IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

THOMAS S. RIDDLE and GLORIA F. RIDDLE,	:	CONSOLIDATED UNDER MDL 875
Plaintiffs,	:	
v.	:	
FOSTER WHEELER, LLC,	:	E.D. PA CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:11-cv-00318-ER
Defendants.	:	

O R D E R

AND NOW, this **25th** day of **May**, **2012**, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Motion for Summary Judgment of Defendant **Rapid-American Corp.** (Doc. No. 128) is **GRANTED.**[1]

---

[1] This case originated in Pennsylvania state court. In January of 2011, it was removed to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania as part of MDL-875.

Plaintiff Thomas Riddle was born in Tennessee, grew up in Indiana. He served in the Navy from 1960 to 1969, during which period he spent most of his time aboard ships, but spent a few months living in Pennsylvania. After being discharged from the Navy, he returned to Indiana, where he worked at a General Motors ("GM") plant for approximately 32 years. After retiring from GM in 2005, Plaintiff moved to Arizona, where he now resides. Defendant Rapid-American ("Rapid-American") is sued by Plaintiff for asbestos insulating block manufactured by Philip Carey (a company that was merged into Rapid-American's predecessor). The alleged exposure pertinent to Rapid-American occurred during Plaintiff's work aboard the following ship:

- USS America (CV-66) - 1964 to 1969

Plaintiff was diagnosed with lung cancer in 2010. He was deposed for two days in March of 2011.

Plaintiff has brought claims against various defendants. Defendant Rapid-American has moved for summary judgment, arguing that Plaintiff has failed to identify product identification evidence sufficient to support a finding of causation with respect to its product(s). The parties both contend that Pennsylvania law applies.

I. Legal Standard

A. Summary Judgment Standard

Summary judgment is appropriate if there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). "A motion for summary judgment will not be defeated by 'the mere existence' of some disputed facts, but will be denied when there is a genuine issue of material fact." Am. Eagle Outfitters v. Lyle & Scott Ltd., 584 F.3d 575, 581 (3d Cir. 2009) (quoting Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247-248 (1986)). A fact is "material" if proof of its existence or non-existence might affect the outcome of the litigation, and a dispute is "genuine" if "the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party." Anderson, 477 U.S. at 248.

In undertaking this analysis, the court views the facts in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. "After making all reasonable inferences in the nonmoving party's favor, there is a genuine issue of material fact if a reasonable jury could find for the nonmoving party." Pignataro v. Port Auth. of N.Y. & N.J., 593 F.3d 265, 268 (3d Cir. 2010) (citing Reliance Ins. Co. v. Moessner, 121 F.3d 895, 900 (3d Cir. 1997)). While the moving party bears the initial burden of showing the absence of a genuine issue of material fact, meeting this obligation shifts the burden to the non-moving party who must "set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial." Anderson, 477 U.S. at 250.

B. The Applicable Law

Although the parties contend that Pennsylvania law applies, the Court notes that the claims against Defendant Rapid American sound in admiralty. Where a case sounds in admiralty, application of a state's law (including a choice of law analysis under its choice of law rules) would be inappropriate. Gibbs ex rel. Gibbs v. Carnival Cruise Lines, 314 F.3d 125, 131-32 (3d Cir. 2002). If the Court determines that maritime law is in fact

applicable, the analysis ends there and the Court is to apply maritime law. See id. Whether maritime law is applicable is a threshold dispute that is a question of federal law, see U.S. Const. Art. III, § 2; 28 U.S.C. § 1333(1), and is therefore governed by the law of the circuit in which this MDL court sits. See Various Plaintiffs v. Various Defendants ("Oil Field Cases"), 673 F. Supp. 2d 358, 362 (E.D. Pa. 2009)(Robreno, J.). This court has previously set forth guidance on this issue. See Conner v. Alfa Laval, Inc., 799 F. Supp. 2d 455 (E.D. Pa. 2011)(Robreno, J.).

In order for maritime law to apply, a plaintiff's exposure underlying a products liability claim must meet both a locality test and a connection test. Id. at 463-66 (discussing Jerome B. Grubart, Inc. v. Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., 513 U.S. 527, 534 (1995)). The locality test requires that the tort occur on navigable waters or, for injuries suffered on land, that the injury be caused by a vessel on navigable waters. Id. In assessing whether work was on "navigable waters" (i.e., was sea-based) it is important to note that work performed aboard a ship that is docked at the shipyard is sea-based work, performed on navigable waters. See Sisson v. Ruby, 497 U.S. 358 (1990). This Court has previously clarified that this includes work aboard a ship that is in "dry dock." See Deuber v. Asbestos Corp. Ltd., No. 10-78931, 2011 WL 6415339, at *1 n.1 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 2, 2011)(Robreno, J.)(applying maritime law to ship in "dry dock" for overhaul). By contrast, work performed in other areas of the shipyard or on a dock, (such as work performed at a machine shop in the shipyard, for example, as was the case with the Willis plaintiff discussed in Conner) is land-based work. The connection test requires that the incident could have "'a potentially disruptive impact on maritime commerce,'" and that "'the general character' of the 'activity giving rise to the incident' shows a 'substantial relationship to traditional maritime activity.'" Grubart, 513 U.S. at 534 (citing Sisson, 497 U.S. at 364, 365, and n.2).

