

UNLOCKING CONTRACT LAW

4th edition

Chris Turner



UNLOCKING THE LAW



UNLOCKING THE LAW

UNLOCKING CONTRACT LAW

4th edition

Chris Turner



 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

Fourth edition published 2014
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2014 Chris Turner

The right of Chris Turner to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by him/her in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

First edition published by Hodder Education in 2004
Third edition published by Hodder Education in 2010

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Turner, Chris (Barrister)

Unlocking contract law / Chris Turner. — Fourth edition.
pages cm. — (Unlocking the law)
1. Contracts—England 2. Contracts—Wales. I. Title.
KD1554.T875 2014
346.4202'2—dc23

2013020813

ISBN: 978-1-4441-7417-5 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-0-203-77941-5 (ebk)

Typeset in Palatino LT-Roman
Project Managed and Typeset by: diacriTech

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Guide to the book</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>List of figures</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Table of cases</i>	<i>xvii</i>
<i>Table of legislation and other instruments</i>	<i>xxix</i>

1 THE ORIGINS AND CHARACTER OF CONTRACT LAW

1.1	The origins and functions of the law of contract	1
1.1.1	Development of the law of contract	1
1.1.2	The purposes of contract law	2
1.1.3	The character of modern contracts	3
1.1.4	The reasons that contracts are enforced	5
1.2	The concept of freedom of contract	5
1.3	Contract law compared with other areas of law	7
1.3.1	Contract law compared with tort	7
1.3.2	The interrelationship between contract law and tort	7
1.3.3	Contract law compared with criminal law	7
1.4	Contract law and the protection of consumers	8
1.5	The effects on contract law of membership of the EU	9
1.6	Contract law and other jurisdictions	10

2 FORMATION OF A CONTRACT: OFFER AND ACCEPTANCE

2.1	Formation of contracts and the concept of agreement	13
2.2	Offer	14
2.2.1	The character of an offer	14
2.2.2	Distinguishing offer from invitation to treat	15
2.2.3	Examples of invitation to treat	16
2.2.4	Situations which are not invitation to treat	19
2.2.5	Communicating the offer	24
2.2.6	Certainty	25
2.2.7	Revocation of offers	27
2.2.8	Termination of offer	30
2.3	Acceptance	32
2.3.1	The role of acceptance in agreement	32
2.3.2	The basic rules of acceptance	32
2.3.3	Communication of the acceptance	36
2.4	The 'battle of the forms' and associated problems	42

3 FORMATION OF A CONTRACT: CONSIDERATION

3.1	The origins and character of consideration	49
3.1.1	The origins, nature and purpose of consideration	49
3.1.2	Defining 'consideration'	50
3.1.3	Executed and executory consideration	51
3.2	The basic rules of consideration	51
3.2.1	Adequacy and sufficiency of consideration	51
3.2.2	Consideration moving from the promisee: the connection with privity	54
3.2.3	Past consideration and the exception in <i>Lampleigh v Braithwaite</i>	55
3.3	Consideration and the performance of existing duties	58
3.3.1	The basic rule	58
3.3.2	The exceptions to the basic rule	59
3.3.3	The exception in <i>Williams v Roffey</i>	62
3.3.4	The significance of <i>Williams v Roffey</i>	64
3.4	Part-payment of a debt, Pinnel's rule, and the doctrine of promissory estoppel	68

4 FORMATION OF A CONTRACT: INTENTION TO CREATE LEGAL RELATIONS

4.1	The character and purpose of the rule	77
4.2	Social and domestic agreements	78
4.3	Commercial and business dealings	80

5 FORM

5.1	Simple contracts, speciality contracts and the requirement for formalities	89
5.2	Agreements which must be in the form of a deed to be valid	90
5.3	Contracts which must be in writing to be valid	90
5.4	Agreements needing evidence in writing to be valid	91

6 THE OBLIGATIONS UNDER A CONTRACT: TERMS

6.1	Pre-contractual statements and representations	93
6.1.1	The negotiation stage	93
6.1.2	Types of representation and their consequences	94
6.1.3	The process of defining and distinguishing the express terms	98
6.2	Express terms	100
6.2.1	The nature of express terms	100
6.2.2	The process of incorporating express terms	100
6.2.3	Factors relevant to incorporating terms	100
6.2.4	The 'parol evidence' rule	105
6.3	Implied terms	108
6.3.1	The process of implying terms into a contract	108
6.3.2	Terms implied by fact	109
6.3.3	Terms implied by common law	115
6.3.4	Terms implied by statute	116

6.4	The relative significance of terms	123
6.4.1	Introduction	123
6.4.2	Conditions	124
6.4.3	Warranties	125
6.4.4	Innominate terms	125
6.5	The construction of terms	127
7 THE OBLIGATIONS UNDER A CONTRACT: EXCLUSION AND LIMITATION CLAUSES		
7.1	Definition and scope of exclusion clauses and limitation clauses	135
7.2	Judicial control of exemption clauses	136
7.2.1	Incorporation of exemption clauses	136
7.2.2	Construction of the contract	144
7.2.3	Other limitations on the use of exemption clauses	151
7.3	Statutory control of exemption clauses	156
7.3.1	The scope of statutory regulation	156
7.3.2	The unfair contract terms Act 1977	157
7.3.3	The unfair terms in consumer contracts Regulations 1999	163
8 VOID AND VOIDABLE CONTRACTS		
8.1	The nature of vitiating factors	169
8.2	Void contracts	170
8.3	Voidable contracts	170
8.4	Classes of vitiating factors	170
9 VITIATING FACTORS: MISREPRESENTATION		
9.1	Introduction	173
9.2	When a misrepresentation occurs	174
9.3	The classes of misrepresentation and their remedies	180
9.3.1	Fraudulent misrepresentation	180
9.3.2	Negligent misrepresentation	183
9.3.3	Innocent misrepresentation	187
9.4	Equity and misrepresentation	190
9.5	Non-disclosure amounting to misrepresentation	192
10 VITIATING FACTORS: MISTAKE		
10.1	Introduction	197
10.2	Common mistake	199
10.2.1	<i>Res extincta</i> (subject-matter does not exist)	199
10.2.2	<i>Res sua</i> (ownership in different hands)	201
10.2.3	Common mistake as to quality of the bargain	201
10.3	Mutual mistake	206

10.4	Unilateral mistake	207
10.4.1	Introduction	207
10.4.2	Mistaken terms	207
10.4.3	Mistaken identity	208
10.4.4	Mistaken identity and face-to-face dealing	210
10.5	The effects of equity	215
10.5.1	The intervention of equity	215
10.5.2	Rescission	215
10.5.3	Refusal of specific performance	216
10.5.4	Rectification of documents	217
10.5.5	The effects of <i>Great Peace</i>	218
10.6	<i>Non est factum</i>	221

11 VITIATING FACTORS: DURESS AND UNDUE INFLUENCE

11.1	Introduction	227
11.2	Duress	228
11.3	Economic duress	230
11.4	Undue influence	235
11.4.1	The traditional classes	235
11.4.2	The refinement of the traditional classes	237
11.4.3	The classes of undue influence after <i>O'Brien</i>	239
11.4.4	The position after <i>Etridge</i>	245
11.4.5	The effects of pleading undue influence	249
11.4.6	The effect of undue influence on third parties	250

12 VITIATING FACTORS: ILLEGALITY AND UNENFORCEABLE CONTRACTS

12.1	Introduction	261
12.2	Contracts void by statute	262
12.2.1	Restrictive trade practices	262
12.3	Contracts illegal by statute	263
12.3.1	Contracts illegal on formation	264
12.3.2	Contracts illegal in their performance	265
12.4	Contracts void at common law	266
12.4.1	Contracts to avoid the jurisdiction of the courts	266
12.4.2	Contracts prejudicial to family life	267
12.4.3	Contracts in restraint of trade	267
12.5	Contracts illegal at common law and the role of policy	278
12.6	The consequences of a contract being declared void	283
12.6.1	At common law	284
12.6.2	By statute	286
12.7	The consequences of a contract being declared illegal	286
12.7.1	Illegal on formation	286
12.7.2	Illegal on performance	289

13 THIRD PARTY RIGHTS AND THE DOCTRINE OF PRIVITY

13.1	The doctrine of privity of contract	295
13.1.1	The basic rule	295
13.1.2	Consequences and problems associated with the rule	297
13.2	The exceptions to the basic rule	298
13.2.1	Introduction	298
13.2.2	Statutory exceptions	298
13.2.3	Trust law	299
13.2.4	Restrictive covenants	300
13.2.5	Privity of estate in leases	302
13.2.6	The rule in <i>Dunlop v Lambert</i>	302
13.2.7	Procedural rules	304
13.2.8	Actions on behalf of a third party beneficiary and the so-called 'holiday cases'	305
13.2.9	Protecting third parties in exclusion clauses	307
13.2.10	Collateral contracts	308
13.3	Agency, assignment and negotiable instruments	309
13.3.1	Introduction	309
13.3.2	Agency	309
13.3.3	Assignment	315
13.3.4	Negotiable instruments	316
13.4	Statutory intervention and the contracts (rights of third parties) Act 1999	317

14 CAPACITY

14.1	The nature and purpose of capacity	323
14.2	Capacity and minors' contracts	324
14.2.1	The basic principle of minority	324
14.2.2	The character and purpose of rules on minority	324
14.2.3	Contracts valid or enforceable against minors	324
14.2.4	Contracts voidable by minors	328
14.2.5	Contracts void and unenforceable against minors	330
14.2.6	Minors' contracts and the role of equity	331
14.3	Capacity and mentally disordered persons	333
14.4	Capacity and drunkenness	334
14.5	The capacity of corporations	334
14.5.1	The different types of corporation	335
14.5.2	The <i>ultra vires</i> doctrine	335
14.5.3	Statutory controls	337

15 DISCHARGE OF A CONTRACT

15.1	Introduction	343
15.2	Discharge by performance	344
15.2.1	The strict rule of performance and its application	344
15.2.2	The exceptions to the strict rule	347
15.2.3	Stipulations as to time of performance	350

15.3	Discharge by agreement	352
15.3.1	Bilateral agreements	352
15.3.2	Unilateral agreements	353
15.4	Discharge by frustration	356
15.4.1	The purpose and development of the doctrine	356
15.4.2	The classifications of frustrating events	358
15.4.3	The limitations on the doctrine of frustration	363
15.4.4	The common law effects of frustration	367
15.4.5	Statutory effects under the law reform (Frustrated Contracts) Act 1943	368
15.5	Discharge by breach	372
15.5.1	The fundamental nature of breach of contract	372
15.5.2	The different types of breach	373
15.5.3	The different consequences of breach of contract	375
16 REMEDIES IN CONTRACT LAW		
16.1	Common law remedies	385
16.1.1	Introduction	385
16.1.2	Unliquidated damages	387
16.1.3	Tests of causation and remoteness of damage	388
16.1.4	The bases of assessment	393
16.1.5	The duty to mitigate	398
16.1.6	The 'mental distress' cases	399
16.1.7	Liquidated damage clauses	402
16.2	Equitable remedies	405
16.2.1	Introduction	405
16.2.2	Specific performance	406
16.2.3	Injunctions	409
16.2.4	Rescission	412
16.2.5	Rectification of a document	415
17 QUASI-CONTRACT		
17.1	Introduction	421
17.2	Actions to recover payments made	423
17.2.1	Actions to recover payments where there is a total failure of consideration	423
17.2.2	Actions to recover payments made under a mistake of fact	424
17.2.3	Actions to recover payments made under a mistake of law	426
17.3	Actions to recover on a <i>quantum meruit</i> basis	428
	<i>Appendices</i>	433
	<i>Glossary of terms</i>	441
	<i>Index</i>	445

Acknowledgements

The books in the Unlocking the Law series are a departure from traditional law texts and represent one view of a type of learning resource that the editors always felt is particularly useful to students. The success of the series and the fact that many of its features have been subsequently emulated in other publications must surely vindicate that view. The series editors would therefore like to thank the original publishers, Hodder Education, for their support in making the original project a successful reality. In particular we would like to thank Alexia Chan for showing great faith in the project and for her help in getting the series off the ground. We would also like to thank the current publisher, Routledge for the warm enthusiasm it has shown in taking over the series. In this respect we must also thank Fiona Briden, Commissioning Editor for the series for her commitment and enthusiasm towards the series and for her support.

This page intentionally left blank

Guide to the book

In the *Unlocking the Law* books all the essential elements that make up the law are clearly defined to bring the law alive and make it memorable. In addition, the books are enhanced with learning features to reinforce learning and test your knowledge as you study. Follow this guide to make sure you get the most from reading this book.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Defines what you will learn in each chapter.

