Navigating Treacherous Waters: A Legal Analysis of Charterparty Risks in the Red Sea

BY

MOHAMMED FORRUKH RAHMAN
Advocate, Appellate Division, Supreme Court of Bangladesh
Barrister-at-Law (England & Wales, non-practising)
Panel Arbitrator, SCMA | FHKIArb | MCIArb

I. Introduction: The New Maritime Minefield

The escalation of attacks on commercial shipping in the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden has presented the maritime industry with its most significant security challenge in a generation. While piracy and regional conflicts are not new phenomena, the current situation, characterized by sophisticated anti-ship missile and drone attacks by Houthi forces, has transformed a vital artery of global trade into a high-stakes operational minefield. This geopolitical reality serves as the factual matrix against which long-established principles of English charterparty law are being rigorously tested. Arbitral tribunals in London and Singapore are increasingly being called upon to resolve disputes that pit a charterer's commercial imperatives against a shipowner's fundamental duties of safety and vessel preservation.

To explore the complex legal risks faced by both charterers and shipowners, this article will analyze a representative hypothetical scenario. A vessel is operating under a standard time charter for a voyage from a European port to a destination in Asia. The charterparty provides for worldwide trading within standard institute warranty limits and contains common war risk clauses. The charterer, seeking the most direct and economical route, orders the vessel to proceed via the Suez Canal. At the time the order is given, the Houthi attacks are a known and ongoing threat, and war risk underwriters are quoting significant additional premiums for transit. The owner, after assessing the situation and citing grave concerns for the safety of the crew, vessel, and cargo, refuses the order. Instead, the master is instructed to proceed via the much longer and more expensive route around the Cape of Good Hope.

This refusal immediately places the parties in conflict, raising a cascade of fundamental legal questions. Was the charterer's order lawful? Was the owner's refusal a legitimate exercise of contractual discretion or a repudiatory breach? How do war risk and insurance clauses allocate the financial burdens of such decisions? What remedies are available to the aggrieved party? This article will argue that while the English law framework for resolving these questions is well-established, the unique nature of the Red Sea crisis places unprecedented strain on the factual assessments required by the key legal tests. Recent jurisprudence, particularly from the UK Supreme Court, has reinforced the principle of contractual sanctity, placing a heavy burden of proof on the party seeking to deviate from its core obligations. The analysis will proceed through the logical sequence of the dispute: the nature of the charterer's order, the legality of the owner's refusal, the allocation of financial risk, and the remedies for breach.

II. The Charterer's Order: A Matter of Employment or Navigation?

The starting point for any analysis of an owner’s refusal to follow routing instructions is the nature of the order itself. Under a time charter, the right to direct the vessel's movements is the very essence of the service for which the charterer pays hire. However, this right is not absolute and is traditionally delineated by the distinction between "employment" and "navigation."

The Foundational Principle of The Hill Harmony

The definitive modern authority on this distinction is the House of Lords' decision in *Whistler International Ltd v Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd (The "Hill Harmony")* 1 AC 638. The case concerned a time charterer who had ordered the vessel to take the shorter great circle route across the Pacific, which the master refused in favour of a longer, more southerly route due to his past experience of heavy weather. The owners argued that the choice of route was a matter of "navigation," falling exclusively within the master's authority, and that any error on his part was excused by the Hague Rules exception for "neglect or default of the master... in the navigation... of the ship".

The House of Lords emphatically rejected this argument. It held that the terms "employment" and "navigation" reflect different aspects of the vessel's operation. "Navigation" encompasses matters of seamanship—the "tactics" of handling the vessel safely through the water, such as course adjustments to avoid hazards, managing speed in heavy seas, or deciding when to take a pilot. In contrast, "employment" concerns the commercial exploitation of the vessel—the "strategy" of how its earning potential is utilized. The choice of an ocean route between two ports, being fundamental to the vessel's scheduling, voyage duration, and bunker consumption, was held to be a matter of employment. The charterer is not merely entitled to order the vessel from Port A to Port B, but, subject to safety considerations, is also entitled to direct the route to be followed between them.

