

CONTRACT DAMAGES

This book is a collection of essays examining the remedy of contract damages in the common law and under the international contract law instruments such as the Vienna Convention on Contracts for the International Sales of Goods and the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts. The essays, written by leading experts in the area, raise important and topical issues relating to the law of contract damages from both theoretical and practical perspectives. The book aims to inform readers of current developments, problems, trends and debates surrounding contract damages and reflects an ongoing dialogue on damages among representatives of common law, civil law, mixed and transnational legal systems. The general issues addressed in the collection include the purpose and scope of damages, the measures of damages, recoverability of losses, methods of limiting damages and assessment of damages. A special emphasis is placed on the examination of the role of gain-based damages, the meaning and definition of loss, the recoverability of damages for injury to business reputation, the recoverability of legal fees, the rules of mitigation and foreseeability, the dilemma between 'abstract' and 'concrete' approaches to the calculation of damages, and the relationship between changes in monetary value and the assessment of damages.

Contract Damages

Domestic and International Perspectives

Edited by
Djakhongir Saidov and Ralph Cunnington



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON
2008

Published in North America (US and Canada) by
Hart Publishing
c/o International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Avenue, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213-3786
USA

Tel: +1 503 287 3093 or toll-free: (1) 800 944 6190
Fax: +1 503 280 8832
E-mail: orders@isbs.com
Website: www.isbs.com

© The editors and contributors severally, 2008

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

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of Hart Publishing, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to Hart Publishing at the address below.

Hart Publishing, 16C Worcester Place, Oxford, OX1 2JW
Telephone: +44 (0)1865 517530 Fax: +44 (0) 1865 510710
E-mail: mail@hartpub.co.uk
Website: <http://www.hartpub.co.uk>

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data Available

ISBN: 978-1-84113-741-4

Typeset by Forewords, Oxford
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

Foreword

This collection of essays is one result of a conference in June 2007 in Birmingham University's attractive Business School, part of which I had the pleasure of chairing. Their focus is on a traditionally somewhat neglected field, but one of domestic and international significance to which increasing attention has rightly been addressed in recent years.

The essays take damages in the widest (perhaps even controversial) sense of the word, with a number of papers tackling the border territory where 'restitutionary damages' may represent an alternative to reliance and expectation measures. This is territory where, since the House of Lords' decision in *Attorney General v Blake* in 2000, no practitioner can afford to be lost. But the maps are still being written, with academic assistance playing an invaluable role. The courts will for some time be engaged in implementing Lord Steyn's injunction in *Blake* to hammer out 'on the anvil of concrete cases' exceptions to the general principle that there is no remedy for disgorgement of profits in cases of breach of contract.

The whole collection includes essays by a range of distinguished experts which address not only the philosophical underpinning of the law of damages, but also more specifically topics such as the UN Convention on the International Sale of Goods and UNIDROIT principles. Together, these essays represent a valuable, informative and stimulating body of material, for both study and reference. The organisers, Djakhongir Saidov and Ralph Cunningham, are to be congratulated for arranging the conference and marshalling, as a result, a most interesting set of contributions to learning in this important field.

Lord Mance of Frogna

Contents

Foreword	v
LORD MANCE	
List of Contributors	ix
Tables of Cases	xi
Table of Legislation	xxvii
Current Themes in the Law of Contract Damages: Introductory Remarks	i
DJAKHONGIR SAIDOV AND RALPH CUNNINGTON	
Part I The Purpose and Scope of Damages	
1 The Law of Damages: Rules for Citizens or Rules for Courts?	33
STEPHEN A SMITH	
2 Economic Aspects of Damages and Specific Performance Compared	65
DANIEL FRIEDMANN	
3 The Scope of the CISG Provisions on Damages	91
INGEBORG SCHWENZER AND PASCAL HACHEM	
4 Using the UNIDROIT Principles to Fill Gaps in the CISG	107
JOHN Y GOTANDA	
Part II The Measures of Damages	
5 The Economic Basis of Damages for Breach of Contract: Inducement and Expectation	125
ANTHONY OGUS	
6 Damages and the Protection of Contractual Reliance	139
PETER JAFFEY	
7 Are 'Damages on the Wrotham Park Basis' Compensatory, Restitutionary or Neither?	165
ANDREW BURROWS	
8 Gains Derived from Breach of Contract: Historical and Conceptual Perspectives	187
STEPHEN WADDAMS	
9 The Measure and Availability of Gain-based Damages for Breach of Contract	207
RALPH CUNNINGTON	