SECTION

definition

Find key legal terminology at-a-glance.

Highlights sections from Acts.

ARTICLE

Defines Articles of the EC Treaty or of the European Convention on Human Rights or other Treaty.

tutor tip

Provides key ideas on how to get ahead from lecturers.

CLAUSE

Shows a Bill going through Parliament or a draft Bill proposed by the Law Commission.

CASE EXAMPLE



Illustrates the law in action.

JUDGMENT



Provides extracts from judgments on cases.



Indicates that you will be able to test yourself further on this topic using the Key Questions and Answers section of this book on www.unlockingthelaw.co.uk.

QUOTATION

Encourages you to engage with primary sources.

ACTIVITY



Enables you to test yourself as you progress through the chapter.

student mentor tip

Offers advice from law graduates on the best way to achieve the results you want.

SAMPLE ESSAY QUESTIONS

Provide you with real-life sample essays and show you the best way to plan your answer.

SUMMARY

Concludes each chapter to reinforce learning.

Preface

The 'Unlocking the Law' series on its creation was hailed as an entirely new style of undergraduate law textbooks and many of its ground-breaking features have subsequently been emulated in other publications. However, many student texts are still very prose dense and have little in the way of interactive materials to help a student feel his or her way through the course of study on a given module.

The purpose of the series has always been to try to make learning each subject area more accessible by focusing on actual learning needs, and by providing a range of different supporting materials and features.

All topic areas are broken up into manageable sections with a logical progression and extensive use of headings and numerous sub-headings as well as an extensive contents list and index. Each book in the series also contains a variety of flow charts, diagrams, key facts charts and summaries to reinforce the information in the body of the text. Diagrams and flow charts are particularly useful because they can provide a quick and easy understanding of the key points, especially when revising for examinations. Key facts charts not only provide a quick visual guide through the subject but are also useful for revision.

Many cases are separated out for easy access and all cases have full citation in the text as well as the table of cases for easy reference. The emphasis of the series is on depth of understanding much more than breadth of detail. For this reason each text also includes key extracts from judgments where appropriate. Extracts from academic comment from journal articles and leading texts are also included to give some insight into the academic debate on complex or controversial areas. In both cases these are highlighted and removed from the body of the text.

Finally the books also include much formative 'self-testing', with a variety of activities ranging through subject specific comprehension, application of the law and a range of other activities to help the student gain a good idea of his or her progress in the course. Appendices with guides on completing essay style questions and legal problem solving supplement and support this interactivity. Besides this a sample essay plan is added at the end of most chapters.

A feature of the most recent editions is the inclusion of some case extracts from the actual law reports which not only provide more detail on some of the important cases but also help to support students in their use of law reports by providing a simple commentary and also activities to cement understanding.

Contract law is actually a very relevant and useful area of law. We are all constantly forming different contractual relationships even though we might not think about them in that manner. An understanding of the basic rules of contract in any case is essential for a full understanding of other areas such as commercial law and employment law. Since Contract Law is also in the main a common law area much of this book is devoted to cases and case notes, and these are separated out in the text for easy reference.

The book is designed to cover all of the main topic areas on undergraduate, degree-equivalent and professional contract syllabuses and help provide a full understanding of each.

I hope that you will gain as much enjoyment in reading about the Contract Law, and testing your understanding with the various activities in the book as I have had in writing it, and that you gain much enjoyment and interest from your study of the law.

The law is stated as I believe it to be on 1st August 2013.

Chris Turner

List of figures

Figure 1.1	How the various elements of a contract fit together	11
Figure 2.1	The point at which a contract is made in a standard offer and acceptance, and where there is firstly an invitation to treat	15
Figure 2.2	The differences between a standard auction situation and a competitive tender	21
Figure 3.1	Using the agreement in <i>Tweddle v Atkinson</i> to illustrate the rule that consideration must move from the promisee	54
Figure 3.2	The operation of the past consideration rule	56
Figure 3.3	The exception in <i>Lampleigh v Braithwaite</i> in operation	57
Figure 3.4	The relationship between <i>Williams v Roffey</i> and <i>Stilk v Myrick</i>	67
Figure 4.1	The uses of the presumptions in determining an intention to create legal relations	85
Figure 5.1	The ways in which form is significant in contracts	92
Figure 6.1	The relationship between different types of representation and the legal consequences attaching to them	97
Figure 6.2	Diagram illustrating the relative effects of terms	131
Figure 7.1	Diagram illustrating judicial controls on the use of exemption clauses	155
Figure 8.1	The different consequences on a contract of the different vitiating factors	171
Figure 9.1	Diagram illustrating when a misrepresentation has occurred	179
Figure 9.2	The different classes of misrepresentation, the possible actions and the available remedies	189
Figure 10.1	The different types of common mistake and their consequences	205
Figure 10.2	The different types of mistake and their legal consequences	214
Figure 11.1	Diagram illustrating how economic duress is established	234
Figure 11.2	The developments in pleading undue influence	247
Figure 11.3	Claiming undue influence after <i>O'Brien</i>	248
Figure 11.4	Claiming undue influence after <i>Etridge</i>	249
Figure 12.1	Diagram illustrating how a court determines the legitimacy of a restraint of trade clause in a contract	277
Figure 12.2	Diagram illustrating the consequences of a contract being tainted with illegality	290
Figure 13.1	The basic operation of the doctrine of privity of contract	297
Figure 13.2	The comparison between the simple rule on privity of contract and the agency relationship	310
Figure 14.1	The different effects of capacity on minors' contracts	332
Figure 15.1	When a contract will be considered frustrated	369
Figure 15.2	The consequences of different types of breach of contract	380
Figure 16.1	Chart illustrating the difference between the different remedies available in contract law	416
Figure 17.1	Diagram illustrating a claim for restitution	428

This page intentionally left blank

Table of cases

<i>Adams v Lindsell</i> (1818) 106 ER 250.....	39, 48, 438
<i>Adderly v Dixon</i> (1824) 57 ER 239	406, 417
<i>Addis v The Gramophone Company</i> [1909] AC 488	399, 400
<i>Agathon, The</i> [1983] 2 Lloyd's Rep 211	360
<i>Ailsa Craig Fishing Co Ltd v Malvern Fishing Co Ltd</i> (Securicor case) [1983] 1 WLR 964	150, 156
<i>Akerhielm v De Mare</i> [1959] AC 789	181
<i>Alec Lobb (Garages) Ltd v Total Oil Great Britain Ltd</i> [1983] 1 WLR 87	233
<i>Alexander v Rayson</i> [1936] 1 KB 169.....	279
<i>Alfred McAlpine Capital Projects Ltd v Tilebox Ltd</i> (2005) 104 Con LR 39.....	403
<i>Alfred McAlpine Construction Ltd v Panatown Ltd</i> [2000] 4 All ER 97, reversing (1998) 88 BLR 67.....	303, 307
<i>Al-Kishtaini v Shansal</i> [2001] 2 All ER Comm 601.....	288
<i>Allan (JW) (Merchandising) Ltd v Cloke</i> [1960] 2 All ER 258	287
<i>Allcard v Skinner</i> (1887) 36 Ch D 145.....	236, 240, 242, 249, 260, 385
<i>Allen v Rescouis</i> (1676) 2 Lev 174	278
<i>Alliance Bank Ltd v Broom</i> (1864) 2 Drew & Sm 289.....	53
<i>Amalgamated Investment & Property Co Ltd v John Walker & Sons Ltd</i> [1977] 1 WLR 164.....	365, 372
<i>American Cyanamid Co v Ethicon Ltd</i> [1975] AC 396, (1975) 8 Sydney LR 207	410
<i>Anderson Ltd v Daniel</i> [1924] 1 KB 138	265, 292
<i>Andrews Bros (Bournemouth) Ltd v Singer & Co</i> [1934] 1 KB 17.....	145
<i>Anglia Television Ltd v Reed</i> [1972] 1 QB 60.....	395, 404
<i>Antons Trawling Co Ltd v Smith</i> [2003] 2 NZLR 23	66
<i>Arcos Ltd v EA Ronaasen & Son</i> [1933] AC 470.....	117, 345
<i>Armhouse Lee Ltd v Chappell</i> (1996) <i>The Times</i> , 7 August.....	283
<i>Armstrong v Jackson</i> [1917] 2 KB 822.....	413
<i>Ashbury Railway Carriage Co Ltd v Riche</i> (1875) LR 7 HL 653.....	336, 341
<i>Ashmore v Corporation of Lloyd's (No 2)</i> [1992] 2 Lloyd's Rep 620.....	114
<i>Associated Japanese Bank (International) Ltd v Credit du Nord SA</i> [1988] 3 All ER 902	201, 223
<i>Associated Provincial Picture House v Wednesbury Corporation</i> [1948] 1 KB 223	113
<i>Ateni Maritime Corporation v Great Marine</i> (1991) <i>The Times</i> , 13 February	346
<i>Atlas Express Ltd v Kafco (Importers and Distributors) Ltd</i> [1989] QB 833	231, 233
<i>Attorney-General v Blake</i> [2001] 1 AC 268.....	397
<i>Attwood v Lamont</i> [1920] 3 KB 571	284, 285
<i>Attwood v Small</i> (1838) 7 ER 684, [1835–42] All ER Rep 258	178
<i>Austin Knight (UK) Ltd v Hinds</i> [1994] FSR 52	270
<i>Avery v Bowden</i> (1855) 5 E & B 714	377, 382
<i>Avon Finance Ltd v Bridger</i> [1985] 2 All ER 281	250, 252, 254
<i>Avraamides and Another v Colwill</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 1533	319
<i>BP Exploration Co (Libya) Ltd v Hunt (No 2)</i> [1979] 1 WLR 783.....	370, 372
<i>Baldry v Marshall</i> [1925] 1 KB 260.....	120
<i>Balfour v Balfour</i> [1919] 2 KB 571.....	78, 79, 84, 85, 87
<i>Banco Exterior Internacional v Mann</i> [1994] 1 All ER 936.....	244, 255
<i>Bank of Credit and Commerce International SA v Aboody</i> [1990] 1 QB 923.....	238, 240, 243
<i>Bannerman v White</i> (1861) 10 CBNS 844.....	101
<i>Barclays Bank plc v Boulter and Another</i> [1997] 2 All ER 1002	253
<i>Barclays Bank plc v Coleman</i> [2000] 3 WLR 405.....	245

<i>Barclays Bank plc v O'Brien</i> [1993] 4 All ER 417.....	238, 239, 243, 245, 246, 252–257, 260
<i>Barrow Lane and Ballard Ltd v Phillip Phillips & Co Ltd</i> [1929] 1 KB 574.....	200
<i>Barry v Heathcote Ball & Co (Commercial Auctions) Ltd</i> [2001] 1 All ER 994; 1 WLR 1962.....	22
<i>Bartlett v Sidney Marcus Ltd</i> [1965] 1 WLR 1013.....	118
<i>Barton v Armstrong</i> [1975] 2 All ER 465.....	229, 259
<i>Bell v Lever Brothers Ltd</i> [1932] AC 161.....	201–203, 214, 218–220, 224
<i>Bence Graphics International Ltd v Fasson UK Ltd</i> (1996) <i>The Times</i> , 24 October.....	394
<i>Benningfield v Baxter</i> (1886) 12 App Cas 167.....	242
<i>Bentley (Dick) Productions Ltd v Harold Smith (Motors) Ltd</i> [1965] 1 WLR 623.....	9, 102, 108
<i>Benyon v Nettleford</i> (1850) 3 Mac & G 94.....	283
<i>Beresford v Royal Insurance Co Ltd</i> [1937] 2 KB 197.....	279, 293
<i>Bernstein v Pamsons Motors (Golders Green) Ltd</i> [1987] 2 All ER 220.....	119
<i>Beswick v Beswick</i> [1968] AC 58.....	298
<i>Bettini v Gye</i> (1876) 1 QBD 183.....	125, 134
<i>Biggs v Boyd Gibbins</i> [1971] 1 WLR 913.....	20
<i>Bilbie v Lumley</i> (1802) 2 East 469.....	426
<i>Birch v Paramount Estates (Liverpool) Ltd</i> (1956) 167 Estates Gazette 396.....	101, 108
<i>Bisset v Wilkinson</i> [1927] AC 177.....	96, 97, 99, 175
<i>Blackpool and Fylde Aero Club Ltd v Blackpool Borough Council</i> [1990] 1 WLR 1195.....	22, 45
<i>Bolton v Mahadeva</i> [1972] 1 WLR 1009.....	349, 350, 351
<i>Boots v Pharmaceutical Society of GB</i> , See <i>Pharmaceutical Society of GB v Boots Cash Chemists Ltd—Borag, The</i> , See <i>Compania Financiera v Har Moor Tanker Corp, The Borag—</i>	
<i>Bormarin AB v IBM Investments Ltd</i> [1999] STC 301.....	365
<i>Bosman Ruling</i> , See <i>Hooper's Settlement Trusts, Re Bosman v Hooper—</i>	
<i>Boulton v Jones</i> (1857) 2 H & N 564.....	210
<i>Bradbury v Morgan</i> (1862) 1 H & C 249.....	30
<i>Brennan v Bolt Burdon</i> [2005] 1 QB 303.....	204
<i>Bridge v Campbell Discount Co</i> [1962] AC 600.....	402
<i>Brikom Investments Ltd v Carr</i> [1979] QB 467.....	71
<i>Brinkibon Ltd v Stahag Stahl</i> [1983] 2 AC 34.....	41, 48
<i>Brisbane v Dacres</i> (1813) 5 Taunt 143.....	426, 431
<i>British Reinforced Concrete Co v Schelff</i> [1921] 2 Ch 563.....	274, 293
<i>British Russian Gazette Ltd v Associated Newspapers Ltd</i> [1933] 2 KB 616.....	354, 356
<i>British Steel Corporation v Cleveland Bridge and Engineering Co</i> [1984] 1 All ER 504.....	26, 43, 45, 220, 336, 421, 430
<i>British Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co Ltd v Underground Electric Railways Co of London Ltd</i> [1912] AC 673.....	398
<i>Brogden v Metropolitan Railway Co</i> (1877) 2 App Cas 666.....	35, 37, 48
<i>Bull v Pitney Bowes</i> [1966] 1 WLR 273.....	273, 293
<i>Bunge Corporation v Tradax Export SA</i> [1981] 1 WLR 711.....	127, 374
<i>Bunn v Guy</i> (1803) 4 East 190.....	50
<i>Butler Machine Tool Co Ltd v Ex-Cell-O Corporation</i> [1979] 1 WLR 401.....	14, 44
<i>Byrne v Van Tienhoven</i> (1880) 5 CPD 344.....	28, 31, 438
<i>C & P Haulage v Middleton</i> [1993] 3 All ER 94.....	388
<i>CIBC Mortgages Ltd v Pitt</i> [1993] 4 All ER 433.....	240, 244, 256, 260
<i>Canada Steamship Lines Ltd v R</i> [1952] AC 192.....	146, 147
<i>Candler v Crane Christmas & Co</i> [1951] 2 KB 164.....	183, 184
<i>Caparo Industries plc v Dickman</i> [1990] 1 All ER 568.....	184
<i>Carlill v The Carbolic Smoke Ball Co Ltd</i> [1893] 1 QB 256.....	19, 24, 29, 38, 51, 95, 99, 176
<i>Carnduff v Rock and Another</i> (2001) <i>The Times</i> , 30 May.....	281
<i>Casey's Patents, Re, Stewart v Casey</i> [1892] 1 Ch 104.....	57
<i>Castle Phillips Finance Co Ltd v Piddington</i> (1995) 70 P & CR 592, [1995] 1 FLR 783.....	256
<i>Cehave NV v Bremer Handelsgesellschaft MbH, The Hansa Nord</i> [1976] QB 44.....	126, 134, 376
<i>Central London Property Trust Ltd v High Trees House Ltd</i> [1947] KB 130.....	69, 73, 356
<i>Chandler v Webster</i> [1904] 1 KB 493.....	367, 372

<i>Chapelton v Barry Urban District Council</i> [1940] 1 KB 532.....	104, 142
<i>Chaplin v Hicks</i> [1911] 2 KB 786.....	395, 399, 405
<i>Chaplin v Leslie Frewin (Publishers) Ltd</i> [1966] Ch 71.....	328
<i>Chapple v Cooper</i> (1844) 3 M & W 252.....	325
<i>Chappell & Co Ltd v Nestlé Co Ltd</i> [1960] AC 87.....	53, 73
<i>Charnock v Liverpool Corporation</i> [1968] 1 WLR 1498.....	122
<i>Chartbrook Ltd v Persimmon Homes Ltd</i> [2009] UKHL 38,.....	130, 131
<i>Charter v Sullivan</i> [1957] 2 QB 117.....	394, 404
<i>Chaudhry v Prabhakar</i> [1988] 3 All ER 718.....	184
<i>Cheese v Thomas</i> [1994] 1 FLR 118.....	250
<i>Cherrilow Ltd v Richard Butler-Creagh</i> [2011] EWCH 2525.....	181
<i>Chiemgauer Membrand und Zeltbau (formerly Koch Hightex GmbH) v New Millenium Experience Co Ltd (formerly Millenium Central Ltd)</i> (No 2) (2001) <i>The Times</i> , 16 January.....	378
<i>Chipsaway International Ltd v Errol Kerr</i> [2009] EWCA 320.....	285–286
<i>Cine Bes Filmcilik ve Yapimcilik v United International Pictures</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 1669.....	403
<i>Citibank NA v Brown Shipley & Co Ltd, Midland Bank v Brown Shipley & Co Ltd</i> [1991] 2 All ER 690.....	212
<i>City and Westminster Properties (1934) Ltd v Mudd</i> [1958] 2 All ER 733.....	107–108
<i>Clarion Ltd v National Provident Institution</i> [2000] 2 All ER 265.....	216
<i>Clarke v Dickson</i> (1858) 120 ER 463, (1858) EB & E 148.....	194, 413, 418
<i>Clef Aquitaine SARL v Laporte Materials (Barrow) Ltd</i> [2000] 3 All ER 493.....	182
<i>Clements v London and North Western Railway Company</i> [1894] 2 QB 482.....	327
<i>Collier v P & M J Wright (Holdings) Ltd</i> [2008] 1 WLR 643.....	71
<i>Collins v Godefroy</i> (1831) 109 ER 1040.....	58, 68, 434
<i>Combe v Combe</i> [1951] 2 KB 215.....	70, 355
<i>Compagnie de Commerce et Commissions SARL v Parkinson Stove Co</i> [1953] 2 Lloyd’s Rep 487.....	36
<i>Compania Financiera ‘Soleada’ SA, Netherlands Antilles Ships Management Co and Dammers and van der Heide’s Shipping and Trading Co v Hamoor Tanker Corp, The Borag</i> [1981] 1 WLR 274.....	399
<i>Condor v The Baron Knights</i> [1966] 1 WLR 87.....	359
<i>Cook v Spanish Holidays</i> (1960) <i>The Times</i> , 6 February.....	400
<i>Cooper v Phibbs</i> (1867) LR 2 HL 149.....	201, 214, 224
<i>Cooper v Willis</i> (1906) 22 TLR 582.....	282
<i>Cope v Rowlands</i> (1836) 2 M & W 149.....	264, 266
<i>Cornish v Midland Bank plc</i> [1985] 3 All ER 513.....	250
<i>Corpe v Overton</i> (1833) 10 Bing 252.....	330, 333
<i>Cosgrove v Horsefell</i> (1945) 62 TLR 140.....	153
<i>Couchman v Hill</i> [1947] KB 554.....	101, 178
<i>Couturier v Hastie</i> (1852) 5 HLC 673.....	199–200, 214, 224
<i>Craddock Bros Ltd v Hunt</i> [1923] 2 Ch 136.....	217, 224, 415, 418
<i>Craven-Ellis v Canons Ltd</i> [1936] 2 KB 403.....	430, 431
<i>Cricklewood Property and Investment Trust Ltd v Leighton’s Investment Trust Ltd</i> [1945] AC 221.....	362
<i>Crossley v Faithful & Gould Holdings Ltd</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 293; [2004] IRLR 377.....	115
<i>CTI Group v Transclear SA (The Mary Nour)</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 856.....	365
<i>Cumming v Ince</i> (1847) 11 QBD 112.....	228
<i>Cundy v Lindsay</i> (1878) 3 App Cas 459.....	209, 212, 214, 224
<i>Currie v Misa</i> (1875) 1 App Cas 554.....	50
<i>Curtis v Chemical Cleaning and Dyeing Co Ltd</i> [1951] 1 KB 805.....	152, 156
<i>Cutter v Powell</i> (1795) 6 Term Rep 320.....	344–345, 347, 351
<i>DC Builders v Rees</i> [1965] 3 All ER 837.....	68, 71, 230, 258
<i>Dakin (H) & Co v Lee</i> [1916] 1 KB 566.....	348
<i>Dalrymple v Dalrymple</i> (1811) 2 Hag Con 54.....	77
<i>Dann v Curzon</i> (1910) 104 LT 66.....	279, 286, 293

<i>Darlington BC v Wiltshier Northern Ltd</i> [1995] 1 WLR 68.....	303, 320
<i>Davies & Co Ltd v William Old</i> (1969) 67 LGR 395	34, 43, 48
<i>Davis Contractors Ltd v Fareham UDC</i> [1956] AC 696.....	357–358, 364–365, 372
<i>Day Morris Associates v Voyce</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 189; [2003] All ER (D) 368.....	37
<i>De Barnady v Harding</i> (1853) 8 Exch 822.....	430, 431
<i>De Francesco v Barnum</i> (1890) 45 Ch D 430.....	327, 340, 407, 417
<i>De La Bere v Pearson Ltd</i> [1908] 1 KB 280	389
<i>Deacons v Bridge</i> [1984] AC 705.....	410
<i>Denny, Mott & Dickson Ltd v James B Fraser & Co Ltd</i> [1944] 1 All ER 678	361, 371
<i>Derry v Peek</i> (1889) 14 App Cas 337	97, 181, 183, 185, 189, 194
<i>Dickinson v Dodds</i> (1876) 2 Ch D 463.....	28, 31
<i>Dillon v Baltic Shipping Co Ltd, The Mikhail Lermontov</i> [1991] 2 Lloyd's Rep 155, NSW	143
<i>Dimmock v Hallett</i> (1866) LR 2 Ch App 21.....	193, 194
<i>Dimskal Shipping Co SA v International Transport Workers Federation, The Evia Luck</i> [1991] 2 AC 152	232
<i>Director General of Fair Trading v First National Bank plc</i> [2002] 1 All ER 97	164
<i>Doyle v Olby (Ironmongers) Ltd</i> [1969] 2 QB 158.....	182
<i>Doyle v White City Stadium Ltd</i> [1935] 1 KB 110.....	328
<i>Duffen v Fra Bo Spa</i> [2000] Lloyd's Rep 180.....	403
<i>Dunlop v Lambert</i> (1839) 6 Cl & Fin 600	302–303, 304, 306, 307, 320, 321, 322
<i>Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co v New Garage and Motor Co</i> [1914] AC 79.....	402–403, 405
<i>Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co v Selfridge & Co Ltd</i> [1915] AC 847	50, 73, 296, 298, 320, 322, 434
<i>Dyster v Randall and Sons</i> [1926] Ch 932.....	408, 417
<i>Eastham v Newcastle United FC Ltd</i> [1964] Ch 413	273
<i>Edgington v Fitzmaurice</i> (1885) 29 Ch D 459.....	175, 178
<i>Edmonds v Lawson</i> [2000] 2 WLR 1091	53
<i>Edwards v Carter</i> [1893] AC 360	329
<i>Edwards v Skyways Ltd</i> [1969] 1 WLR 349.....	81, 85, 87
<i>Egan v Static Control Components (Europe) Ltd</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 392	130
<i>English Hop Growers v Dering</i> [1928] 2 KB 124.....	275
<i>Entores Ltd v Miles Far East Corporation</i> [1955] 2 QB 327	40
<i>Equitable Life Assurance Society v Hyman</i> [2000] 3 All ER 961	115
<i>Errington v Errington & Woods</i> [1952] 1 KB 290	29, 32
<i>Esso Petroleum Co Ltd v Commissioners of Customs and Excise</i> [1976] 1 All ER 117.....	81, 85, 87
<i>Esso Petroleum Co Ltd v Harper's Garage (Stourport) Ltd</i> [1968] AC 269, HL.....	275, 276
<i>Esso Petroleum Co Ltd v Marden</i> [1976] QB 801	96, 97, 184
<i>Evans (J) & Son (Portsmouth) Ltd v Andrea Merzario Ltd</i> [1976] 1 WLR 1078.....	107, 152
<i>Evia, The</i> [1983] 1 AC 736.....	232, 371
<i>Experience Hendrix LLC v PPX Enterprises Inc</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 323.....	398
<i>Faccenda Chicken v Fowler</i> [1986] 1 All ER 617.....	411, 418
<i>Falcke v Gray</i> (1859) 4 Drew 651.....	406
<i>Farley v Skinner</i> [2001] 3 WLR 899, HL.....	396, 404
<i>Fawcett v Smethurst</i> [1914] 84 KB 473.....	326
<i>Fellowes v Fisher</i> [1976] QB 122.....	271, 410
<i>Felthouse v Bindley</i> (1863) 142 ER 1037.....	37, 48, 438
<i>Ferrometal SARL v Mediterranean Shipping Co SA, The Simona</i> [1989] 2 All ER 742.....	377, 382
<i>Fibrosa Spolka Akcyjna v Fairbairn Lawson Combe Barbour Ltd (The Fibrosa case)</i> [1943] AC 32	366, 367, 368, 372, 422, 423–424, 431
<i>Financings Ltd v Stimson</i> [1962] 3 All ER 386.....	31
<i>Finelvet AG v Vinava Shipping Co Ltd</i> [1983] 2 All ER 658	360
<i>Fitch v Dewes</i> [1921] 2 AC 158.....	271, 293, 409, 418
<i>Fletcher v Krell</i> (1873) 42 LJ QB 55.....	192
<i>Flight v Bolland</i> (1828) 4 Russ 298	408, 417
<i>Foakes v Beer</i> (1884) 9 App Cas 605.....	69, 71

<i>Foley v Classique Coaches Ltd</i> [1934] 2 KB 1	26
<i>Forster v Suggett</i> (1918) 35 TLR 87	269
<i>Foster v Driscoll</i> [1929] 1 KB 470	280
<i>Fothergill v Rowland</i> (1873) LR 17 Eq 132	406, 417
<i>Freeman & Lockyer v Buckhurst Park Properties (Mangal) Ltd</i> [1964] 2 QB 480	313
<i>Frost v Knight</i> (1872) LR 7 Exch 111	376, 382
<i>Gallie v Lee, See Saunders (Executrix of the Estate of Rose Maud Gallie) v Anglian Building Society—Galoo Ltd and Others v Bright Grahame Murray</i> [1995] 1 All ER 16	388
<i>Gamerco SA v ICM/Fair Warning Agency</i> [1995] 1 WLR 1226	369
<i>George Mitchell Ltd v Finney Lock Seeds Ltd</i> [1983] 2 AC 803	151, 162
<i>George Wimpey UK Ltd v VI Construction Ltd</i> (2005) 103 Con LR 67, [2005] EWCA Civ 77	217
<i>Glassbrook Bros v Glamorgan County Council</i> [1925] AC 270	59, 68, 434
<i>Godley v Perry</i> [1960] 1 WLR 9, QBD	121
<i>Goldsoll v Goldman</i> [1915] 1 Ch 292	284–285, 293
<i>Gore v Gibson</i> (1845) 13 M & W 623	334, 340
<i>Grant v Australian Knitting Mills Ltd</i> [1936] AC 85	120
<i>Great Northern Railway Co v Swaffield</i> (1874) LR 9 Exch 132	313
<i>Great Peace Shipping Ltd v Tsavliris Salvage (International) Ltd</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 1407, CA	171, 203–203, 216, 218–221, 223, 224
<i>Green v Russell</i> [1959] 2 QB 226	300, 320
<i>Gregory & Parker v Williams</i> (1817) 3 Mer 582	299, 320
<i>Guthing v Lynn</i> (1831) 2 B & Ad 232	26, 31
<i>HIH Casualty and General Insurance v Chase Manhattan Bank</i> [2003] UKHL 6; [2003] 2 Lloyd’s Rep 61	146
<i>Hadley v Baxendale</i> (1854) 9 Exch 341	378, 389–393, 404
<i>Hall v Woolston Hall Leisure Ltd</i> [2000] 4 All ER 787	289
<i>Hands v Simpson, Fawcett & Co</i> (1928) 44 TLR 295	192
<i>Hanover Insurance Brokers Ltd and Christchurch Insurance Brokers Ltd v Schapiro</i> [1994] IRLR 82	270
<i>Harlingdon & Leinster Enterprises Ltd v Christopher Hull Fine Art Ltd</i> [1990] 3 WLR 13	129
<i>Harmony Shipping Co SA v Davis</i> [1979] 3 All ER 177	281, 293
<i>Harris v Wyre Forest District Council</i> [1988] 1 AC 831	184
<i>Hartley v Ponsonby</i> (1857) 7 E & B 872	60, 65, 66, 68, 72, 73, 434
<i>Hartog v Colin & Shields</i> [1939] 3 All ER 566	207, 214, 224
<i>Harvela Investments Ltd v Royal Trust Co of Canada Ltd</i> [1986] AC 207	20, 31
<i>Harvey v Facey</i> [1893] AC 552	31
<i>Hayes v James and Charles Dodd</i> [1990] 2 All ER 815	401
<i>Hazell v Hammersmith and Fulham London Borough Council</i> [1992] 2 AC 1	427
<i>Head v Tattersall</i> (1871) LR 7 Exch 7	414
<i>Hedley Byrne & Co Ltd v Heller & Partners Ltd</i> [1964] AC 465	183–187, 189, 190, 194
<i>Hely-Hutchinson v Brayhead Ltd</i> [1967] 3 All ER 98, CA	311
<i>Henderson v Merrett Syndicates Ltd</i> [1994] 3 All ER 506	184, 189
<i>Henthorn v Fraser</i> [1892] 2 Ch 27	39
<i>Herbert Morris Ltd v Saxelby</i> [1916] AC 688, HL	268, 269
<i>Hermann v Charlesworth</i> [1905] 2 KB 123	283, 293
<i>Herne Bay Steamboat Co v Hutton</i> [1903] 2 KB 683	362, 371
<i>Heywood v Wellers</i> [1976] QB 446	401
<i>Hillas & Co Ltd v Arcos Ltd</i> (1932) 147 LT 503	111, 123
<i>Hilton v Barker Booth and Eastwood</i> [2005] 1 All ER 651	193
<i>Hochster v De la Tour</i> (1853) 2 E & B 678	375, 382
<i>Hoening v Isaacs</i> [1952] 2 All ER 176	348, 350, 351
<i>Hollier v Rambler Motors (AMC) Ltd</i> [1972] 2 QB 71	145, 156
<i>Holwell Securities v Hughes</i> [1974] 1 WLR 155	40

<i>Home Counties Dairies Ltd v Skilton</i> [1970] 1 WLR 526.....	272, 284, 293, 411
<i>Hong Kong Fir Shipping Co Ltd v Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd (The Hong Kong Fir Case)</i> [1962] 2 QB 26.....	126, 134
<i>Hooper's Settlement Trusts, Re Bosman v Hooper</i> [1948] Ch 586; [1948] 1 All ER 261.....	273
<i>Hope v Walter</i> [1900] 1 Ch 257.....	408, 417
<i>Household Fire Insurance v Grant</i> (1879) 4 Ex D 216.....	39, 48
<i>Howard Marine & Dredging Co Ltd v Ogden & Sons (Excavating) Ltd</i> [1978] QB 574.....	186
<i>Howard v Shirlstar Container Transport Ltd</i> [1990] 3 All ER 366.....	287
<i>Hughes v Asset Managers plc</i> [1995] 3 All ER 669.....	266
<i>Hughes v Liverpool and Victoria Legal Friendly Society</i> [1916] 2 KB 482.....	288
<i>Hunt v Silk</i> (1804) 5 East 449.....	424, 431
<i>Hurst v Picture Theatres</i> [1915] 1 KB 1.....	400
<i>Hutton v Warren</i> (1836) 150 ER 517.....	109, 123
<i>Hyde v Wrench</i> (1840) 49 ER 132.....	33, 48, 438
<i>Hyman v Hyman</i> [1929] AC 601.....	282
<i>Imperial Loan Co v Stone</i> [1892] 1 QB 599.....	334, 340
<i>Ingram v Little</i> [1960] 3 All ER 332.....	210, 212, 214
<i>Inland Revenue Commissioners v Fry</i> (2001) NLJ, 7 December.....	25, 31
<i>Interfoto Picture Library Ltd v Stiletto Visual Programmes Ltd</i> [1988] 2 WLR 615.....	9, 144
<i>Introductions Ltd v National Provincial Bank Ltd</i> [1970] Ch 199.....	336
<i>Investors Compensation Scheme Ltd v West Bromwich Building Society</i> [1998] 1 All ER 98.....	129, 130
<i>JEB Fasteners Ltd v Marks Bloom & Co Ltd</i> [1983] 1 All ER 583.....	177
<i>Jackson v Horizon Holidays</i> [1975] 1 WLR 1468.....	305, 319, 320, 400
<i>Jackson v Royal Bank of Scotland plc</i> [2005] UKHL 3; [2005] 2 All ER 71.....	392
<i>Jackson v Union Marine Insurance Co Ltd</i> (1874) LR 10 CP 125.....	359, 366
<i>Jarvis v Swan Tours Ltd</i> [1973] 1 QB 233; [1973] 1 All ER 71.....	188, 400, 405
<i>Jon Beauforte Ltd, Re</i> [1953] Ch 131.....	336
<i>Jones v Daniel</i> [1894] 2 Ch 332.....	33
<i>Jones v Humphreys</i> [1902] 1 KB 10.....	316
<i>Jones v Padavatton</i> [1969] 1 WLR 328.....	80, 84, 85
<i>Jones v Vernons' Pools Ltd</i> [1938] 2 All ER 626.....	82, 85, 87
<i>Julian v Furby</i> (1982) 132 NLJ 64.....	84
<i>Karsales (Harrow) Ltd v Wallis</i> [1956] 1 WLR 936.....	147–148
<i>Kearley v Thomson</i> (1890) 24 QBD 742.....	281, 288
<i>Kelly v Solari</i> (1841) 9 M & W 54.....	425, 431
<i>Kelner v Baxter</i> (1866) LR 2 CP 174.....	312
<i>Kendall (Henry) & Sons v William Lillico & Sons Ltd</i> [1969] 2 AC 31.....	118
<i>Kenyon-Brown v Desmond Banks & Co</i> (1999) 149 NLJ 1832.....	255
<i>Kerr v Morris</i> [1987] Ch 90.....	410
<i>Kings Norton Metal Co Ltd v Edridge, Merrett & Co Ltd (The Kings Norton Metal Case)</i> (1897)14 TLR 98.....	209
<i>Kingsnorth Trust v Bell</i> [1986] 1 All ER 423.....	251–252
<i>Kiriri Cotton Co Ltd v Dewani</i> [1960] AC 192.....	288, 426, 431
<i>Kleinwort Benson Ltd v Lincoln City Council</i> [1999] 2 AC 349.....	427, 431
<i>Kleinwort Benson Ltd v Malaysia Mining Corporation</i> [1989] 1 WLR 379.....	82, 85, 87
<i>Kores Manufacturing Co v Kolok Manufacturing Co</i> [1959] Ch 108.....	273
<i>Koufos v C Czarnikow Ltd, The Heron II</i> [1969] 1 AC 350.....	391
<i>Krell v Henry</i> [1903] 2 KB 740.....	361, 367, 371
<i>L'Estrange v Graucob</i> [1934] 2 KB 394.....	103, 108, 137, 151, 156, 221
<i>Lagunas Nitrate Co v Lagunas Syndicate</i> [1899] 2 Ch 392.....	190–191, 413
<i>Lampleigh v Braithwaite</i> (1615) 80 ER 255.....	55, 57, 61, 73
<i>Lancashire Loans Co v Black</i> [1933] 1 KB 380.....	242, 249, 260