Applying this principle to the Red Sea scenario, the charterer's order to proceed via the Suez Canal is presumptively a lawful order as to the vessel's employment. It is a strategic commercial decision about how the vessel is to perform the chartered service. It is not an improper interference with the master's authority over the day-to-day seamanship and safe conduct of the vessel.

The Master's Overriding Duty of Safety

While the order is valid as to employment, it does not follow that the master is automatically bound to comply. The master's duty to obey the charterer's employment orders is always subject to his paramount and non-delegable responsibility for the safety of the crew, the vessel, and its cargo. As Lord Hobhouse noted in *The Hill Harmony*, if an order is given that would expose the vessel to a risk that the owners have not contractually agreed to bear, the master is not only entitled but is, in fact, obligated to refuse to obey it.

This establishes the central battleground of the dispute. The charterer issues a presumptively valid employment order. The owner refuses, invoking the master's overriding duty of safety. The legality of the owner's refusal, therefore, does not turn on the *category* of the order (which is settled as "employment"), but on the *justification* for disobeying it. This distinction is not merely academic; it has a profound effect on the burden of proof. Because the routing order is a valid employment order, the owner's refusal constitutes a prima facie breach of the charterparty. To escape liability, the burden shifts squarely onto the owner to demonstrate, on the balance of probabilities, that the master's refusal was a contractually permissible response to an unacceptable level of danger. The owner cannot simply assert that the decision was a "navigational" one and seek shelter behind the master's discretion. They must positively prove that the safety risk was sufficient to override their fundamental contractual obligation to follow the charterer's orders.

III. The Owner's Refusal: A Valid Exercise of Contractual Discretion?

Having established that the burden lies with the owner to justify the refusal, the analysis turns to the contractual provisions governing that decision, typically found in the charterparty's war risk clauses. These clauses grant the owner a degree of discretion to refuse orders that might expose the vessel to war perils. However, English law has developed a sophisticated body of case law that places significant constraints on how such discretion may be exercised.

The Core Doctrine of The Product Star

The controlling authority is *Abu Dhabi National Tanker Co v Product Star Shipping (The "Product Star") (No. 2)* 1 Lloyd's LR 397. In that case, the charterparty gave the owners discretion to refuse to proceed to any port they considered dangerous. The vessel was ordered to a port in the Arabian Gulf at a time when the Iran-Iraq war made the region notoriously hazardous. The owners refused the order. The Court of Appeal held that where a charter is entered into at a time when a particular risk in a particular area is already known and contemplated by the parties—evidenced, for example, by an agreement for the charterer to pay additional war risk premiums (AWRP) for trading in that area—the owner's discretion to refuse orders to go there is significantly curtailed. The owner is deemed to have accepted the "background" level of risk prevailing at the time of the fixture. Consequently, they can only justify a subsequent refusal if they can prove that the risk has *materially changed* or *escalated* in nature or degree since the contract was made.

The application of this principle to the Red Sea crisis is direct and potent. An arbitral tribunal will be required to undertake a critical factual comparison. It must assess the level and nature of the risk from Houthi attacks as it was known and understood by the parties at the time the charter was fixed. It must then compare this with the risk profile that existed at the moment the charterer's order was given and refused. If the charter was concluded when attacks were already a regular occurrence and AWRP was being charged, an owner will face a very high evidentiary hurdle to prove that a subsequent attack or threat was so qualitatively different as to constitute a material escalation justifying a refusal to perform an agreed service.

The Limits of Discretion: Good Faith and Rationality

Even where an owner has the right to exercise discretion, that discretion is not unfettered. Citing a long line of authority, Leggatt LJ in *The Product Star* held that the discretion "must be exercised honestly and in good faith" and "must not be exercised arbitrarily, capriciously or unreasonably". The standard of "unreasonableness" in this context is not the same as negligence; it is analogous to the high public law standard of *Wednesbury* unreasonableness—a decision so outrageous in its defiance of logic or accepted moral standards that no sensible person who had applied his mind to the question to be decided could have arrived at it.

