

What is Law	4
Non-Legal Rules	4
Law-Making Authorities in Australia	5
Main Areas of Law	5
Business Law	6
Historical Foundations of Australian Law	6
Western Legal Traditions	7
Evolution of Law	7
Sources of Law	7
The Federal System and Constitution	8
How a Bill Becomes Law	8
Identifying and Citing Legislation	9
Judicial Law-Making and Common Law	9
The Doctrine of Precedent and Stare Decisis	10
Ratio Decidendi and Obiter Dicta	10
Applying Precedent	11
Court Hierarchy and Precedent	12
A lower court must follow the decisions of higher courts within the same hierarchy.	
Decisions from other jurisdictions can be persuasive but are not binding.	12
Law Reports	13
CONTRACT FORMATION	15
3. The Objective Approach	15
4. Executory/Bilateral vs. Unilateral Contracts	15
WHAT MAKES A CONTRACT VALID?	16
1. CAPACITY	16
Summary	17
2. AGREEMENT (OFFER, ACCEPTANCE & CERTAINTY)	18
3. CONSIDERATION	20
4. INTENTION TO CREATE LEGAL RELATIONS	21
5. PRIVITY	22
6. ESTOPPEL	22

7. EXAM SUMMARY — BUILDING A VALID CONTRACT	23
CONTRACT LAW — EXPRESS & IMPLIED TERMS	24
OVERVIEW: EXPRESS vs IMPLIED TERMS	24
5.2 EXPRESS TERMS – SIGNED DOCUMENTS	24
5.3 EXPRESS TERMS – REASONABLE NOTICE	25
Takeaway Summary	26
5.4 EXPRESS TERMS – STATEMENTS MADE DURING NEGOTIATIONS	27
5.5 IMPLIED TERMS – OVERVIEW	28
UNIVERSAL IMPLIED TERM – DUTY OF CO-OPERATION	29
5.6 GENERIC IMPLIED TERMS – COMMON LAW & STATUTE	29
Statutory Implied Terms – Goods Act 1958 (Vic)	29
5.7 IMPLIED TERMS – AD HOC (IN FACT)	30
CONTRACT LAW — PERFORMANCE AND BREACH	31
1. How a Contract Comes to an End	31
2. What Constitutes Breach	32
3. Interpreting Contractual Obligations	32
The Objective Test	32
4. Assessing Performance and Breach	33
5. Divisible and Indivisible Contracts	34
6. Exclusion and Limitation Clauses	35
7. Frustration	36
8. Summary of Discharge and Breach Rules	38
7.1 Remedies for Breach	38
7.2 Damages	39
1. Purpose of Damages	39
2. Measuring Damages	39
3. Types of Loss	41
4. Other Types of Compensable Loss	41
5. Duty to Mitigate	42
6. Agreed Penalty or Liquidated Damages Clauses	42
7.4 Termination	42

1. What is Termination?	42
2. Types of Breach	42
3. Classifying Terms	43
7.6 Equity	44
1. What is Equity?	44
7.7 Equitable Remedies	44
1. Overview	44
2. Specific Performance	45
3. Injunctions	46
4. Key Takeaways	46
5. Exam Application Summary	46
8.1 Vitiating Factors	47
Overview	47
8.2 Duress	48
8.3 Undue Influence	49
8.4 Mistake	51
8.5 Misrepresentation	52
8.6 Illegality	53
Summary	54
9.1 Overview — Fair Trading and Consumer Protection under the ACL	55
9.2 Misleading or Deceptive Conduct — s 18 ACL	55
9.3 Unconscionable Conduct — ss 20–22 ACL	58
9.4 Unfair Contract Terms — ss 23–24 ACL	59
9.5 Consumer Guarantees — ss 54–58, 64 ACL	60
9.6 Other Unfair Business Practices — ss 29–82 ACL	61
10.1 The Tort of Negligence	63
10.2 Duty of Care	64
10.3 Breach, Causation and Damage	67
11.1 Agency	68
11.2 Agent's Authority	69
11.3 Duties of the Agent, Duties of the Principal, and Related Liability	72

