Can a Port "Borrow" a State's Antitrust Immunity?

PRESENTED BY Molly Henry





December 7, 2022

Antitrust Law

Example:

Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. Sec. 1-7)

Source:

Black's Law Dictionary (11th ed. 2019)

A body of law designed to protect trade and commerce from restraints, monopolies, price-fixing, and price discrimination.



Practices That May Violate Federal Antitrust Laws

- Outlaws all contracts, combinations, and conspiracies that unreasonably restrain interstate and foreign trade.
- Outlaws any agreements between competitors to fix prices, rig bids, and allocate customers.
- Makes it a crime to monopolize any part of interstate commerce.



The Shipping Act Immunity 46 U.S.C. Sec. 40307

Antitrust laws "do not apply" to:

- Agreements on file with the Federal Maritime Commission ("FMC")
 - Ocean common carrier agreements
 - Marine terminal operator agreements to discuss, fix or regulate rates or conditions of service or to engage in exclusive, preferential, or cooperative working arrangements (i.e., alliances) to the extent the agreement involves ocean transportation in the foreign commerce of the United States.
- Other agreements exempted by the FMC



Key Definitions For Shipping Act Immunity

MARINE TERMINAL OPERATOR:

A person engaged in the business of providing wharfage, dock, warehouse, or other terminal facilities in connection with a common carrier

COMMON CARRIER:

(i)

Holds itself out to the general public to provide transportation by water of passengers or cargo between the United States and a foreign country for compensation;

(ii)

assumes responsibility for the transportation from the port or point of receipt to the port or point of destination; and

(iii)

uses, for all or part of that transportation, a vessel operating on the high seas or the Great Lakes between a port in the United States and a port in a foreign country



The FMC Cleans House



State Law to the Rescue?

- State action is immune from federal antitrust laws. *Parker v. Brown*, 317 U.S. 341 (1943)
- When a state authorizes another entity to carry out its activities, it can cloak the authorized entity with the state's immunity. *Lafayette v. Louisiana Power & Light Co.,* 435 U.S. 389 (1978)



State Action and

Ports

Interface Group, Inc. v. Massachusetts Port Authority, 816 F.2d 9 (1987

Schwabe

The Requirements

- State legislation must clearly and affirmatively authorize the particular conduct.
- The conduct must then stay within the bounds of the authorizing legislation.



Future State Immunity for Non MTO Ports?



Questions?





206-405-1969 mhenry@schwabe.com

Molly Henry Shareholder

Molly Henry is an experienced civil litigator and appellate attorney. She co-leads the appellate practice group in Seattle.

She regularly represents vessel owners, operators, and their underwriters in all aspects of maritime law, including casualty response and investigations, vessel attachments and arrests, commercial disputes, marine-related regulatory compliance such as environmental matters and admeasurement of vessels, personal injury claims, and cargo loss and damage claims.

She also represents ports and other marine service providers and contractors.



REPRESENTED BY Schwabe

INDIAN COUNTRY AND ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATIONS HEALTHCARE AND LIFE SCIENCES

TECHNOLOGY

REAL ESTATE AND CONSTRUCTION

MANUFACTURING, DISTRIBUTION AND RETAIL

NATURAL RESOURCES

s

TRANSPORTATION, PORTS AND MARITIME