

McGuinn, Hillsman & Palefsky
535 Pacific Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133
(415) 421-9292

JOHN R. HILLSMAN (S.B.N. 71220)
jrhillsman@mhpsf.com
DEREK B. JACOBSON (S.B.N. 88417)
dbjacobson@mhpsf.com
ABRAHAM F. HILLSMAN (S.B.N. 241810)
bfh@mhpsf.com
MCGUINN, HILLSMAN & PALEFSKY
535 Pacific Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133
Telephone: (415) 421-9292
Facsimile: (415) 403-0202

CYNTHIA MCGUINN (S.B.N. 99324)
CMcGuinn@RFTMLaw.com
ROUDA FEDER TIETJEN & MCGUINN
44 Montgomery, Suite 750
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 801-8318
Facsimile: (415)

Attorneys for Jasmine Lord
Personal Representative of the Estate of
CHARLES SPENCER McILVAIN
Claimant/Respondent

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
IN ADMIRALTY

In the Matter of the Complaint of)	Case No. CV 19-7693 PA (MRWx)
TRUTH AQUATICS, INC. and)	
GLEN RICHARD FRITZLER and)	CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT
DANA JEANNE FRITZLER,)	JASMINE LORD'S ANSWER TO
Individually and as Trustees of the)	THE FIRST AMENDED
Fritzler Family Trust DTD 7/27/92 as)	COMPLAINT FOR
owners and/or owners <i>pro hac vice</i> of)	EXONERATION FROM OR
the dive vessel CONCEPTION,)	LIMITATION OF LIABILITY
Official Number 638133, for)	
Exoneration from or Limitation of)	
Liability)	

COMES NOW CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT JASMINE LORD
 (“CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT”) WHO, acting as the Duly Appointed Personal
 Representative of the Estate of CHARLES SPENCER McILVAIN (Deceased),
 hereby answers the Complaint for Exoneration from or Limitation of Liability
 filed herein by admitting, denying, and alleging, on information and belief, as
 follows:

ADMISSIONS AND DENIALS

1. Admits the allegations and accepts the legal conclusions set forth in Paragraph 1.
2. Admits that Plaintiffs and Petitioners allege they are the owners or owners *pro hac vice* of the CONCEPTION, but currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief about the other allegations in Paragraph 2 and, on that basis, denies those allegations.
3. Admits that Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. Supp. Adm. R. F(9), and that the incident which forms the basis of this action occurred upon the navigable waters of the Santa Barbara Channel, within the territorial waters of the State of California, but currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief about the other allegations of Paragraph 3 and, on that basis, denies those allegations.
4. Admits that thirty-three passengers and one crew member died aboard the CONCEPTION as a direct and proximate result of the Fire on September 2, 2019, but currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief

1 about the other allegations of Paragraph 4 and, on that basis, denies those
2 allegations.

3
4 5. Admits that she has not yet filed suit against the Plaintiffs and
5 Petitioners in any other forum by reason of the premises herein, but otherwise
6 lacks sufficient information to form a belief about the other allegations of
7 Paragraph 5 and, on that basis, denies those allegations.

8
9 6. Currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief about the
10 allegations of Paragraph 6 and, on that basis, denies those allegations.

11
12 7. Currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief about the
13 allegations of Paragraph 7 and, on that basis, denies those allegations.

14
15 8. Currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief about the
16 allegations of Paragraph 8 and, on that basis, denies those allegations.

17
18 9. Currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief about the
19 allegations of Paragraph 9 and, on that basis, denies those allegations.

20 10. Denies the allegations in Paragraph 10.

21
22 11. Admits that the CONCEPTION departed Santa Barbara, California
23 on August 31, 2019, with thirty-three passengers and six crew members on board
24 for a three-day voyage upon the navigable waters of the Santa Barbara Channel,
25 within the territorial limits of the State of California, but denies each and every
26 one of the other allegations in Paragraph 11.

27
28 12. Admits that a fire broke out on board the CONCEPTION during the
early morning hours of September 2, 2019, while that vessel was anchored upon
the navigable waters of the Santa Barbara Channel less than one marine league

McGuinn, Hillsman & Palefsky
535 Pacific Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133
(415) 421-9292

1 from shore and within the territorial waters of the State of California, but denies
2 each and every one of the other allegations in Paragraph 12.

3
4 13. Currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief about the
5 allegations of Paragraph 13.

6
7 14. Currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief about the
8 allegations of Paragraph 14.

9 15. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 15.

