

# **Comparative remedies for breach of contract**

edited by Nili Cohen and Ewan McKendrick.

## International Studies in the Theory of Private Law

This series of books edited by a distinguished international team of legal scholars aims to investigate the normative and theoretical foundations of the law governing relations between citizens. The context for such investigations of private law systems is set by important modern tendencies in systems of governance. The advent of the regulatory state marks the withdrawal of the state from direct control and management of social and economic activity, and the adoption instead of procedural regulation and co-regulatory strategies that promote the use of private law techniques of ordering and self-regulation in social and economic interactions between citizens. The tendency known as globalisation and the corresponding increases in cross-border trade produce the responses of transnational regulation of commerce and private governance regimes, and these new systems of governance challenge the hegemony of traditional national private law systems. Furthermore, these tendencies towards transnational governance regimes compel an interaction between different national legal traditions, with their differences in culture and philosophy as well as their differences based upon variations in market systems, which provokes questions not only about competing policy frameworks but also about the nature and adequacy of different kinds of legal reasoning.

The series encompasses a diverse range of theoretical approaches in the examination of these issues including approaches using socio-legal methods, economics, critical theory, systems theory, regulation theory, and moral and political theory. With the aim of stimulating an international discussion of these issues, volumes will be published in Germany, France, and the United Kingdom in one of the three languages.

### Editors

Hugh Collins, *London School of Economics*  
Christian Joerges, *European University Institute Florence*  
Antoine Lyon-Caen, *Université de Paris X-Nanterre*  
Horatia Muir Watt, *Université de Paris I*  
Gunther Teubner, *Frankfurt University*  
James Q Whitman, *Yale Law School, New Haven, CT*

Volumes published with Hart Publishing, Oxford

1. David Campbell, Hugh Collins und John Wightman (eds), *Implicit Dimensions of Contract: Discrete, Relational and Network Contracts* (2003)
2. Christian Joerges, Inger-Johanne Sand and Gunther Teubner (eds), *Transnational Governance and Constitutionalism* (2004)
3. Oren Perez, *Ecological Sensitivity and Global Legal Pluralism: Rethinking the Trade and Environment Debate* (2004)
4. Harm Schepel, *The Constitution of Private Governance* (2004)

Volumes published in German by Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden

1. Peer Zumbansen, *Ordnungsmuster im modernen Wohlfahrtsstaat: Lernerfahrungen zwischen Staat, Gesellschaft und Vertrag* (2000)
2. Dan Wielisch, *Freiheit und Funktion: Zur Struktur- und Theoriegeschichte des Rechts der Wirtschaftsgesellschaft* (2001)
3. Marc Amstutz, *Evolutorisches Wirtschaftsrecht: Vorstudien zum Recht und seiner Methode in den Diskurskollisionen der Marktgemeinschaft* (2001)
4. Christian Joerges and Gunther Teubner (eds), *Rechtsverfassungsrecht: Recht-Fertigungen zwischen Sozialtheorie und Privatrechtsdogmatik* (2003)
5. Gunther Teubner, *Netzwerk als Vertragsverbund: Virtuelle Unternehmen, Franchising, Just in Time in sozialwissenschaftlicher und juristischer Sicht* (2004)

Volume published with Dalloz, Paris

1. Geoffrey Samuel, *Essai d'épistémologie juridique comparative* (forthcoming)

# Comparative Remedies for Breach of Contract

Edited by

NILI COHEN  
AND  
EWAN MCKENDRICK



OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON  
2005

Published in North America (US and Canada) by  
Hart Publishing  
c/o International Specialized Book Services  
5804 NE Hassalo Street  
Portland, Oregon  
97213-3644  
USA

© The Editors and Contributors severally 2005

The editors and contributors have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work.

Hart Publishing is a specialist legal publisher based in Oxford, England.  
To order further copies of this book or to request a list of other publications please write to:

Hart Publishing, Salters Boatyard, Folly Bridge, Abingdon Rd, Oxford,  
OX1 4LB Telephone: +44 (0)1865 245533 Fax: +44 (0)1865 794882  
email: mail@hartpub.co.uk  
WEBSITE: <http://www.hartpub.co.uk>

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data Available

ISBN 1-84113-453-8 (hardback)

Typeset by Olympus Infotech Pvt Ltd, India (Palatino, 10/12 pt)  
Printed and bound in Great Britain by  
MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall

## *List of Contributors*

**MAURO BUSSANI** is Professor of Private and Comparative Law, University of Trieste.

**DAGMAR COESTER-WALTJEN** is Ordinarius Professor of Comparative Law at the Ludwig-Maximilians Universitaet, Munich; and Director of the Institute of International Law/Comparative Law.

**NILI COHEN** is the Pro-Rector and the Benno Gitter Professor of Comparative Contract Law at Tel-Aviv University.

**DANIEL FRIEDMANN** is Professor Emeritus, Tel-Aviv University and Professor of Law, The College of Management.

**MARK P GERGEN** is Professor of Law, University of Texas, Austin.

**DAVID GILO** is Lecturer, The Buchman Faculty of Law, Tel-Aviv University.

**ANDREAS HELDRICH** is Professor of Law Emeritus, University of Munich.

**ADAM KRAMER** is a Pupil Barrister, 3 Verulam Bldgs, London.

**ROY KREITNER** is a Lecturer in the Faculty of Law, Tel-Aviv University.

**YVES-MARIE LAITHIER** is Maître de Conférences at the University of Paris I (Panthéon-Sorbonne).

**EWAN MCKENDRICK** is Professor of English Private Law, University of Oxford and a Fellow of Lady Margaret Hall.

**BARAK MEDINA** is Joseph H and Belle R Braun Senior Lecturer in Law, Faculty of Law, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

**VERNON VALENTINE PALMER** is Thomas Pickles Professor of Law and Director of European Legal Studies, Tulane University.

**GEBHARD M REHM** is Lecturer in Law, University of Munich.

**LIONEL SMITH** is James McGill Professor of Law at McGill University.

**KATHERINE WORTHINGTON** is a post-graduate student at the European University Institute, Florence.

# Contents

<i>List of Contributors</i>	v
<i>Table of Cases</i>	ix
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxi
<i>Introduction</i>	xxix
<i>Nili Cohen and Ewan McKendrick</i>	
<b>Part One: Concepts, Coherence and Choice</b>	1
1 Rights and Remedies	3
<i>Daniel Friedmann</i>	
2 Multiplicity in Contract Remedies	19
<i>Roy Kreitner</i>	
3 Renegotiation, 'Efficient Breach' and Adjustment: The Choice of Remedy for Breach of Contract as a Choice of a Contract-Modification Theory	51
<i>Barak Medina</i>	
<b>Part Two: Comparisons</b>	73
4 The Law's Response to Exit and Loyalty in Contract Disputes	75
<i>Mark P Gergen</i>	
5 Comparative Reflections on the French Law of Remedies for Breach of Contract	103
<i>Yves-Marie Laithier</i>	
6 Modernisation of the German Law of Obligations: Harmonisation of Civil Law and Common Law in the Recent Reform of the German Civil Code	123
<i>Andreas Heldrich and Gebhard M Rehm</i>	
7 The New Approach to Breach of Contract in German Law	135
<i>Dagmar Coester-Waltjen</i>	
8 Remedies for Breach through the Lens of the Third Party Beneficiary	157
<i>Nili Cohen</i>	
9 Between Contract and Tort: Pure Economic Loss in Europe	189
<i>Mauro Bussani and Vernon Valentine Palmer</i>	

viii *Contents*

<b>Part Three: Specific Performance and Damages</b>	219
10 Understanding Specific Performance	221
<i>Lionel Smith</i>	
11 The Deterrent Factor of Damages where Pricing is Affected	235
<i>David Gilo</i>	
12 An Agreement-Centred Approach to Remoteness and Contract Damages	249
<i>Adam Kramer</i>	
13 Damages for Non-Pecuniary Loss	287
<i>Ewan McKendrick and Katherine Worthington</i>	
<b>Index</b>	323

## *Table of Cases*

### AUSTRALIA

<i>Chan v Cresdon Pty Ltd</i> (1989) 168 CLR 242 (HC) .....	232
<i>Dillon v Baltic Shipping Co (The Mikhail Lermontov)</i> (1992) 176	
CLR 344 .....	287
<i>Mikhail Lermontov, The, see Dillon v Baltic Shipping Co</i>	