CONTRACT FORMATION

- **Definition:** A contract is a **legally enforceable agreement** between two or more parties (people or companies).
 - **Legal effect:** Parties become legally obliged to honour the promises.
 - **Discharge of obligations:** Usually by **voluntary performance**.
 - **Breach:** If a party fails to perform, they are in **breach of contract**. Remedies include:
 - **Damages:** Monetary compensation for loss.
 - **Specific performance:** Court orders the breaching party to fulfil their promise.
 - **Injunction:** Court orders a party to stop breaching behaviour.
-

3. The Objective Approach

- Courts assess contract formation **objectively**, not subjectively.
- **Not about actual intention** (“Did the party secretly want to be bound?”).
- **Instead:** Would a **reasonable person**, in the shoes of the other party, interpret the words and conduct as intending to be legally binding?
- Example: If someone shakes hands on a deal and says “we have a deal,” even if internally they didn’t intend to commit, the law may hold them bound.

Key principle: Behaviour and communication matter more than hidden intentions.

4. Executory/Bilateral vs. Unilateral Contracts

Bilateral Contracts

- **Definition:** Both parties make **promises**.
- Formed at the exchange of promises.
- Each party has obligations to perform later.
- Example: A builder promises to construct a house, homeowner promises to pay \$500,000. Both still owe performance.

Unilateral Contracts

- **Definition:** Only **one party's performance** remains outstanding after acceptance.
- Formed only when the requested act is performed.
- Example: "\$1,000 reward if you return my lost dog." The offeror promises payment, but the offeree accepts only by actually returning the dog.

Executory contracts: Another word for contracts where performance remains outstanding.

WHAT MAKES A CONTRACT VALID?

- Look for:
 1. Was there **agreement** (offer + acceptance)?
 2. Was there **intention** to be legally bound?
 3. Was there **consideration** (or deed)?
 4. Were the terms **certain**?
 5. Did parties have **capacity**?
- Apply the **objective approach** in your analysis.

If any of these are missing, the agreement will not constitute a valid, enforceable contract.

1. CAPACITY

General Rule

A contract is valid only if each party has **legal capacity** to acquire rights and assume obligations.

- **Adults (18+):** full capacity.
 - **Corporations:** full capacity under *s 124 Corporations Act 2001 (Cth)*.
 - **Minors / people with mental incapacity:** limited or qualified capacity.
-

Cognitive Disability

A person is bound unless:

1. They were **incapable of understanding** the general nature/effect of the transaction, **and**
2. The other party **knew or ought to have known** of this lack of understanding.

Effect: Contract is **voidable**, not void.

Minors

General Rule

Minors' contracts are generally unenforceable, except where:

1. The contract concerns **necessaries**, or
 2. It is a **beneficial employment contract**.
-

Case: **Scarborough v Sturzaker (1945) 70 CLR 141**

Facts: 16-year-old bought a new bicycle to ride to work after trading in his old one.

Issue: Was the new bike a necessity?

Decision: Yes — required for employment.

Principle: Necessities depend on lifestyle and actual needs at the time.

Case: **Hamilton v Lethbridge (1912) 14 CLR 236**

Facts: Minor articulated clerk bound by 5-year employment contract with restraint clause.

Decision: Binding — overall beneficial (training and experience outweighed restraint).

Principle: Employment contracts are valid if **beneficial as a whole**, even with some limitations.

Summary

Category	Rule	Key Cases	Enforceable When
----------	------	-----------	------------------

Adults / Corporations	Full capacity	—	Always
Cognitive Disability	Voidable if lack of understanding known	—	Understanding + knowledge test
Minors	Limited capacity	<i>Scarborough ; Hamilton</i>	Necessaries / beneficial employment

2. AGREEMENT (OFFER, ACCEPTANCE & CERTAINTY)

Core Rule

A valid agreement requires:

1. **Offer**
2. **Acceptance**
3. **Certainty of terms**

Courts use an **objective test**:

Would a reasonable observer think the parties intended to be legally bound?

