

GOFF & JONES THE LAW OF RESTITUTION

龙夫和琼斯 论返还法



THE COMMON LAW LIBRARY

普通法图书馆

(第7版)

〔英〕加雷斯•琼斯 编



图书在版编目(CIP)数据

I. ① 戈··· II. ① 琼··· III. ① 侵仅行为—民法—研究—英文 IV. ① D913. 04

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2012)第 162013 号

所有权利保留。 未经许可,不得以任何方式使用。

普通法图书馆 **戈夫和琼斯论返还法** (第7版)

〔英〕加雷斯・琼斯 编

商 务 印 书 馆 出 版 (北京王府井大街36号 邮政编码 100710) 商 务 印 书 馆 发 行北京瑞古冠中印刷厂印刷 ISBN 978-7-100-09307-1

2013 年 3 月第 1 版 开本 787 × 1092 1/16 2013 年 3 月北京第 1 次印刷 印张 67½

定价: 680.00 元

Edited By Gareth Jones GOFF & JONES: THE LAW OF RESTITUTION

Seventh Edition

© Sweet & Maxwell Limited, 2007 本书由 Sweet & Maxwell 公司授权影印出版 仅限中国大陆地区销售

THE COMMON LAW LIBRARY

THE LAW OF RESTITUTION

by

Lord Goff of Chieveley, P.C., D.C.L., F.B.A.

Formerly Senior Law Lord; Honorary Fellow of Lincoln College and of New College, Oxford, and formerly Tutorial Fellow of Lincoln College; A Master of the Bench of the Inner Temple;

President of the British Institute of International and Comparative Law

and

Gareth Jones, Q.C., LL.D., F.B.A.

Downing Professor of the Laws of England Emeritus in the University of Cambridge; Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Fellow of University College, London; Honorary Bencher of Lincoln's Inn

> Seventh Edition edited by Gareth Jones

First Edition 1	966 F	ifth Edition 1998
Second Edition 1	978 S	ixth Edition 2002
Third Edition 1	986 Sev	enth Edition 2007
Fourth Edition 1	993	

PREFACE

In the first edition in 1966 of the *Law of Restitution* Robert Goff and I wrote: "In this book we have attempted to state in a coherent rational form, the principles of the English Law of Restitution."

The text of this, the seventh edition, published forty years later, still seeks to do so.

The four or more years which have elapsed since the last edition has seen many important decisions. The House of Lords decided *Actionstrength v International Glass Engineering* and *Wilson v First County Trust Ltd* (public policy and restitutionary claims), *HIH Casualty and General Insurance Ltd v Chase Manhattan Bank* (non disclosure of fraud), *Co-operative Retail Services v Taylor Young* (contribution), *Criterion Properties plc v Stratford UK Properties Ltd* (want of authority and knowing receipt), *Campbell v MGN Ltd* (breach of confidence) and *Burnett's Trustee v Grainger* (omission). And at the end of July this year it heard argument in *Deutsche Morgan Grenfell v IRC* (ultra vires demands and mistake of law). On October 25, 2006 the House of Lords, Lord Scott, dissenting, reversed the Court of Appeal [2006] UKHL 49: s.32(1)(a) of the Limitation Act 1980, below, para.43–004, postponed the commencement of the limitation period in respect of all Advance Corporation Tax payments. The claim based on mistake of law was not subsumed in the claim based on an unlawful demand: above para.27–003A.

Privy Council decisions are: Waikato Regional Airport Ltd v Att-Gen (duress, failure of consideration, and passing on) and Att-Gen v R (duress, undue influence and accounting of profits) and National Commercial Bank (Jamaica) Ltd v Hew's Executors (undue influence).