### CANADA

<i>Brown v Waterloo Regional Board of Commissioners of Police</i> (1982) 136	
DLR (3d) 49 .....	287
<i>Domowicz v Orsa Investments Ltd</i> (1993) 15 OR (3d) 661 (Ont Gen	
Div) .....	221, 226, 227
<i>Rivers v George White &amp; Sons Co Ltd</i> (1919) 46 DLR 145 (Sask CA) .....	269
<i>Semelhago v Paramadevan</i> [1996] 2 SCR 415; 136 DLR (4 <sup>th</sup> )	
1 (SCC) .....	221, 228-32
<i>306793 Ontario Ltd v Rimes</i> (1979) 25 OR (2d) 79, 100 DLR (3d) 350	
(Ont CA) .....	228
<i>Wallace v United Grain Growers Ltd</i> (1997) 152 DLR (4 <sup>th</sup> ) 1 .....	294

### EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE

<i>Brasserie du Pêcheur v Germany; R v Secretary of State for Transport, ex parte Factortame</i> (Cases C-46/93 and C-48/93) [1996]	
ECR I-1029 .....	194
<i>Courage Ltd v Bernard Crehan</i> (Case C-453/99) [2001] ECR I-6297 .....	194
<i>Mulder v Council of the European Communities</i> (Cases C-104/89 and	
C-37/90) [1992] ECR I-3061 .....	194

### FRANCE

<i>Bordeaux, 17 mai 1977, D, 1978</i> .....	206
<i>CA Aix-en-Provence, 12 juillet 1993, D 1994, 13</i> .....	158
<i>Cass 1<sup>st</sup> Ch, 20 Dec 1960, D 1961.141</i> .....	205
<i>Cass 1<sup>st</sup> Civ Ch, 13 Feb 2001, JCP 2002.II.10099</i> .....	206

Cass 2 <sup>nd</sup> Civ Ch, 25 June 1975, <i>Bull Civ II</i> , no 195 .....	206
Cass 2 <sup>nd</sup> Civ Ch, 21 Feb 1979, <i>JCP</i> 1979.IV.145 .....	206
Cass 2 <sup>nd</sup> Civ Ch, 12 June 1987, <i>JCP</i> 1987.IV.286 .....	206
Cass Civ 2e, 21 fév 1979, <i>JCP</i> 1979, IV, 145 .....	206
Civ, 2 juillet 1860, <i>D</i> 1860, I, 284 .....	118
Civ, 6 mars 1876, <i>Canal de Craponne</i> , <i>D</i> 1876, I, 193 .....	105
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 20 janvier 1953, <i>D</i> 1953, 222 .....	110
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 18 janvier 1956, <i>Bull I</i> , n° 34 .....	110
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 5 juillet 1956, <i>D</i> 1956, 719 .....	110
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 14 janvier 1959, <i>Bull I</i> , n° 26 .....	110
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 24 mai 1960, <i>Bull I</i> , n° 283 .....	113
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 13 mars 1963, <i>D</i> 1963, somm p 79 .....	111
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 14 octobre 1964, <i>D</i> 1964, p 710 .....	111
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 18 octobre 1965, <i>Bull I</i> , n° 546 .....	110
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 26 juin 1967, <i>D</i> 1967, p 673 .....	111
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 19 décembre 1984, <i>Bull I</i> , n° 343 .....	122
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 25 juin 1991, <i>D</i> 1991.566 .....	206
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 31 janvier 1995, <i>D</i> 1995, 389 .....	120
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 13 octobre 1998, <i>Bull I</i> , n° 300; <i>D</i> 1999, 197 .....	119
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 16 février 1999, <i>Bull I</i> , n° 52 .....	120
Civ 1 <sup>ère</sup> , 28 octobre 2003, <i>Bull I</i> , n° 211 .....	119
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 19 février 1970, <i>GP</i> 1970, I, p 282 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 9 décembre 1970, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 683 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 24 juin 1971, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 411 .....	114
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 5 février 1974, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 56 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 15 février 1978, <i>D</i> 1978, IR, p 414 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 23 mai 1978, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 213 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 18 novembre 1980, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 177 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 18 février 1981, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 38 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 19 mai 1981, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 101 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 13 octobre 1981, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 152 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 26 novembre 1986, <i>RD imm</i> 1987, p 236 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 8 avril 1987, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 88 .....	120
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 10 janvier 1990, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 6 .....	110
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 27 mars 1991, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 106 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 30 juin 1993, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 105 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 25 janvier 1995, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 29 .....	111
Civ 3 <sup>e</sup> , 3 avril 1996, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 91 .....	111
Colmar, 18 octobre 1972, <i>D</i> 1973, p 496 .....	111
Com, 31 mars 1952, <i>Bull</i> , n° 155 .....	110
Com, 7 janvier 1963, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 16 .....	120
Com, 23 mai 1964, <i>Bull III</i> , n° 260 .....	110
Com, 31 Octobre 1978, <i>GP</i> 1979, I, pan 38 .....	104

Com, 23 avril 1985, <i>Bull IV</i> , n° 123 .....	111
Com, 25 mars 1991, <i>Panel de France v Performax Systems International</i> , CCC 1991, n° 162 .....	118
Conseil d'Etat, 12.11.1965, Rec. Lebon, 1965, 613 .....	199
Cour de Cassation en Assemblée Plénière, 17.11.2000, <i>JCP</i> , 2000, n 50 .....	206
Paris, 14 janvier 1889, <i>D</i> 1890, II, 289 .....	110
Req, 24 février 1862, <i>S</i> 1862, 241 .....	110
Req, 18 juin 1883, <i>D</i> 1884, V, p 353 .....	111
Req, 7 juillet 1898, <i>S</i> 1898, I, 520 .....	110
Req, 21 octobre 1913, <i>S</i> 1914, I, 182 .....	121
Soc, 8 juin 1956, <i>Bull IV</i> , n° 535 .....	110
Soc, 8 Mars 1972, <i>D</i> 1972, p 340 .....	104
Soc, 14 juin 1972, <i>JCP</i> 1972, II, 17275 .....	110
Soc, 24 janvier 1979, <i>Bull V</i> , n° 67 .....	110
Soc, 20 février 1996, <i>Bull V</i> , n° 59 .....	104

## GERMANY

BGH 29.5.1968 BGHZ 50, 200 .....	127
BGH 20.1.1972 BGHZ 58, 85 .....	127
BGH 2.6.1980 BGHZ 77, 215 .....	127
BGH, NJW 1980, 1742, 1743 .....	146
BGH, NJW 1986, 2037 .....	153
BGH 7.2.1992 BGHZ 117, 159 .....	127
BGH 19.11.1999 NJW 2000, 803 .....	127
BVerfG, NJW 2000, 2187 .....	153
LG Erfurt, <i>Neue Juristische Wochenschrift-Rechtsprechungs Report Zivilrecht</i> (2003) 49 .....	136
OLG Brandenburg, FPR 2002, 133 .....	136
OLG Karlsruhe, IBR 2002, 314 .....	146

## ISRAEL

<i>Abu Chatum v Abu Chatum</i> (CA 8109/98) 55(2) PD 267 .....	158, 160
<i>Adras Ltd v Harlow GmbH</i> (1988) 42(1) PD 221 (SC) .....	226
<i>Association of Journalists v ISL</i> (CA 393/73) 28(1) PD 470 .....	168
<i>Bezalel v The New Bus Central Station</i> (CA (TA) 1412/95), Dinim District Court 32(7) PD 627 .....	159
<i>Car Rental Agencies Ltd v Tarablus</i> (CA 186/77) 33 PD(1) 197 .....	183
<i>Mazor v Hidi</i> (CA 2106/91) 47 PD(5) 788 .....	178
<i>Shalom v Mota</i> (CA 158/80) 36 PD(4) 793 .....	178