10 16. The allegations and legal conclusions set forth in Paragraph 16 do
11 not call for an answer from CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT LORD.

12 17. Denies and disputes the allegations, beliefs, and legal conclusions
13 set forth in Paragraph 17.

14 18. The allegations and legal conclusions set forth in Paragraph 18 do
15 not call for an answer from CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT LORD.

16 19. Admits the allegations of Paragraph 19.

20 **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

21 20. As and for a first affirmative defense, CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT
22 alleges that:

23
24 a.) She is prepared to join with the other Claimants and
25 Respondents herein and offer stipulations that will fully protect Plaintiffs'
26 and Petitioners' right to limitation, if any;

27 b.) This action should therefore be abated under *Langnes v.*
28 *Green*, 282 U.S. 531 (1931), *Lewis v. Lewis & Clark Marine, Inc.*, 531
U.S. 438 (2001), *Lake Tankers Corp. v. Henn*, 354 U.S. 147, 152 (1957),

1 *Newton v. Shipman*, 718 F.2d 959, 962 (9th Cir. 1983), and;

2 b.) CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT should be allowed to pursue her
3 claims against Plaintiffs and Petitioners, at law and in the forum of her
4 choice before a jury of her peers, under the “Saving to Suitors Clause,” 28
5 U.S.C. § 1333(1).
6

7 **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

8
9 21. As and for a Second Affirmative Defense,
10 CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT alleges that:
11

12 a. Insofar as she is prepared to protect Plaintiffs’ and Petitioners’
13 right to limitation, if any, as was alleged in Paragraph 20 hereinabove, the
14 Vessel Owners Limitation Act, 46 U.S.C. §§ 30501 *et seq.*, and its rules of
15 practice do not create a freestanding right to exoneration herein, and;
16

17 b. This Court should therefore defer any decisions about the
18 merits of her claims to the California Superior Courts in accordance with
19 the decisions in *Lewis v. Lewis & Clark Marine*, 531 U.S. 438, 453 (2001),
20 *Lake Tankers Corp. v. Henn*, 354 U.S. 147, 152 (1957), and *In re*
21 *Tidewater Inc.*, 249 F.3d 342, 347 (5th Cir. 2001).
22

23 **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

24
25 22. As and for a Third Affirmative Defense, CLAIMANT/
26 RESPONDENT alleges that the CONCEPTION was unseaworthy at the outset of
27 her alleged August 31, 2019 voyage in that:
28

a. She was outfitted and furnished with dangerous and defective
features, equipment, and apparel including, but not limited to, escape

McGuinn, Hillsman & Palefsky
 535 Pacific Avenue
 San Francisco, CA 94133
 (415) 421-9292

hatches, smoke detectors, fire extinguishers, electrical systems, and battery chargers which were not fit for their intended purposes;

b. She was commanded by an unfit master and manned by an unfit crew, and;

c. She was deliberately and habitually operated in violation of Sub-chapter T of the United States Coast Guard Regulations, including but not limited to the provisions of 46 CFR § 185.410, as well as the requirements of her own Certificate of Inspection.

23. Plaintiffs and Petitioners are charged with privity and knowledge of those unseaworthy conditions under *In the Matter of the Complaint of Villers Seafood Co*, 813 F.2d 339, 343 (11th Cir., 1987).

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

24. CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT presently lacks sufficient knowledge or information to formulate all affirmative defenses that may ultimately prove to be applicable herein and therefore reserves the right to later assert additional affirmative defenses in the event that additional facts become known to her which would justify the assertion of additional defenses.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT JASMINE LORD, acting as the duly appointed Personal Representative of the Estate of CHARLES SPENCER McILVAIN (DECEASED, prays that:

1. Petitioners be denied Exoneration from and/or Limitation of Liability herein;

1 2. The Complaint be dismissed and judgment rendered in favor of
2 CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT;

3
4 3. CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT be awarded her costs of suit incurred
5 in defense of this action; and,

6 4. The Court grant such other and further relief as it deems just and
7 proper.
8

9
10 Dated: January 29, 2020

MCGUINN, HILLSMAN & PALEFSKY
ROUDA FEDER TIETJEN & MCGUINN

11 By: JOHN R. HILLSMAN
12 JOHN R. HILLSMAN

13 Attorneys for
14 CLAIMANT/RESPONDENT
15 JASMINE LORD, Personal
16 Representative of the Estate of
17 CHARLES SPENCER McILVAIN
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

McGuinn, Hillsman & Palefsky
535 Pacific Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133
(415) 421-9292