Many of the important decisions are Court of Appeal decisions. They include R McDonald v Coys of Kensington (incontrovertible benefit), Boake Allen Ltd v Commissioners for Revenue and Customs (absence of consideration and a critical comment on DMG v IRC, above), Brennan v Bolt Burdon (compromise and mistake of law), Halley v Law Society (rescission), Clark v Cutland (tracing), Cheltenham & Gloucester plc v Appleyard (subrogation), DMG v IRC (mistake of law, doubt and the Woolwich principle), Niru Battery Mfg Co v Milestone Trading Ltd (contribution, subrogation and change of position); Jennings v Rice (equitable estoppel), Drake Insurance plc v Provident Insurance plc (insurance, non-disclosure), Gwembe Valley Development Co Ltd v Koshy (breach of fiduciary duties and statute of limitation), Smithkline Beecham plc v Apotex (Europe) Ltd (restitution after discharge of injunction), Experience Hendrix LLC v PPX Enterprises Inc (breach of contract, quantum meruit and accounting of profits), A L Barnes Ltd v Time Talk (UK) Ltd (illegality), Murad v Al-Saraj (breach of fiduciary duties), It's A Wrap (UK) v Gula (Companies Act and Community Law), Item Software (UK) v Fassihi (duty of fiduciaries and employees to disclose misconduct), Douglas v Hello! (No.3) (privacy, breach of confidence and the Human Rights Act), Commerzbank AG v Price-Jones (change of position) and Halton International Inc v Guernroy (Limitation Act).

In consequence there have been many changes to the text of the sixth edition. No chapter has escaped some revision. In particular many pages of the chapters on rescission (especially *Great Peace Shipping* and the demise of *Solle v Butcher*), on contribution, on breach of contract (the post-*Blake* decisions, prominently a discussion of *Experience Hendrix*), on breach of fiduciary relationships, on breach of confidence and on change of position have been rewritten.

Professor Burrows and Mr Virgo have published important second editions of their established texts. The posthumous publication of Peter Birks' second edition of *Unjust Enrichment* in which he rejected his "old thinking" and proposed a new, radical structure and analysis was a notable event. His book is, as we would expect, elegantly stimulating, although I have not been able to accept its principal thesis: para.1–016 n.5. The debt which the profession and scholars owe to Peter is immeasurable. The volume, *Mapping The Law*, edited by Professor Burrows and Lord Rodger of Earlsferry, containing 33 essays written in his memory and published a few days ago, is a measure of the respect and affection felt for him by so many in so many countries.

I owe much to the scholarship of these authors and younger colleagues. I have also taken the opportunity of citing the *Council Drafts* of the Restatement of the Law Third: Restitution and Unjust Enrichment, written by the Reporter, Professor Andrew Kull. In recent years the subject has fallen into relative desuetude in the United States. It is to be hoped that Professor Kull's scholarship will revive the law of restitution in the country of its birth.

I have attempted to state the law as on October 1 2006.

It is my pleasure to thank my publishers and their representatives for their diligence, patience and unfailing courtesy.

Gareth Jones Trinity College Cambridge October 2, 2006

CONTENTS

			Page	
Prefa	reface			
	able of Cases		xiii	
	able of Statutes		cxix	
Table	ble of Statutory Instruments		cxxvii	
Table	of no	n-UK Statutes	cxxix	
Table	of Ab	pbreviations	cxxxi	
		PART I—INTRODUCTION		
			Para	
1.	Gene	ral Principles	1-001	
	1.	Introduction	1-001	
	2.	The Principle of Unjust Enrichment	1-012	
	3.	The Limits to a Restitutionary Claim based on Another's		
		Unjust Enrichment	1-061	
	4.	The Classification of Restitutionary Claims	1-092	
2.	Propr	ietary Claims and Proprietary Remedies	2-001	
	1.	Why Would a Claimant Wish to Vindicate his Proprietary		
		Title?	2-002	
	2.	Proprietary Claims	2-003	
	3.	Tracing Value at Law and in Equity	2-020	
3.	Subro	ogation	3-001	
	1.	General Principles	3-001	
	2.	The Established Categories of Subrogation	3-023	
	3.	Authorised Borrowings: The Discharge of the Borrower's		
		Valid Liabilities	3-047	
	4.	Unauthorised Borrowings: The Discharge of the Borrower's Valid Liabilities	3-048	
		PART II—THE RIGHT TO RESTITUTION		
Section One: Where the Defendant has Acquired a Benefit from or by the Act of the Plaintiff				
	A. Mistake			
4.	Reco	very of Money Paid Under a Mistake of Fact	4-001	
			5-001	
5.	Keco'	very of Money Paid Under a Mistake of Law	3-001	