NEW ZEALAND	
<i>Mouat v Clark Boyce</i> [1992] 2 NZLR 559 .....	287
<i>Rowlands v Collow</i> [1992] 1 NZLR 178 .....	287
SOUTH AFRICA	
<i>Lavery &amp; Co Ltd v Jungheinrich</i> 1931 AD 156 .....	268
<i>Shatz Investments (Pty) Ltd v Kalovyrnas</i> 1976 (2) AD 545 .....	268
<i>Thoroughbred Breeders' Association of South Africa v Price Waterhouse</i> (2001) SA 551 (SCA) .....	268
<i>Victoria Falls &amp; Transvaal Power C Ltd v Langlaagte Mines Ltd</i> 1915 AD 1 (SC).....	249
UNITED KINGDOM	
<i>A v National Blood Authority</i> [2001] 3 All ER 289 .....	158
<i>ABD Corp v CD Co (The Sine Nomine)</i> [2002] 1 Lloyd's Rep 805 .....	255–56
<i>Addis v Gramophone Co Ltd</i> [1909] AC 488.....	287, 289–94, 300, 310–11
<i>Alfred McAlpine Construction Ltd v Panatown Ltd</i> (1998) <i>Construction Law Review</i> 46; [2001] 1 AC 518 (HL) .....	174–25, 279, 305
<i>Aliakmon, The</i> [1986] AC 785 .....	196
<i>Angullia (Ahmed) bin Hadjee Mohamed Salleh Angullia v Estate and Trust Agencies</i> (1927) Ltd [1938] AC 624 (PC Singapore) .....	226
<i>Anns v Merton London Borough Council</i> [1978] AC 728 (HL) .....	209
<i>Ashby v White</i> 2 Raym Ld 938, 92 ER 126 .....	8
<i>Attorney-General v Blake</i> [2001] 1 AC 268 (HL) .....	4, 9, 57, 226
<i>Bailey v Bullock</i> [1950] 2 All ER 1167 .....	292, 309
<i>Bank of Credit and Commerce International SA v Ali</i> [2001] UKHL 8, [2002] 1 AC 251 .....	286
<i>Bank of Credit and Commerce International SA v Ali</i> (No 2) [2002] EWCA Civ 82; [2002] ICR 1258 .....	310
<i>Barber v Somerset County Council</i> [2004] UKHL 13 .....	296, 298
<i>Barlow v Broxbourne Borough Council</i> [2003] EWHC 50 (QB); [2003] All ER (D) 208 .....	296, 299
<i>Beswick v Beswick</i> [1968] AC 58 .....	260
<i>Blackburn Bobbin Co Ltd v TW Allen &amp; Sons Ltd</i> [1918] 2 KB 467 .....	285
<i>Borradaile v Brunton</i> .....	41
<i>British Columbia and Vancouver's Island Spar, Lumber, and Saw-Mill Co v Nettleship</i> (1868) LR 3 CP 499 (CCP) .....	250, 267, 269, 272
<i>Brown v KMR Services Ltd</i> [1995] 4 All ER 598 .....	265, 274–75
<i>Burton v Pinkerton</i> (1867) LR 2 Exch 340 .....	311
<i>Canada Steamship Lines Ltd v The King</i> [1952] AC 192 .....	265
<i>Caparo Industries plc v Dickman</i> [1990] 2 AC 605 (HL) .....	209
<i>Clea Shipping Corp v Bulk Oil International Ltd</i> [1984] 1 All ER 129 .....	87
<i>Cook v Swinfen</i> [1967] 1 WLR 457 .....	287, 309–10, 317
<i>Cory v Thames Ironworks Co</i> (1868) LR 3 QB 181 .....	276
<i>Coxall v Goodyear Great Britain Ltd</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 1010; [2003] 1 WLR 536 .....	296
<i>David v Abdul Cader</i> [1963] 1 WLR 834 (PC) .....	208
<i>Dickinson v Jones Alexander &amp; Co</i> [1993] 2 FLR 521 .....	309
<i>Diesen v Samson</i> 1971 SLT (Sh Ct) 49 .....	277, 287, 302, 304
<i>Donoghue v Stevenson</i> [1932] AC 562, [1932] All ER 1 (HL) .....	209
<i>Dunnachie v Kingston upon Hull City Council</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 84; [2004] UKHL 34 .....	294, 299
<i>Eastwood v Magnox Electric plc</i> [2004] UKHL 35 .....	293
<i>Elbinger Aktiengesellschaft v Armstrong</i> (1874) LR 9 QB 473 .....	267
<i>F v Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council</i> [1991] Fam 69 .....	298
<i>Fairchild v Glenhaven Funeral Services Ltd</i> [2002] UHKL 22; [2003] 1 AC 32 .....	318
<i>Farley v Skinner</i> [2000] PNLR 441; [2001] UKHL 49, [2002] 2 AC 732 .....	277, 279, 287–92, 300–5, 308, 312, 314–15, 317, 319–20
<i>Flureau v Thornhill</i> (1776) 2 Wm Bl 1078 .....	41
<i>Frost v Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police</i> [1999] 2 AC 455 .....	297
<i>George Mitchell (Chesterhall) Ltd v Finney Lock Seeds Ltd</i> [1983] 2 AC 803; [1983] QB 284 (CA) .....	262
<i>GKN Centrax Gears Ltd v Matbro Ltd</i> [1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep 555 (CA) .....	267, 272
<i>Godley v Perry</i> [1960] 1 WLR 9 .....	309
<i>Gogay v Hertfordshire County Council</i> [2000] IRLR 705 .....	293
<i>Grant v Australian Knitting Mills Ltd</i> [1936] AC 85 .....	309
<i>Hadley v Baxendale</i> (1854) 9 Ex 341, 156 ER 145 .....	16, 33, 39, 68, 236–37, 239–40, 243, 249, 265–67, 269–70, 283, 315
<i>Hamilton Jones v David &amp; Snape (a firm)</i> [2003] EWHC 3147 (Ch); [2004] 1 All ER 657 .....	287, 298
<i>Hatton v Sutherland</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 76; [2002] ICR 613 .....	289, 296, 298–99, 309, 317–18
<i>Hayes v James and Charles Dodd</i> [1990] 2 All ER 815 .....	287, 306
<i>Hedley Byrne &amp; Co Ltd v Heller &amp; Partners Ltd</i> [1964] AC 465 (HL) .....	198–99, 209–10
<i>Henderson v Merrett Syndicate Ltd</i> [1994] 3 All ER 506; [1995] 2 AC 145 (HL) .....	210, 297
<i>Heron II, The</i> [1966] 2 QB 695 (CA); [1969] 1 AC 350 .....	256, 266, 269, 272–74, 276
<i>Heywood v Wellers</i> [1976] QB 446 .....	287, 290, 301, 304
<i>HIH Casualty &amp; General Insurance Ltd v Chase Manhattan Bank</i> [2003] UKHL 6, [2003] 2 Lloyd's Rep 61 .....	265

- Hobbs v London and South Western Railway Co* (1875) LR 10 QB 111 ..... 287, 292, 311, 313–14, 319  
*Hochester v de la Tour* (1853) 2 E&B 678, 118 ER 922 ..... 100  
*Horne v Midland Railway Co* (1873) LR 8 CP 131 (Exch) ..... 267, 269  
*Hunter v Canary Wharf* [1997] AC 655 ..... 255  
*Investors Compensation Scheme v West Bromwich Building Society* [1998] 1 WLR 896 (HL) ..... 250, 258  
*Jackson v Chrysler Acceptances Ltd* [1978] RTR 474 ..... 287, 290  
*Jackson v Horizon Holidays Ltd* [1975] 3 All ER; [1975] 1 WLR 1468 92 ..... 174, 277, 287, 290, 304  
*Jarvis v Swan's Tours Ltd* [1973] QB 233 ..... 277, 287, 290, 302, 304  
*Johnson v Agnew* [1980] AC 367 (HL) ..... 228  
*Johnson v Gore Wood & Co (No 1)* [2002] 2 AC 1 ..... 278, 289–91, 311  
*Johnson v Unisys Ltd* [2001] UKHL 13; [2003] 1 AC 518 ..... 289–90, 292–94, 299, 311, 316  
*Junior Books v Veitchi* [1983] 1 AC 520 (HL) ..... 210  
*Kemp v Intasun Holidays Ltd* [1987] 2 FTLR 234 ..... 271  
*Knott v Bolton* (1995) 11 Const LJ 375 ..... 287  
*Koufos v C Czarnikow Ltd* [1969] 1 AC 350 ..... 17  
*La Société Anonyme de Remorquage à Hélice v Bennets* [1911] 1 KB 243 ..... 196  
*Lagden v O'Connor* [2003] UKHL 64, [2003] 3 WLR 1571 ..... 264  
*Liesbosch Dredger (Owners of) v Owners of SS Edison (The Liesbosch)* [1933] AC 449 ..... 264  
*Linden Gardens Ltd v Lenesta Sludge Disposals Ltd* [1994] 1 AC 85 ..... 279  
*Lister v Romford Ice and Cold Storage Co Ltd* [1957] AC 555 ..... 297  
*Lumley v Gye* (1853) El & Bl 216, 118 ER 749 ..... 4, 232  
*Lumley v Wagner* (1852) 1 De Gm & G 604, 42 ER 687 ..... 7  
*Mahmoud v Bank of Credit and Commerce International SA* [1998] AC 20 ..... 293, 310–11  
*Mulvenna v Royal Bank of Scotland plc* [2003] EWCA Civ 1112 ..... 272, 280  
*Murphy v Brentwood District Council* [1991] 1 AC 398 ..... 209  
*Nicholas H, The* [1996] AC 211 ..... 209  
*Pan Ocean Shipping v Creditcorp Ltd (The Trident Beauty)* [1994] 1 WLR 161 ..... 182–83  
*Parsons v Uttley Ingham & Co Ltd* [1978] QB 791 (CA) ..... 263, 265, 274, 276  
*Patrick v Russo-British Grain Export Co* [1927] 2 KB 535 ..... 267  
*Pegase, The, see Satef-Huttenes Alberns SpA v Paloma Tercera Shipping Co SA*  
*Perry v Sidney Phillips & Son* [1982] 1 WLR 1297 ..... 287  
*Photo Production Ltd v Securicor Transport Ltd* [1980] AC 827 ..... 256, 265  
*Portman v Middleton* (1858) 4 CB (NS) 322 ..... 267  
*Pratley v Surrey County Council* [2003] EWCA Civ 1067 ..... 296, 299

- Radford v De Froberg* [1977] 1 WLR 1262 ..... 307  
*Robinson v Harman* (1848) 1 Exch 850 ..... 257, 287–88  
*Robophone Facilities Ltd v Blank* [1966] 1 WLR 1428 ..... 268  
*Ross v Caunters* [1980] Ch 297 ..... 198  
*Ruxley Electronics and Construction Ltd v Forsyth* [1996] AC 344 ..... 259–60, 277, 279, 287, 305–7, 317, 320  
*SAAMCO, see South Australia Asset Management Corp v York Montague*  
*Satef-Huttenes Alberns SpA v Paloma Tercera Shipping Co SA (The Pegase)* [1981] 1 Lloyd's Rep 175 ..... 268–69, 272–73  
*Seven Seas Properties Ltd v Al-Essa (No 2)* [1993] 1 WLR 1083 (ChD) ..... 270  
*Sine Nomine, The, see ABD Corp v CD Co*  
*South Australia Asset Management Corp (SAAMCO) v York Montague* [1997] AC 191 ..... 252, 256–57, 279–81, 283  
*Spartan Steel & Alloys Ltd v Martin & Co Ltd* [1973] QB 27 ..... 192  
*Spring v Guardian Assurance plc* [1995] 2 AC 296 (HL) ..... 210  
*Summers v Salford Corporation* [1943] AC 283 ..... 309  
*Sumpter v Hedges* [1898] 1 QB 673 (CA) ..... 96  
*Surrey County Council and Mole District Council v Bredero Homes Ltd* [1993] 1 WLR 1361 ..... 57, 260, 279  
*Tai Hing Cotton Mill Ltd v Liu Chong Hing Bank Ltd* [1986] AC 80 ..... 297  
*Three Rivers District Council v Governor and Company of the Bank of England* [2003] 2 AC 1 (HL) ..... 208  
*Trident Beauty, The, see Pan Ocean Shipping v Creditcorp Ltd*  
*Verderame v Commercial Union Assurance Co* [1993] BCAC 793 ..... 298  
*Victoria Laundry (Windsor) Ltd v Newman Industries Ltd* [1949] 2 KB 528 ..... 266–67, 274, 276, 316  
*Waters v Towers* 8 Ex 401 ..... 40  
*Watts v Morrow* [1991] 1 WLR 1421 ..... 277–79, 287–88, 290, 292, 300–1, 303, 311, 316, 322  
*Weller v Foot & Mouth Disease Research Institute* [1966] 1 QB 569 ..... 197  
*White v Jones* [1993] 3 WLR 7301 (CA); [1995] 2 AC 207 (HL) ..... 4, 198–99, 210  
*White Arrow Express Ltd v Lamey's Distribution Ltd* (1996) 15 Trading LR 69, *The Times* 21 July 1995 ..... 279, 288  
*White & Carter (Councils) Ltd v McGregor* [1962] AC 413 (HL Scot) ..... 86, 224, 230–32  
*Winkfield, The* [1902] P 42 ..... 174  
*Woodar Investment Development Ltd v Wimpey Construction UK Ltd* [1980] 1 WLR 277 (HL) ..... 94  
*Wren v Holt* [1903] 1 KB 610 ..... 309  
*Wroth v Tyler* [1974] Ch 30 ..... 228, 316  
*X (some minors) v Bedfordshire County Council* [1995] 2 AC 633 (HL) ..... 208  
*Young v Post Office* [2002] EWCA Civ 661; [2002] IRLR 660 ..... 296

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
<i>Air Van Lines Inc v Buster</i> 673 P 2d 774 (1984) .....	89, 94
<i>Ariola v Nigro</i> 16 Ill 2d 46, 156 NE 2d 536 (1959) .....	83
<i>Associated Lathing and Plastering Co v Louis C Dunn Inc</i> 286 P 2d 825, 135 Cal App 2d 40 (1955).....	80
<i>Avianca Inc v Corriea</i> 1992 WL 93128 (DDC 1992) .....	90
<i>Berke &amp; Co v Griffin Inc</i> 116 NH 760, 367 A 2d 583 (1976) .....	93
<i>Berland's Inc of Tulsa v Northside Village Shopping Ctr Inc</i> 378 P 2d 860 (Okla 1963) .....	79
<i>Bomberger v McKelvey</i> 35 Cal 2d 607, 220 P 2d 729 (1950).....	87
<i>Boomer v Muir</i> 24 P 2d 570 (Cal App 1933) .....	95
<i>Branco Enterprises Inc v Delta Roofing Inc</i> 886 SW 2d 157 (Mo App 1994).....	36
<i>Brown-Marx Associates Ltd v Emigrant Savings Bank</i> 703 F 2d 1361 (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1983) .....	66
<i>Canadian Industrial Alcohol Co v Dunbar Molasses Co</i> 258 NY 194, 179 NE 383 (1932) .....	78
<i>Capps v Georgia Pacific Corp</i> 253 Or 248, 453 P 2d 935 (1969) .....	88
<i>Chateaugay Corp, In re</i> 104 BR 637 (SDNY 1989) .....	93
<i>City of Miami v Keton</i> 115 So 2d 547 (Fla 1959) .....	90
<i>City of New Orleans v Firemen's Charitable Association</i> 9 So 486 (1891)....	279
<i>CL Maddox Inc v Coalfield Services</i> 51 F 3d 76 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1995) .....	96, 99–100
<i>Clark v Marsiglia</i> 1 Derio (NY) 317, 43 Am Dec 670 (1845) .....	86
<i>Colonial Dodge Inc v Miller</i> 420 Mich 452, 362 NW 2d 704 (1984) .....	84
<i>Community Convalescent Center of Naperville Inc v First Interstate Mortgage Company of Illinois</i> 181 Ill App 3d 996, 537 NE 2d 1162, 130 Ill Dec 833 (1989) .....	90
<i>Cyclo Floor Machine Corp v National Housewares Inc</i> 296 F Supp 665 (DUtah 1968) .....	78
<i>Denver D Darling Inc v Controlled Environments Construction Inc</i> 89 Cal App 4 <sup>th</sup> 1221, 108 Cal Rptr 2d 213 (2001) .....	99
<i>Dixie Roof Decks Inc v Borggren/Dickson Construction Inc</i> 195 Ga App 881, 395 SE 2d 19 (1990) .....	93
<i>Doran v Salem Inn</i> 422 US 922 (1975) .....	76
<i>Drennan v Star Paving Co</i> 333 P 2d 757 (Cal 1958) .....	36
<i>Duval &amp; Company v Malcom</i> 214 SE 2d 356 .....	115
<i>Ervin Const Co v Van Orden</i> 125 Idaho 695, 874 P 2d 506 (Idaho 1993)....	79
<i>Evra Corp v Swiss Bank Corp</i> 673 F 2d 951 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1982) .....	264
<i>Federal Trade Commission v University Health Inc</i> 938 F 2d 1206 (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1991) .....	246
<i>Flagel v Southwest Clinical Psychiatrists</i> 157 Ariz 196, 755 P 2d 1184 (Ariz App 1988).....	90
<i>Getto v City of Chicago</i> 86 Ill 2d 39, 55 Ill Dec 519, NE 2d 844 (1981).....	90

