OPINION 2063 (Case 3106)

Remipes marmoratus Jacquinot, 1846 (currently Hippa marmorata; Crustacea, Anomura): priority maintained

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that priority should be maintained for the specific name of the Indo-Pacific sand or mole crab Remipes marmoratus Jacquinot, 1846 (family Hippidae). The junior synonym Remipes pacifica Dana, 1852 is not given precedence.
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Ruling
(1) The proposal to give the specific name pacifica Dana, 1852, as published in the binomen Remipes pacifica, precedence over marmoratus Jacquinot, 1846, as published in the binomen Remipes marmoratus, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms was not approved.

(2) The name marmoratus Jacquinot, 1846, as published in the binomen Remipes marmoratus, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3106
An application to conserve the usage of the specific name of Remipes pacifica Dana, 1852 for an Indo-Pacific sand or mole crab (family Hippidae) by giving it precedence over R. marmoratus Jacquinot, 1846 was received from Christopher B. Boyko (American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY, U.S.A. and Department of Biology, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island, U.S.A.) and Alan W. Harvey (Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, Georgia, U.S.A.) on 16 November 1998. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 59: 12–16 (March 2002). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission’s website. A comment from L.B. Holthuis opposing this case was published in BZN 59: 131.

Decision of the Commission
On 1 September 2003 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 59: 14. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2003 the votes were as follows: 11 Commissioners voted FOR the proposals, 11 Commissioners (Alonso-Zarazaga, Bouchet, Calder, Lamas, Macpherson, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Minelli, Song, Štys and van Tol) voted AGAINST, no vote was received from Eschmeyer. Böhme and Patterson were on leave of absence.

Since there was no majority in favour of the proposals the application was not approved.

Original reference
The following is the original reference to the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion: