IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-31109	United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit FILED January 10, 2014
STEPHEN MARSHALL GABARICK, etc.; ET AL,	Lyle W. Cayce Clerk
Plaintiffs v.	
LAURIN MARITIME (AMERICA), INCORPORATED; ET AL,	
Defendants	
WHITEFIN SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED, As owner and Managing Owner of the M/V Tintomara, Petitioning for Exoneration from or Limitation of Liability; LAURIN MARITIME (AMERICA), INCORPORATED, As Owner and Managing Owner of the M/V Tintomara, Petitioning for Exoneration from or Limitation of Liability; LAURIN MARITIME AB; ANGLO-ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP LIMITED,	
${\bf Petitioners-Appellee\text{-}Cross\ Appe}$	llants
v.	
DRD TOWING COMPANY, L.L.C.,	
Claimant - Appellee	
v.	
AMERICAN COMMERCIAL LINES, L.L.C.,	
${ m Appellant-Cross-App}$	oellee

No. 12-31109

AMERICAN COMMERCIAL LINES, L.L.C., As Owner of Barge DM-932, Praying for Exoneration from or Limitation of Liability,

Petitioner – Appellant Cross-Appellee

v.

LAURIN MARITIME AB; WHITEFIN SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; ANGLO ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP LIMITED; LAURIN MARITIME (AMERICA), INCORPORATED,

Movants – Appellee-Cross Appellants

DRD TOWING COMPANY, INCORPORATED, as Owner Pro Hac Vice or Alleged owner Pro Hac Vice of the M/V Mel Oliver,

Petitioner – Appellee

v.

AMERICAN COMMERCIAL LINES, L.L.C.,

Claimant-Appellant-Cross-Appellee

v.

LAURIN MARITIME AB; WHITEFIN SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; ANGLO ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP LIMITED; LAURIN MARITIME (AMERICA), INCORPORATED,

 $Movants-Appellee-Cross\ Appellants$

AMERICAN COMMERCIAL LINES, L.L.C., As Owner of the M/V Mel Oliver Praying for Exoneration from or Limitation of Liability,

Petitioner – Appellant-Cross Appellee

v.

No. 12-31109

LAURIN MARITIME (AMERICA), INCORPORATED; LAURIN MARITIME AB; WHITEFIN SHIPPING COMPANY LIMITED; ANGLO ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP LIMITED,

 $Movants-Appellee-Cross\ Appellants$

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana USDC No. 08-4007 Consolidated Cases B-4

Before JOLLY, SOUTHWICK, and HAYNES, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:*

We have considered the thorough briefing, heard oral argument, and analyzed the extensive record in this case. For substantially the reasons set forth in the well-reasoned opinion of the district court, we AFFIRM.

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH

CIR. R. 47.5.4.

3