A. Offer

A definite, promissory statement showing willingness to be bound if accepted.

Case: *Placer Development Ltd v Commonwealth (1969) 121 CLR 353*

Facts: Govt promised subsidy “at a rate to be determined.”

Decision: Not binding — illusory promise.

Principle: No valid offer where one party retains total discretion.

B. Invitation to Treat

An **invitation to treat** is merely an invitation to negotiate or make offers.

Type	Case	Principle
Shop displays	<i>Pharmaceutical Society v Boots (1953)</i>	Goods on shelves = invitation; offer made at register.
Advertisements (general)	<i>Partridge v Crittenden (1968)</i>	Ads usually invitations to treat.
Reward advertisements	<i>Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Co (1893)</i>	Specific, definite, promissory ads can be offers.

Exam tip: Use wording — if the ad uses definite language (“we promise £100”) and shows sincerity (e.g. bank deposit), it is an **offer**, not an invitation.

C. Acceptance

Must be a **clear and unconditional “yes”** mirroring the offer.

Case: *Masters v Cameron (1954) 91 CLR 353*

Facts: Sale of land “subject to contract acceptable to solicitors.”

Decision: No contract; intention was to be bound only after signing.

Principle: “Subject to contract” = no binding agreement unless category 1 or 2 (see below).

Category	Effect
1	Final agreement; formality later → binding
2	Binding, but conditional on event/signing
3	No intent until signed → not binding

D. Communication of Acceptance

Method	Rule	Cases
General	Must be communicated	—
Post	Effective on posting (if reasonable)	<i>Henthorn v Fraser (1892)</i>
Instantaneous (email, telex)	Effective on receipt	<i>Brinkibon v Stahag Stahl (1983)</i> ; <i>Electronic Transactions (Vic) Act 2000</i>

Unilateral contracts	Performance = acceptance	<i>Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Co (1893)</i>
----------------------	--------------------------	--

E. Termination of Offer

- **Revocation** before acceptance.
- **Lapse** after expiry date or reasonable time.
- **Rejection** or **counter-offer** ends the offer.

F. Certainty

Contracts must contain terms clear enough to enforce.
Vague agreements (“we’ll agree later”) are unenforceable.

3. CONSIDERATION

Rule

A promise must be supported by **something of value** (benefit or detriment).
Courts do not assess fairness, only **existence**.

Case: *Thomas v Thomas (1842) 2 QB 851*

Facts: Widow allowed to live in husband’s house for £1 rent per year.

Decision: Binding — £1 sufficient consideration.

Principle: Consideration need not be adequate, only sufficient in law.

Case: *Stilk v Myrick (1809) 2 Camp 317*

Facts: Captain promised extra pay if sailors worked after others deserted.

Decision: Unenforceable — already contractually bound.

Principle: Performing an existing duty is not valid consideration.

Modern Exception – *Musumeci v Winadell Pty Ltd (1994) 34 NSWLR 723*

Facts: Landlord reduced rent after leasing nearby space to competitor.

Decision: Binding — landlord gained **practical benefit** of retaining tenant.

Principle: A **practical advantage** can count as consideration if it benefits the promisor.

4. INTENTION TO CREATE LEGAL RELATIONS

Rule

The parties must **intend** their agreement to be legally binding.

Intention is assessed **objectively**.

Context	Presumption	Key Cases	Principle
Domestic / Social	No intent	<i>Balfour v Balfour (1919)</i> ; <i>Cohen v Cohen (1929)</i>	Family arrangements usually non-contractual.
Commercial	Intention presumed	<i>Esso Petroleum v Customs & Excise (1976)</i>	Promotions and business deals presumed binding.
Modern Australian approach	Contextual, not presumption-based	<i>Ermogenous v Greek Orthodox Community (2002)</i>	Assess all facts (payment, structure, relationship).

