

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

ATLANTIC OCEANIC LLC

CIVIL ACTION

VERSUS

NO: 25-974

**HF OFFSHORE SERVICES
MEXICO SAPI DE CV, ET AL.**

SECTION: “H”

ORDER

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Dossier’s Report and Recommendation¹ granting in part Defendant HF Hunter Shipping Pte. Ltd. (“HF Hunter”)’s Motion to Vacate Maritime Attachment.²

Magistrate Judge Dossier held a hearing with the parties regarding the Motion to Vacate on June 18, 2025.³ In conjunction with the filing of their objections⁴ to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, Plaintiff Atlantic Oceanic LLC (“Atlantic Oceanic”) filed a Motion to Alter or Amend the Judgment⁵ that expanded on their issues with the Magistrate Judge’s

¹ Doc. 57. Judge Lance Africk, to whom this matter was temporarily reallocated, designated Magistrate Judge Dossier to hear and determine Defendant’s Motion to Vacate Maritime Attachment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(A). Doc. 41. Though it is styled as an “Order and Reasons,” the Court will review Magistrate Judge Dossier’s Order as a Report & Recommendation as it addresses a pretrial matter pending before the Court. *See* 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(A).

² Doc. 55.

³ Doc. 16.

⁴ Doc. 60.

⁵ Doc. 66.

⁶ Doc. 68

conclusions. Plaintiff predicated their arguments in both filings on the assertion that manipulated evidence in the form of a changed IMO Certificate and relatedly impeachable testimony from HF Hunter's officer, Heiko Felderhoff, appeared before the Magistrate Judge and impacted her decision regarding attachment. Defendant HF Hunter opposed⁶, asserting that Plaintiff's claims that their IMO certificates were not manipulated, and that Plaintiff's objections do not undermine Magistrate Judge Dossier's findings that Plaintiff failed to meet its burden of producing sufficient evidence to show probable cause for the attachment.

Magistrate Judge Dossier then ordered that both parties address specific factual issues that were raised in Plaintiff's Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment.⁷ Both parties filed responses.⁸ In her Order and Reasons, Magistrate Judge Dossier emphasized her previous consideration of all the evidence before her, which included the only IMO certificate presented and the testimony of Mr. Felderhoff, as well as other officers employed by Defendant. Ultimately, finding that there was "no basis for reconsideration at this stage" in the litigation, Magistrate Judge Dossier denied Plaintiff's Motion to Alter and Amend Judgment.⁹

"Magistrate judges are empowered by statute to preside over certain pretrial matters upon appointment by a district judge. A district court evaluating a magistrate judge's recommendation may adopt those portions of the recommendation to which no specific objection is made, as long as those sections are not clearly erroneous."¹⁰ "However, where a party makes 'specific,

⁶ Doc. 69.

⁷ Doc. 71.

⁸ Docs. 73, 74.

⁹ Doc. 76 at 9.

¹⁰ *Rodriguez v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*, No. CV 25-197, 2025 WL 1257997, at *1 (E.D. La. Apr. 30, 2025) (citing 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A)–(C)).

written objections’ within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the magistrate judge's recommendations, the district court must undertake a *de novo* review of those contested aspects of the report.”¹¹ “The Court may then ‘accept, reject, or modify the recommended decision; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.’”¹²

After conducting a *de novo* review of the issues raised by Plaintiff’s objections and reviewing the portions of the recommendation to which no specific objection was made for clear error Plaintiff has not demonstrated that Magistrate Judge Dossier’s ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law. The Court finds the ruling and reasoning upon which it is based to be complete and unimpeachable, agreeing with Magistrate Judge’s assertion that Plaintiff’s “post-hearing attempt to create a new evidentiary record” is unpersuasive.¹³ “The plain text of Rule E(4)(f) confirms that the quintessential purpose of a motion to vacate is to obtain a ‘prompt’ preliminary ruling as to whether the plaintiff can ‘show why the attachment should not be vacated.’”¹⁴ The Court finds that this is what happened here.

The Court, having considered the record, the applicable law, the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, all objections thereto, hereby approves the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation and adopts it as its opinion.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion to vacate the maritime attachment is **GRANTED IN PART** and that the attachment and garnishment of the *M/V*

¹¹ *Id.* (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)).

¹² *Id.* (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3)).

¹³ Doc. 76 at 6.

¹⁴ Doc. 76 (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. Supp. R. E(4)(f)).

HF Hunter (IMO #9269506), its engines, tackle, and appurtenances (R. Doc. 8) are **VACATED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** in all other respects. HF Hunter's requests for additional relief may be urged via separate motion.

New Orleans, Louisiana this 30th day of June, 2025.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jane Triche Milazzo', is written over a horizontal line.

JANE TRICHE MILAZZO
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE