

transportation of goods in interstate commerce. 1

Thereafter, Plaintiffs moved this Court to remand the claims to state court of the basis that removal was improper on the face of the complaint. However, on April 13, 2010, the Court denied Plaintiffs' motion to remand and held that because "the Carmack Amendment is the exclusive cause of action for contract claims alleging delay, loss, failure to deliver or damage to property," Plaintiffs' state law claims were completely preempted and were, accordingly, dismissed. (See Order at 6 (citing Hall v. North American Van Lines, Inc., 476 F.3d 683, 688-89 (9th Cir. 2007) (citing Moffit v. Bekins Van Lines Co., 6 F.3d 305, 306-07 (5th Cir. 1993))).

9 On May 24, 2010, Legacy filed an amended third-party complaint against United for 10 equitable indemnity and contribution, express contractual indemnity, apportionment, and declaratory relief. United moves to dismiss the third-party complaint for failure to state a claim 12 upon which relief can be granted on the basis that: (1) each of the causes of action are premised 13 upon state law which is preempted by the Carmack Amendment; (2) there are no indemnity 14 rights against United as Plaintiffs fail to state a valid claim against Legacy; and (3) Plaintiffs' 15 action against United is time-barred and without liability, there is no indemnity.

The Court shall address additional facts as necessary in the remainder of the order.

ANALYSIS

18 The scheme of the Carmack Amendment is "comprehensive enough to embrace 19 responsibility for all losses resulting from any failure to discharge a carrier's duty as to any part 20 of the agreed transportation." Georgia, Florida & Alabama Ry. Co. v. Blish Milling Co., 241 21 U.S. 190, 196 (1916). The Carmack Amendment imposes strict liability for "actual loss or 22 injury to property." 49 U.S.C. § 14706(a). Additionally, the Carmack Amendment allows the 23 "initial carrier found strictly liable under subpart (a) to be indemnified by the carrier over whose 24 line or route the loss of injury occurred." FNS, Inc. v. Bowerman Trucking, Inc., 2010 WL 25 532421, *3 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2010) (quoting PHN Corp. v. Hullquist Corp., 843 F.2d 586, 589 26 (1st Cir. 1988)); see also 49 U.S.C. § 14706(b).

27 The Ninth Circuit has held that the Carmack Amendment completely preempts state law 28 claims against interstate carriers. See Hall v. N.Am. Can Lines, Inc., 476 F.3d 683, 688-89 (9th

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

16

17

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Cir. 2007); see also Hughes Aircraft Co. v. N. Am. Van Lines, Inc., 970 F.2d 609, 613 (9th Cir. 2 1992) (rejecting the argument that the Carmack Amendment does not preempt state law causes 3 of action where the carrier is operating on a contract basis). Because the Carmack Amendment 4 preempts all state law claims, the Court dismisses the first, second and third causes of action in 5 the amended third-party complaint. However, a claim for indemnity under the Carmack Amendment may properly lie and similarly, one for declaratory relief as to the parties' 6 7 respective status under the Carmack Amendment. Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES the 8 amended third-party complaint with leave to amend to state a proper cause of action for 9 indemnity under the Carmack Amendment, as well as an attendant declaratory relief claim.¹

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS United's motion to dismiss the amended third-party complaint with leave to amend. Legacy must file an amended third-party complaint by no later than August 6, 2010.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: July 19, 2010

Huy S White

JEFFREY S. WHITE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The Court finds premature United's contention that neither United nor Legacy have 27 independent liability to Plaintiffs because of failure to state a claim. To the extent there remains a claim for indemnity under the Carmack Amendment, such a claim would lie as 28 between Legacy and United. It is unclear what effect, if any, timing of a possible direct cause of action between Plaintiffs and United would have on an indemnification claim.