Contents

6.	 Restitution in Respect of Services Rendered Under a Mistake 1. Introduction 2. Restitutionary Claims Arising from Mistaken Improvements to Land 3. Other Restitutionary Claims 	6-001 6-001 6-002 6-007
7.	Restitution in Respect of Chattels (Other than Money) Transferred Under a Mistake	7-001
8.	Recovery of Land Transferred Under a Mistake	8-001
9.	Relief from Transactions Entered into Under a Mistake 1. Rescission 2. Rectification 3. Reopening Accounts	9-001 9-002 9-053 9-062
	B. Compulsion	
10.	Recovery of Benefits Conferred Under Duress 1. Introduction 2. The Established Categories of Duress 3. Duress and Submission to Honest Claims 4. Proprietary Claims 5. Failure to Tender Amends	10-001 10-001 10-004 10-052 10-057 10-058
11.	Recovery of Benefits Conferred Under Undue Influence 1. General Principles 2. Actual Undue Influence 3. Presumed Undue Influence 4. Limits to Relief and Defences 5. Propriety Claims	11-001 11-001 11-003 11-004 11-010 11-015
12.	Relief from Unconscionable Bargains 1. In Equity 2. In Admiralty	12-001 12-001 12-007
13.	The Right to Contribution or Recoupment 1. General Introduction	13-001 13-001
14.	The Right to Contribution 1. Introduction 2. Particular Contribution Claims	14-001 14-001 14-005
15.	 The Right to Recoupment: Compulsory Discharge of Another's Liability 1. The Claimant's Payment must have been Compulsory 2. The Claimant must not have Officiously Exposed himself to the Liability to Make the Payment 3. The Claimant's Payment must have Discharged a Liability of the Defendant 	15-001 15-002 15-009 15-015

CONTENTS

	4. The Restitutionary Right is a Right to Reimbursement not to an Indemnity	15-020
	5. Cases in which the Claimant has a Right of Deduction	15-022
16.	Recovery of Benefits Conferred Under Judgments or Orders Subsequently Reversed or Set Aside	16–001
	C. Necessity	
17.	Restitution at Common Law	17-001
	1. Agency of Necessity	17-002
	2. Necessitous Intervention by a Stranger	17-008
	3. Conclusion	17–026
18.	Other Restitutionary Claims	10 001
	I. Maritime Salvage	18-001
	1. The Nature of the Right	18-001
	2. Conditions of the Right to Salvage Reward	18-004
	3. The Award4. Remedies	18-015 18-023
	II. General Average Contribution	18-023
	1. The Basis of the Contribution	18-024
		10-024
	D. Ineffective Transactions	
19.	Introduction	19–001
20.	Contracts Discharged through Breach or Frustration	20-001
	1. The Common Law Background	20-002
	2. Contracts Discharged through Breach	20-007
	3. Contracts Discharged through Frustration	20-058
	4. The Law Reform (Frustrated Contracts) Act 1943	20-061
21.	Contracts for the Sale or Disposition of Land which are Void for	
	Lack of Writing: and Void Bills of Sale	21-001
	1. Contracts for the Sale of Land	21-001
	2. Void Bills of Sale	21-007
22.	Contracts Void for Want of Authority	22-001
	1. Where T Paid Money to P or to A	22-002
	2. Where T Transferred Goods to P or to A	22-003
	3. Where T Rendered Services to P or to A	22–004
23.	Contracts Void for Mistake or Uncertainty	23-001
	1. Where there is Held to be No Contract because of some	
	Unresolved Ambiguity in, or Incompleteness of, the Con-	
	tractual Terms	23-002
	2. Where the Contract is Void because there has been no Objective Correspondence of Offer and Acceptance	23-005

Contents

	3.	Where the Contract is Held to be Void by Reason of the Failure of Some Condition, Precedent or Other Essential Term	23–008
	4.	Where there has been a Successful Plea of Non Est Factum	23–012
24.	Restit	utionary Claims and Illegal Contracts The General Rule: Illegality as a Defence to a Restitu-	24-001
		tionary Claim	24-002
	2.	When Will a Restitutionary Claim be Successful?	24-004
	3.	Cases on Agency	24-017
	4.	Critique	24–019
25	Contr	eats Affacted by Inconscity	25-001
25.	1.	acts Affected by Incapacity Contracts of the Mentally Disordered and Drunkards	25-001
		Minors' Contracts	25-001
			25-002
	3.	Contracts made by Companies and Corporations	25-012
26.	Antic	ipated Contracts which do not Materialise	26-001
	1.	The Restitutionary Claim: In Principle	26-002
	2.	The English Case Law	26-006
	3.	Some Tentative Conclusions	26–010
27.		ey Paid to the Revenue or to a Public Authority Pursuant to tra Vires Demand	27–001
	S	ection Two: Where the Defendant has Acquired from a Third Party a Benefit for Which he must Account to the Claimant	
28.	Attor	nment	28-001
		Attornment in Respect of Money	28-001
		Attornment in Respect of Chattels	28-004
29.		s where the Defendant without Right Intervenes Between the	20, 001
		nant and a Third Party	29-001
	1.	1	29–001 29–002
		Other Cases	29-002
	3.	Proprietary Claims	29-003
30.		ns under a Will or Intestacy or under an Inter Vivos Trust	30-001
		Personal Claims	30-001
	2.	Proprietary Claims	30-004
31.	Perfe	ction of Imperfect Gifts in Favour of Intended Donees	31-001

CONTENTS

Section Three: Where the Defendant has Acquired a Benefit Through his own Wrongful Act

32.	Introduction	32-001
	The Claimant Suffers a Wrong; the Wrongdoer is Unjustly Enriched at his Expense The Claimant Suffers a Wrong The Wrongdoer is Pagnized.	32-002
	 The Claimant Suffers a Wrong: The Wrongdoer is Required to Disgorge the Gain although He may not be Unjustly Enriched at the Claimant's Expense The Wrongdoer is Enriched at the Claimant's Expense, Yet 	32-003
	His Only Claim will be Damages for Loss Suffered	32-004
	4. A Criminal Benefits from His Crime; The Ground of the Claim is the Wrongful Act, the Crime	32-005
33.	Benefits Acquired in Breach of Fiduciary Relationships	33-001
	 Introduction The Liability of a Fiduciary Who Abuses His Position of 	33–001
	Trust	33-004
	3. The Liability of a Stranger Who Receives Trust Property Transferred to Him in Breach of Trust4. The Restitutionary Liability of Third Parties who Instigate	33–027
	or Participate in, a Breach of Trust	33-032
34.	Benefits Acquired in breach of Another's Confidence 1. Introduction 2. The Basis and Scope of the Restitutionary Claim 3. Remedies 4. Defences	34-001 34-001 34-015 34-017 34-025
35.	Benefits Acquired in Breach of an Undertaking to Hold Property for the Benefit of Another	35–001
36.	Restitutionary Claims Based on Another's Tortious Act 1. What Torts Can Form the Basis of a Restitutionary	36-001
	Claim?	36–002
	 The Advantages of Bringing a Restitutionary Claim Election 	36–009 36–016
	4. Proprietary Claims	36–018
37.	Benefits Acquired by Reprehensible Means	37–001
38.	Benefits Accruing to a Criminal from his Crime	38-001
	1. A General Restitutionary Principle?	38-001
	2. The Common Law Rule of Forfeiture	38-002
	3. Specific Problems arising from Succession to Property on	
	Death 1992	38-003
	4. The Forfeiture Act 1982	38–006 38–008
	5. Profits from the Crime	20-008

Contents

PART III—DEFENCES

39.	Introduction	39-001
40.	Change of Position and Estoppel I. Change of Position 1. The General principle 2. Is Change of Position a Defence to all Restitutionary Claims?	40-001 40-001 40-001 40-002
	3. Public Policy Defeats the Defence of Change of Position	40-003
	 Change of Position Should be a Defence to a Claim for Rescission 	40–007 40–008
	 5. The Scope of the Defence 6. The Irrelevance of Fault or Negligence 7. A Critical Question: When is it Inequitable to Paguire 	40–008
	 7. A Critical Question: When is it Inequitable to Require the Recipient to Make Restitution? 8. Exceptionally Change of Position May be a Defence Even if the Claim in Record on the Claimant's Title and 	40–012
	Even if the Claim is Based on the Claimant's Title and not upon Another's Unjust Enrichment 9. Joint Tenancy and Change of Position	40–016 40–021
	II. Common Law EstoppelIII. Two Special Groups of Cases1. The Cases on Agency: Recovery from Agents and	40–022 40–027
	Persons in an Analogous Position: Payment to the Principal 2. Bills of Exchange	40–027 40–032
41.	Good Consideration	41-001
42.	Bona Fide Purchase 1. At Common Law 2. In Equity	42–001 42–001 42–002
43.	Statutes of Limitation and Laches 1. Where the Defendant has Acquired a Benefit from or by the	43-001
	Act of the Plaintiff 2. Where the Defendant has Acquired from a Third Party	43-004
	Benefit for which he must Account to the Claimant 3. Where the Defendant has Acquired a Benefit through his	43–013
	own Wrongful Act 4. Proprietary Claims	43–017 43–024
44.	Res Judicata and Election 1. Res Judicata 2. Election	44–001 44–001 44–002
Biblic	ography	915
Index		919

TABLE OF CASES

123 East Fifty-Fourth Street Inc. v United States, 157 F.2d 68 (1946)	27–004
139 Deptford High Street, Ex p. British Transport Commission, Re [1951] Ch. 884; [1951]	
1 All E.R. 950; [1951] 1 T.L.R. 1045, Ch D	8-002
AD COLUMN WAR OF THE PROPERTY	
AB v South West Water Services Ltd [1993] Q.B. 507; [1993] 2 W.L.R. 507; [1993] 1 All	
E.R. 609; [1993] Env. L.R. 266; [1993] P.I.Q.R. P167; (1993) 143 N.L.J. 235; [1992]	
N.P.C. 146; The Times, November 26, 1992; Independent, November 18, 1992, CA (Civ	26 011
Div)	
AB Consolidated Ltd v Europe Strenght Food Co. Pty Ltd [1978] 2 N.Z.L.R. 515	34-012
A Coker & Co. v Limerick S.S. Co. (1918) 87 L.J.K.B. 767; 118 L.T. 726; 34 T.L.R. 296;	
14 Asp.M.L.C. 287	
AB Corporation v CD Corporation (The Sine Nomine) [2002] 1 Lloyds Rep. 805	20-034
AG Spalding & Bros v AW Gamage Ltd; sub nom. Spalding v Gamage [1914–15] All E.R.	
Rep. 147; (1915) 32 R.P.C. 273; (1915) 84 L.J.Ch. 449, HL	34–012
AR Lepage Investments Ltd v Rattray Publications Ltd (1995) 21 OR (3d) 164, CA	
(Ontario)	4-039
A Roberts & Co. v Leicestershire C.C. [1961] Ch. 555; [1961] 2 W.L.R. 1000; [1961] 2 All	
E.R. 545; 59 L.G.R. 349; 105 S.J. 425, Ch D	9–063
AL Barnes Ltd v Time Talk (UK) Ltd [2003] EWCA Civ 402; [2003] B.L.R. 331; (2003) 147	
S.J.L.B. 385; The Times, April 9, 2003, A (Civ Div)	24–012
AMP (UK) Plc v Barker [2001] O.P.L.R. 197; [2001] Pens. L.R. 77; [2001] W.T.L.R. 1237;	
(2000–01) 3 I.T.E.L.R. 414, Ch D	9–058
A/S Awilco of Oslo v Fulvia SpA di Navigazione of Cagliari; Chikuma, The [1981] 1 W.L.R.	
314; [1981] 1 All E.R. 652; [1981] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 371; [1981] Com. L.R. 64; 125 S.J.	
184, HL	9–002
A Schroeder Music Publishing Co. Ltd v Instone (formerly Macaulay); sub nom. Instone	
(formerly Macaulay) v A Schroeder Music Publishing Co. Ltd [1974] 1 W.L.R. 1308;	10.040
[1974] 3 All E.R. 616; 118 S.J. 734, HL; affirming [1974] 1 All E.R. 171, CA	
12-005, 12-006,	24-002
A v B (A Firm); <i>sub nom.</i> A v B plc [2002] EWCA Civ 337; (2002) 152 N.L.J. 434, CA;	
reversing [2001] 1 W.L.R. 2341; [2002] 1 All E.R. 449; [2002] E.M.L.R. 7; [2002] 1	
F.L.R. 179; [2002] 1 F.C.R. 369; [2002] Fam. Law 100; (2001) 98(41) L.S.G. 34; (2001)	
145 S.J.L.B. 235; <i>The Times</i> , November 2, 2001; <i>Independent</i> , November 16, 2001,	24 020
QBD	
Aaron's Reefs v Twis [1896] A.C. 273; L.J.P.C. 54; 74 L.T. 794, HL (UK-Irl) 9-008,	
9–035, 9–036,	
Aas v Benham [1891] 2 Ch. 244; 65 L.T. 25, CA	34-007
Abacus Trust Co (Isle of Man) Ltd v Barr [2003] EWHC 114; [2003] Ch. 409; [2003] 2	
W.L.R. 1362; [2003] 1 All E.R. 763; [2003] W.T.L.R. 149; (2002–03) 5 I.T.E.L.R. 602;	
(2003) 100(13) L.S.G. 27; <i>The Times</i> , February 28, 2003; <i>Independent</i> , March 31, 2003	0.050
(C.S), Ch D	
	33–015,
Abbots v Barry (1820) 2 B. & B. 369; Moo. C.P. 98	
Abordes V Barry (1820) 2 B. & B. 369; Moo. C.P. 98	
	33–003,
Aberdeen Town Council v Aberdeen University (1877) 2 App.Cas. 544	33-013
sub nom. Westville Shipping Co. Ltd (in Elquidation); sub nom. Westville Shipping Co. Ltd (1923] A.C. 773;	
(1923) 16 Ll. L. Rep. 245, HL	20.012
(1925) 10 Ll. L. Kep. 243, fil	20-013

TABLE OF CASES

Acanthus, The [1902] P.17; 71 L.J.P. 14; 85 L.T. 696; 18 T.L.R. 160; 9 Asp.M.L.C. 276, PDAP	1_076
Ackroyds (London) v Islington Plastics [1962] R.P.C. 97	34-007
Acme Process Equipment Co. Ltd v U.S. 347F. 2d 509 (1965)	20-023
Acquaculture Corp. v New Zealand Green Mussel Co. Ltd [1990] 3 N.Z.L.R. 299	34-014
Actionstrength Ltd (t/a Vital Resources) v International Glass Engineering IN.GL.EN SpA [2003] UKHL 17; [2003] 2 A.C. 541; [2003] 2 W.L.R. 1060; [2003] 2 All E.R. 615;	
[2003] 2 All E.R. (Comm) 331; [2005] 1 B.C.L.C. 606; [2003] 1 C.L.C. 1003; [2003]	
B.L.R. 207; 88 Con. L.R. 208; (2003) 153 N.L.J. 563; (2003) 147 S.J.L.B. 418; The	
Times, April 4, 2003, HL	1-087
Adam v Newbigging; <i>sub nom.</i> Newbigging v Adam (1888) 13 App.Cas. 308; affirming (1886) 34 Ch.D. 582; 56 L.J.Ch. 275; 55 L.T. 794; 35 W.R. 597	
Adamson, Ex p. (1878) 8 Ch.D. 807	
Addison v Ottawa Auto and Taxi Co. (1914) 16 D.L.R. 318	9-026
Adras Ltd v Harlow & Jones GmbH (Israeli Supreme Court) (1988), [1995] R.L.R. 235	
Adrich v Cooper (1803) 8 ves. 382	3_038
Aer Lingus Plc v Gildacroft Ltd [2006] EWCA Civ 4; [2006] 1 W.L.R. 1173; [2006] 2 All	, 5-056
E.R. 290; [2006] C.P. Rep. 21; [2006] P.I.Q.R. P16; (2006) 103(6) L.S.G. 32; (2006)	
156 N.L.J. 147; (2006) 150 S.J.L.B. 129; [2006] N.P.C. 4; The Times, January 23, 2006;	
Independent, January 19, 2006, CA (Civ Div)	14-030
Afovos Shipping Co. SA v R Pagnan & Fratelli; Afovos, The [1983] 1 W.L.R. 195; [1983]	T 1 D D D
1 All E.R. 449; [1983] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 335; [1983] Com. L.R. 83; (1983) 127 S.J. 98,	
HL; affirming [1982] 1 W.L.R. 848; [1982] 3 All E.R. 18; [1982] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 562;	
[1982] Com. L.R. 128; 126 S.J. 242, CA; reversing [1980] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 469, QBD	
(Comm Ct)	20-043
Africa, The (1880) 5 P.D. 192	18-015
Agip (Africa) Ltd v Jackson [1991] Ch. 547; [1991] 3 W.L.R. 116; [1992] 4 All E.R. 451;	
(1991) 135 S.J. 117; The Times, January 9, 1991; The Financial Times, January 18,	
1991, CA; affirming [1990] Ch. 265; [1989] 3 W.L.R. 1367; [1992] 4 All E.R. 385;	
(1989) 86(3) L.S.G. 34; (1990) 134 S.J. 198; <i>The Times</i> , June 5, 1989, Ch D 2–004,	
2-023, 2-025, 2-026, 2-027, 2-030, 2-048, 9-065, 30-002, 3	
33–028, 33–029, 33–031, 34–015,	42-003
Agip SpA v Navigazione Alta Italia SpA; Nai Genova, The and Nai Superba, The [1984] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 353, CA9-061, 9-063, 9-064	0 065
Agnew's Will, Re, 230 N.Y.S. 519 (1928)	
Agra & Masterman's Bank Ltd v Leighton (1866) L.R. 2 Ex. 56; 4 H. & C. 656; 36 L.J. Ex.	0-009
33	15_012
Agriculturist Cattle Insurance Co., Re, Baird's case (1870) 5 Ch.App. 725; 23 L.T. 424; 18	15 012
W.R. 1094	14-042
Ahearne v Hogan (1844) Dr.t.Sug. 310	
Aiken v Short (1856) 1 H. & N. 210; 35 L.J.Exch. 321; 27 LT. 188; 4 W.R. 645; 108 R.R.	
526 1-018, 1-075, 4-003, 4-006, 4-011, 4-015, 4-017, 4-044, 4-045, 4-046, 4-047,	4-048,
41-001, 41-002, 41-003,	42-001
Ailion v Spiekermann [1976] Ch. 158; [1976] 2 W.L.R. 556; [1976] 1 All E.R. 497; (1975)	
29 P. & C.R. 369; (1975) 238 E.G. 48; (1975) 120 S.J. 9, Ch D	24-020
Ainsworth (David), Re; sub nom. Finch v Smith [1915] 2 Ch. 96, Ch D	5-011
Air Canada v British Columbia (1989) 59 D.L.R. (4th) 161; [1989] 4 W.W.R. 137, Sup Ct	
(Can)	
Airedale Cooperative Worsted Manufacturing Society Ltd, Re [1933] Ch. 639, Ch D	3–066
Ajello v Worsley [1898] 1 Ch. 274; 67 L.J.Ch. 172; 77 L.T. 783; 46 W.R. 245; 14 T.L.R. 168; 42 S.J. 212, Ch D	9–007
Akerblom v Price, Potter, Walker & Co. (1881) 7 Q.B.D. 129; 50 L.J.Q.B. 629; 44 L.T. 837;	
29 W.R. 797; 4 Asp.M.C.C. 441	18-008
Akerhielm v De Mare; sub nom. Baron Uno Carl Samuel Akerhielm v Rolf de Mare [1959]	0.003
A.C. 789; [1959] 3 W.L.R. 108; [1959] 3 All E.R. 485; 103 S.J. 527, PC (EA)	9-003
Alamida v Wilson, 495 P.2d 585 (1972)	2 017
Alati v Kruger (1955) 94 C I R 218	3-017
Alati v Kruger (1955) 94 C.L.R. 218	

TABLE OF CASES

Albert Life Assurance Co., Re (1870) L.R. 11 Eq. 164; 49 L.J.Ch. 166; 23 L.T. 726; 19 W.R. 321	14–013
Albert, Prince v Strange (1849) 2 De Gex. & Sm. 652; (1849) 18 L.J.Ch. 120; 1 Mac. & G. 25	34_011
Albion, The (1861) 1 Lush. 282	18-02
Albion Insurance Co. Ltd v Government Insurance Office of New South Wales (1969) 121 C.L.R. 342	3-020
Albion Steel and Wire Co. v Martin (1875) 1 Ch.D. 580; (1874–80) All E.R. Rep. Ext. 2205;	3-020
45 L.J.Ch. 173; 33 L.T. 660; 24 W.R. 134	
Albionic, The (1941) 111 L.J.P. 1; 70 Ll. L. Rep. 257	
Albright v Sandoval, 216 U.S. 331 (1910)	
Albyn v Harding (1857) 27 Beav. 11	14 012
— v Norwich Union Life Insurance Co. Ltd (formerly Norwich Union Life Insurance	14-015
Society); Norwich Union Life Insurance Society v Qureshi; Norwich Union Life Insurance Co. Ltd v Qureshi [1999] 2 All E.R. (Comm) 707; [1999] C.L.C. 1963;	0.010
[2000] Lloyd's Rep. I.R. 1; The Times, August 13, 1999, CA	9-019
Aldridge v Turner [2004] EWHC 2768, Ch D	11-006
Alec Lobb Garages Ltd v Total Oil Great Britain Ltd [1985] 1 W.L.R. 173; [1985] 1 All E.R. 303; [1985] 1 E.G.L.R. 33; (1985) 273 E.G. 659; (1985) 82 L.S.G. 45; (1985) 129 S.J. 83, CA; affirming [1983] 1 W.L.R. 87; [1983] 1 All E.R. 944; (1983) 133 N.L.J. 401; 126 S.J. 768, Ch D	12–006
Alenquer, The. See Owners of the Rene v Owners of the Alenquer.	
Alev, The. See Vantage Navigation Corp. v Suhail and Saud Bahwan Building Materials.	
Alexander v Rayson [1936] 1 K.B. 169; 105 L.J.K.B. 148; 154 L.T. 205; 800 S.J. 15; 52 T.L.R. 137, CA	24–010
Alf Vaughan & Co. Ltd (In Receivership) v Royscot Trust plc [1999] 1 All E.R. (Comm.)	
856, Ch D	
Allcard v Skinner (1887) 36 Ch.D. 145; 56 L.J.Ch. 1052; 57 L.T. 61 11-001, 11-003, 1	
11-007, 11-010, 11-012, 40-002, 40-006, 40-007, 4	
Allen v De Lisle (1857) 3 Jur.(N.S.) 928; 5 W.R. 158	3-027
	0.025
(1969) 113 S.J. 484, CA	
Allfrey v Allfrey (1849) 1 Mac. & G. 87; 1 H. & T. 179; 13 L.T.(O.S.) 250; 13 Jur. 269	9-068
Allgemeine Versicherungs Gesellschaft Helvetia v Administrator of German Property [1931]	9-006
1 K.B. 672; (1930) 38 Ll. L. Rep. 247, CA	3-041
Alliance & Leicester Building Society v Edgestop Ltd (Application for Leave); Alliance &	
Leicester Building Society v Dhanoa; Alliance & Leicester Building Society v Samra;	
Mercantile Credit Co. Ltd v Lancaster; Alliance & Leicester Building Society v	
Hamptons [1993] 1 W.L.R. 1462; [1994] 2 All E.R. 38; [1994] 2 E.G.L.R. 229; [1993]	
E.G.C.S. 93; [1993] N.P.C. 79, Ch D	33–021
Allied Irish Bank plc v Byrne [1995] 2 F.L.R. 325; [1995] 1 F.C.R. 430; [1995] Fam. Law	
609, Ch D	11-011
Allison Johnson & Foster Ltd, Ex p. Birkenshaw, Re [1904] 2 K.B. 327, KBD 22–007, 2	23-008
Allison v Bristol Marine Insurance Co. (1876) 1 App.Cas. 209; 34 L.T. 809; 24 W.R. 1039;	20 002
3 Asp. M.L.C. 178	
Allkins v Jupe (1877) 2 C.P.D. 375; 46 L.J.Q.B. 824; 36 L.T. 851; 3 Asp. M.L.C. 449	
Alpha, The. See Corfu Navigation Co. v Mobil Shipping Co.	24-002
Alsager v Spalding (1838) 4 Bing (N.C.) 407; 6 Scott 204; 7 L.J.C.P. 225	24_016
Alton v Midland Ry. (1865) 19 C.B.(N.S.) 213; 34 L.J.C.P. 292; 12 C.T. 703; 11 Jur.(N.S.)	21 010
672; 13 W.R. 918	25-007
Aluminium Industrie Vaassen BV v Romalpa Aluminium [1976] 1 W.L.R. 676; [1976] 2 All	
E.R. 552; [1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 443; 120 S.J. 95, CA	2-033
Amalgamated Investment & Property Co. v John Walker & Sons [1977] 1 W.L.R. 164;	
[1976] 3 All E.R. 509; (1976) 32 P. & C.R. 278; (1976) 239 E.G. 277; 120 S.J. 252,	9-052
CA	7-032