This test was further refined by the UK Supreme Court in *Braganza v BP Shipping Ltd* UKSC 17. While affirming that the ultimate decision rests with the contractual decision-maker, the court held that the *process* by which the decision is reached is also subject to review. This imports the two limbs of the *Wednesbury* test into contract law. The decision-maker must not only reach a rational conclusion (the outcome limb), but must also take into account all relevant factors and disregard all irrelevant factors in their decision-making process (the procedural limb). For a shipowner refusing a Red Sea transit, this means their decision cannot be based on generalized anxiety or unsubstantiated media reports. They must be able to demonstrate a rational process of evaluation, likely involving specific, credible intelligence from security advisors, flag state authorities, and P&I Clubs, which logically supports the conclusion that the risk has become unacceptable. A failure to do so could render the refusal an invalid exercise of discretion, even if the danger was, in fact, real.

When the Risk is New: Distinguishing The Paiwan Wisdom

A crucial counterpoint to the stringent test in *The Product Star* is found in *Taokas Navigation SA v Komrowski Bulk Shipping KG (The "Paiwan Wisdom")* 2 Lloyd's Rep 416. The charterparty in that case contained a CONWARTIME 2004 clause and specific provisions for transiting the Gulf of Aden, with charterers paying the associated AWRP. The charterers ordered the vessel to Mombasa, Kenya, a voyage which at the time also carried a significant risk of Somali piracy, but for which no specific contractual provision had been made. The owners refused. The court held that the *Product Star* principle did not apply. Because the owners had not expressly contemplated and contractually accepted the specific risk of proceeding to Kenya (in contrast to the Gulf of Aden), their discretion under the general war risk clause remained broad. They were entitled to refuse the order based on their reasonable judgment of the prevailing danger and were *not* required to demonstrate a material escalation of risk since the date of the charter.

This distinction underscores the critical importance of the precise terms of the charterparty. The first question for any tribunal will be whether the parties, through the voyage description, trading limits, or specific clauses, can be said to have contractually accepted the risk of transiting the Red Sea. If the charter includes a "via Suez" routing or a "Gulf of Aden clause," the stringent *Product Star* test will almost certainly apply. If, however, the charter is for general worldwide trading and is silent on the Red Sea, an owner may have more latitude under the principles of *The Paiwan Wisdom*.

In this context, the payment of an AWRP by the charterer becomes a factual lynchpin of immense significance. While it does not, in itself, alter the legal test, it serves as powerful evidence that both parties acknowledged, contemplated, and financially accounted for the specific peril of a Red Sea transit. The very act of calculating and paying this premium demonstrates a meeting of minds: the owner agreed to face the peril in exchange for the charterer bearing the cost of insuring against it. This act makes it far more difficult for the owner to later argue that the risk was not an "accepted" one, thereby strengthening the charterer's case that the high-threshold *Product Star* test must be applied.

IV. Paying the Premium: The "Insurance Code" Fallacy and Risk Allocation

The role of insurance, and specifically the payment of AWRP by the charterer, was the subject of a landmark UK Supreme Court judgment that has profound implications for risk allocation in high-risk transits: *Herculito Maritime Ltd v Gunvor International BV (The "Polar")* UKSC 2.

The Supreme Court's Landmark Ruling in The Polar

The case arose from the seizure of the M/V Polar by Somali pirates in 2010. A ransom of USD 7.7 million was paid to secure the release of the vessel, crew, and cargo. The owners declared General Average (GA) to recover contributions from the cargo interests for this expenditure, a classic GA sacrifice made for the benefit of the common maritime adventure. The cargo interests refused to contribute. They argued that because the charterer had paid the AWRP for the vessel's K&R and war risk insurance, an "insurance code" was created. This code, they contended, meant the parties had agreed that insurance was the owner's sole and exclusive remedy for any losses arising from piracy, thereby ousting the owner's common law and contractual right to claim GA contributions.

The Supreme Court unanimously and emphatically rejected this argument. The Court clarified the juridical basis for such an arrangement, stating that an agreement to look solely to insurers for recourse—effectively waiving rights of recovery against a contractual counterparty—is a fundamental reallocation of risk. Such a significant surrender of valuable common law rights, like the right to GA, will not be inferred lightly. It requires clear, express, and unequivocal language in the contract to that effect. The mere fact that one party agrees to pay the premium for another party's insurance is insufficient to create an implied "insurance code".

