

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

Nos. 93-762 AND 93-1094

93-762 JEROME B. GRUBART, INC., PETITIONER  
v.  
GREAT LAKES DREDGE & DOCK  
COMPANY ET AL.

93-1094 CITY OF CHICAGO, PETITIONER  
v.  
GREAT LAKES DREDGE & DOCK  
COMPANY ET AL.

ON WRITS OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF  
APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT  
[February 22, 1995]

JUSTICE O'CONNOR, concurring.

I concur in the Court's judgment and opinion. The Court properly holds that, when a court is faced with a case involving multiple tortfeasors, some of whom may not be maritime actors, if *one* of the putative tortfeasors was engaged in traditional maritime activity alleged to have proximately caused the incident, then the supposedly wrongful activity "involves" traditional maritime activity. The possible involvement of other, nonmaritime parties does not affect the jurisdictional inquiry as to the maritime party. *Ante*, at 13-14. I do not, however, understand the Court's opinion to suggest that, having found admiralty jurisdiction over a particular claim against a particular party, a court *must* then exercise admiralty jurisdiction over *all* the claims and parties involved in the case. Rather, the court should engage in the usual supplemental jurisdiction and impleader inquiries. See 28 U. S. C. §1367 (1988 ed., Supp. V); Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 14; see also *ante*, at 3. I find nothing in the Court's opinion to the contrary.