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PART THREE – TERMINATION

Breach and Frustration

“Discharge” is process whereby a valid and enforceable contract is brought to an end, thereby releasing the parties to it from all further obligation to perform.

Contracts can be discharged in five ways:

1. By **performance**: when all the duties required in the contract are performed by all the parties, the contract comes to an end. It is called discharge by performance.

2. Through **breach**: when one party violates the conditions of lawful contract it is called breach of contract. When there is a breach by one party the other party gets a right not to perform his obligations it may also take action against the other party who has failed to perform.

3. Through **frustration**

4. By **agreement** between the parties

5. By **operation of law**: if any contract is declared void by law, then the parties involved are discharged from the liabilities of the contract.

Unless one of these occurs, the contract remains on foot and its obligation can be enforced by either party. However, if the contract is brought to an end, the parties’ consequential rights, duties and liabilities vary according to the type of termination.

A. The order of performance

Determining the order of performance (i.e., which party performs their obligations under the contract first) is a question of construction of the contract.

In every contract, there must be receipt of the bargain, therefore, it is necessary to decide who has to perform first. The Courts will construe the contract according to the objective intention of the parties, namely:

- **Dependent obligations**: those which are not required to be performed until the other party has performed their obligations.

- **Independent obligations**: those which must be performed regardless of the performance of the other party.

- **Concurrent obligations**: where performance of obligation occurs simultaneously.
### Automatic Fire Sprinklers Pty Ltd v Watson (1946) HCA

**Facts:** Watson worked as a GM of Automatic Fire Sprinklers Pty Ltd and was dismissed. Watson continued to present himself to work even though there was no work for him to do since he had been dismissed and excluded from the company’s offices. Court was asked whether he was entitled to salary.

**Principles:**

- Employer’s obligation to pay is dependent on the employee’s obligation to perform his tasks.
- If an employer wrongfully dismisses an employee and refuses to allow further performance of services, i.e., a breach of contract, the effect at common law is to terminate the contract of employment and to confine the employee to remedies in damages.

**Reasoning:** Since the employee was not given any work and therefore did not complete any tasks he was not entitled to any pay – therefore the salary was a price for the transfer of services.

The employee's remedies in the case of an ineffectual dismissal included a right to salary during the period where the employee continues to offer performance of employment because the employer’s obligation to pay depends on the employee’s obligation to perform his tasks.

*Case also discussed that in situations of contracts for sale of goods, where a buyer refuses to accept the goods, seller cannot sue for price as the price is only paid for the goods and not the promise to provide the goods, until they are accepted there is no indebtedness.*

*Suggested that parties can expressly convey that payment is to be made at a certain time irrespective of transfer of goods, in which case claim for payment can be made.*

*In respect to instalment payments for sale of land, instalments are paid for the promise to convey land and only the last instalment is paid for the actual conveyance of land.*

### B. Prevention of performance

When one party prevents performance, the other may regard the contract as at an end, will be released from further obligation and may:

- Sue for damages for the breach occasioned by the wrongful prevention;
- Sue for damages on a *quantum meruit* if the performance of an “entire” contract had commenced but had not been completed at the point of obstruction.

**Refusal of tender of performance**

Where a party cannot perform without the co-operation of the other, a tender (or offer of performance) is sufficient to make the other party liable. The offer to perform is treated as equivalent to performance to the extent that the party refusing to co-operate will be liable in damages.
C. Discharge by performance

What performance is sufficient to discharge the parties?

i) Entire contracts

An entire contract is one in which the parties have agreed, expressly or impliedly, that
complete performance by the promisor, is a condition precedent to the enforcement of the
contract, i.e., performance must be exact.

Where A's obligation to perform is dependent on B completely performing his or her
obligations, B will not be discharged until he or she has completely performed and cannot
call upon A to perform. Principles:

- A contractual obligation arises only when the other party has fully discharged their
  contractual duties (Cutter v Powell)
- Part contractual performance by promisor does not oblige the promisee to pay for the
  part of the contract that the promisor has performed (Sumpter v Hedges)
- Recovery will be refused even if the promisor has an excuse in respect of the failure
  of the condition precedent (Cutter v Powell)
- ‘Exact performance’ exceptions: substantial performance & severable contracts.

★Cutter v Powell (1795) UK

Facts: Cutter signed a contract to be the second mate on a ship sailing from Jamaica. The
contract stipulated that he would be paid 30 guineas “provided he proceeds, continues and does
his duty...to the port of Liverpool”. Three quarters of the way through the voyage he died. His
wife sued for a proportionate share of his wages on a quantum meruit. Her action failed for
Cutter’s contract was “entire”.

Principles:

- Where a contract is entire and the condition precedent has not been fulfilled, the
cost.price will not be recoverable.

Reasoning: Under the doctrine of entire contract, recovery will be refused even if the promisor
has an excuse in respect of the failure of the condition precedent

★Sumpter v Hedges [1898] UK

Facts: The plaintiff contracted to build two houses and stables for the defendant for $565. When
the houses just over half completed, the plaintiff ran out of money and abandoned the job. The
defendant then completed the work. The plaintiff sued for payment for what he had done.

Principles:

- Part contractual performance by promisor does not oblige the promisee to pay for the
  part of the contract that the promisor has performed.

Reasoning: If no new contract can be inferred from the mere fact (i.e., it is an entire contract)
and the defendant does not restrict or prevent performance, a plaintiff who has done part of what
was required by the contract but who has not completed performance because of some personal
breach cannot usually recover either damages or a quantum meruit, even though the defendant
may take the benefit as an unjust enrichment.

The contract is an entire contract, the employer will not be happy with partial performance
because the benefit received is not intended to be half built houses. Therefore, if you do not get
the benefit that you have requested there is not a legal benefit.
# PART ONE – FORMATION
## Agreement and Estoppel

Introduction: Approaches and theories of contract law  
**Page 1**

Freedom of contract?  

Public Policy and Illegality  
**Page 2**

Other vitiating factors  

### A. Offer and acceptance  
**Page 3**

#### i) Offer

- *Pharmaceutical Society v Boots Cash Chemist [1953] UK*
- *Thornton v Shoe Lane Parking Ltd (1971)*
- *Australian Woollen Mills v Commonwealth (1954) HCA*

#### ii) Offers can be made to the whole world, or a more limited group  

- *Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball [1893] UK*

Auctions; Tenders; Application for shares or debentures; Cross-offer  

#### Counter-offer  
**Page 6**

#### Responses to an offer

#### iii) Acceptance

- **a) Communication of acceptance is generally required**
  - *Felthouse v Bindley (1862) UK*

- **b) Correspondence with offer**
  - Butler Machine Tool Co Ltd v Ex-Cell-O Corporation (Eng) Ltd [1979] UK

- **c) Postal Acceptance Rule**  
  - Empirnall Holdings Pty Ltd v Machon Paul Partners Pty Ltd (1988) NSW SC  
  - *Wardle v Agricultural and Rural Finance Pty Ltd [2012]*
  - *Bressan v Squires [1974] NSW Supreme Court*

- **d) Knowledge of offer required for acceptance?**

- **Flogging a Dead Horse - The Postal Acceptance Rule and Email**  
  - *Page 10*
# CONTRACTS NOTES - LAWS5002

## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>★R v Clarke (1927) HCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### iv) Duration of offers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Revocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ★Dickinson v Dodds (1876) UK |

- Goldsborough, Mort & Co Ltd v Quinn [1910] HCA

- Revocation of offer of a unilateral contract |

- ★Mobil Oil Australia Ltd v Lyndel Nominees Pty Ltd (1998) Federal Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Rejection, lapse, non-occurrence of condition and death</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ★Steveson, Jaques & Co v McLean (1880) UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lapse of time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Subject to Condition |

- Financing Limited v Stimson [1962] UK

- Death of a party |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v) Uncertainty and incompleteness of terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Uncertainty and incompleteness generally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Council of the Upper Hunter County District v Australian Chilling (1968) HCA

- Hillas v Arcos Ltd (1932) UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Severance of unenforceable clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ★Whitlock v Brew (1968) HCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Agreements to negotiate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ★Coal Cliff Collieries Pty Ltd v Sijehama Pty Ltd (1991) NSW Supreme Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Conditional promises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ★Meehan v Jones (1982) HCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>★Masters v Cameron (1954) HCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## B. Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) What promises are legally enforceable?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Consideration must move from the promisee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii) Consideration must be referrable to the promise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ★Australian Woollen Mills v Commonwealth (1954) HCA
iii) Consideration must move from the promisee (but not necessarily to the promisor)