Implications for General Average and Subrogation

The decision robustly reaffirms the shipowner's ancient right to declare GA in circumstances where a sacrifice (such as a ransom payment) is made to save the common venture. *The Polar* makes it clear that charterers and bill of lading holders cannot use their payment of an AWRP as a shield to avoid their obligation to contribute in GA.

This has a crucial knock-on effect for insurers. The ruling preserves the subrogation rights of the owner's war risk and K&R underwriters. Having indemnified the owner for the ransom payment, these insurers are entitled to "step into the shoes" of the owner and pursue GA contributions from the cargo interests and their insurers. This ensures that the ultimate financial loss is distributed proportionately among all the underwriting parties who accepted premiums to cover the risks of the voyage, rather than falling entirely on the owner's insurers alone.

The Supreme Court's Endorsement of The Product Star

Of equal, if not greater, importance for the Red Sea scenario is the Supreme Court's express approval in *The Polar* of the Court of Appeal's reasoning in *The Product Star*. The Court observed that the charterparty in *The Polar* provided for a voyage "via Suez" and contained clauses requiring the charterer to pay the AWRP for transiting the Gulf of Aden. In such circumstances, the Court held, the owners had contractually committed to the route. They could not later rely on the general liberties in the war risks clause to refuse to transit the area simply because it was dangerous. The right to refuse was limited to situations where the risk had materially changed or escalated since the time of the fixture. This endorsement from the UK's highest court elevates the *Product Star* doctrine from a strong Court of Appeal authority to an unimpeachable statement of English law.

This creates a crucial, if seemingly paradoxical, dynamic for charterers. On one hand, *The Polar* confirms that their payment of an AWRP does not shield them from a multi-million-dollar GA claim if a casualty occurs. On the other hand, the Supreme Court's simultaneous endorsement of *The Product Star* means that the very same payment significantly strengthens their argument that the owner is obliged to undertake the voyage in the first place. This reveals a deep-seated principle of English maritime law: the contractual *performance obligation* (to sail the agreed route) is treated as legally distinct from the *liability and indemnity regime* (who pays for losses if something goes wrong). The payment of a premium is primarily a mechanism to address the latter, but in doing so, it creates powerful factual evidence that solidifies the former. The charterer, therefore, loses the "insurance shield" argument but gains a much stronger "you must perform" argument, forcing a strategic re-evaluation of risk for all parties involved.

V. The Aftermath: Remedies for a Wrongful Refusal

Where an owner's refusal to transit the Red Sea is determined to be a breach of the charterparty, the charterer is not left without recourse. The primary remedies are to place the vessel off-hire for the time lost and to claim damages for additional costs incurred.

Triggering the Off-Hire Clause

Most standard time charter forms, such as the New York Produce Exchange (NYPE) 1946 form, contain an off-hire clause (e.g., Clause 15) that suspends the charterer's obligation to pay hire in specified circumstances. A common trigger is the "default of master, officers or crew". A deliberate and contractually unjustified refusal by the master to follow the charterer's lawful employment order to proceed via the Suez Canal would almost certainly be construed as a "default" for the purposes of this clause. This is a positive act of non-compliance, distinct from a mere error of judgment in navigation. For instance, in *Actis Co v Sanko Steamship Co (The "Aquacharm")* 1 Lloyd's Rep 7, the master's negligent miscalculation of the vessel's draught for the Panama Canal was held not to be a "default of crew" that triggered the off-hire clause, but rather an error in the performance of his duties.

For the clause to bite, the charterer must also typically show that the default has prevented the "full working of the vessel". While this phrase usually relates to the physical condition of the vessel, a refusal by the crew to perform the service required is considered an intrinsic failure that prevents the vessel from working as the charter requires.

