

Lagrange v. Eagle, Inc.

United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana

September 6, 2024, Decided; September 6, 2024, Filed

CIVIL ACTION NO: 23-628 SECTION: "J"(5)

Reporter

2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 160320 *

IRMA LEE LAGRANGE VERSUS EAGLE, INC., ET AL.

Core Terms

removal, federal court, supplemental jurisdiction, federal official, state law, novel, subject matter jurisdiction, removal statute, state law claim, district court, complex issue, state court, contractor, asbestos, exercise jurisdiction, original jurisdiction, court's jurisdiction, federal jurisdiction, asbestos exposure, remaining claim, time of removal, federal claim, contracted, eliminated, defenses, shipyard, REASONS, clothes, courts, color

Counsel: [*1] For Irma Lee Lagrange, Plaintiff: David Ryan Cannella, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baron & Budd, New Orleans, LA; Christopher C. Colley, Baron & Budd, P.C. (Baton Rouge), Baton Rouge, LA; Emily Catherine LaCerte, Baron & Budd, Baton Rouge, LA; Kristopher Lynn Thompson, Baron & Budd, P.C., Dallas, TX.

For Huntington Ingalls Incorporated, formerly known as, Avondale Industries, Inc, formerly known as, Northrup Grumman Ship Systems, Inc., formerly known as, Northrup Grumman Shipbuilding, Inc., formerly known as, Avondale Shipyards, Inc., formerly known as, Avondale Marine Ways, Inc., Defendant: Gustave A. Fritchie, III, LEAD ATTORNEY, David Michael Melancon, David Wayne O'Quinn, Laura Ashleigh Leggette, Michael Scott Minyard, Timothy Farrow Daniels, Irwin Fritchie Urquhart & Moore LLC (New Orleans), New Orleans, LA; Diana J Masters, Irwin Fritchie Urquhart Moore & Daniels LLC, New Orleans, LA; Kelli Murphy Miller, Michael Kevin Powell, Irwin Fritchie Urquhart Moore & Daniels, New Orleans, LA.

For Hopeman Brothers Inc, Liberty Mutual Insurance Company, as Insurer of Wayne Manufacturing, Defendants: Kaye N. Courington, LEAD ATTORNEY, Blaine Augusta Moore, Jeffrey Matthew Burg, Mathilde Villere Semmes, [*2] Troy Nathan Bell, Courington, Kiefer, Sommers, Marullo & Matherne, New Orleans,

LA; Brittney Bullock Ankersen, Wanek Kirsch Davies Law Firm, New Orleans, LA.

For Union Carbide Corporation, Bayer Cropscience Inc., Successor to Rhone Poulenc Ag Company, formerly known as, Amchem Products, Inc., formerly known as, Benjamin Foster Co, Defendants: McGready Lewis Richeson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Milele N. St. Julien, Pugh Accardo, New Orleans, LA; Francis Xavier deBlanc, III, Pugh, Accardo, Haas, Radecker & Carey (New Orleans), New Orleans, LA.

For Taylor Seidenbach, Inc., Defendant: Christopher Kelly Lightfoot, LEAD ATTORNEY, Hailey, McNamara, Hall, Larmann & Papale, Metairie, LA; Edward J. Lassus, Jr., Hailey, McNamara, Hall, Larmann & Papale, LLP, Metairie, LA.

For Paramount Global, formerly known as, Viacom CBS, Inc., formerly known as, CBS Corporation, formerly known as, Viacom Inc, formerly known as, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, General Electric Company, Defendants: John Joseph Hainkel, III, Magali Ann Puente-Martin, LEAD ATTORNEYS, Angela M. Bowlin, Kelly L. Long, Kelsey Eagan, Frilot L.L.C., Energy Centre, New Orleans, LA; Roth Martin Hainkel, Frilot LLC, New Orleans, LA.

For Metropolitan [*3] Life Insurance Company, Defendant: Jay Morton Jalenak, Jr., LEAD ATTORNEY, Patrick Dale Roquemore, Kean Miller, LLP (Baton Rouge), Baton Rouge, LA.

For Zurich American Insurance Company, as successor by merger to Maryland Casualty Company, Defendant: Edward T. Hayes, LEAD ATTORNEY, Marc E. Devenport, Leake & Andersson, LLP (New Orleans), Energy Centre, New Orleans, LA.

For Foster Wheeler LLC, formerly known as Foster Wheeler Energy Corporation, Defendant: John Joseph Hainkel, III, Magali Ann Puente-Martin, LEAD ATTORNEYS, Angela M. Bowlin, Kelly L. Long, Kelsey Eagan, Frilot L.L.C., Energy Centre, New Orleans, LA; Roth Martin Hainkel, Frilot LLC, New Orleans, LA.

For Uniroyal Holding, Inc., erroneously named as Uniroyal Inc., Third Party Defendant: Mary Reeves Arthur, LEAD ATTORNEY, Heidelberg Patterson Welch Wright, Ridgeland, MS; Elizabeth Riddell Penn, Husch Blackwell LLP, Louisiana, Houston, TX.

For Hopeman Brothers Inc, Cross Claimant: Kaye N. Courington, LEAD ATTORNEY, Blaine Augusta Moore, Jeffrey Matthew Burg, Mathilde Villere Semmes, Troy Nathan Bell, Courington, Kiefer, Sommers, Marullo & Matherne, New Orleans, LA; Brittney Bullock Ankersen, Wanek Kirsch Davies Law Firm, New Orleans, LA.

For Foster Wheeler LLC, formerly known as Foster Wheeler Energy Corporation, Cross Defendant: John Joseph Hainkel, III, LEAD ATTORNEY, Angela M. Bowlin, Kelly L. Long, Kelsey Eagan, Magali Ann Puente-Martin, Frilot L.L.C., Energy Centre, New Orleans, LA; Roth Martin Hainkel, Frilot LLC, New Orleans, LA.

For Huntington Ingalls Incorporated, Third Party Plaintiff: Gustave A. Fritchie, III, LEAD ATTORNEY, David Michael Melancon, David Wayne O'Quinn, Laura Ashleigh Leggette, Michael Scott Minyard, Timothy Farrow Daniels, Irwin Fritchie Urquhart & Moore, LLC (New Orleans), New Orleans, LA; Diana J Masters, Irwin Fritchie Urquhart Moore & Daniels LLC, New Orleans, LA; Kelli Murphy Miller, Michael Kevin Powell, Irwin Fritchie Urquhart Moore & Daniels, New Orleans, LA.

For Uniroyal, Inc., (erroneously named), Third Party Defendant: Mary Reeves Arthur, Heidelberg Patterson Welch Wright, Ridgeland, MS.

For Huntington Ingalls Incorporated, Cross Claimant: Gustave A. Fritchie, III, LEAD ATTORNEY, David Michael Melancon, David Wayne O'Quinn, Laura Ashleigh Leggette, Michael Scott Minyard, Timothy Farrow Daniels, Irwin Fritchie Urquhart & Moore, LLC (New Orleans), New Orleans, LA; Diana J Masters, Irwin Fritchie Urquhart Moore & Daniels LLC, New Orleans, LA; Kelli Murphy Miller, Michael Kevin Powell, Irwin Fritchie Urquhart Moore & Daniels, New Orleans, LA.

For Bayer Cropscience Inc., Successor to Rhone Poulenc Ag Company, Cross Defendant: McGready Lewis Richeson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Milele N. St. Julien, Pugh Accardo, New Orleans, LA; Francis Xavier deBlanc, III, Pugh, Accardo, Haas, Radecker & Carey (New Orleans), New Orleans, LA.

For General Electric Company, Cross Defendant: John Joseph Hainkel, III, Magali Ann Puente-Martin, LEAD

ATTORNEYS, Angela M. Bowlin, Kelly L. Long, Kelsey Eagan, Frilot L.L.C., Energy Centre, New Orleans, LA; Roth Martin Hainkel, Frilot LLC, New Orleans, LA.

For Hopeman Brothers Inc, Cross Defendant: Kaye N. Courington, LEAD ATTORNEY, Blaine Augusta Moore, Jeffrey Matthew Burg, Mathilde Villere Semmes, Troy Nathan Bell, Courington, Kiefer, Sommers, Marullo & Matherne, New Orleans, LA; Brittney Bullock Ankersen, Wanek Kirsch Davies Law Firm, New Orleans, LA.

For International Paper Company, Individually and as Successor by Merger to Champion International Corporation and U.S. Plywood, Cross Defendant: Autumn Breeden, Forman Watkins & Krutz LLP, Jackson, MS.

For Liberty Mutual Insurance Company, as Insurer of Wayne Manufacturing, Cross Defendant: Kaye N. Courington, LEAD ATTORNEY, Blaine Augusta Moore, Jeffrey Matthew Burg, Mathilde Villere Semmes, Troy Nathan Bell, Courington, Kiefer, Sommers, Marullo & Matherne, New Orleans, LA; Brittney Bullock Ankersen, Wanek Kirsch Davies Law Firm, New Orleans, LA.

