators' liabilities, pre-loading surveys, vessel and cargo inspections, reefer and dry container inspections, investigations (theft, fraud, etc.) and legal remedies in customs affairs. Globalpandi, S.A. is another sister company, acting purely as Commercial P&I Correspondents.

In addition, the office has close relationships with legal firms and specialised international agencies worldwide, providing periodic updates to its domestic and international clients – ship owners, protection and indemnity clubs, port operators, ship agents, etc. – through the publication of the Sabatino Pizzolante Newsletter, fully searchable alongside a significant number of articles and papers on the firm's website.

Current titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Investigations
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Cybersecurity
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Family Law
- Fintech
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Outsourcing
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks
- Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms



59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk

www.iclg.com