<i>Gilson v FS Royster Guano Co</i> 1 F 2d 82 (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir 1924) .....	91
<i>Globe Refining Co v Landa Cotton Oil Co</i> 190 US 540 (1903).....	267
<i>Golf Carts Inc v Mid-Pacific Country Club</i> 493 P 2d 1338 (Haw 1972) .....	93
<i>Groves v John Wunder</i> 205 Minn 163, 286 NW 235 (1939) .....	83
<i>Hackley v Headley</i> 50 Mich 43, 14 NW 693 (1883) .....	88
<i>Hadden v Consolidated Edison Co of New York</i> 34 NY 2d 88, 356 NYS 2d 249, 312 NE 2d 445 (1974) .....	77, 81
<i>Hanson v Duffy</i> 106 Ill App 3d 727, 62 Ill Dec 401, 435 NE 2d 1373 (1982).....	93
<i>Henrici v South Feather Land &amp; Water Co</i> 177 Cal 442, 170 P 1135 (1918).....	78–79, 82, 90–92, 95
<i>Hoffman v Red Owl Stores Inc</i> 133 NW 2d 267 (Wisc 1965) .....	36
<i>Hoosier Rural Energy Electric Co-op Inc v Amoco Tax Leasing IV Corp</i> 34 F 3d 1310 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1995).....	81
<i>Hope's Architectural Products Inc v Lundy's Construction Inc</i> 781 F Supp 711 (D Kans 1991) .....	98–100
<i>Horn Waterproofing Corp v Bushwick Iron &amp; Steel Co</i> 66 NY 2d 321, 488 NE 2d 56, 497 NYS 2d 310 (1985).....	89
<i>Huffman v Saul Holdings Ltd</i> 194 F 3d 1072 (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1999) .....	79
<i>JA Sullivan Corp v Commonwealth</i> 397 Mass 789, 494 NE 2d 374 (1986).....	77
<i>Jacobs v Atlantco Ltd Partnership No 1</i> 36 Md App 335, 373 A 2d 1255 (1977) .....	95
<i>Jacob &amp; Young v Kent</i> 230 NY 239, 129 NE 889 (1921) .....	82, 84
<i>James Baird Co v Gimbel Bros Inc</i> 64 F 2d 344 (2d Cir 1933) .....	36
<i>K &amp; G Construction Co v Harris</i> 223 Md 305, 164 A 2d 451 (1960) .....	92, 95
<i>Kenford Co v County of Erie</i> 73 NY 2d 312, 537 NE 2d 176, 540 NYS 2d 1 (1989) .....	37
<i>Kenford Co v Erie County</i> 493 NE 2d 234 (NY 1986) .....	34
<i>Kershentsev v Mascotte Prods Inc</i> 781 F Supp 339 (ED Pa 1991), rev'd 981 F 2d 1247 (3d Cir 1992) .....	80
<i>Kilander v Blickle Co</i> 280 Or 425, 571 P 2d 503 (Or 1977) .....	89–90
<i>Kiriakides v United Artists Communications Inc</i> 312 SC 271, 440 SE 2d 364 (SC 1994) .....	80, 93
<i>Klein v Pepsico Inc</i> 845 F 2d 76 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988) .....	115
<i>Koch v Koch</i> 903 F 2d 1333 (10 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1990) .....	67
<i>Lamm v Shingleton</i> 55 SE 2d 810 (1949) .....	304
<i>Lawrence v Fox</i> 20 NY 268 (1859) .....	160
<i>Levan v Richter</i> 152 Ill App 3d 1082, 504 NE 2d 1373 (1987) .....	77
<i>Louisiana ex rel Guste v M/V Testbank (The Testbank)</i> 752 F 2d 1019 (1985).....	197
<i>Lucas v Hamm</i> 11 Cal Rptr 727 (1967) .....	198
<i>McClain v Kimbrough Construction Co</i> 806 SW 2d 194 (Tenn App 1990)....	78
<i>McElroy v BF Godorich</i> 73 F 3d 722 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1996).....	96

<i>McNeal-Edwards Co v Frank L Young Co</i> 35 F 2d 829 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir 1929) .....	81
<i>Mannillo v Gorski</i> 54 NJ 378, 255 A 2d 258 (1969) .....	83
<i>Mathis v Thunderbird Village</i> 236 Or 425, 389 P 2d 343 (1964) .....	81
<i>Meade v Kubinski</i> 661 NE 2d 1178 (Ill App 1996) .....	32
<i>Mills Acquisition Co v MacMillan Inc</i> 559 A 2d 1261 (Del 1989) .....	44
<i>Milner Hotels Inc v Norfolk and Western Railway Co</i> 822 F Supp 341, aff'd 19 F 3d 1429 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1994) .....	80
<i>Mineral Park Land Co v Howard</i> 172 Cal. 289; (Cal. 1916) 156, 458 .....	103
<i>Monsanto Co v McFarling</i> 302 F 3d 1291 (Fed Cir 2002) .....	246
<i>National Electrical Manufacturers Assoc v Sorrell</i> 272 F 3d 104 (2d Cir 2001) .....	246
<i>Needham v American National Insurance Co</i> 97 SW 2d 1016 (Tex Civ App Dallas 1936) .....	88
<i>New York Life Insurance Co v Viglas</i> 297 US 672 .....	93
<i>Nolan v Sam Fox Publishing Co</i> 499 F 2d 1394 (2d Cir 1974) .....	81
<i>Northern Helix Co v United States</i> 19 Ct Cl 118, 455 F 2d 546 (1972), 207 Ct Cl 862, 524 F 2d 707 (1975), cert den 429 US 866 (1976) .....	86
<i>O'Hare v Peacock Dairies Inc</i> 26 Cal App 2d 345, 79 P 2d 433 (1938) .....	86
<i>Oak Ridge Construction Co v Tolley</i> 351 Pa Super 32, 504 A 2d 1343 (1985) .....	93
<i>Oglebay Norton Co v Armco Inc</i> 52 Ohio St 3d 232, 556 NE 2d 515 (1990) .....	67
<i>Pacific Coast Engineering Co v Merritt-Chapman &amp; Scott Corp</i> 411 F 2d 889 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1969) .....	93
<i>Palmco Corp v American Airlines Inc</i> 983 F 2d 681 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1993) .....	99
<i>Paramount Communications Inc v QVC Network Inc</i> 637 A 2d 34 (Del 1994) .....	44
<i>Parker v Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp</i> 3 Cal 3d 176, 86 Cal Rptr 737, 474 P 2d 689 (1970) .....	85, 87
<i>Peevyhouse v Garland Coal &amp; Mining Co</i> 382 P 2d 109 (Okla 1962), cert den 375 US 906 (1963) .....	32, 83
<i>Pennzoil Co v Getty Oil Co</i> 1984 WL 15, 664 (Court of Chancery of Delaware 6 February 1984) .....	77
<i>Perma Research and Development Co v Singer Co</i> 402 F Supp 881 (SDNY 1975) .....	34
<i>Peter Kiewit Sons' Co v Summit Construction Co</i> 422 F 2d 242 (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1969) .....	93
<i>Peters v Blagden Homes Inc</i> 151 A 2d 183 (DC 1959) .....	79
<i>Pilot Insurance Co v Cudd</i> 208 SC 6, 36 SE 2d 860 (1945) .....	94
<i>Plante v Jacobs</i> 10 Wis 2d 567, 103 NW 2d 96 (1960) .....	77, 83-84
<i>Pollard v Saxe &amp; Holles Dev Co</i> 12 Cal 3d 374, 525 P 2d 88, 115 Cal Rptr 648 (1974) .....	78
<i>Prenalta Corp v Colorado Interstate Gas Co</i> 944 F 2d 677 (10 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1991) .....	90

