MAKING AND DOING DEALS: CONTRACTS IN CONTEXT

David G. Epstein Bruce A. Markell Lawrence Ponoroff



Making and Doing Deals: Contracts in Context

DAVID G. EPSTEIN

Charles E. Tweedy, Jr. Chairholder of Law The University of Alabama School of Law

BRUCE A. MARKELL

Doris S. and Theodore B. Lee Professor of Law William S. Boyd School of Law The University of Nevada, Las Vegas

LAWRENCE PONOROFF

Dean and Mitchell Franklin Professor of Law of Private and Commercial Law Tulane Law School



Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Epstein, David G., 1943-

Making and doing deals: contract and related law / David G. Epstein, Bruce A.

Markell, Lawrence Ponoroff. p. cm.

Includes index

ISBN 0-8205-5393-X

1. Contracts—United States—Cases. I. Markell, Bruce A. II. Ponoroff, Lawrence. III. Title.

KF801.A7 E65 2002 346.7302---dc21

2002016059

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis, the knowledge burst logo, and Michie are trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties, Inc. used under license. Matthew Bender is a registered trademark of Matthew Bender Properties, Inc.

Copyright © 2002 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material exceeding fair use, 17 U.S.C. § 107, may be licensed for a fee of 10¢ per page per copy from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Preface

Our primary objectives¹ in writing this book were to give you a better understanding of:

- (1) how to do contract law in law school—what legal issues arise when there is a dispute² over a deal and what legal concepts law students should use in addressing these issues; and
- (2) how to do contract law in the "real world"—what a lawyer can do to minimize the possibility that her client will be involved in disputes and maximize the possibility that if disputes nonetheless arise, resolution will be favorable to her client.

The book, like most law school "case books," is mostly cases.³ Some of the cases are "classics," part of a legal culture shared by lawyers regardless of the law school they attended or the case book their contracts professor selected. Other cases have been selected because they raise interesting questions or contain insightful analysis of important legal issues. We have also tried, whenever possible, to include recent cases that involve contemporary issues such as shrinkwrap contracts and arbitration clauses. We don't agree with the reasoning or result of all of the cases in the book; your teacher won't; you shouldn't.

¹The objectives of making money, gaining academic prestige, convincing David Kelley to develop a new television series about contract law professors were, of course, secondary.

²People may disagree about (i) whether they ever made a deal or (ii) what the terms of the deal are or (iii) whether the other guy did what he agreed to do or (iv) if there is some legal excuse for not doing what you agreed to do or (v) how courts should enforce deals.

³Additionally, the book has both textual notes before the cases to give you some idea of what you are supposed to look for in the case and also questions after the cases to give you some idea of whether you found it. While we are of course proud of every word we have written, we want to single out the material in the Appendix on what is a contract, what is contract law, and what is a law school course on contracts. We urge you to read these pages at some point during the first few weeks of the semester.

We just want you to think about the cases. Not "think like a lawyer," just think.

Through law school and beyond, we have heard the phrase "think like a lawyer." We still don't know what it means. Each of us practiced law for more than eight years, and have been partners in large law firms; each of us approaches legal issues differently. While we disagree over the phrase "think like a lawyer," we agree with the phrase that "lawyers think."

A big part of that thinking is questioning constantly what you read. It is important that you read the cases and other materials in this book, asking yourself questions such as:

- (1) What facts in this case are important?
- (2) What were the questions that the court decided?
- (3) What were the reasons for the decision? Do I agree with the result? Do I agree with the reasons for the result?
- (4) Why is this case in the book? How is it similar to and different from other cases in the book?
- (5) How can the decision in this case be helpful in avoiding other disputes or in resolving other disputes?
- (6) How come Epstein, Markell and Ponoroff are funnier and more interesting than my contracts teacher?

One last point before you turn the page. When communicating in writing, people often use footnotes. In this book, the footnotes that are noted with asterisks contain material that we, the casebook editors, have written for explanatory or other purposes. Footnotes with actual numbers are the footnotes from the original material, be it actual cases, articles, or the like. In addition, we have retained the original numbers of these footnotes. You should keep this in mind because, due to our sometimes heavy editing, these numbered footnotes do not always appear in consecutive numerical order.

We have had fun writing this book, and we learned a lot. We hope that you have fun using the book and that you also learn a lot.