*Integration Case – **Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Co (1893)***

- **Offer:** Reward ad was definite and sincere.
- **Acceptance:** Using the smoke ball = performance.
- **Consideration:** Purchase and inconvenience.
- **Certainty:** Terms clear and specific.
- **Intention:** Bank deposit showed real intent.

Principle: All contract elements met — unilateral contract binding.

5. PRIVITY

Doctrine of Privity

Only those who are **parties** to a contract can sue or be sued under it.

Case: *Price v Easton (1833) 4 B & Ad 433*

Facts: Builder contracted with Easton to pay Price (third party). Easton didn't pay.

Decision: Price couldn't enforce — not a party.

Principle: Third-party beneficiaries lack enforcement rights.

Case: *Coulls v Bagot's Executor (1967) 119 CLR 460*

Facts: Contract between Mr Coulls and O'Neil Constructions for royalties payable to "Mr and Mrs Coulls."

Decision: Only Mr Coulls was a party; Mrs Coulls had no separate rights.

Principle: Signing or benefiting doesn't make someone a contracting party.

Summary – Privity

Rule	Effect	Cases
Only parties can enforce	Outsiders cannot sue	<i>Price v Easton</i>
Benefit ≠ contractual right	Must be named as party	<i>Coulls v Bagot's Executor</i>

6. ESTOPPEL

Function

Estoppel prevents a party from going back on a promise where it would be **unconscionable** to do so.

Requirements

1. Clear promise or representation.
2. Reliance by the promisee.

3. Detriment suffered as a result.
4. Unconscionability in allowing withdrawal.

Case: **Waltons Stores (Interstate) Ltd v Maher (1988) 164 CLR 387**

Facts: Maher demolished building and began construction expecting Waltons to sign lease; Waltons delayed then withdrew.

Decision: Waltons estopped — must compensate as if bound.

Principle: Estoppel prevents unconscionable withdrawal of an induced belief; operates even without consideration.

Purpose

Estoppel acts as a **fairness safety net** where:

- No formal contract exists, but
 - Reliance and detriment make enforcement just.
-

7. EXAM SUMMARY — BUILDING A VALID CONTRACT

Element	Legal Test	Key Authorities	Common Pitfalls
Capacity	Party legally able to contract	<i>Scarborough, Hamilton</i>	Minor not bound unless necessity/beneficial
Offer	Clear, promissory, not discretionary	<i>Placer, Carlill</i>	Illusory or vague “offers” fail
Acceptance	Unqualified, communicated, mirror offer	<i>Masters v Cameron, Henthorn, Brinkibon</i>	Silence ≠ acceptance
Consideration	Something of value exchanged	<i>Thomas, Stilk, Musumeci</i>	Past or existing duty ≠ valid
Intention	Objective intent to be bound	<i>Balfour, Esso, Ermogenous</i>	Family/social promises often non-binding
Certainty	Terms must be clear	—	“Agreement to agree” unenforceable

Reasoning: Seller not expert; no intention to guarantee; buyer (dealer) in better position to know.
Principle: Where the speaker lacks special knowledge, statement likely a non-binding representation.

Case 3 – **Handbury v Nolan (1977)**

Facts: At cattle auction, auctioneer said cow “tested pregnant”; cow was infertile.

Decision: Statement **was** a contractual term.

Reasoning:

- Made just before sale.
- Auctioneer in position of knowledge.
- Buyer reasonably relied on it.

Principle: Statements in serious commercial contexts by knowledgeable parties are binding promises.

Takeaway Table

Case	Binding?	Why
<i>Van den Esschert</i>	Yes	Important issue; relied on
<i>Oscar Chess</i>	No	Representation; seller lacked expertise
<i>Handbury v Nolan</i>	Yes	Promissory; expert statement relied upon

5.5 IMPLIED TERMS – OVERVIEW

What They Are

Terms not written or spoken but **imposed by law, by statute, or by necessity** to make the contract workable and fair.

Types:

1. **By law** (universal or generic)
2. **By statute** (e.g. *Goods Act 1958 (Vic)*)
3. **By fact (ad hoc)** — to fill specific gaps