

# The Burger Court Opinion Writing Database

*American Foreign Steamship Co. v. Matise*  
423 U.S. 150 (1975)

Paul J. Wahlbeck, George Washington University  
James F. Spriggs, II, Washington University in St. Louis  
Forrest Maltzman, George Washington University



✓ J  
Supreme Court of the United States  
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF  
THE CHIEF JUSTICE

December 8, 1975

Re: 74-966 - American Foreign SS Co. v. Matise

Dear Thurgood:

I join your opinion circulated December 3.

Regards,

*WEB*

Mr. Justice Marshall

Copies to the Conference

✓  
Supreme Court of the United States  
Washington, D. C. 20543  
5

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE WM. J. BRENNAN, JR.

December 4, 1975

RE: No. 74-966 American Foreign Steamship Co. v.  
Matise, etc.

Dear Thurgood:

I agree.

Sincerely,



Mr. Justice Marshall

cc: The Conference

✓  
Supreme Court of the United States  
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE POTTER STEWART

December 3, 1975

74-966 - American Fireign S. S. Co. v. Matise

Dear Thurgood,

I am glad to join your opinion for the  
Court in this case.

Sincerely yours,

P. S.

Mr. Justice Marshall

Copies to the Conference

Supreme Court of the United States  
Washington, D. C. 20543

6

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE BYRON R. WHITE

December 5, 1975

Re: No. 74-966 - American Foreign Steamship Co.  
v. Matise

Dear Thurgood:

I agree.

Sincerely,

*Byron*

Mr. Justice Marshall

Copies to Conference

DEC 3 1975

2nd DRAFT

## SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 74-966

American Foreign Steamship Company, Petitioner  
v.  
Lillian M. Matise, etc. } On Writ of Certiorari to  
the United States Court  
of Appeals for the  
Ninth Circuit.

[December —, 1975]

MR. JUSTICE MARSHALL delivered the opinion of the Court.

Granville C. Matise, a seaman, brought this suit alleging that upon his discharge from the S. S. *American Hawk*, petitioner, the ship's owner, withheld \$510 in wages from him. Matise claimed that, pursuant to 46 U. S. C. § 596, he was entitled to two days' pay for every day that payment of the \$510 had been delayed.

46 U. S. C. § 596 provides in relevant part:

"The master or owner of any vessel [making foreign voyages] shall pay to every seaman his wages . . . within 24 hours after the cargo has been discharged or within four days after the seaman has been discharged, whichever first happens. . . . Every master or owner who refuses or neglects to make payment in the manner hereinbefore mentioned without sufficient cause shall pay to the seaman a sum equal to two days' pay for each and every day during which payment is delayed beyond the respective periods, which sum shall be recoverable as wages in any claim made before the court."

The parties to this case differ over the meaning of "sufficient cause" under § 596; they are in conflict, too, over

5,7,8

DEC 11 1975

3rd DRAFT

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

No. 74-966

American Foreign Steamship) On Writ of Certiorari to  
Company, Petitioner, } the United States Court  
v. } of Appeals for the  
Lillian M. Matise, etc. } Ninth Circuit.

[December —, 1975]

MR. JUSTICE MARSHALL delivered the opinion of the Court.

Granville C. Matise, a seaman, brought this suit alleging that upon his discharge from the S. S. *American Hawk*, petitioner, the ship's owner, withheld \$510 in wages from him. Matise claimed that, pursuant to 46 U. S. C. § 596, he was entitled to two days' pay for every day that payment of the \$510 had been delayed.

46 U. S. C. § 596 provides in relevant part:

"The master or owner of any vessel [making foreign voyages] shall pay to every seaman his wages . . . within 24 hours after the cargo has been discharged or within four days after the seaman has been discharged, whichever first happens. . . . Every master or owner who refuses or neglects to make payment in the manner hereinbefore mentioned without sufficient cause shall pay to the seaman a sum equal to two days' pay for each and every day during which payment is delayed beyond the respective periods, which sum shall be recoverable as wages in any claim made before the court."

The parties to this case differ over the meaning of "sufficient cause" under § 596; they are in conflict, too, over

Supreme Court of the United States  
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE THURGOOD MARSHALL

January 7, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO THE CONFERENCE

CASE HELD FOR No. 74-966, AMERICAN FOREIGN  
STEAMSHIP COMPANY v. MATISE

No. 74-1184 American Trading Transportation  
Company v. Escobar.

Respondent, a seaman, was discharged from petitioner's ship on grounds of misconduct while the ship was docked in Subic Bay in the Phillipines. While respondent did not receive his full wages in Manila, petitioner did agree to pay his air fare to San Francisco if respondent signed a guarantee to reimburse petitioner for all repatriation costs. When respondent arrived in San Francisco, he was paid his wages less repatriation costs that had been incurred by petitioner.

Respondent filed suit under 46 U. S. C. §596. The District Court found that respondent had been discharged for good cause and that petitioner's payment of repatriation expenses represented a payment of wages in kind so that there was no "withholding" under §596. Relying on its previous decision in Matise, CA9 reversed on this point, rejecting the District Court's analysis on the grounds that §596 provides that wages are to be paid to the seaman. It went on to find the "withholding" to be without sufficient cause and held that there was no discretion in the District Court in determining the length of time to which §596's double wage penalty applies.

CA9's refusal to view petitioner's payment of respondent's repatriation expenses as a "payment of wages" was based on an analysis which we rejected in Matise. We held there that the language of §596 is not a per se bar on all indirect payments of wages. It may be that the weight put in Matise on the unique

fact situation of that case (i.e., respondent's consent to the application of his wages to a plane fare and the special benefit that he received from the plane ticket) provides a basis for distinguishing that case from this one and for finding a "withholding" here. Nevertheless, CA9 should have a chance to reconsider its ruling in light of our decision in Matise.

I will vote to GRANT, VACATE AND REMAND FOR RECONSIDERATION IN LIGHT OF No. 74-966, American Foreign Steamship Company v. Matise.

*T.M.*

T. M.

Supreme Court of the United States

Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE HARRY A. BLACKMUN

December 4, 1975

Re: No. 74-966 - American Foreign Steamship Co.  
v. Matise

Dear Thurgood:

I agree.

Sincerely,



Mr. Justice Marshall

cc: The Conference

Supreme Court of the United States  
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE LEWIS F. POWELL, JR.

December 4, 1975

4

No. 74-966 American Foreign Steamship  
Company v. Matise

Dear Thurgood:

Please join me.

Sincerely,

*Lewis*

Mr. Justice Marshall

lfp/ss

cc: The Conference

✓  
✓  
3  
Supreme Court of the United States  
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF  
JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

December 4, 1975

Re: No. 74-966 - American Foreign Steamship v. Matise

Dear Thurgood:

Please join me.

Sincerely,

WRW

Mr. Justice Marshall

Copies to the Conference