<i>Larner v LCC</i> [1949] 2 KB 683	426, 431
<i>Lauritzen (J) AS v Wijsmuller BV, The Super Servant Two</i> [1990] 1 Lloyd's Rep 1	364
<i>Law Debenture Trust Corporation plc v Ural Caspian Corporation Ltd and Others</i> [1993] 2 All ER 355	302
<i>Lawson v Supasink Ltd</i> (1984) 3 TRL 37	121
<i>Lazard Bros & Co Ltd v Fairfield Properties (Mayfair) Ltd</i> (1977) 121 SJ 793	407
<i>Leaf v International Galleries</i> [1950] 2 KB 86	191, 194, 204, 206, 224, 385, 414, 418
<i>Leeds Rugby Ltd v Harris</i> [2005] EWHC 2290	269
<i>Les Affréteurs Réunis SA v Leopold Walford (London Ltd) (Walford's Case)</i> [1919] AC 801	110, 300
<i>Leslie (R) Ltd v Sheill</i> [1914] 3 KB 607	331, 340
<i>Lewis v Avery</i> [1972] 1 QB 198	211, 214, 224
<i>Lidl UK GmbH v Hertford Foods Ltd</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 938 (20 June, Court of Appeal)	104–105
<i>Linden Gardens Ltd v Lenesta Sludge Disposals Ltd</i> [1994] AC 85	306, 307
<i>Liverpool City Council v Irwin</i> [1976] 2 WLR 562	113, 116, 123
<i>Lloyd's v Harper</i> (1880) 16 Ch D 290	305, 306
<i>Lloyds Bank v Bundy</i> [1979] QB 326	242
<i>Locker and Woolf Ltd v Western Australian Insurance Co Ltd</i> [1936] 1 KB 408	192–193, 194
<i>London and Northern Bank, ex parte Jones, Re</i> [1900] 1 Ch 220	39
<i>London Joint Stock Bank v MacMillan</i> [1918] AC 777	388, 404
<i>Long v Lloyd</i> [1958] 1 WLR 753	191, 194, 414, 418
<i>Lord Strathcona Steamship Co v Dominion Coal Co</i> [1926] AC 108	301–302
<i>Lumley v Wagner</i> (1852) 42 ER 687	412, 418
<i>McGowan v Radio Buxton</i> (2001) (unreported)	82, 87
<i>McManus v Fortescue</i> [1907] 2 KB 1	22
<i>McNally v Welltrade International Ltd</i> [1978] IRLR 497	186
<i>McRae v Commonwealth Disposals Commission</i> (1950) 84 CLR 377, High Court of Australia	200, 219
<i>Magee v Pennine Insurance Co Ltd</i> [1969] 2 QB 507	215–216, 219
<i>Mahmoud and Ispahani, Re</i> [1921] 2 KB 716	264, 292
<i>Manchester Diocesan Council for Education v Commercial and General Investments Ltd</i> [1969] 3 All ER 159	40
<i>Maredelanto Cia Naviera SA v Bergbau-Handel GmbH, The Mihalis Angelos</i> [1970] 3 All ER 125	129
<i>Maritime National Fish Ltd v Ocean Trawlers Ltd</i> [1935] AC 524	364, 372
<i>Marles v Trant</i> [1954] 1 QB 29	289, 293
<i>Martell v Consett Iron Co Ltd</i> [1955] Ch 363	282
<i>Massey v Midland Bank</i> [1995] 1 All ER 929	244, 254, 260
<i>Matthews v Baxter</i> (1873) LR 8 Exch 132	334, 340
<i>Merritt v Merritt</i> [1970] 1 WLR 1211	79, 85, 87
<i>Metropolitan Water Board v Dick Kerr & Co Ltd</i> [1918] AC 119	360, 371
<i>Midland Bank v Shepherd</i> [1988] 3 All ER 17	236, 241, 243
<i>Miller Paving Ltd v B Gottardo Construction Ltd</i> (2007) ONCA 422, 31 BLR (4th) 33, 62 CLR (3d) 161, 86 OR (3d) 161	204
<i>Mohamed v Alaga</i> [1999] 3 All ER 699	279
<i>Mont (JA) (UK) Ltd v Mills</i> (1994) <i>The Times</i> , 5 May	272
<i>Moorcock, The</i> (1889) 14 PD 64	110–111, 123
<i>Moore & Co and Landauer & Co's Arbitration, Re</i> [1921] 2 KB 519	117, 346, 351
<i>Morgan v Manser</i> [1948] 1 KB 184	360
<i>Moses v Macferlan</i> (1760) 2 Burr 1005	422
<i>Mullens v Miller</i> (1822) 22 Ch D 194	311
<i>Museprime Properties Ltd v Adhill Properties Ltd</i> [1990] EGLR 196	177–178

<i>Napier v The National Business Agency</i> [1951] 2 All ER 264.....	280, 285, 293
<i>Nash v Inman</i> [1908] 2 KB 1	325–326, 340
<i>National Carriers Ltd v Panalpina (Northern) Ltd</i> [1981] AC 675	363
<i>National Westminster Bank plc v Morgan</i> [1985] AC 686	237, 240, 243, 245
<i>New Zealand Shipping Co Ltd v AM Satterthwaite & Co Ltd, The Eurymedon</i> [1975] AC 154	44, 62, 68, 154, 156, 308, 320, 434
<i>Niblett Ltd v Confectioners' Materials Co Ltd</i> [1921] 3 KB 387	117
<i>Nisshin Shipping Co v Cleaves & Co Ltd</i> [2003] EWHC 2602; [2004] 1 All ER (Comm) 481	318–319
<i>Nordenfelt v Maxim Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Co</i> [1894] AC 535, HL.....	267, 274, 293
<i>North Ocean Shipping Co Ltd v Hyundai Construction Co Ltd, The Atlantic Baron</i> [1979] QB 705.....	233, 259
<i>Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society Ltd v Price Ltd</i> [1934] AC 455	425, 431
<i>Nurdin and Peacock plc v D B Ramsden & Co Ltd (No 2)</i> [1999] 1 All ER 941.....	427
<i>O'Brien v Mirror Group Newspapers Ltd</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 1279.....	104, 108
<i>Oakes v Turquand and Harding</i> (1867) LR 2 HL 325.....	415, 418
<i>Occidental Worldwide Investment Corporation v Skibs A/S Avanti, The Siboen</i> <i>and The Sibotre</i> [1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep 293.....	231
<i>Olley v Marlborough Court Hotel</i> [1949] 1 KB 532.....	104, 137, 141, 156
<i>Oscar Chess Ltd v Williams</i> [1957] 1 WLR 370.....	9, 102, 108
<i>Overland Shoes Ltd v Shenkers Ltd</i> [1998] 1 Lloyd's Rep 498.....	151
<i>Page One Records v Britton</i> [1968] 1 WLR 157.....	412, 418
<i>Pagnan SpA v Feed Products Ltd</i> [1987] 2 Lloyd's Rep 601.....	45
<i>Panayiotou v Sony Music International (UK) Ltd</i> [1994] 1 All ER 755	276
<i>Pao On v Lau Yiu Long</i> [1980] AC 614.....	57, 61, 65, 68, 73, 231, 434, 435
<i>Paradine v Jane</i> (1647) Aleyn 26.....	356, 357, 363, 367, 371, 383
<i>Paragon Finance v Nash</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 1466.....	113
<i>Parker v Clarke</i> [1960] 1 WLR 286.....	80, 87
<i>Parker v South Eastern Railway Co</i> (1877) 2 CPD 416	142
<i>Parkinson v The College of Ambulance Ltd</i> [1925] 2 KB 1	281, 286, 293
<i>Pars Technology Ltd v City Link Transport Holdings Ltd</i> [1999] EWCA Civ 1822.....	35
<i>Parsons (H) (Livestock) Ltd v Uttley Ingham</i> [1978] QB 791.....	391–392, 404
<i>Pearce v Brooks</i> (1866) LR 1 Ex 213	283, 293
<i>Peco Arts Inc v Hazlitt Gallery Ltd</i> [1983] 1 WLR 1315.....	205–206, 224
<i>Peyman v Lanjani</i> [1985] 2 WLR 154	176
<i>Pharmaceutical Society of GB v Boots Cash Chemists Ltd</i> [1953] 1 All ER 482.....	16, 31
<i>Phillips v Brooks Ltd</i> [1919] 2 KB 243.....	210, 211
<i>Photo Productions Ltd v Securicor Transport Ltd (Securicor case)</i> [1980] AC 827	6, 147, 149, 155, 156, 372
<i>Picton Jones & Co v Arcadia Developments</i> [1989] 3 EG 85	282
<i>Pilkington v Wood</i> [1953] 2 All ER 810	398
<i>Pinnel's Case (Pinnel's rule)</i> (1602) 5 Co Rep 117a; 77 ER 237	68, 69, 72, 354, 356
<i>Pioneer Shipping Ltd v BTP Tioxide Ltd, The Nema</i> [1981] 2 All ER 1030.....	360
<i>Planche v Colburn</i> (1831) 8 Bing 14.....	349, 351, 429
<i>Plowman (G W) & Son Ltd v Ash</i> [1964] 1 WLR 568.....	271
<i>Posner v Scott-Lewis</i> [1987] 3 WLR 53.....	407, 417
<i>Poussard v Spiers and Pond</i> (1876) 1 QBD 410.....	124, 134
<i>Powell v Lee</i> (1908) 99 LT 284	36
<i>Price v Easton</i> (1833) 110 ER 518.....	296, 297
<i>Proform Sports Management Ltd v Proactive Sports Management Ltd and another</i> [2006] All ER (D) 38	328
<i>Pym v Campbell</i> (1856) 119 ER 903	107

<i>R v Attorney General for England and Wales</i> [2003] UKPC 22.....	229–230, 247
<i>R v Clarke</i> (1927) 40 CLR 227.....	25
<i>R and B Customs Brokers Co Ltd v United Dominions Trust Ltd</i> [1988] 1 All ER 847.....	159
<i>Raffles v Wichelhaus</i> (1864) 159 ER 375, (1864) 2 H & C 906.....	206, 214, 224
<i>Ramsgate Victoria Hotel Co Ltd v Montefiore</i> (1866) LR 1 Ex 109.....	30
<i>Reardon Smith Line Ltd v Hansen-Tangen</i> [1976] 1 WLR 989.....	127, 134, 346
<i>Redgrave v Hurd</i> (1881) 20 Ch D 1.....	189
<i>Reichman v Beveridge</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 1659.....	399
<i>Reynolds v Atherton</i> (1921) 125 LT 690.....	30
<i>Rice v Great Yarmouth Borough Council</i> (2000) <i>The Times</i> , 30 June.....	376
<i>Robb v Hammersmith and Fulham LBC</i> [1991] IRLR 72.....	407
<i>Robinson v Davidson</i> (1871) LR 6 Ex 269.....	359, 371
<i>Robinson v Harman</i> (1848) 154 ER 363.....	387, 404
<i>Robinson v HM Customs and Excise</i> (2000) <i>The Times</i> , 28 April.....	83
<i>Rogers v Parish (Scarborough) Ltd</i> [1987] 2 All ER 232.....	118
<i>Rolled Steel Products (Holdings) Ltd v British Steel Corporation</i> [1985] 2 WLR 908.....	336
<i>Roscorla v Thomas</i> (1842) 3 QBD 234.....	56, 177
<i>Rose and Frank Co v J R Crompton & Bros</i> [1925] AC 445; HL, reversing [1923] 2 KB 261, CA.....	83
<i>Routledge v Grant</i> (1828) 4 Bing 653.....	27, 31, 438
<i>Routledge v McKay</i> [1954] 1 WLR 615.....	102, 103, 108
<i>Rowland v Divall</i> [1923] 2 KB 500.....	117, 424
<i>Royal Bank of Scotland plc v Etridge (No 2) and other appeals</i> [2001] UKHL 44.....	245–246, 256, 257, 260, 392
<i>Royal Trust Co of Canada v Harvela Investments</i> , See <i>Harvela Investments v Royal Trust Co of Canada</i> —	
<i>Royscot Trust Ltd v Rogerson</i> [1991] 3 All ER 294.....	186–187, 189
<i>RTS Flexible Systems Ltd v Molkerei Alois Muller GmbH & Co (UK Production)</i> [2010] UKSC14.....	43–44
<i>Ruxley Electronics and Construction Ltd v Forsyth; Laddingford Enclosures Ltd v Forsyth</i> [1995] 3 All ER 268, HL.....	396, 401, 405
<i>Ryan v Mutual Tontine Westminster Chambers Association</i> [1893] 1 Ch 116.....	406
<i>Said v Butt</i> [1920] 3 KB 497.....	314
<i>Saunders (Executrix of the Estate of Rose Maud Gallie) v Anglian Building Society</i> [1971] AC 1004.....	214, 221, 224
<i>Schawel v Reade</i> [1913] 2 IR 64.....	110
<i>Schroeder Music Publishing Co Ltd v Macaulay</i> [1974] 1 WLR 1308.....	275
<i>Schuler (L) AG v Wickman Machine Tool Sales Ltd</i> [1974] AC 235.....	128, 134, 373–74, 382
<i>Scotson v Pegg</i> (1861) 6 H & N 295.....	60, 434, 435
<i>Scott v Avery</i> (1856) 5 HL Cas 81.....	266
<i>Scriven Bros & Co v Hindley & Co</i> [1913] 3 KB 564.....	206–207
<i>Scruttons Ltd v Midland Silicones Ltd</i> [1962] 1 All ER 1, [1962] AC 446.....	153, 156, 307, 320
<i>Selectmove, Re</i> [1995] 2 All ER 531.....	71–73, 435
<i>Shadwell v Shadwell</i> (1860) 9 CBNS 159.....	60, 434, 435
<i>Shanklin Pier v Detel Products Ltd</i> [1951] 2 KB 854.....	55, 72, 308, 320
<i>Sharneyford Supplies Ltd v Edge</i> [1987] Ch 305, reversing [1985] 1 All ER 976.....	186
<i>Shaw v Groom</i> [1970] 2 QB 504.....	265
<i>Shearson Lehman Hutton Inc v Maclaine Watson & Co Ltd (No 2)</i> [1990] 3 All ER 732.....	395
<i>Shell (UK) Ltd v Lostock Garage Ltd</i> [1977] 1 All ER 481.....	112–113
<i>Shine v General Guarantee Corporation</i> [1988] 1 All ER 911.....	119
<i>Shipton Anderson & Co and Harrison Bros & Co, Re</i> [1915] 3 KB 676.....	361, 371
<i>Shirlaw v Southern Foundries Ltd</i> [1939] 2 KB 206.....	111, 123
<i>Shogun Finance Ltd v Hudson</i> [2003] UKHL 62.....	212
<i>Simpkins v Pays</i> [1955] 1 WLR 975.....	80, 85, 87
<i>Sirius International Insurance Co (Publ) v FAI General Insurance Ltd</i> [2005] 1 All ER 191.....	130

