

# **REPORTS OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRAL AWARDS**

---

## **RECUEIL DES SENTENCES ARBITRALES**

**John W. Browne (United States) v. Panama**

26 June 1933

VOLUME VI pp. 333-334



NATIONS UNIES - UNITED NATIONS  
Copyright (c) 2006

The claim of Joseph Steinbrenner is disallowed. His evidence is ambiguous and unconvincing, and seems to indicate that his injuries arose out of a fight with the police in which he was the aggressor. Though he was knocked unconscious, his injuries were not serious, and seem to have all been inflicted in that encounter for which Panama cannot be held accountable.

Charles B. Reppert, administrator of the estate of Morris C. Stettler, deceased, is awarded the sum of \$250. Stettler's injury, a bayonet wound in the chest, was received in a fight with the police in which, by his own statement, he was the aggressor, and no award is rendered therefor for that reason. But he was very roughly carried to the police station in a semiconscious condition, after being taken from the Panama Athletic Club where his wound was being tended, and the award is for this rough treatment of a wounded man.

Lowndes O. Webb is awarded the sum of \$500. He was in a carriage outside of Cocoa Grove, with several other soldiers. The carriage was attacked by a crowd and the occupants thrown out. Webb ran away, and while running was shot in the back of the leg. Though he saw no police in the crowd, his companions did, and one of them saw police in the crowd shooting. Webb incurred no permanent disability.

The Commission decides that the Republic of Panama is obligated to pay to the United States of America, on behalf of the claimants herein, the sum of \$14,500, without interest. This sum is apportioned in the manner indicated above, and all awards are without interest.

---

### JOHN W. BROWNE (UNITED STATES) *v.* PANAMA

(June 26, 1933. Pages 530-531.)

---

JURISDICTION: CLAIMS ARISEN AFTER SIGNATURE OF CLAIMS CONVENTION.—INTERPRETATION OF TREATIES. *Held* that Commission has jurisdiction to entertain claims arisen after signature of Claims Convention. July 28, 1926: reference to Walter A. Noyes award, p. 308 *supra*.

NEGLIGENCE.—EVIDENCE: PROOF OF DAMAGE.—CONTRACT, INTERPRETATION: REASONABLE CONSTRUCTION.—INTERPRETATION OF MUNICIPAL LAW. Purchase by Panama in 1929 of right of way. Improvement by Panama of existing road. Partial washout of road in October, 1930, whereafter general reconstruction. *Held* that no adequate evidence brought of negligent construction, nor of damage caused during reconstruction as distinguished from damage by washout. *Held* also that certain arrangement between claimant and Panama would have been so unreasonable that, in the absence of contract which has not been put in evidence, it is difficult to believe that parties did agree upon it; additional argument from Panamanian law.

*Cross-reference:* Comisión General de Reclamaciones entre Panamá y Estados Unidos de América, Reclamación del Norteamericano John W. Browne, Registro No. 14. (Publicación Oficial, Panamá, 1934.)

*Bibliography:* Hunt, Report, p. 532; Borchard, "The United States-Panama Claims Arbitration", Am. J. Int. Law, vol. 29 (1935), p. 103; Friede, "Die Entscheidungen . . .", Z.a.ö.R.u.V., Band V (1935), pp. 453, 466.

The facts on which this claim is based happened between the signing and the exchange of ratifications of the convention of July 28, 1926. On the grounds stated in the case of Walter A. Noyes (Registry No. 5) the Commission holds that it has jurisdiction to decide upon the claim.

The Government of Panama in 1929 purchased a right of way through a coffee *finca* belonging to John W. Browne and George A. Browne and improved a road already existing along this right of way. In October, 1930, part of the road was washed out by heavy rains and thereafter there was a general repair reconstruction of the road.

Claim is made for \$500. The first ground on which the claim is based is that the washout above referred to was caused by a negligent construction of the road and resulted in damage to claimants' property. The Commission finds no adequate evidence that the washout was the result of negligent construction. The terrain was of that rough and broken type where washouts are difficult to guard against except by a kind of construction which cannot be expected in connection with small country roads.

The second ground on which the claim is based is that in making the general reconstruction of the road after the washout, the workmen rolled rocks onto the property of the claimants. There is no satisfactory evidence as to the damage caused by this action as distinguished from the damage caused by the washout.

The third ground for the claim is that the right of way purchased by the Government was a strip 8 feet in width along its entire length and that in the reconstruction of the road in some places the final road exceeded 8 feet. The contract under which the alleged 8-foot strip was purchased by the Government has not been put in evidence. The Commission is left in doubt whether the right acquired by the Government was to build a road the usable portion of which was to be 8 feet wide or whether the Government's right was to build a road no portion of which, including cuts and fills, should ever exceed 8 feet. The latter arrangement would have been so unreasonable that it is difficult to believe that it occurred, without clear evidence. If the Government was entitled, under its contract, to a usable road 8 feet wide plus necessary cuts and fills, then there is no evidence in the record that the lawful width was exceeded. Moreover, the lands on which the claimants' *finca* was situated were originally *indultado* lands, the grant whereof by the Government to the claimants' predecessor in title reserved the Government's rights for the construction of roads as set forth in art. 102 of law 20 of 1913. Among the rights reserved in this article was that of taking without compensation the right of way necessary for the construction of *caminos de herradura*. There is some question as to whether this phrase includes ordinary country wagon roads or only trails for horses. At any rate, it is clear that the right of the Government under this article extends to whatever property is required for cuts, fills and drains, and it is not shown that the actual road in question after reconstruction exceeded in width a reasonable allowance for a *camino de herradura* under art. 102, with reasonable extensions for cuts and fills.

The Commission decides that the claim must be disallowed.

---

LETTIE CHARLOTTE DENHAM AND FRANK PARLIN DENHAM  
(UNITED STATES) *v.* PANAMA

(*June 27, 1933. Pages 516-521.*)

---

PROCEDURE: COUNTERACTION.—DENIAL OF JUSTICE: VIOLATION OF LAW, GOOD FAITH.—INTERPRETATION OF MUNICIPAL LAW. Dissolution of conjugal partnership between first claimant and James Fleming Denham by agreement set forth in public instrument executed before Panamanian notary on Novem-