★ Coulls v Bagot’s Executor and Trustee Co Ltd (1967) HCA

iv) Consideration must be sufficient, but need not be adequate

★ Chappell & Co Ltd v Nestle & Co Ltd [1960] UK

Thomas v Thomas (1842) UK

v) Past consideration is not good consideration

Re Casey’s Patents [1892] UK

vi) Consideration must not be illusory

★ Placer Developments Ltd v Cth (1969) HCA

★ Meehan v Jones (1982) HCA

vii) Performing existing legal duties

a) Duties imposed by law

Glasbrook Bros Ltd v Glamorgan County Council [1925] UK

Popiw v Popiw [1959] UK

Ward v Byham [1956] UK

b) Contractual duties

Stilk v Myrick (1809) UK

Existing duties owned to third party

★ Williams v Roffey Bros & Nicholls (Contractors) Ltd [1991] UK

Musumeci v Winadell Pty Ltd (1994) NSW Supreme Court

Part payment of a debt

★ Foakes v Beer (1884) UK

viii) Forbearance to sue/compromise of disputed claim are good consideration

★ Wigan v Edwards (1973) HCA

C. Estoppel and its effect on consideration

Promissory Estoppel

Estoppel in pre-existing relationships

Estoppel where there is no pre-existing legal relationship

★ Waltons Stores (Interstate) Ltd v Maher (1988) HCA

★ Austotel v Franklins (1989) NSW Supreme Court
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>D. Intent to create legal relations</strong></th>
<th>Page 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Family and social situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen v Cohen (1929) HCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★Balfour v Balfour [1919] UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★Jones v Padavatton [1969] UK</td>
<td>Page 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★Ermogenous v Greek Orthodox Community of SA Inc (2002) HCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Commercial situations</td>
<td>Page 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eso Petroleum Ltd v Commissioners of Customs &amp; Excise [1976] UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose and Frank Co v JR Crompton &amp; Bros Ltd [1923] UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Letters of comfort</td>
<td>Page 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>E. Contracts requiring written evidence</strong></th>
<th>Page 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Contracts requiring writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVEYANCING ACT 1919 (NSW) – SECT 54A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUTE OF FRAUDS 1677 – SECT 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Requirement of writing</td>
<td>Page 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Effect of non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Common law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavey &amp; Matthews Pty Ltd v Paul (1987) HCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Equity</td>
<td>Page 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Discharge of contracts required to be evidenced in writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris v Baron &amp; Co [1918] UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART TWO – CONSTRUCTION
Terms and Parties

Express and implied terms  Page 37

A. Express Terms  Page 38

i) Deciding whether a statement is a term or a mere representation

a) The intention of the party  Page 39
★Oscar Chess v Williams [1957] UK

b) The timing of the statement
Harling v Eddy [1951] UK

c) The content of the contract  Page 40
★Couchman v Hill [1947] UK

d) The knowledge and expertise of the parties
★Dick Bentley Productions Ltd v Harold Smith (Motors) Ltd [1965] UK

ii) Deciding whether a statement forms part of a collateral contract  Page 41
★Hoyt's Pty Ltd v Spencer (1919) HCA  Page 42
★Shepperd v Ryde Municipal Council (1952) HCA  Page 43
★JJ Savage & Sons Pty Ltd v Blakney (1970) HCA

B. Incorporation of Terms  Page 44

i) Signed contracts
★L'Estrange v Graucob [1934] UK
Curtis v Chemical Cleaning & Dyeing Co [1951] UK
Toll (FGCT) v Alphapharm (2004) HCA  Page 45

ii) Incorporation of unsigned documents – tickets and notices
Factors to consider for adequate notice
Parker v South Eastern Railway Co [1877] UK  Page 46
Causer v Brown [1952] Victorian Supreme Court

★Thornton v Shoe Lane Parking [1971] UK  Page 47
Interphoto Picture Library Ltd v Stiletto Visual Programmes Ltd [1989] UK  Page 48

iii) Incorporation by course of dealing
Elements of incorporation by past dealings
★Hardwick Game Farm v Suffolk Agricultural Poultry Producers [1966] UK  Page 49
## CONTENTS

**C. Implied Terms**

* i) Terms implied in fact

  - BP Refinery (Westernport) Pty Ltd v Hasting Shire Council [1977] UK
  - The Moorcock [1889] UK
  - Breen v Williams (1996) HCA

* ii) Terms implied in law

  - Codelfa Constructions v Rail Authority of NSW (1982) HCA (Implied Terms)
  - Rectification v Implication
  - Byrne v Australian Airlines (1995) HCA

* iii) Terms implied in custom/trade usage

  - Con-Stan Industries of Australia v Norwich Winterthur (Australia) (1986) HCA

* iv) Good faith

  - Renard Constructions v Minister for Public Works (1992) NSW Court of Appeal

## D. Construction of Contracts

* i) Extrinsic Evidence and Parol Evidence Rule

  - Bacchus Marsh Concentrated Milk v Joseph Nathan & (1919) HCA
  - Hope v RCA Photophone of Australia Pty Ltd (1937) 59 CLR 348.