HAVE A GREAT FIRST YEAR.

David G. Epstein

Bruce A. Markell

Lawrence Ponoroff

Tuscaloosa, Las Vegas and New Orleans,

February 2002

Acknowledgments

Actress' Settlement Ends Long Legal Saga, LOS ANGELES TIMES, at page B2 (May 27, 1999), reprinted with permission of the Los Angeles Times Syndicate.

Atiyah, Patrick S., AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LAW OF CONTRACTS (5th ed. 1975), by permission of Oxford University Press.

Brennan, Justice William J., Jr., In Memoriam: J. Skelly Wright, 102 HARV. L. REV. 361 (1988).

Eisenberg, Melvin Aron, The World of Contract and the World of Gift, 85 CALIF. L. REV. 821 (1997).

Esptein, Richard A., Unconscionability: A Critical Appraisal, 18 J. LAW & ECON. 293 (1975).

Farber, Daniel A. & Matheson, John E., Beyond Promissory Estoppel: Contract Law and the Invisible Handshake, 52 U. CHI. L. REV. 903, 945 (1985), reprinted with permission.

Farnsworth, E. Allan, Precontractual Liability and Preliminary Agreements: Fair Dealing and Failed Negotiations, 87 COLUM. L. REV. 217, 257–58 (1987), reprinted with permission of the Columbia Law Review and Professor Farnsworth.

Farnsworth, E. Allan, *The Past of Promise: An Historical Introduction to Contract*, 69 COLUM. L. REV. 576, 592–98 (1969), reprinted with permission of the Columbia Law Review and Professor Farnsworth.

Fessler, Daniel Wm., TEACHING NOTES FOR FESSLER & LOISEAUX'S CONTRACTS: MORALITY, ECONOMICS AND THE MARKETPLACE 47–48 (1982), reprinted with permission.

Friedman, Lawrence M., CONTRACT LAW IN AMERICA 17–18, 20–22 (1965), reprinted by permission of The University of Wisconsin Press.

Farnsworth, E. Allan, CHANGING YOUR MIND 13–14, 16–18, 24, 26–27 (1998), reprinted with permission of The Yale University Press.

Fuller, Lon, Consideration and Form, 41 COLUM. L. REV. 799, 821–22 (1941), reprinted with permission.

Herman, Shael, Detrimental Reliance in Louisiana Law—Past, Present, and Future: The Code Drafter's Perspective, 58 TULANE L. REV. 707, 715 (1984), reprinted with permission of the Tulane Law Review Association.

Hillman, Robert A., Contract Modifications Under the Restatement (Second) of Contracts, 67 CORNELL L. REV. 680 (1982), reprinted with permission.

Kasterly, Amy H., Cogs or Cyborgs, Blasphemy and Irony in Contract Theories, 90 NW. L. REV. 132, 138 (1995), reprinted with permission.

Kidwell, John, Ruminations on Teaching the Statute of Frauds, 44 St. Louis U. L.J. 1427 (2000).

Kozinski, Alex, Who Gives a Hoot About Legal Scholarship?, 37 HOUSTON L. REV. 295, 289–99 (2000), reprinted with permission from Judge Kozinski.

Leslie, Melanie B., Enforcing Family Promises: Reliance, Reciprocity and Relational Contract, 77 N.C. L. REV. 551 (1999).

Macneil, Ian R., A Primer of Contract Planning, 48 S. CAL. L. REV. (1975), reprinted with the permission of the Southern California Law review and Professor MacNeil.

Markell, Bruce A., A View From the Field: Some Observations on the Effect of Interpretational Commercial Law Reform Efforts on the Rule of Law, 6 IND. J. OF GLOBAL LEGAL STUDIES, 497, 498–99 (1999), reprinted with permission.

McConnaughey, Janet, Court: Failed Fantasy Worth Only \$57,500, THE BATON ROUGE ADVOCATE, at page 7B (Aug. 14, 1998), reprinted with permission of the Associated Press.

Patterson, Edwin W., The Interpretation and Construction of Contracts, 64 COLUM. L. REV. 833, 852–54 (1964), reprinted with permission.

Peters, Ellen, In Memory of Grant Gilmore: Grant Gilmore and the Illusion of Certainty, 92 YALE L.J. 8, 11 (1982), reprinted with permission of the Yale Law Journal.