Calculating "Loss of Time": The Net Loss Principle

Once an off-hire event is established, the question turns to the duration of the off-hire period. The foundational principle was laid down by the House of Lords in *Hogarth v Miller (The "Westfalia")* AC 48, which established that a vessel's "efficiency" must be judged against the specific service immediately required of her at that moment in time. If the vessel is disabled at sea, she is inefficient for propulsion. If she is at a discharge port with working cranes, she is efficient for discharging, and hire resumes.

This "immediate service" concept was critically refined by the Court of Appeal in *Minerva Navigation v Oceana Shipping (The "Athena")* EWCA Civ 1743. In that case, the master wrongfully refused to proceed to a Libyan port and drifted for nearly 11 days. The owners argued that the vessel should not be off-hire because, even if it had proceeded directly to the port, it would have had to wait at anchorage for the same period due to port congestion, meaning there was no "net loss of time to the chartered service". The Court of Appeal rejected this "net result" approach. It held that the off-hire clause is concerned with the loss of time in performing the service *immediately required* of the vessel at the time of the default. The service immediately required was to proceed to the port; the master's refusal caused a loss of that service for 11 days, and the vessel was therefore off-hire for that period. What might have happened later was irrelevant.

This principle provides a powerful and clear-cut remedy for charterers. If the service immediately required is for the vessel to proceed south towards the Suez Canal, and the master instead deviates west to begin the voyage around Africa, the time lost during that period of non-compliance is off-hire. The owner is precluded from mounting complex and speculative counterfactual arguments that the vessel would have been delayed by a convoy or other issues at Suez anyway. The calculation is simplified to a direct measurement of the time lost due to the specific act of default, making the charterer's claim cleaner and more difficult to rebut.

The Charterer's Claim for Damages

In addition to, or as an alternative to, an off-hire claim, the charterer can bring a claim for damages for the owner's breach of contract. The purpose of damages is to place the charterer in the financial position they would have been in had the contract been properly performed. The primary heads of loss in a Red Sea deviation scenario would be the significant difference in bunker consumption for the much longer voyage around the Cape of Good Hope, and potentially any additional port costs incurred on the alternative route. Other consequential losses might also be recoverable, subject to the ordinary principles of remoteness and the charterer's duty to mitigate their loss.

VI. Conclusion: Charting a Course Through Legal Uncertainty

The complex interplay of contractual obligations, discretionary powers, and risk allocation clauses in a modern time charter is being tested to its limits by the security crisis in the Red Sea. The English law authorities provide a clear, logical pathway for the resolution of these disputes, but the outcome in any given case will be intensely fact-sensitive.

The analysis can be synthesized into a clear progression. An order to transit the Red Sea is a lawful employment order under the principle of *The Hill Harmony*. The burden therefore falls on the owner to justify a refusal. That justification will be assessed against the stringent test in *The Product Star*, now endorsed by the Supreme Court: the owner must prove a material escalation of a risk that was known and accepted at the time of the fixture. The owner's decision-making process itself will be subject to scrutiny for rationality under the principles refined in *Braganza*. The charterer's payment of an AWRP, while not creating an "insurance code" that shields them from GA liability as established in *The Polar*, serves as compelling evidence that the risk was indeed accepted, making the *Product Star* hurdle even higher for the owner. Finally, if the refusal is found to be wrongful, it constitutes a "default of master," placing the vessel off-hire for the period of time lost in performing the "immediately required service," a calculation simplified by the ruling in *The Athena*.

For shipowners, the key takeaway is the imperative of a robust, evidence-based, and rational decision-making process before refusing a charterer's order. A decision based on generalized fear or commercial preference is unlikely to withstand scrutiny. For charterers, the lesson is twofold: their routing orders are presumptively valid, but paying an AWRP is not a panacea. It solidifies the owner's performance obligation but does not absolve the charterer of their liability to contribute in General Average should the worst occur.

Ultimately, these cases highlight the paramount importance of foresight and precision in contractual drafting. Ambiguities in war risk clauses, bespoke trading warranties, and insurance provisions are fertile ground for costly and protracted disputes. The consistent message from the English courts is a strong preference for enforcing the bargain that the parties have expressly made, not the one they might, with the benefit of hindsight, wish they had made.

The article is for informational purposes only, does not constitute legal advice, and that the views expressed are the author's own.