* ii) Exceptions to the Parol Evidence Rule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Classification of Terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) The Tripartite Classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Exclusion Clauses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Construction of Exclusion Clauses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallis v Pratt (1911) UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules for Exclusion Clauses (contra proferentem; four corners; concept of deviation; negligence; fundamental breach)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Privity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) General rule of privity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Exceptions to the rule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co Ltd v Selfridge &amp; Co Ltd [1915] UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ii) Statutory control of Exclusion Clauses – Consumer Protection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council of the City of Sydney v West (1965)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Production Ltd v Securicor Transport Ltd [1980] UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis v Pearce Parking Station (1954) HCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada SS Lines Ltd v The King [1952] UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Statutory control of Exclusion Clauses – Consumer Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More on Trident: the application of trust analysis beyond insurance contracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Contracts for the benefit of a third party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Can B claim damages or specific performance of A’s promise to pay C?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beswick v Beswick [1986] UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Can A and B rescind their contract by agreement without C’s consent?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Can the contract be construed as containing a promise made to B and C jointly in return for B’s consideration? If so, could C enforce A’s promise?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulls v Bagot's Executors and Trustee Co Ltd (1967) HCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART THREE – TERMINATION
Breach and Frustration

Contracts can be discharged in five ways

A. The order of performance

Automatic Fire Sprinklers Pty Ltd v Watson (1946) HCA

B. Prevention of performance

Refusal of tender of performance

C. Discharge by performance

i) Entire contracts

★Cutter v Powell (1795) UK
★Sumpter v Hedges [1898] UK

ii) Substantial performance

★Hoenig v Isaacs [1952] UK
★Bolton v Mahadeva [1972] UK

Jacob & Youngs Inc v Kent (1921) US

iii) Severable contracts

Government of Newfoundland v Newfoundland Railway Co (1888) UK
★Steele v Tardiani (1946) HCA

D. Discharge for breach of term

i) Late performance

Holland v Wiltshire (1954) HCA
Canning v Temby (1905) HCA
ii) Defective performance
Derbyshire Building Co Pty Ltd v Becker (1962) HCA
Greaves & Co (Contractors) Ltd v Baynham Meikle & Partners [1975] UK

iii) Effect of failure to perform – termination for breach
- Associated Newspapers Ltd v Bancks (1951) HCA
- Ankar Pty Ltd v National Westminster Finance (Australia) Ltd (1987) HCA
- Luna Park (NSW Ltd) v Tramways Advertising Pty Ltd (1938) HCA

Intermediate terms
- Hong Kong Fir Shipping Co v Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd [1962] UK
- Koompahtoo Local Aboriginal Land Council v Sanpine Pty Ltd [2007] HCA
- Cehave NV v Bremer Handelgesellschaft mbH (The Hansa Nord) (1976) UK

E. Discharge for repudiation
- Bowes v Chaleyer (1923) HCA
- Universal Cargo Carrier Corporation v Citati [1957] UK

SALE OF GOODS ACT 1923 (NSW) - SECT 34
Laurinda Pty Ltd v Capalaba Park Shopping Centre Pty Ltd (1989) HCA

F. Discharge for delay and time stipulations.
CONVEYANCING ACT 1919 (NSW) – SECT 13
- Louinder v Leis (1982) HCA

G. Termination
i) Process of termination
- Election and waiver of right to terminate (Termination or Affirmation)
- Photo Production Ltd v Securicor Transport Ltd [1980] UK
- Tropical Traders Ltd v Goonan (1964) HCA
- White & Carter Councils Ltd v McGregor [1962] UK
- Rawson v Hobbs (1961) HCA

ii) Estoppel as a restriction on right to terminate
- Legione v Hateley (1983) HCA
- Foran v Wight (1989) HCA
## Effect of termination

- McDonald v Dennys Lascelles Ltd (1933) HCA
- Shevill v Builders Licensing Board (1982) HCA
- Heyman v Darwins [1942] UK

### H. Discharge by frustration

#### i) The general rule of frustration

- a) Impossibility
  - Taylor v Caldwell (1863) UK
- b) Frustration of purpose
  - Krell v Henry [1903] UK
- c) Frustration of the commercial venture
  - Davis Contractor Ltd v Fareham Urban District Council [1956] UK
  - Codelfa Constructions v State Rail Authority NSW (1982) HCA (Frustration)
  - Bank Line Ltd v Arthur Capel & Co [1919] UK

#### ii) Application of the doctrine of frustration in various circumstances

- a) Leases and contracts for the sale of land
- b) Where frustration was foreseen but not provided for in the contract
- c) Where the contract provides for the consequences of frustration
  - Simmons Ltd v Hay (1964) NSW

#### d) Self-induced frustration

- J Lauritzen AS v Wijsmuller BV (Super Servant Two) [1990] UK

### iii) Consequences of frustration

- Fibrosa Spolka Akcyjna v Fairbairn Lawson Combe Barbour Ltd [1943] UK

### ‘Force majeure’ clauses

- Baltic Shipping Co v Dillion (The Mikhail Lermontov) (1993) HCA

### I. Discharge by agreement