Posner, Richard, *In Memoriam: Henry J. Friendly*, 99 HARV. L. REV. 1724 (1986), reprinted with the permission of the Harvard Law Review.

Restatement (Second) of Contracts. Copyright 1981 by the American Law Institute. Reprinted with permission. All rights reserved.

Threedy, Debora L., Feminists and Contract Doctrine, 32 IND. L. REV. 1347 (1999), reprinted by permission.

Uniform Commercial Code. Copyright 2000 by the American Law Institute and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. Reproduced with the permission of the Permanent Editorial Board for the Uniform Commercial Code. All rights reserved.

Wade, John, W., Restitution for the Benefit Conferred Without Request, 19 VAND. L. REV. 1183, 1183–84, 1211–12 (1966), reprinted with permission.

Waters, Antony Jon, The Property in the Promise – A Study of the Third Party Beneficiary Rule, 98 HARV. L. REV. 1109, 1117, 1148–51 (1985), reprinted with permission.

Yorio, Edward & Thel, Steve, *The Promissory Basis of* § 90, 101 YALE L.J. 111, 116–17 (1991), reprinted by permission of the Yale Law Journal Company and William S. Hein Company.

Epstein thanks Alabama law students, especially Kris Aungst, Thomas Casey, and Adam Plant, for their help with the book, especially with Markell and Ponoroff's parts of the book. And Erica Nicholson for turning the words that I put on disks and the words that I meant to be put on disks into a book.

Markell wishes to thank Natalie Cox, of the William S. Boyd School of Law's charter 2001 class, and Elizabeth Bradley and Carla Kok, of the Boyd School of Law's 2003 class, for their superb and tireless research assistance. A big tip o' the hat is due Dan McNutt, also of the Boyd School of Law's charter class for his comments (some of which were constructive) and help (all of which was needed) as a teaching assistant. Teresa Eckersall, Markell's secretary and assistant, was invaluable for her patient and competent handling of all the messes Markell makes. Finally, the biggest thanks go to Markell's students at the Boyd School of Law who, for the past three years, were cheerful (albeit involuntary) participants in the creation of this book; they were great, each and every one of them.

Ponoroff wishes to thank Michelle Emmert, Tulane Law School class of 2002, for her able assistance, including a harrowing trip to the courthouse ar-

chives in Shreveport, Louisiana to track down a copy of the contract in *Ever-Tite Roofing v. Green*. He would also like to thank the students in the classes of 2002 and 2003 in his Contracts I section who, without too much grousing, served as guinea pigs on earlier manuscripts of this book and, in the process, provided enormously useful feedback and, on occasion, painful (but constructive) criticism.

Table of Contents

Preface		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	v
Acknowledgement	s		ix
Table of Contents.	******		xiii
Introduction: V	Vhat Are We G	oing to Be Doing in this Course?	1
Section 1	. What is a c	CONTRACT?	1
Section 2	. What is a i	FIRST YEAR COURSE IN CONTRACTS?	2
		Hill v. Gateway 2000, Inc.	5
Chapter One: H	las Your Client	Made a Deal?	13
SECTION 1	. Determini	ng the Meeting of the Minds	13
		Lucy v. Zehmer	14
		Leonard v. Pepsico, Inc	25 36
		Note on the Intention to be Legally Bound	41
0		Problems on Mutual Consent	
SECTION 2	. OFFER		
		Lonergan v. Scolnick	45
		Woodenware Co.	49
		Note on U.C.C. Article 2	
Sporton 2	Drethova	Donovan v. RRL Corporation	
SECTION 3		G THE OFFER	
A	l. Indirect K	Pevocation	
E	3. Lapse	Distribution in Decident	
	-	Minnesota Linseed Oil Co. v. Collier White	76
(Death (or	Lead Co	
		New Headley Tobacco Warehouse Co. v.	
		Gentry's Ex'r	81