<i>Skeate v Beale</i> (1840) 11 A & E 983	229
<i>Smith v Eric S Bush</i> [1990] 1 AC 831	161, 184
<i>Smith v Hughes</i> (1871) LR 6 QB 597	207, 214, 224
<i>Smith v Marwood</i> (1845) 14 M & W 452	264
<i>Smith, Hogg & Co v Black Sea Insurance</i> [1939] 2 All ER 855	389
<i>Smith New Court Securities v Scrimgeour Vickers</i> [1996] 4 All ER 769	182–83, 189
<i>Snelling v John G Snelling Ltd</i> [1973] 1 QB 87	304, 320
<i>Solle v Butcher</i> [1950] 1 KB 671	202–3, 215, 216, 218, 220, 223, 224
<i>Spice Girls Ltd v Aprilia World Service BV</i> [2000] EMLR 478	176
<i>Spiro v Lintern</i> [1973] 3 All ER 319	312–13
<i>Spring v National Amalgamated Stevedores and Dockers Society</i> [1956] 1 WLR 585	112
<i>Springwell Navigation Corporation v J P Morgan Chase Bank</i> [2010] EWCA Civ 1221	175
<i>Spurling (J) Ltd v Bradshaw</i> [1956] 1 WLR 561	137–138, 141
<i>St John Shipping Corporation v Joseph Rank Ltd</i> [1956] 3 All ER 683	265–266
<i>Staniforth v Lyall</i> (1830) 7 Bing 169	393, 405
<i>Stansbie v Troman</i> [1948] 2 KB 48	388–389
<i>Startup v Macdonald</i> (1843) 6 Man & G 593	350, 351
<i>Statoil ASA v Louis Dreyfus Energy Services LP; The Harriette N</i> [2008] EWHC 2257 (Comm); [2009] 1 All ER (Comm) 1035	216
<i>Steinberg v Scala (Leeds) Ltd</i> [1923] 2 Ch 452	329–330, 333, 340
<i>Steven v Bromley</i> [1919] 2 KB 722	429–430, 431
<i>Stevenson v McLean</i> (1880) 5 QBD 346	34, 48
<i>Stilk v Myrick</i> (1809) 170 ER 1168	58–59, 80, 62–68, 72–75, 434
<i>Stocznia Gdanska SA v Latvian Shipping Co</i> [1998] 1 WLR 574, HL	397
<i>Stocznia Gdynia SA v Gearbulk Holdings Ltd</i> [2009] EWCA Civ 75	378
<i>Suisse Atlantique Société d'Armement Maritime SA v NV Rotterdamsche Kolen Centrale</i> (<i>The Suisse Atlantique Case</i>) [1967] 1 AC 361	148
<i>Sumpter v Hedges</i> [1898] 1 QB 673	347, 351, 353
<i>Sybron Corporation v Rochem Ltd</i> [1984] Ch 112	208
<i>TSB Bank plc v Camfield</i> [1995] 1 All ER 951	256, 260
<i>Taddy v Sterious</i> [1904] 1 Ch 354	301, 320
<i>Tamplin v James</i> (1880) 15 Ch D 215	216–217
<i>Tate v Williamson</i> (1866) LR 2 Ch App 55	193
<i>Taylor v Caldwell</i> (1863) 32 LJ QB 164	357–359, 361–363, 371
<i>Taylor v Laird</i> (1856) 25 LJ Ex 329	24, 31, 438
<i>Taylor v Webb</i> [1937] 2 QB 283	347, 351
<i>Templiss Properties Ltd v Hyams</i> [1999] EGCS 60	217
<i>Thomas v Thomas</i> (1842) 2 QB 851	50, 51, 73
<i>Thomas Witter Ltd v TBP Industries Ltd</i> [1996] 2 All ER 573	182, 188
<i>Thompson v T Lohan (Plant Hire) Ltd & J W Hurdiss Ltd</i> [1987] 1 WLR 649	160
<i>Thompson (W L) Ltd v Robinson Gunmakers Ltd</i> [1955] Ch 177	394
<i>Thornton v Shoe Lane Parking Ltd</i> [1971] 2 QB 163	104, 143, 156
<i>Tinsley v Milligan</i> [1993] 3 WLR 126	287
<i>Transfield Shipping Inc. v Mercador Shipping Inc. (The Achilles)</i> [2008] UKHL 48	392–393
<i>Tulk v Moxhay</i> (1848) 41 ER 1143	301, 302, 320
<i>Tweddle v Atkinson</i> (1861) 121 ER 762	54, 73, 295, 297, 319, 320
<i>Universe Tankships Incorporated of Monrovia v International Transport Workers Federation,</i> <i>The Universal Sentinel</i> [1983] 1 AC 366	232
<i>Upton RDC v Powell</i> [1942] 1 All ER 220	429, 431
<i>Vaswani v Italian Motor Cars Ltd</i> [1996] 1 WLR 270, PC	146
<i>Victoria Laundry Ltd v Newman Industries Ltd</i> [1949] 2 KB 528	390, 404

<i>Walford v Miles</i> [1992] 2 AC 128	45
<i>Ward v Byham</i> [1956] 1 WLR 496	52, 59, 65, 75, 434, 435
<i>Warlow v Harrison</i> (1859) 1 E & E 309	22
<i>Warner Bros Pictures Inc v Nelson</i> [1937] 1 KB 209	412, 418
<i>Warren v Truprint Ltd</i> [1986] BTLC 344	161
<i>Watford Electronics Ltd v Sanderson CFL</i> [2001] 1 All ER (Comm) 696	162
<i>Watteau v Fenwick</i> [1893] 1 QB 346	311–312
<i>Watts v Spence</i> [1976] Ch 165; [1975] 2 All ER 528	186, 188
<i>Webster v Cecil</i> (1861) 54 ER 812; (1861) 30 Beav 62	106, 216, 224, 408, 417
<i>Webster v Higgin</i> [1948] 2 All ER 127	152–153
<i>Wenjiang, The</i> [1983] 1 Lloyd’s Rep 400	360
<i>Westdeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale v Islington London Borough Council</i> [1996] AC 669	426
<i>Western Web Offset Printers Ltd v Independent Media Ltd</i> (1995) <i>The Times</i> , 10 October	396
<i>Whincup v Hughes</i> (1871) LR 6 CP 78	423, 431
<i>White v Bluett</i> (1853) 23 LJ Ex 36	26, 52
<i>White v Garden</i> (1851) 10 CB 919	191
<i>White v John Warwick & Co Ltd</i> [1953] 1 WLR 1285	146–147
<i>White and Carter Ltd v McGregor</i> [1962] AC 413	377, 382, 399
<i>Whittington v Seale-Hayne</i> (1900) 44 SJ 229	191
<i>William Sindall plc v Cambridgeshire County Council</i> [1994] 3 All ER 932	188
<i>Williams v Bayley</i> (1886) LR 1 HL 200	229, 235, 240
<i>Williams v Cawardine</i> (1833) 5 C & P 566	25
<i>Williams v Roffey Bros & Nicholls Contractors Ltd</i> [1990] 1 All ER 512	5–6, 53, 62–68, 72–73, 232, 353, 356, 434, 435
<i>Wilson v Best Travel Ltd</i> [1993] 1 All ER 353	114
<i>With v O’Flanagan</i> [1936] Ch 575	193, 194
<i>Wood v Scarth</i> (1858) 1 F & F 293	208
<i>Woodar Investment Development Ltd v Wimpey Construction (UK) Ltd</i> [1980] 1 WLR 277, [1980] 1 All ER 571	305–306, 402
<i>Woolwich plc v Gomm</i> (1999) 78 P & CR D 45	255
<i>Yates v Pulleyn</i> (1975) 119 SJ 370	38
<i>Yonge v Toynbee</i> [1910] 1 KB 215 CA	314
<i>Young v Thames Properties Ltd</i> [1999] EWCA Civ 629	349
<i>Zanzibar v British Aerospace (Lancaster House) Ltd</i> (2000) <i>The Times</i> , 28 March	188

This page intentionally left blank

Table of legislation and other instruments

STATUTES

Arbitration Act 1996.....	266	Law of Property Act 1925.....	299
Betting and Gaming Act 1960.....	287	s 4.....	91
Bills of Exchange Act 1882.....	109, 316	s 40.....	90, 353, 355
Companies Acts.....	334, 335	s 53(1)(c).....	316
Companies Act 1985—		s 56.....	299
s 14.....	319	(1).....	299
s 35.....	337	s 136.....	315, 316
s 35A.....	337, 341	s 141.....	302
s 35B.....	337, 341	s 142.....	302
Companies Act 1989.....	336, 341	s 205.....	299
s 108.....	337	Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions)	
Competition Act 1980.....	262	Act 1989.....	91
Competition Act 1998.....	263–266, 296	s 1(1).....	90
s 2(1).....	263	s 2(1).....	90
s 18.....	263	Law Reform (Frustrated Contracts)	
Consumer Credit Act 1974.....	8, 90, 114, 312	Act 1943.....	368–372, 381, 424
Sch 4.....	158	s 1(2).....	368, 370, 372
Consumer Protection Act 1987.....	8, 158, 386	(3).....	368, 370, 372, 430, 432
Contracts (Rights of Third Parties)		s 2(3).....	371
Act 1999.....	295, 298, 307, 317–322	(4).....	370
s 1.....	318	(5).....	370, 371
(1).....	321	(c).....	371
(b).....	318	Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions)	
(2).....	318, 319, 321	Act 1970—	
(3).....	318	s 1.....	84
Disability Discrimination Act 1995.....	116	Limitation Act 1980.....	414
Employers' Liability Act 1880.....	327	s 5.....	386
Employment Rights Act 1996.....	116, 289	Married Women's Property Act 1882.....	298
s 1.....	116	Mental Health Act 1983— Pt VII.....	334, 340
European Communities Act 1972.....	9	Minors' Contracts Act 1987.....	330, 331
Family Law Reform Act 1969.....	324	s 2.....	331, 338, 340
Food Safety Act 1990.....	8	s 3.....	332, 333, 338, 340
Gaming Act 1738.....	19	Misrepresentation	
Gaming Act 1845.....	19	Act 1967.....	105, 174, 180, 183, 185–187, 189, 190, 192, 194–196
Hire Purchase Act 1964.....	187	s 2(1).....	185–190, 194, 195
Human Rights Act 1998.....	288	(2).....	187–189, 191, 192, 194, 195, 220, 416, 418
Infants Relief Act 1874.....	330	Official Secrets Act 1989.....	397
s 1.....	330	Pharmacy and Poisons Act 1933—	
		s 18.....	16
		Prevention of Fraud (Investments)	
		Act 1958.....	266
		s 1(1).....	266

Race Relations Act 1976	116	s 6	158
Rent Restrictions (Notices of Increase)		(1)	158, 166
Act 1923	202–203, 215	(2)	158, 160, 166
Resale Prices Act 1964	262	(3)	160, 161, 166
Resale Prices Act 1976	262	s 7(1)	158
Restrictive Trade Practices Act 1956	262	(2)	166
Restrictive Trade Practices Act 1968	262	(3)	160, 161, 166
Restrictive Trade Practices Act 1976	262	s 8	160
Road Traffic Acts	320, 321	s 11	161, 166
Road Traffic Act 1988—		(1)	161
s 148(7)	298	(2)	161
		(4)	162
		(5)	161
Sale and Supply of Goods Act 1994	116, 119	s 12	158
s 4(2)	346	(1)	158
Sale of Goods Act 1893	103, 116, 127,	(3)	158
	135, 137, 168	s 13	158
s 55	135, 137	s 14	157
Sale of Goods Act 1979 ..	9, 116, 117, 121, 128,	(2)	158
	151, 160, 161, 209, 334, 346, 372, 373	(3)	158
s 3	326, 338, 340	s 15	158
s 6	199	Sch 1	162, 163
s 7	371	Sch 2	161–162, 166
s 12	117, 118, 158, 424	Unsolicited Goods and Services	
s 13	117, 123, 160	Act 1971	5, 37
s 14(2)	118–120, 123		
(2A)	119	Weights and Measures Act 1985	8
(2B)	119		
(a)–(e)	119	STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS	
(3)	118, 120, 123	Commercial Agents (Council Directive)	
(6)	118	Regulations 1993 (SI 1993/3053)	10, 315
s 15	120, 123, 160	Consumer Protection (Distance Selling)	
s 30(2A)	346	Regulations 2000 (SI 2000/2334)	8, 9, 37,
s 53(3)	394		41, 122–123
Sex Discrimination Act 1975	116	reg 7	41, 122
Statute of Frauds 1677	91	(4)	122
Supply of Goods and Services		reg 8	122
Act 1982	9, 116, 121, 158, 161	reg 10	122
s 2	121	reg 11	123
s 3	121, 160	reg 12	123
s 4	121, 160	reg 14	123
s 5	121, 160	reg 24(4)	37
s 13	114, 121, 123		
s 14	121, 123	Electronic Commerce (EC Directive)	
s 15	122, 123	Regulations 2002 (SI 2002/2013)	42
Trade Descriptions Act 1968	8	Package Travel, Package Holidays and	
		Package Tours Regulations 1992 (SI	
Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977	9, 103, 114,	1992/3288)	8
	116, 135, 149, 150, 157–163, 165, 166, 167		
s 1(3)	157	Seeds, Oils and Fats Order 1919	264
ss 2–7	157		
s 2(1)	158, 160, 163, 166	Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts	
(2)	159	Regulations 1994 (SI 1994/3159) ..	156, 166
s 3	160	reg 4(1)	163
s 4	160	Sch 2	163
s 5(1)	158, 163	Sch 3	164

Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts	
Regulations 1999 (SI 1999/2083)	9, 10, 103, 122, 135, 156, 163–165, 166, 167
reg 5(1)	163
reg 7	165
Sch 2	164

EUROPEAN LEGISLATION

Directives

Distance Selling Directive (97/7/EC)	9, 41
--	--------------

Electronic Commerce Directive

(2000/31/EC).....	9, 42
Art 11	42

Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts

Directive (93/13/EEC) ...	10, 122, 156, 166
---------------------------	--------------------------

Treaties and Conventions

Treaty on the Functioning of the European

Union Art 45	273
Art 101	10, 262, 263
(2)	263
(3)	263

Art 102.....	10, 262, 263
--------------	---------------------

European Convention on the

Protection of Human Rights and

Fundamental Freedoms 1950	288
---------------------------------	------------

European Convention on the

Protection of Human Rights and

Fundamental Freedoms 1950, Protocol

1— Art 1	288
----------------	------------

This page intentionally left blank

1

The origins and character of contract law

1.1 The origins and functions of the law of contract

1.1.1 Development of the law of contract

Much of the modern law of contract developed in the nineteenth century and derives from the *laissez-faire* principles of economics that characterised the Industrial Revolution.

Nevertheless, the origins of contract law are much more ancient than that and are to be found in the early common law of the Middle Ages. The main preoccupation of society at that time was land ownership and law developed very quickly in relation to the protection of ownership of land or of interests in land. As a result, the law of that time was also mainly concerned with property rights.

The distinction that the law drew in terms of identifying the enforceability of rights was between formal agreements and informal ones. A formal agreement was one made in writing and which was authenticated by the practice of 'sealing'. This is the origin of the deed, which was the method accepted for transfer of land and interests in land up to 1989, when the requirement to complete the document by the process of sealing was relaxed in favour of the already common practice of witnessing the document.

Two principal types of formal **agreement**, which were required to be under seal to be enforceable, developed during the twelfth century:

- A covenant – such an agreement was usually to do something, for example an agreement to build a house. The available remedy that developed in relation to such agreements was specific performance.
- A formal debt – this was again an agreement under seal, but to pay a sum of money. This agreement was actionable as an 'obligation' and the available remedy was the payment of the debt.

..... **agreement**

The first requirement for a validly formed contract which involves a valid offer by one party being followed by a valid acceptance by the other
.....

detinue

In early contract law an action for delivery of a chattel

assumpsit

An old form of enforcing an undertaking to carry out a promise

consideration

The thing (or promise) given by a party to a contract in exchange for what the other party gives (promises to give)

term

An obligation under a contract

Informal agreements also gradually gained the recognition of the law. These became known as 'parol' agreements, following the simple meaning of the word at the time: 'by word of honour'. The clear problem with informal agreements was the availability of proof of their actual existence in order for the parties to be able to enforce their provisions.

Two particular actions developed for informal agreements:

- An action for debt – this was usually an oral agreement for the sale of the goods, and the remedy sought was usually the price of the goods
- **Detinue** – this was a claim in respect of a chattel due to the person bringing the action, for instance for delivery of a horse or other livestock.

The more modern law of contract begins with the law of '*assumpsit*' in the fourteenth century. This had its origins in the tort of trespass, and was an action in respect of the breach of an informal promise. The *assumpsit* was the undertaking to carry out the promise.

Moving even further forward in time, one of the most essential requirements of modern contract law, the doctrine of **consideration**, was also established. The consideration was the reason for the promise being given, and was based on the assumption that nobody does anything for nothing.

1.1.2 The purposes of contract law

People make contracts all the time, whether individually or within the framework of a business activity. In this way there are inevitably many different types of contracts and the contracts may satisfy different purposes. However, it is possible to identify an overriding purpose as identified in the following quote:

QUOTATION

'... contract law has many "purposes", but the central one is to support and to control the millions of agreements that collectively make up the "market economy".'

H G Beale, W D Bishop and M P Furmston, Contract Cases and Materials (4th edn, Butterworths, 2001)

In a market economy, everything depends on an exchange of resources, whether that means the sale and purchase of goods or services or the payment of a wage in return for labour. In some instances, the exchange takes place immediately but more often the exchange is based on a set of promises, for example the promise to deliver goods in return for the promise to pay for them after they are delivered.

Contract law tends to be the means of supporting the bargain and of ensuring that there will be a remedy if the agreement is not carried out according to the **terms** laid down by the parties. By developing a body of rules to deal with specific situations it also gives parties who contract a set of guidelines by which they can safely contract in the future without having to negotiate each separate aspect of the contract. The rules, then, not only identify how the parties must behave in order to say that they have formed a valid and enforceable contract; they also identify things that the parties must not do in order to achieve the contract, such as misrepresenting the truth of the agreement being reached. In essence, then, the law of contract gives contracting parties a framework to operate within and a means of finding a remedy when things go wrong.

However, the function of the law of contract is to balance out the interests of a free market and the protection of the weaker parties to contracts. Generally, this would be through consumer protection of one sort or another.

Adams and Brownsword identify that

QUOTATION

'... market-individualism enshrines the landmark principles of "freedom of contract" and "sanctity of contract", the essential thrust of which is to give the parties the maximum licence in setting their own terms, and to hold parties to their freely made bargains.'

In pursuit of this aim they suggest that judges 'should offer no succour to parties who are simply trying to escape from a bad bargain [as this] results in an economically efficient use of resources'. On the other hand, they identify that the need to protect consumers also means that judges must ensure that

QUOTATION

'... contracting parties should not mislead each other, that they should act in good faith, that a stronger party should not exploit the weakness of another's bargaining position, that no party should profit from his own wrong or be unjustly enriched, that remedies should be proportionate to the breach, [and] that contracting parties who are at fault should not be able to dodge their responsibilities.'

R Brownsword and J N Adams, Understanding Contract Law (Fontana, 1987) pp 52–53

Inevitably, what this also means is that judges will also engage in policy decisions with the following result, as identified by Beale, Bishop and Furmston:

QUOTATION

'In some cases the control takes the form of frustrating the parties for the good of the rest of society.'

H G Beale, W D Bishop and M P Furmston, Contract Cases and Materials (4th edn, Butterworths, 2001)

There are many areas of contract law where we can identify underlying policy.

1.1.3 The character of modern contracts

It is quite usual for non-lawyers to assume that a contract is an official agreement of some kind that is written down, and that has probably even been prepared by a lawyer. This, of course, is not the case. We all make many contracts every day, even though we rarely put them into writing or contemplate the consequences of making them. In fact, we generally take the situation for granted and it is not until such time as we realise that we have not got what we bargained for that we begin to think in terms of any rights attaching to the transaction.

For instance, this morning I had to go to London. I parked my car in the multi-storey car park at Wolverhampton station, taking the ticket from the machine at the entrance.

Inside the station, I bought a newspaper. On the train, I bought a cup of coffee in a sealed container and a packet of crisps.

There is nothing exceptional about any of these events. I gave no thought to contract law in relation to any one of them, but I was making a contract in every case.

However, the implications of the various transactions and the significance of contract law become apparent if in each case I do not get what I bargained for. If, for instance, on opening the newspaper I discovered that only the cover pages were printed on, or on drinking it that the coffee was in fact tea, or on eating them that the crisps were mouldy, or finally that on returning from London I found my car had been badly damaged in the car park, I would want at least my money back, and probably some other form of remedy. At that point I would be very eager to know about the contractual nature of the arrangements that I had made in each case.

The thing that distinguishes a contract in the modern day, then, is not necessarily whether it is in a written agreement, even though this may have been absolutely critical in former times. The significant point is that there is in fact an agreement made between two parties, by which they are both bound, and which if necessary can be enforced in the courts. Of course, many agreements will be in written form. However, many more will merely be made orally, and of course some may even be made by conduct, as is often the case in auctions. Such contracts are called simple contracts.

Some contracts, because of their nature, have to be in writing or in other cases there should at least be evidence of the existence of the contract in writing. These contracts we call speciality contracts, and the most common is a contract for the transfer of land, but these are beyond the scope of this book.

A contract is essentially a commercial agreement, an agreement between two parties which is enforceable in law. It is based on the promises that the two parties make to each other. However, while the law rightly protects many of the promises that we make to one another, not all promises are contractual. For instance, a beneficiary under a will has in effect been promised that inheritance and has a legal right to receive it. The will is not, however, covered by contract law. The heir has promised nothing in return for the inheritance.

A contract can alternatively be described as a bargain. One party makes a promise in return for the promise of the other and the promises are mutually enforceable because of the price that one party has paid for the promise of the other.

Many of the rules of contract law came about in the nineteenth century. At that time, people believed very much in the idea that there was freedom of contract. This is a nice idea, that we are all free to make whatever contracts we want, on whatever terms we want.

It does not, of course, bear much relationship with reality. Commonly, the two parties to a contract have unequal bargaining strength. A prospective employee at interview is rarely telling the prospective employer what conditions he is prepared to work for, but is trying to impress to get the job.

Consumers too, even though they may have a choice of where to buy from, will rarely negotiate the terms of the transaction they are making. More often than not, in the present day, contracts with businesses will be done on the latter's 'standard forms'.

As a result of this, Parliament in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has produced many laws inserting, or implying, terms into contracts which the parties themselves have not chosen but by which they both are bound.

So the notion of freedom of contract is not as straightforward as it seems, and a party to a contract has to be aware of the numerous contractual obligations by which he will be bound other than those which he has personally negotiated.

1.1.4 The reasons that contracts are enforced

As we have seen, then, a contract is an enforceable agreement between two parties. The rules regarding enforceability of agreements obviously grew out of the need for certainty in relationships, whether between businesses or between private individuals. We can none of us safely conduct ourselves without knowing that we are able to rely on arrangements that we have made.

The enforceability of contracts is based on three significant factors:

- An agreement made between two parties creates legitimate expectations in both that the terms of the arrangement will be carried out and that they will receive whatever benefit that is expected from the agreement.
- Parties will commonly risk expenditure or do work in reliance on a promise that a particular agreement will be carried out.
- It is simply unfair that if one party is ready to perform, or indeed has performed, their part of the bargain, the other party should escape or avoid his obligations without some means of redress for the injured party.

1.2 The concept of freedom of contract

Freedom of contract is not just something that we expect – the right to contract with whomever we want and on the terms that we want – it is also at the heart of contract law. In the nineteenth century, when many of the rules of contract law were devised, Britain was subject to what was known as *laissez-faire* economics. In modern times, politicians as well as economists refer to this as ‘the market’ and there is a prevailing theory that market forces rather than government intervention should dictate the economic relations between people.

The basic proposition in any case is that the parties to a contract should be free to include in a contract whatever terms they choose. In this way the courts will not interfere in contracts by trying to make a bad bargain good. They will merely ensure that there is a bargain and that it has been properly created. Treitel identified this point clearly when he said:

QUOTATION

‘In its most obvious sense, the expression “freedom of contract” is used to refer to the general principle that the law does not restrict the terms on which the parties may contract: it will not give relief merely because the terms of the contract are harsh or unfair to one party.’

*G H Treitel, An Outline of the Law of Contracts
(5th edn, Butterworths, 1995)*

The idea of freedom of contract is central to enforcement of contracts and it runs through many of the individual rules of contract law:

consensus ad idem

The agreement between the parties— literally a meeting of minds

- An agreement (offer and acceptance) is said not to exist unless there is a *consensus ad idem*, the so-called mutuality of the parties. So even though the parties think that they have agreed on something, there will not be an enforceable contract between them unless this mutuality can be shown. The law prevents one party from forcing goods and services on another party without an actual agreement to take them. This is apparent in the common law rules on acceptance as well as in statutes such as the Unsolicited Goods and Services Act 1971.
- Contract law only concerns itself with the enforcement of bargains. The rules on consideration, including the most modern case law such as *Williams v Roffey Bros &*

Nicholls Contractors Ltd [1990] 1 All ER 512, demonstrate that the courts are not interested in the quality of the bargain that parties freely reach. They are merely concerned with the existence of a bargain that is then enforceable.

- The requirement that an enforceable agreement must also include within it the intention that the parties are legally bound is another example of freedom of contract. Many agreements are reached between parties where they would not consider that they had brought themselves within the law. We are free to make contracts where we agree to be bound. We will not be bound by agreements that we never intend should carry any legal weight. Even if it is wrong that we break these agreements, it is equally wrong that we should be hauled before the courts for a promise that has no legal basis which for some reason we cannot keep, and the law sensibly recognises this.
- Freedom of contract is recognised also in the fact that many of the terms or obligations of the contract by which the parties are then bound are decided upon by the parties themselves. Where bargaining strength is equal, the law will even allow terms that are clearly disadvantageous to a party if he freely agreed to be bound by it. A very extreme example of this can be seen in the so-called '*Securicor* cases' in exclusion clauses (see [section 7.2.2](#)).
- Even though the court can be seen to be operating in a protectionist manner towards one party, the rules relating to the various **vitiating factors** are in effect another example of freedom of contract. This relates back to the idea of a *consensus ad idem*. If a party is entering a contract only because of false information, or being mistaken as to material facts, or is in any way coerced to enter the contract, then the law will declare the contract void or will set it aside. This will happen because the basis of contracting must be that a party enters the arrangement with free will and by exercising choice.
- Freedom can even be seen in one sense in the rules on **discharge**. For instance, where a party has failed to perform all obligations under the contract precisely, it may still be possible for the other party to accept part-performance, and inevitably to pay only for the part done or given. In the same way, the rules on **breach** of contract allow a party who is the victim of the breach of a central term to choose between giving up his own obligations or continuing with the contract, if it would be advantageous, and merely gaining compensation for the breach in question.

As the law of contract has developed, however, it has also been recognised that the parties to a contract cannot be given unlimited freedom and the law has in many instances intervened to give greater protection to the parties. There are a number of reasons for this:

- It is recognised that very often the parties are of unequal bargaining strength and therefore one party would be able to dictate the terms of the contract, possibly at the expense of the weaker party.
- Particularly since the middle of the twentieth century, judges, Parliament and, more recently, the European Union have all been concerned to give greater protection to consumers to avoid them being taken advantage of by unscrupulous businessmen in contracts that are driven more by the profit motive of business rather than the individual needs of consumers.
- It would be unfair to allow one party to take advantage of the other party's **mistake** or to take advantage of a falsehood, or to allow one party to coerce the other party to enter the contract against his will.
- In certain instances either the courts or Parliament have recognised that it is unacceptable or inadvisable to allow parties to enter specific types of contracts.

..... **vitiating factor**

A defect that renders an otherwise validly formed contract void or voidable
.....

..... **discharge**

How a contract comes to an end
.....

..... **breach**

A failure to honour the obligations under the contract
.....

..... **mistake**

A wrong assumption made by one or more parties to a contract on entering the contract
.....

There are many examples of this protectionism. An obvious example from the common law would be the rules on undue influence that have been developed by the courts in relation to wives who have agreed to allow property jointly owned with their husbands to be used as security for loans. There are many examples of protectionism in statute, usually falling under the general classification of consumer protection (see [section 1.4](#)).

1.3 Contract law compared with other areas of law

1.3.1 Contract law compared with tort

Sometimes both the law of contract and the law of torts are seen as a general law of 'obligations'. Certainly, both branches of the law compensate victims for the harm done to them. Both branches of the law are also ultimately based on duties owed by one party to another.

The traditional distinction between the two is the character of the duty owed. In the case of torts, specific duties are imposed by law and apply to everyone. In contract law, the duties are imposed by the parties themselves and operate only to the extent agreed upon before the contract was formed. Similarly, in the case of tort the duty is usually owed generally to all persons likely to be affected by the tort. In contract law, on the other hand, the duty is only to the other party to the contract.

1.3.2 The interrelationship between contract law and tort

Nevertheless, the distinction is not always so clear and there are many complications and overlaps. In the law of contract many duties are now imposed on parties by statute and as a result of EU law, irrespective of the actual wishes of the parties to the contract. This has been particularly the case in the area of consumer contracts. In the law of torts, in those situations where the law does allow recovery for a pure economic loss, the distinction between the two again is somewhat blurred.

There can be overlap too in areas such as product liability where there can be claims for negligence and also for breach of implied statutory conditions under the contract. In such circumstances a choice is sometimes made whether to sue a manufacturer in tort or a supplier under contract law.

Similar complications have arisen in the field of medicine. Normally, we would expect legal actions to be brought in medical negligence in tort. However, where a patient has taken advantage of private medicine the rules of contract law can be invoked if they may have a more satisfactory answer – if, for instance, the contractual duty is higher than the duty in tort.

Difficulties can also arise because of the doctrine of privity in contract law and the exceptions to it, although legislation has removed some of the hardships here. However, the absence of a contractual relationship again may not prevent an action being brought for a breach of a duty in tort if such a duty exists.

1.3.3 Contract law compared with criminal law

Contract law is very obviously different from criminal law in the same senses that all areas of civil law differ from the criminal law. The differences can be used as an example generally of the differences between criminal law and civil law.

damages

A common remedy for a breach of contract – a sum of money compensation aiming to put the injured party in the position he would have been in had the contract been properly performed

- The whole context of the case is different – the criminal law involves the regulation of behaviour that is unacceptable to the state, while civil law involves the resolution of disputes between two parties (in the case of contract law, a dispute over a contract).
- The purpose of the action is different. In criminal law the purpose is to preserve order in the community. Civil law seeks to regulate relationships and settle disputes (eg, a breach of contract).
- The parties are completely different. In criminal law the state prosecutes a defendant. In civil law, as in a contract action, a defendant answers a claim from a claimant.
- The standard of proof is also different. In criminal law, because a defendant's liberty may be at stake, the prosecution must prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt. In contract actions, on the other hand, as in civil actions in general, the claimant has to prove his case only on a balance of probabilities.
- The potential resolution of the action differs also. A successful criminal trial results in a conviction and subsequent punishment with whatever appropriate sentence. In contract law, as in other civil law actions, a successful claimant will have proved the defendant liable and the defendant must then provide a remedy, often **damages**.
- Besides this, of course, the range of courts in which actions may be heard also varies. Criminal trials will be in either the Magistrates' Court or the Crown Court, depending on the seriousness of the offence. A contract claim could, if seeking under £5,000 worth of damages, be sought under the small claims procedure in the County Court by the claimant himself. Alternatively, depending on the value and complexity of the action, it could be sought under the fast-track procedure in the County Court or the multi-track procedure in either the County Court or the High Court.

Nevertheless, this is not to say that the criminal law has absolutely no relevance for problems arising out of contractual relationships. Particularly in the protection of consumers, the criminal law can be used for the regulation of contracts and the ultimate protection of the consumer. A number of statutes, as well as certain statutory instruments, employ the criminal law as an enforcement mechanism. These include the Consumer Credit Act 1974, the Consumer Protection Act 1987, the Food Safety Act 1990, the Package Travel, Package Holidays and Package Tours Regulations 1992, the Trade Descriptions Act 1968, the Weights and Measures Act 1985 and the Consumer Protection (Distance Selling) Regulations 2000, to name but a few.

The use of the criminal law in this way in the context of consumer contracts is very significant. This is because it gives bodies such as Trading Standards Departments the power and the opportunity to take a more proactive as well as a deterrent role in enforcing appropriate standards of contracting in a consumer context. This is so significant because the consumer in most instances is at a disadvantage, being the weaker party in the bargain.

1.4 Contract law and the protection of consumers

The law of contract was traditionally concerned only with the existence of and the simple regulation of bargains made between individuals. In the nineteenth century this meant that the maxim *caveat emptor* was influential throughout the law.

During previous centuries, this might have been appropriate. Communities were for the most part rural, the master/servant relationship mirrored the realities of economic activity, and there was little in the way of a consumer society. However, in the twentieth century there was a great increase in spending power, the traditional

caveat emptor

means 'let the buyer beware' – so is a principle of freedom of contract

economic relationships changed and the nature of society made a lot of the traditional rules unfair or unworkable.

In the last third of the twentieth century, consumer groups began to emerge to press for fairer treatment and protections. Judicial attitudes to certain contractual rules developed towards the protection of consumers and Parliament also introduced legislation to give greater consumer protection. Finally, membership of the EU has also led to the introduction of a number of significant protections.

Consumer protection (consumer law) is a significant area of law in its own right. As well as contract law, statutory and EU interventions and other common law developments have meant that the area as a whole must be seen to include both tort and criminal law. Nevertheless, there have been significant developments for the protection of the consumer that relate specifically to contract law. These include:

-
exclusion clause
A term of a contract inserted by a party to exclude liability for their contractual breaches or possibly their negligence
.....
-
minor
A person under the age of eighteen
.....
- The rebuttable presumption of an intention to create legal relations in a commercial contract.
- The attitude of the courts towards expert opinions when incorporating terms into contracts (compare *Oscar Chess Ltd v Williams* [1957] 1 WLR 370 and *Dick Bentley Productions Ltd v Harold Smith (Motors) Ltd* [1965] 1 WLR 623).
- The common law protection against excessively unfair terms in *Interfoto Picture Library v Stiletto Visual Programmes Ltd* [1988] 2 WLR 615.
- The implied terms in statutes such as the Sale of Goods Act 1979 and the Supply of Goods and Services Act 1982 and also in the more recent Consumer Protection (Distance Selling) Regulations 2000.
- The controls on **exclusion clauses** provided by the common law, by Parliament through the Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977, and ultimately as a result of membership of the European Union through the Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1999.
- The common law and statutory rules protecting minors by declaring certain contracts void or allowing the **minor** to avoid the consequences of certain other contracts.

1.5 The effects on contract law of membership of the EU

It would be difficult to overemphasise the significance of membership of the EU to any area of English law concerned with economics. Students of employment law, company law, commercial law and general consumer law all need a good appreciation of the effects of EU law and of the influence of treaty articles, directives and regulations on English law, in order to have a good understanding of their subjects.

Contract law is no exception. Since the UK first became a member on 1st January 1973, after signing the treaties and passing the European Communities Act 1972, there have been a number of initiatives leading to changes and developments within English contract law.

Not all of these developments, but certainly many of them, have had particular impact on consumer protection. Not every individual aspect of contract law has been affected but in various chapters the significant influences of EU law will become apparent.

- In the case of agreement (offer and acceptance), the Consumer Protection (Distance Selling) Regulations 2000 have been introduced, affecting the way that we form contracts through modern electronic means. The regulations were introduced to implement provisions of the EU Directive 97/7, the Distance Selling Directive. The Electronic Commerce Directive 2000/31 also demands a specific form of acknowledgement in electronic selling.