Locality Test

If a service member in the Navy performed some work at shipyards (on land) or docks (on land) as opposed to onboard a ship on navigable waters (which includes a ship docked at the shipyard, and includes those in "dry dock"), "the locality test is satisfied as long as some portion of the asbestos exposure occurred on a vessel on navigable waters." Conner, 799 F. Supp. 2d at 466; Deuber, 2011 WL 6415339, at *1 n.1. If, however, the

worker never sustained asbestos exposure onboard a vessel on navigable waters, then the locality test is not met and state law applies.

Connection Test

When a worker whose claims meet the locality test was primarily sea-based during the asbestos exposure, those claims will meet the connection test necessary for the application of maritime law. Conner, 799 F. Supp. 2d at 467-69. But if the worker's exposure was primarily land-based, then, even if the claims could meet the locality test, they do not meet the connection test and state law (rather than maritime law) applies. Id.

It is undisputed that the alleged exposure pertinent to Defendant Rapid-American that occurred during Plaintiff's period of Navy service was aboard a ship (either at sea or during construction at the shipyard). Therefore, this exposure was during sea-based work. See Conner, 799 F. Supp. 2d 455; Deuber, 2011 WL 6415339, at *1 n.1. Accordingly, maritime law is applicable to Plaintiff's claims against Rapid-American. See Conner, 799 F. Supp. 2d at 462-63. The Court will therefore apply maritime law in deciding Rapid-American's motion.

C. Product Identification/Causation Under Maritime Law

In order to establish causation for an asbestos claim under maritime law, a plaintiff must show, for each defendant, that "(1) he was exposed to the defendant's product, and (2) the product was a substantial factor in causing the injury he suffered." Lindstrom v. A-C Prod. Liab. Trust, 424 F.3d 488, 492 (6th Cir. 2005); citing Stark v. Armstrong World Indus., Inc., 21 F. App'x 371, 375 (6th Cir. 2001). This Court has also noted that, in light of its holding in Conner v. Alfa Laval, Inc., No. 09-67099, – F. Supp. 2d –, 2012 WL 288364 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 1, 2012)(Robreno, J.), there is also a requirement (implicit in the test set forth in Lindstrom and Stark) that a plaintiff show that (3) the defendant manufactured or distributed the asbestos-containing product to which exposure is alleged. Abbay v. Armstrong Int'l., Inc., No. 10-83248, 2012 WL 975837, at *1 n.1 (E.D. Pa. Feb 29, 2012)(Robreno, J.).

Substantial factor causation is determined with respect to each defendant separately. Stark, 21 F. App'x. at 375. In establishing causation, a plaintiff may rely upon direct evidence (such as testimony of the plaintiff or Decedent who experienced

the exposure, co-worker testimony, or eye-witness testimony) or circumstantial evidence that will support an inference that there was exposure to the defendant's product for some length of time. Id. at 376 (quoting Harbour v. Armstrong World Indus., Inc., No. 90-1414, 1991 WL 65201, at *4 (6th Cir. April 25, 1991)).

A mere "minimal exposure" to a defendant's product is insufficient to establish causation. Lindstrom, 424 F.3d at 492. "Likewise, a mere showing that defendant's product was present somewhere at plaintiff's place of work is insufficient." Id. Rather, the plaintiff must show "'a high enough level of exposure that an inference that the asbestos was a substantial factor in the injury is more than conjectural.'" Id. (quoting Harbour, 1991 WL 65201, at *4). The exposure must have been "actual" or "real", but the question of "substantiality" is one of degree normally best left to the fact-finder. Redland Soccer Club, Inc. v. Dep't of Army of U.S., 55 F.3d 827, 851 (3d Cir. 1995). "Total failure to show that the defect caused or contributed to the accident will foreclose as a matter of law a finding of strict products liability." Stark, 21 F. App'x at 376 (citing Matthews v. Hyster Co., Inc., 854 F.2d 1166, 1168 (9th Cir. 1988)(citing Restatement (Second) of Torts, § 402A (1965))).

II. Defendant Rapid American's Motion for Summary Judgment

Defendant Rapid-American contends that it is entitled to summary judgment because Plaintiff has failed to identify sufficient product identification evidence to support a finding of causation with respect to its product(s). In response to this argument, Plaintiff cites to documents showing that Philip Carey insulating block was supplied for use with boilers aboard the USS America. Plaintiff contends that the documents indicate that only two brands of insulation were supplied for use with the boilers at issue (Foster Wheeler boilers). Plaintiff also cites to deposition testimony in which he testified that he associates Foster Wheeler boilers with asbestos exposure. However, in this testimony, Plaintiff states that he did not work directly with the insulation on these boilers, but that people who worked for him did. He does not provide any testimony to indicate that he was near the insulation while others removed it, and does not provide any testimony about the insulation releasing airborne dust or being torn in a way that would release respirable asbestos fibers. Although he indicates that the work occurred in the engine room and that he also worked in the engine room, there is no testimony to indicate that the work occurred while he was

in the engine room. Therefore, no reasonable jury could conclude from the evidence that Plaintiff was exposed to asbestos from Philip Carey insulation such that this exposure was a "substantial factor" in the development of his illness. See Lindstrom, 424 F.3d at 492; Stark, 21 F. App'x at 376; Abbay, 2012 WL 975837, at *1 n.1. Accordingly, summary judgment in favor of Defendant Rapid-American is warranted. Anderson, 477 U.S. at 248.