	Problems on Termination of an Offer	0.5
	by Death	85
	Note on Termination by Supervening Incapacity	96
SECTION 4.	Preserving the Offer	87
	Beall v. Beall	88
	Board of Control of Eastern Michigan	
	University v. Burgess	93
	Note on Option Contracts and Firm Offers.	
	Note on Option Contracts and Reliance	
SECTION 5.		
A.	Control Over the Manner of Acceptance	98
	La Salle National Bank v. Vega	100
	Ever-Tite Roofing Corp. v. Green	103
	Note on Required Form of Acceptance	107
	Questions About LaSalle and Ever-Tite	
n	Davis v. Jacoby	
В.	Effectiveness of Promissory Acceptance	110
	Introduction to HendricksHendricks v. Behee	
	Introduction to Adams v. Lindsell	
	Adams v. Lindsell	
	Problems Concerning Application of the	21
	"Mailbox Rule"	126
С.	Effectiveness of Acceptance by Performance	
.	Carlill v. Carbolic Smoke Ball Co	128
	Marchiondo v. Scheck	135
	Problems on Acceptance by Promise,	
	Performance and Part Performance	
D.	Acceptance by Silence or Inaction	141
	Laredo National Bank v. Gordon	
E.	Imperfect Acceptances	145
	Introduction to Egger v. Nesbit	145
	Egger v. Nesbit	146
	Dorton v. Collins & Aikman Corporation	153
	Introduction to Klocek v. Gateway, Inc	162
	Klocek v. Gateway, IncProblems on U.C.C. § 2-207	175
SECTION 6.	COMPLETING THE AGREEMENT	
	Introduction	
А.	Indefiniteness and Open Terms	
71.	Varney v. Ditmars	177

	Nora Beverages, Inc. v. Perrier Group of America, Inc	
В.	Agreements to Agree	193 193 201 208
SECTION 7.	PRE-CONTRACT FORMATION LIABILITY	212
	Budget Marketing, Inc. v. Centronics Corporation	214
SECTION 8.	Defeating Agreements based on Misunderstanding of the Terms	225
	Introduction	226 229
Chapter Two: Is I	t a Deal That the Law Will Enforce?	
Section 1.	PREVIEW OF HOW THE LAW ENFORCES AN AGREEMENT AND AN OVERVIEW OF WHY THE LAW DOES NOT ENFORCE SOME AGREEMENTS	
SECTION 2.	MISTAKEN, UNSTATED FACTUAL ASSUMPTIONS	241
	Sherwood v. Walker Burggraff v. Baum Donovan v. RRL Corp	250
SECTION 3.	Fraud, Fraudulent or Material Misrepresentation, and Nondisclosure	
	Halpert v. Rosenthal Swinton v. Whitinsville Savings Bank Weintraub v. Krobatsch	267
SECTION 4.	CAPACITY	
	Kiefer v. Fred Howe Motors, Inc	
SECTION 5.	PRESSURE—DURESS AND UNDUE INFLUENCE	283
	P.S. Atiyah, An Introduction to the Law of Contract	285 289

SECTION 6.	ILLEGALITY AND PUBLIC POLICY	20/
SECTION 6.		
	Problem	305
	Covert v. South Florida Stadium	206
	CorporationValley Medical Specialists v. Farber	210
	R.R. v. M.H	319
Cromov 7	UNCONSCIONABILITY	
SECTION 7.		349
	Williams v. Walker-Thomas Furniture	220
	Company Williams v. Walker-Thomas Furniture	550
	Company	332
	Morrison v. Circuit City Stores, Inc	338
SECTION 8.	CONSIDERATION	
	Golf Gibbbian 10,	
A.	Changing Your Mind About Agreeing To Give—	
	Looking for Bargained for Benefit to Promisor or Detriment to Promisee	348
	Kirksey v. Kirksey	348
	Hamer v. Sidway	353
В.	Changing Your Mind About Agreeing to Settle Past	
2.	Claims or Release Future Claims	359
	Schnell v. Nell	359
	Dyer v. National By-Products, Inc	364
	Reed v. University of North Dakota and The	
	North Dakota Ass'n for the Disabled, Inc	369
_	Problems	3/3
С.	Changing Your Mind About Employment Agreements	5/5
	Hooters of America, Înc. v. Phillips Asmus v. Pacific Bell	292
D	ASMUS V. Pacific Dell	303
D.	Changing Your Mind About Agreeing to Change the	280
	DealAlaska Packers' Ass'n v. Domenico	
	Angel v. Murray	
SECTION 9.	Consideration Substitutes—Enforcing	
SECTION 7.	AGREEMENTS AND PROMISES WITHOUT A	
	BARGAINED-FOR LEGAL DETRIMENT	402
A.	Promises to "Pay" for Something That Happened Before	
71.	the Promise	402
	Harrington v. Taylor	403
	Mills v. Wyman	404
	Thomas v. Bryant	410
	Webb v. McGowin	414
	Webb v. McGowin	418