For Paramount Global, Cross Defendant: John Joseph Hainkel, III, Magali Ann Puente-Martin, LEAD ATTORNEYS, Angela M. Bowlin, Kelly L. Long, Kelsey Eagan, Frilot L.L.C., Energy Centre, New Orleans, LA; Roth Martin Hainkel, Frilot LLC, New Orleans, LA.

For Taylor Seidenbach, Inc., Cross Defendant: Christopher Kelly Lightfoot, LEAD ATTORNEY, Hailey, McNamara, Hall, Larmann & Papale, Metairie, LA; Edward J. Lassus, Jr., Hailey, McNamara, Hall, Larmann & Papale, LLP, Metairie, LA.

For Union Carbide Corporation, Cross Defendant: McGready Lewis Richeson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Milele N. St. Julien, Pugh Accardo, New Orleans, LA; Francis Xavier deBlanc, III, Pugh, Accardo, Haas, Radecker & Carey (New Orleans), New Orleans, LA.

For Berkshire Hathaway Specialty Insurance Company, Third Party Defendant: Paula Marcello Wellons, LEAD ATTORNEY, Taylor, Wellons, Politz & Duhe APLC, Louisiana, New Orleans, LA; Desiree Weilbaecher Adams, Taylor, Wellons, Politz & Duhe, APLC (New Orleans), New Orleans, LA; Jared A. Davidson, Jonathan B. Womack, Taylor, Wellons, Politz & Duhe APLC, New Orleans, LA; Tiffany Ann Morales, Taylor, Wellons, Politz, & Duhe, LLC, New Orleans, LA.

For First State Insurance Company, Third Party Defendant: Wilson Lewis Maloz, III, LEAD ATTORNEY, Larzelere, Picou, Wells, Simpson, Lonero, LLC, Metairie, LA; Pamela Gautier, Larzelere Picou, Metairie,

LA.

For International Paper Company, Individually and as Successor by Merger to Champion International Corporation and U.S. Plywood, Cross Defendant: Autumn Breeden, Forman Watkins & Krutz LLP, Jackson, MS.

Judges: CARL J. BARBIER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Opinion by: CARL J. BARBIER

Opinion

ORDER & REASONS

Before the Court is an *Emergency Motion Seeking the Court to Decline Supplemental Jurisdiction and Remand to State Court* (**Rec. Doc. 13**). Defendants Huntington Ingalls, Inc. ("Avondale") (Rec. Doc. 24), Hopeman Brothers, Inc. and Liberty Mutual Insurance Company (Rec. Doc. 37) oppose the motion to which Plaintiff has filed a reply (Rec. Doc. 53). Having considered the motion and legal memoranda, [*8] the record, and the applicable law, the Court finds that the motion to remand (**Rec. Doc. 13**) should be **DENIED**.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Irma Lee LaGrange allegedly contracted mesothelioma as a result of **asbestos** exposure by laundering her husband's work clothes. Her husband, Allen C. LaGrange, worked at Avondale's Bridge City, Louisiana shipyard from 1973 until 1996. Allen was allegedly exposed to **asbestos** at Avondale shipyard through his work as a laborer, welder, and pipefitter. This work created dust that accumulated on his clothes. **Asbestos** materials were used pursuant to contracts between the United States Government (U.S. Navy, Coast Guard, and Maritime Administration) and Avondale, and a joiner contractor between Avondale and subcontractor Hopeman. In the instant motion, Plaintiff now seeks to bar Defendants from using the Government Contractor Defense.

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff asserts that, because this Court concluded that Defendants cannot establish a federal defense under

[Boyle v. United Technologies Corp.](#), 487 U.S. 500, 108 S. Ct. 2510, 101 L. Ed. 2d 442 (1988) and [Yearsley v. W.A. Ross Construction Co.](#), 309 U.S. 18, 60 S. Ct. 413, 84 L. Ed. 554 (1940), all remaining claims and defenses arise under state law between parties that are not diverse. (Rec. Doc. 13, at 2). Thus, they argue, this Court should, at its discretion, decline to exercise supplemental [*9] jurisdiction over the remaining claims pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 1367\(c\)](#). Defendants argue that this Court should continue to exercise jurisdiction because it satisfied all elements of federal officer jurisdiction at the time of removal. (Rec. Doc. 24, at 1, 2). Further, Avondale argues that this Court should not decline supplemental jurisdiction because Plaintiff's claims involve no novel or complex issues of state law and because this Court has denied similar motions to remand in other **asbestos** cases. See [Ragusa v. La. Guar. Ins. Ass'n](#), No. 21-1971, 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51215, 2023 WL 2646754 (E.D. La. Mar. 27, 2023); [Falgout v. Anco Insulations, Inc.](#), No. 21-1443, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 196326, 2022 WL 16534223 (E.D. La. Oct. 28, 2022); [Savoie v. Huntington Ingalls Inc.](#), No. 15-1220, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47411, 2022 WL 807525 (E.D. La. Mar. 17, 2022).

Although federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, "federal officer removal under [28 U.S.C. § 1442](#) is unlike other removal doctrines: it is not narrow or limited." [State v. Kleinert](#), 855 F.3d 305, 311 (5th Cir. 2017); [Howery v. Allstate Ins. Co.](#), 243 F.3d 912, 916 (5th Cir. 2001). Although the principle of limited federal court jurisdiction ordinarily compels federal courts to resolve any doubt about removal in favor of remand, courts should analyze removal under [§ 1442\(a\)\(1\)](#) "without a thumb on the remand side of the scale." [Savoie v. Huntington Ingalls, Inc.](#), 817 F. 3d 457, 462 (5th Cir. 2016); see also [Williams v. Lockheed Martin Corp.](#), 990 F.3d 852, 859 (5th Cir. 2021) ("unlike the general removal statute, the federal officer removal statute is to be 'broadly construed' in favor of a federal forum"). Nevertheless, it remains the removing party's burden of showing that federal jurisdiction exists. [Manguno v. Prudential Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co.](#), 276 F.3d 720, 723 (5th Cir. 2002).

Under [28 U.S.C. § 1442\(a\)\(1\)](#), the federal officer removal statute, a federal court [*10] has subject matter jurisdiction if the defendant is "any person acting under [an officer] of the United States or of any agency thereof . . . for or relating to any act under color of such office." [28 U.S.C. § 1442\(a\)\(1\)](#). To qualify for removal under [§ 1442\(a\)\(1\)](#), a defendant must show: (1) it has asserted a colorable federal defense, (2) it is a "person" within the

meaning of the statute, (3) that has acted pursuant to a federal officer's directions, and (4) the charged conduct is connected or associated with an act pursuant to a federal officer's directions. [Latiolais v. Huntington Ingalls, Inc.](#), 951 F.3d 286, 296 (5th Cir. 2020).

Although the "general rule" in the Fifth Circuit is to "decline to exercise jurisdiction over pendent state-law claims when all federal claims are dismissed or otherwise eliminated from a case prior to trial, this rule is neither mandatory nor absolute." [Batiste v. Island Recs. Inc.](#), 179 F.3d 217, 227 (5th Cir. 1999) (holding that district court abused its discretion in dismissing state law claims in a case that had been pending in federal court for three years and lacked any novel or difficult issues of state law). Instead, the Court may, at its discretion, decline to exercise subject matter jurisdiction over claims for which there would be no original subject matter jurisdiction if:

- (1) The claim raises a novel or complex [*11] issue of State law
- (2) The claim substantially predominates over the claim or claims over which the district court has original jurisdiction
- (3) The district court has dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction, or
- (4) In exceptional circumstances, there are other compelling reasons for declining jurisdiction.

[28 U.S.C. § 1367\(c\)](#).

In this case, the statutory factors above do not weigh in favor of this Court remanding the case back to State Court. First, although Plaintiffs argue that their claims are more frequently litigated in state court, the **asbestos** exposure and failure to warn claims do not raise any novel or complex issues of Louisiana law.

Second, although Plaintiffs accurately submit there are no federal questions remaining in this case, a federal court does not lose jurisdiction "if the facts later indicate the federal defense fails." [Williams v. Lockheed Martin Corp.](#), 990 F.3d 852, 863 (5th Cir. 2021) (citing [Rockwell Int'l Corp. v. United States](#), 549 U.S. 457, 474 n.6, 127 S. Ct. 1397, 167 L. Ed. 2d 190 (2007) ("[W]hen a defendant removes a case to federal court based on the presence of a federal claim, an amendment eliminating the original basis for federal jurisdiction generally does not defeat jurisdiction.")). If, at the time of removal, the record indicates the federal contractor defense was not "insubstantial on its face or obviously frivolous," [*12] the exercise of supplemental

jurisdiction over the remaining state law claims is also proper. *Id.* Thus, dismissing Avondale's federal defenses does not affect this Court's jurisdiction over this case. This Court will therefore continue to exercise its supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' remaining state law claims.

Accordingly,

CONCLUSION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion to remand (Rec. Doc. 13) is **DENIED**.

New Orleans, Louisiana this 6th day of September, 2024.

/s/ Carl J. Barbier

CARL J. BARBIER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

End of Document