<i>Putnam v Time Warner Cable of Southeastern Wisconsin</i> 274 Wis 2d 41, 663 NW 2d 254 (2001) .....	90
<i>Randazzo v Harris Bank Palatine NA</i> 262 F 3d 663 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir 2001) .....	89-90
<i>Reiss v Murchison</i> 503 F 2d 999 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1974), cert den 420 US 993 (1975) .....	93
<i>Revlon Inc v MacAndrews &amp; Forbes Holdings Inc</i> 506 A 2d 173 (Del 1986) .....	44
<i>Reynolds v Armstead</i> 166 Colo 372, 443 P 2d 990 (1968) .....	77
<i>Robins Dry Dock v Flint</i> 13 F 2d 3 (2d Cir 1926), 275 US 303 (1927) .....	196
<i>Rockingham County v Luten Bridge Co</i> 35 F 2d 301 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1929) .....	86
<i>Rowe v Union Central Life Insurance Co</i> 194 Miss 328, 12 So 2d 431 (1943) .....	90
<i>Schneberger v Apache Corp</i> 890 P 2d 847 (Okla 1994) .....	32
<i>Security Stove &amp; Manufacturing Co v American Railways Express Co</i> 51 SW 2d 572 (Mo App 1932) .....	37
<i>Selmer Co v Blakesell-Midwest Co</i> 704 F 2d 924 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1983) .....	88
<i>Siegel v Western Union Telephone Co</i> 37 NE 2d 868 (Ill App 1941) .....	264
<i>Silsbee v Webber</i> 171 Mass 378, 50 NE 555 (1898) .....	92
<i>Southern Cotton-Oil Co v Heflin</i> 99 Fed 339 (1900) .....	86
<i>Steel Storage &amp; Elevator Construction Co v Stock</i> 225 NY 173, 121 NE 786 (1919) .....	77
<i>Sturdy Concrete Corp v Nab Constr Corp</i> 65 AD 2d 262, 411 NYS 2D 637 (1978) .....	78
<i>Testbank, The</i> , see <i>Louisiana ex rel Guste v M/V Testbank</i>	
<i>Texas Assoc of Counties County Government Risk Mgmt Pool v Matagorda     County</i> 52 SW 3d 128 (Tex 2000) .....	48
<i>Ultramaras Corp v Touche</i> 255 NY 170 (1931) .....	216
<i>United States v El Du Pont de Nemours &amp; Co</i> 351 US 377 (1956) .....	246
<i>United States ex rel Cortolano &amp; Barone Inc v Morano Constr Corp</i> 724 F Supp 88 (SDNY 1989) .....	78
<i>United States Pipe &amp; Foundry Co v City of Waco</i> 100 SW 2d 1099 (Tex Civ App Waco 1936), aff'd on other grounds 130 Tex 126, 108 SW 2d 432 (1937) .....	82
<i>Venture Assocs Corp v Zenith Data Systems Corp</i> 96 F 3d 275 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1996) .....	45
<i>Vincent v Lake Erie Transportation Co</i> 109 Minn 456, 124 NW 221 (1910) ....	5
<i>Vincenzi v Cerro</i> 186 Conn 612, 442 A 2d 1352 (1982) .....	81
<i>Vines v Orchards Hills Inc</i> 181 Conn 501, 435 A 2d 1022 (1980) .....	81
<i>W-V Enterprises Inc v Federal Savings &amp; Loan Insurance Corp</i> 234 Kan 354, 673 P 2d 1112 (1983) .....	78
<i>Wachter v Gratech Co Ltd</i> 608 NW 2d 279 (ND 2000) .....	93
<i>Wells Fargo Bank v United States</i> 33 Fed Cl 233 (1995) .....	268

**xx Table of Cases**

<i>Wickman v Kane</i> 136 Md App 554, 766 A 2d 241 (2001).....	88
<i>Williams v Mutual Benefits Health &amp; Accident Assoc</i> 100 F 2d 264 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1938) .....	88
<i>Willie's Construction Co v Baker</i> 596 NE 2d 958 (Ind App 1992) .....	32
<i>WJ Walker v Shasta Minerals &amp; Chemical Co</i> 352 F 2d 634 (10 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1965) ..	93

**Table of Legislation**

**AUSTRIA**

Civil Code (ABGB)	
Art 1295 .....	214, 215
Arts 1299–1300 .....	215
Art 1330 .....	215

**CANADA**

Quebec Civil Code.....	282
Art 1613 .....	249, 281–82

**EUROPEAN UNION**

EC Treaty	
Arts 81–82 .....	194
Art 234 .....	194
Art 288 .....	194
Principles of European Contract Law (PECL).....	130, 135, 138, 142, 281–82
Art 4.102 .....	145
Art 8.101 .....	136
Art 8.103 .....	141
Art 8.104 .....	138
Art 8.106 .....	138, 142
Art 8.107 .....	144
Arts 9.101–9.102 .....	138
Art 9.103 .....	140
Art 9.201 .....	137
Art 9.301 .....	141
Art 9.306 .....	141
Arts 9.307–9.309 .....	143
Art 9.401 .....	137
Art 9.501 .....	144
Art 9.502 .....	153
Art 9.503 .....	152, 249, 281–82

**Directives**

Council Directive (EEC) 76/207 [1976] OJ L39/40 .....	153
Council Directive (EEC) 90/314 [1990] OJ L158/59 .....	153
Directive 1999/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 on certain aspects of the sale of consumer goods and associated guarantees [1999] OJ L171/12.....	122, 124, 135

**INTERNATIONAL**

<b>UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts 1994 .....</b>	<b>79–80, 130–31</b>
Art 7.1.1 .....	136
Art 7.1.3 .....	137
Art 7.1.4 .....	138
Art 7.1.5 .....	142
Arts 7.2.1–7.2.3 .....	138
Art 7.3.1 .....	79, 141
Arts 7.3.5–7.3.6 .....	143
Art 7.4.1 .....	144
Art 7.4.2 .....	153
Art 7.4.4 .....	152, 249
<b>UN Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (Vienna Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods/CISG).....</b>	<b>xv, 84, 122, 124, 130–31, 135</b>
Art 28 .....	138
Art 45 .....	130, 140
Arts 46–48 .....	130
Art 49 .....	130, 141
Art 50 .....	130, 137
Art 51 .....	130
Art 71 .....	121
Art 74 .....	152, 249
Art 77 .....	150
Art 79 .....	149

**FRANCE**

<b>Act of 9 July 1991 .....</b>	<b>116</b>
Civil Code ( <i>Code Civil</i> ).....	105–6, 115–17, 201, 205–6, 282

Art 1121 .....	161
Art 1134 .....	105, 109–12, 115–17, 120
Art 1142 .....	113–14
Art 1143 .....	113
Art 1144 .....	116
Art 1150 .....	249, 281–82
Art 1151 .....	281–82
Art 1184 .....	112, 117–19, 121–22
Arts 1382–1383 .....	205
Art 1386 .....	207
Art 2270 .....	207
Arts 2272–2277 .....	207

**GERMANY**

<b>Civil Code (BGB) .....</b>	<b>xv, 125–26, 128–29, 132, 201, 212, 215</b>
Art 195 .....	125
Art 199 .....	125
Art 241 .....	125–26, 131, 141, 151, 155
Art 252 .....	146, 249
Art 253 .....	153
Art 254 .....	149–50
Art 275 .....	129, 136–40, 145–46, 150
Art 276 .....	131, 144, 148, 151
Art 277 .....	143
Art 278 .....	144, 148, 150, 151, 213
Art 280 .....	126, 129, 131, 136, 139, 141, 144–47, 149, 151
Art 281 .....	129, 138, 144–47, 150–52, 154, 180
Art 282 .....	144, 146–47, 150–51, 213
Art 283 .....	129, 139, 144, 146–47, 150
Art 284 aF .....	142
Art 284 .....	139, 144–45, 147
Art 285 aF .....	142
Art 285 .....	137–39, 142
Art 286 .....	142, 147, 151–52
Art 287 .....	142, 149
Art 288 .....	142
Art 300 .....	149
Art 306 aF .....	144
Art 308 aF .....	139
Art 311 .....	125–26, 155
Art 311a .....	139, 144–45