В.	Promis	sory Estoppel	422
	1.	Overview	422
	2.	Historical Development	423
		Ricketts v. Scothorn	423
		Shael Herman, Detrimental Reliance In	
		Louisiana Law-Past, Present, and Future	
		The Code Drafter's Perspective	
	3.	Contemporary Applications of the Doctrine.	430
		Katz v. Danny Dare, Inc	430
		Midwest Energy, Inc. v. Orion Food	
		Systems, Inc.	439
		Introduction to Pavel Enterprises	446
		Pavel Enterprises, Inc. v. A. S. Johnson	//0
		Company, Inc.	448
		Note on Promissory Estoppel and Pre-	465
		Contract Negotiations Problem on Promissory Estoppel	465
	4.	Remedial Considerations	400
	4.	Edward Yorio & Steve Thel, The Promisso	1 00
		Basis of § 90	
	5.	The Diminishing Importance of Reliance	
	٦.	Salsbury v. Northwestern Bell Telephone	100
		Company	469
		Daniel A. Farber & John E. Matheson,	
		Beyond Promissory Estoppel: Contract	
		Law and the Invisible Handshake	475
SECTION 10.	. Statute	OF FRAUDS	476
		Radke v. Brenon	
		DF Activities Corporation v. Brown	485
		McIntosh v. Murphy	491
Charta Than Wi	hat Amath	e Terms of the Deal?	
_			
SECTION 1.	I HE AG	REEMENT: BEYOND THE WRITTEN WORD	
		Threadgill v. Peabody Coal Co	503
SECTION 2.	EXPRESS	TERMS, PAROL EVIDENCE AND THE	
	ARGUME	ENT OVER THE COMPLETENESS OF THE	
	WRITTE	n Contract	508
A.	Comn	10n Law	509
211	Gomm	Nelson v. Elway	511
		Esbensen v. Userware International, Inc	520
В.	Unifo	rm Commercial Code	526
	,	Herman Oil, Inc. v. Peterman	527

<i>C</i> .	Exceptions533
	Problems on Parol Evidence534
D.	A World Without Parol Evidence—The Convention on
	the International Sale of Goods536
	MCC-Marble Ceramic Center, Inc. v.
	Ceramica Nuova D'Agostino, S.p.A536
SECTION 3.	Ambiguous Express Terms: Using Parol
	EVIDENCE AND OTHER EXTRINSIC EVIDENCE TO
	DISCOVER THE MEANING OF THE TERMS USED547
	Frigaliment Importing Co., Ltd. v. B.N.S.
	International Sales Corp548
A.	Course of Performance, Course of Dealing and Trade
	<i>Usage (Again)</i> 556
	Problems on Trade Usage and Course
	of Dealing558
В.	Ambiguity in Contract Terms—When Does It Exist,
	and How Do Courts Clarify the Deal?558
	Random House, Inc. v. Rosetta Books LLC559
	Trident Center v. Connecticut General Life Ins. Co570
C.	The Use of Rules, Maxims and Extrinsic Evidence to
С.	Construe Contract Language579
	Edwin W. Patterson, The Interpretation and
	Construction of Contracts581
	Problems on Construction of Contracts583
D.	Special Interpretive Rules for Contracts of Adhesion?584
_	Meyer v. State Farm Fire & Čas. Co585
	Lauvetz v. Alaska Sales and Service d/b/a
	National Car Rental588
SECTION 4.	IMPLIED TERMS595
А.	Terms Implied by Courts to Effectuate Assumed Intent596
11.	Wood v. Lucy, Lady Duff-Gordon596
	Daniel Wm. Fessler, Teaching Notes for
	Fessler & Loiseaux's Contracts: Morality,
	Economics and the Marketplace598
	U.C.C. § 2-312 Warranty of Title and
n	Against Infringement
В.	Terms Implied by Courts to Effectuate Public Policy—
	The Implied Duty of Good Faith and Fair Dealing601 Locke v. Warner Bros., Inc602
	Hobin v. Coldwell Banker Residential
	Affiliates, Inc615
	· witherest tree contributions to the contribution of the contribu

С.		620
D.	Problems on Terms Implied by the U.C.C Special Legislative Provisions—Warranties and the	621
	Û.C.C	622
	1. Introduction	622
	2. Express Warranties	623
	Daughtrey v. Ashe	624
	Problem on Express Warranty	632
	3. Implied Warranties Generally	
	4. Implied Warranty of Merchantability	
	Webster v. Blue Ship Tea Room, Inc	
	Note on Causation	
	Problems on Merchantability	641
	Implied Warranty of Fitness for Particular	
	Purpose	642
	Leal v. Holtvogt	643
	The Singer Company v. E.I. du Pont de	
	Nemours and Company	651
	6. Disclaimers of Warranties	660
	Office Supply Co., Inc. v. Basic/Four	
	Corporation	661
Chapter Four: W	hen Is Someone Who Made an Enforceable Deal	
	Then Is Someone Who Made an Enforceable Deal scused from Doing What She Agreed to Do?	
Ex	scused from Doing What She Agreed to Do?	
	scused from Doing What She Agreed to Do?	675
Ex Section 1.	scused from Doing What She Agreed to Do? Satisfaction of Mature Obligations to Perform: The Concept of Discharge	675 676
SECTION 1. SECTION 2.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE IS PERFORMANCE DUE?: CONDITIONS	675 676
Ex Section 1.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE	675 676 679
SECTION 1. SECTION 2.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE	675 676 679
SECTION 1. SECTION 2. A.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE IS PERFORMANCE DUE?: CONDITIONS	675 676 679 679
SECTION 1. SECTION 2.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE IS PERFORMANCE DUE?: CONDITIONS	675 676 679 680
SECTION 1. SECTION 2. A.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE	675 676 679 680
SECTION 1. SECTION 2. A.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE IS PERFORMANCE DUE?: CONDITIONS Conditions as Devices to Allocate Risk (of Express Conditions) West v. United States Postal Service Regulating Exchanges, or, Who is to Do What When (of Implied Conditions)	675 676 679 680
SECTION 1. SECTION 2. A.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE	675 676 679 680 684 684
SECTION 1. SECTION 2. A.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE IS PERFORMANCE DUE?: CONDITIONS Conditions as Devices to Allocate Risk (of Express Conditions) West v. United States Postal Service Regulating Exchanges, or, Who is to Do What When (of Implied Conditions) 1. A Short History of Constructive Conditions Nichols v. Raynbred	675 676 679 680 684 684
SECTION 1. SECTION 2. A.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE IS PERFORMANCE DUE?: CONDITIONS Conditions as Devices to Allocate Risk (of Express Conditions) West v. United States Postal Service Regulating Exchanges, or, Who is to Do What When (of Implied Conditions) 1. A Short History of Constructive Conditions Nichols v. Raynbred Kingston v. Preston	675 676 679 680 684 684 684
SECTION 1. SECTION 2. A.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE IS PERFORMANCE DUE?: CONDITIONS Conditions as Devices to Allocate Risk (of Express Conditions) West v. United States Postal Service Regulating Exchanges, or, Who is to Do What When (of Implied Conditions) 1. A Short History of Constructive Conditions Nichols v. Raynbred	675 676 679 680 684 684 684
SECTION 1. SECTION 2. A.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE IS PERFORMANCE DUE?: CONDITIONS Conditions as Devices to Allocate Risk (of Express Conditions) West v. United States Postal Service Regulating Exchanges, or, Who is to Do What When (of Implied Conditions) 1. A Short History of Constructive Conditions Nichols v. Raynbred	675 676 679 680 684 684 684 685
SECTION 1. SECTION 2. A.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE	675 676 679 680 684 684 684 685
SECTION 1. SECTION 2. A.	SATISFACTION OF MATURE OBLIGATIONS TO PERFORM: THE CONCEPT OF DISCHARGE IS PERFORMANCE DUE?: CONDITIONS Conditions as Devices to Allocate Risk (of Express Conditions) West v. United States Postal Service Regulating Exchanges, or, Who is to Do What When (of Implied Conditions) 1. A Short History of Constructive Conditions Nichols v. Raynbred	675676679680684684684685688