Art 313 .....	126, 139, 155
Art 314 .....	126
Art 320 .....	136–37, 140
Art 323 .....	129, 137–38, 141–42, 151
Art 324 .....	141–42
Art 325 aF .....	127, 154
Art 325 .....	129, 140, 154
Art 326 aF .....	142, 154
Art 326 .....	137, 139–40, 142
Art 327 aF .....	143
Art 328 .....	158, 161–63, 182
Art 329 .....	161
Art 330 .....	161, 163
Arts 331–333 .....	161
Art 334 .....	161–62, 182
Art 335 .....	161, 166, 168, 171, 176, 178, 180
Art 346 .....	137, 143, 146
Arts 347–348 .....	137, 146
Art 349 .....	154
Arts 350–352 aF .....	143
Art 433 .....	129
Art 434 aF .....	127
Art 437 .....	129, 137–38, 150
Art 439 .....	150
Art 440 aF .....	127
Art 441 .....	137, 143
Art 463 aF .....	127
Art 476a aF .....	129
Art 480 aF .....	127
Arts 516ff .....	136
Art 536 .....	137
Art 611a .....	153
Art 619a .....	149
Art 633 aF .....	129
Art 634 .....	129, 137, 150
Art 635 .....	150
Art 638 .....	137, 143
Art 651 .....	153
Arts 662ff .....	136
Arts 742ff .....	136
Art 823 .....	194, 204, 211–12
Art 824 .....	211
Art 826 .....	212
Arts 827–828 .....	148
Art 847 .....	153

Code of Civil Procedure ( <i>Zivilprozeßordnung</i> /II ZPO) .....	138
Art 888 .....	138
Commercial Code ( <i>Handelsgesetzbuch</i> /HGB) .....	138, 143
Art 376 .....	138, 143
Constitution .....	153
Arts 1–2 .....	125
Statute on General Conditions .....	125
Statute on the Modernisation of the Law of Obligations 2002 ( <i>Gesetz zur Modernisierung des Schuldrechts</i> ) .....	135, 213
Art 9 .....	123

## ISRAEL

Civil Procedure Regulations 1984 .....	169, 175
reg 24 .....	169
reg 224 .....	169
Contracts (General Part) Law 1973 (Contracts Law) .....	10, 160–61, 163–65
Ch 4 .....	161
s 3 .....	170
s 7 .....	158
s 14 .....	177
s 21 .....	181
s 32 .....	10
s 34 .....	161, 166, 170
s 35 .....	157, 161–62
s 36 .....	161, 165–66, 175
s 37 .....	161, 170, 176
s 38 .....	161, 166–67, 170
s 39 .....	181
s 48 .....	159
s 52 .....	179–80
s 59 .....	167
Contracts (Remedies for Breach of Contract) Law 1970 (Remedies Law) .....	161, 178
s 1 .....	169, 171
s 2 .....	169, 175
s 3 .....	11, 170–71, 179
s 6 .....	175
s 7 .....	176
s 8 .....	175
s 9 .....	169, 180
s 10 .....	173, 249
s 12 .....	173
s 14 .....	173

Gift Law 1968 .....	166
s 3 .....	158, 162
s 5 .....	166, 173
Guarantee Law 1967 .....	
s 8 .....	172
Insurance Contract Law 1981 .....	.85
s 11 .....	165
s 45 .....	185
Succession Law 1965 .....	
s 147 .....	160
Transfer of Obligations Law 1968 .....	
s 6 .....	172

**NETHERLANDS**

Civil Code (6 <sup>th</sup> book) .....	193
---	-----

**SWEDEN**

Tort Law Act .....	
Art 2 .....	192

**UNITED KINGDOM**

Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999 .....	160, 175
s 1 .....	162, 176
s 3 .....	171
Judicatures Acts .....	228
Lord Cairns' Act 1858 .....	227
Misrepresentation Act 1967 .....	
s 2 .....	209
Sale of Goods Act 1979 .....	
s 48C .....	122
Sale and Supply of Goods to Consumers Regulations 2002 .....	122
Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977 .....	262
Unfair Terms in Consumer Contract Regulations 1999 (SI 1999, No 2083) .....	262

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Louisiana Civil Code 1996 .....	249, 282
S 1996 .....	281

S 1997 .....	281–82
OCGA .....	
S 13–1–13 .....	.90
Restatement of Contracts .....	.81, 164–65
S 90 .....	.35
S 133 .....	164
SS 142–143 .....	165
Restatement (Second) of Contracts .....	.77, 78, 79, 81, 92–93, 104, 268–69
S 1 .....	.36
SS 82–89 .....	.36
S 90 .....	.36, 171
SS 91–92 .....	.36
S 176 .....	.92, 94
S 227 .....	.82
S 229 .....	.66
S 236 .....	.78
S 241 .....	.79, 81
SS 242–243 .....	.78
S 246 .....	.96
S 250 .....	.93
S 251 .....	.121
S 261 .....	.104
S 302 .....	.164–65
S 305 .....	.166, 174
S 307 .....	.169–70
S 310 .....	.172
S 311 .....	.165
S 351 .....	.33, 249, 268–69
S 360 .....	.115
S 366 .....	.34
S 370 .....	.91
S 373 .....	.78
S 374 .....	.81
Restatement of Restitution .....	.5
S 45 .....	.90
S 122 .....	.5
S 126 .....	.167
Restatement (Third) of Restitution .....	.90
Restatement (Second) of Torts .....	.5
S 197 .....	.5
Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) .....	.78, 82, 84, 100, 104, 268
S 2 .....	.65, 70
S 1–203 .....	.131
S 1–204 .....	.98
S 1–308 (former S 1–207) .....	.89, 91–92, 94

*xxviii Table of Legislation*

S 2-207 .....	100
S 2-209 .....	70
S 2-508 .....	80
S 2-608 .....	84, 96
S 2-609 .....	97, 99, 121
S 2-615 .....	104
S 2-715 .....	249, 268
S 2-716 .....	53, 67
S 2-717 .....	99

## *Introduction*

NILI COHEN AND EWAN MCKENDRICK

The book is the product of a conference entitled 'Comparative Remedies for Breach of Contract' which took place at the Faculty of Law, Tel-Aviv University between 4 and 6 June 2002. Most, but not all of the papers in this book were presented at that conference.

The purpose of the conference and the book is to present a theoretical as well as a descriptive picture of contract remedies. This has been done by reference to various legal systems representing the common law (English, American, Canadian), some continental systems (French, German) and also a mixed system (Israeli). The sphere of inquiry has not, however, been confined strictly to claims which assume the form of a claim for breach of contract. Taking into account the blurred borderlines between contract and torts, we decided to include in the book a comparative work on economic loss, in which consideration is given both to the role of the law of contract and to the law of tort in the recovery of pure economic loss. A legal system which has a conservative law of tort may resort to the law of contract for the purpose of enabling a claimant to recover pure economic loss, and vice versa. Thus there is a need to examine the relationship between the law of contract and the law of torts.

When it is said that the law of contract can best be understood by reference to the remedies it offers, what is often meant is that the law is best examined and evaluated not by reference to its bare, black-letter rules, but rather by reference to their practical application. It is, perhaps, for this reason that the law and economics school has devoted a considerable amount of energy to the study of the law relating to remedies for breach of contract. It can also be important to appreciate that an understanding of the law of contract does not end in the courthouse. Litigation is not the only means of resolving contractual disputes (indeed, in many jurisdictions only a small percentage of contractual disputes end up in court). Today many contracting parties resort to other dispute resolution mechanisms, such as mediation, commercial arbitration and other fori which claim to offer efficiency, creativity and flexibility in the resolution of contractual disputes. Our work does not deal with these trends, nor with their impact on the understanding of contract remedies and contract theory. Rather, it examines the traditional solutions where contract disputes are dealt with

by the courts, and it scrutinises the interrelationship between substantive rights and the remedies that are intended to protect these rights.

The book deals with remedies for breach but as a collection which has its origins in a set of conference papers it neither deals with the whole range of remedies (such as price reduction, set-off, or liens and other possessory security rights), nor with every major question within each remedy (restitution is mentioned in some of the chapters but is not examined separately). Further, although the book purports to serve as a comparative study of remedies for breach of contract, its framework is confined to a limited number of systems. In these senses the book does not aim to be comprehensive. But we believe that the limited picture (both in terms of the remedies and the legal systems subject to analysis) may well mirror the basic trends of the modern law of remedies in both continental and common law systems. These trends include: the efficient protection of contract rights; an increased willingness on the part of legal systems to draw from the experiences of other legal systems; a proper balance between the interests of the injured party and the party in breach; increased protection of the performance interest and a recognition of the non-pecuniary interests that may be affected by a breach of contract; the need to ensure compatibility between the various remedies on offer within a legal system; and responsiveness to the basic values of the legal system.

The book is divided into three broad parts, although these parts do not purport to be water-tight. The first part consists of three chapters which, in their different ways, are devoted to an analysis of concepts and to the basic structure and aims of the law of remedies for breach of contract. The second part, which consists of six chapters, consists of a series of comparisons. In some cases the comparison is to be found within the chapters (as in the case of the chapters by Cohen and by Bussani and Palmer). In other cases the comparison can be seen not within the chapters but between the chapters. For example, the chapters by Gergen and Laithier illustrate the contrasting perceptions of the right to terminate a contract to be found in American and French law respectively. Finally, the two chapters on the recent reforms enacted in Germany (by Heldrich and Rehm and by Coester-Waltjen) illustrate a further aspect of comparative law in that here we see the influence which other legal systems and international conventions have had on the development of the domestic law of a nation state. The third part, which consists of four chapters, deals with a number of issues relating to the remedies of specific performance and damages. We shall now introduce the various chapters and outline some of the principal issues which they raise.

The book opens with 'Rights and Remedies' by Daniel Friedmann. The author deals with the basic question underlying any discussion of remedies, namely the interrelationship between rights and remedies.

Friedmann offers four basic models which can help us to answer questions such as: can there be a legal right that is unprotected by a remedy? should the nature of a legal right be reflected in the type of remedy offered for its protection or is it the case that the type of remedy available sheds light on the nature of the right involved? The analysis of the relationship between rights and remedies also has significant implications for the debate over discretionary remedies. In the case where a remedy lies in the discretion of the court, what does this tell us about the nature of the legal right involved and of the relationship between this right and the remedy which the court, in the exercise of its discretion, decides to grant?

The four models which Friedmann identifies are as follows. The first model is the primacy of the remedy model. According to this model, it is the potency of the remedy and its availability which determines the nature of the legal right and, indeed, the very existence of the right. The second model is the primacy of the right model. The basis of this model is the assumption that the legal right precedes the remedy both in time and in importance and that remedies are merely derivative and follow from the legal right. The third model is the 'unity of the right remedy model.' This model casts doubt upon the right-remedy dichotomy and assumes that the remedy constitutes an integral part of the legal right. On this basis the remedy available for protection of the right is simply one of the many attributes of the right itself. The last model is the 'acoustic separation model.' This model was developed in the context of the criminal law and is applied by Friedmann to the law of remedies for breach of contract. According to this model legal rules can be divided into 'conduct rules' (namely rules which are intended to guide private actors) and 'decision rules' (being rules which are binding on the officials who apply the law to the conduct of others).

Friedmann evaluates the relative strengths and weaknesses of the four models and then draws his chapter to a conclusion by giving brief consideration to the role of certainty, predictability and discretion in the law of remedies. He concludes that the commitment of private law to certainty and to the non-retroactive nature of rights and obligations is not as strong as in the case of the criminal law. But it does not follow from this that certainty is not an important value in private law. On the contrary, he concludes that certainty is an important value in private law but that it is 'much less significant in the area of remedies.' The reason for this is that, while a person is entitled to know what are his primary contractual rights and obligations, she has no similar entitlement to know with certainty the consequences that will flow from a breach by her of one of her primary contractual obligations. This being the case, the rules regarding remedies have a degree of 'built-in flexibility' and 'contain many open-ended points that leave much to the court's discretion.' Friedmann maintains that this

uncertainty exists even in the case where the legal right is clearly defined. In his view the fact that the right is clearly defined *ex ante* does not have the consequence that the remedy is thereby fixed because the court, when called upon to determine the remedy after the breach, has the benefit of formulating the remedy *ex post* and it may take account of circumstances and policy considerations which were not, perhaps, apparent to the parties at the moment at which they agreed on the content of the primary right. Thus, while the primary right is generally 'fixed and pre-determined,' the remedy that is applicable in the event of a breach of that right is neither fixed nor pre-determined but rather is characterised by flexibility and (a degree of) uncertainty.

In the second chapter, 'Multiplicity in Contract Remedies,' Roy Kreitner argues that the attempt to solve all of the problems of contract remedies by the application of a single, unified principle is misguided and, ultimately, futile. He argues that an adequate understanding of remedies for breach of contract must take into account the multiplicity of interests that should be protected by remedial rules. Yet in recent years there has been a proliferation of theoretical models in the common law world that attempt to give a new foundation to the law of remedies through a single, unified principle. These attempts are reviewed critically in this chapter. The critical claim made by Kreitner is that these models are 'fundamentally flawed' and are 'doomed to failure.' In his view, unification theories

fail to explain the practice of the courts in granting diverse remedies for breach, and more importantly, they fail to account adequately for justificatory considerations that are and ought to be an inherent part of remedial rules.

Beyond the critique of unification theories, Kreitner suggests that contract scholars ought to look to contract types as a guide to the further theorisation of remedies. He offers an analysis based on contract types and employs contracts of carriage and merger agreements in order to illustrate his point.

He claims that the analysis of contract types offers two distinct advantages over unification theory. First, it provides 'a better tool for analysing and understanding the varying results of cases involving contract breaches and the remedies they entail.' Second, he asserts that contract types offer 'a research agenda that would never divorce itself from the underlying considerations that ought to govern the choice of rules governing contract breach', namely fairness between the parties, social utility and administrative concerns.

In the third chapter, 'Renegotiation, "Efficient Breach" and Adjustment: The Choice of Remedy for Breach of Contract as a Choice of a Contract-Modification Theory,' Barak Medina explores three distinct accounts of the purpose of remedies for breach of contract. The primary significance of the three accounts is said to lie in the distinct view which each gives of

the contract's 'completeness.' The first account is labelled the 'traditional' approach and it is based on the notion that the purpose of remedies is to 'preserve' the contractual right by deterring violations of the contractual right and correcting the unjust consequences that flow from a violation of the right: The second account is called the 'economic' approach and it is based on the premise that the rules relating to remedies define the terms on which the parties can exit from the contract which they have concluded. The first two accounts can be distinguished on the ground that they rest on different perceptions of the contract's 'completeness'. The traditional approach is based on the perception that contractual provisions are 'all-inclusive' so that they regulate the rights and duties of the parties in all situations. The 'economic' approach by contrast recognises that the contract is not all-inclusive and provides an escape route from the contract based on the prospect of 'efficient breach.' The third account shares the perception of the 'economic' approach that parties' contract is incomplete but differs in the remedial prescription which it provides. This account is based on remedies as a 'modification mechanism', according to which the parties prefer that their contract is completed by a compelled adjustment of the contract by a third party such as a court. On this view the choice of remedy is based on considerations such as what remedy best fits as an 'adjustment mechanism' and remedies can be perceived as a means of adjusting the contract's express provisions.

This chapter underscores the need to decide what is the purpose of remedy, as a precondition to the choice of the appropriate remedy. This decision is said to be 'a choice of a theory of contract interpretation and modification'. Medina maintains that the debate between the 'traditional' and the 'economic approach' is implicitly based on the formalistic, binary model and it reflects a notion of remedies as extra-contractual. His perception that contracts are not all-inclusive leads him to the conclusion that remedies may serve not only to 'preserve' a given contractual right, but also to fill a gap in the incomplete contract in case of a substantial change in surrounding circumstances. If this is so, then a choice must be made between the concept of remedies as exit rules and of remedies as a modification mechanism.

At this point we move from the general themes of Part One into a series of comparisons to be found in Part Two. This part opens with two chapters that can usefully be read together because of the contrasting perceptions which they present of the right to exit from a contract and of the value of 'protecting' a contract (or a contractual relationship) in the event of breach. In chapter four 'The Law's Response to Exit and Loyalty in Contract Disputes' Mark Gergen examines the rules in American private law that regulate exit and loyalty in contract disputes. 'Exit' refers to the situation which arises when one party to a contract suspends or withdraws performance, refuses performance or obtains substitute performance as a result