Part III Methods of Limiting Damages

- 10 The Limitation of Contract Damages in Domestic Legal Systems
and International Instruments 245**
ALEXANDER KOMAROV
- 11 No Need to Limit Where There is No Promise? 265**
JAN RAMBERG
- 12 Remoteness: New Problems with the Old Test 277**
ADAM KRAMER
- 13 *Hadley v Baxendale* v Foreseeability under Article 74 CISG 305**
FRANCO FERRARI
- 14 The Role of Mitigation in the Assessment of Damages 329**
HARVEY MCGREGOR QC

Part IV The Assessment of Damages

- 15 Expectation Damages: Avoided Loss, Offsetting Gains and
Subsequent Events 349**
DAVID McLAUHLAN
- 16 Damage to Business Reputation and Goodwill under the Vienna
Sales Convention 389**
DJAKHONGIR SAIDOV
- 17 Actual Damages, Notional Damages and Loss of a Chance 419**
MICHAEL FURMSTON
- 18 The Market Rule of Damages Assessment 431**
MICHAEL BRIDGE
- 19 Changes in Monetary Values and the Assessment of Damages 459**
CHARLES PROCTOR

List of Contributors

MICHAEL BRIDGE, LLB, LLM, Professor of Commercial Law, London School of Economics

ANDREW BURROWS, BCL, MA, LLM, QC, Norton Rose Professor of Commercial Law and Fellow of St Hugh's College, University of Oxford

RALPH CUNNINGTON, LLB, LLM, Lecturer in Law, University of Birmingham

FRANCO FERRARI, JD, LLM, Professor, University of Verona

DANIEL FRIEDMANN, MJur, LLM, DRJ Sur, Minister of Justice, Israel

MICHAEL FURMSTON, LLM, MA, BCL, Dean, School of Law, Singapore Management University, Professor Emeritus, University of Bristol

JOHN GOTANDA, JD, Professor of Law, Associate Dean for Faculty Research, Villanova University

PASCAL HACHEM, Referendar, Research and Teaching Assistant, University of Basel

PETER JAFFEY, BA, LLM, Professor of Law, Brunel University

ALEXANDER KOMAROV, Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor and Head of Private Law Chair, Russian Academy of Foreign Trade, President, International Commercial Arbitration Court at the Russian Federation Chamber of Commerce and Industry

ADAM KRAMER, BA, LLM, Barrister, 3 Verulam Buildings

HARVEY MCGREGOR, QC, DCL, SJD, Barrister, Hailsham Chambers

DAVID MCLAUHLAN, LLM, Professor of Law, Victoria University Wellington

ANTHONY OGUS, BCL, MA, CBE, FBA, Professor of Law, University of Manchester

CHARLES PROCTOR, LLB, LLD, Partner, Bird & Bird, Honorary Professor of Law, University of Birmingham

JAN RAMBERG, LLD, Professor Emeritus, University of Stockholm

DJAKHONGIR SAIDOV, LLB, LLM, PHD, Lecturer in Commercial Law, University of Birmingham

x *List of Contributors*

INGEBORG SCHWENZER, Dr iur, LL.M., Professor of Private Law,
University of Basel

STEPHEN A SMITH, BA, DPhil, William Dawson Scholar and Professor
of Law, McGill University

STEPHEN WADDAMS, BA, MA, PhD, LL.B., LL.M., SJD, FRSC, University
Professor and Goodman / Schipper Professor of Law, University of
Toronto

Table of Cases

English law

AB v South West Water Services Ltd [1993] QB 507 (CA)	56
Achilleas, The see Transfield Shipping Inc v Mercator Shipping Inc	
Adderley v Dixon (1824) 1 Sim & St 607, 57 ER 239 (Ch).	232
Addis v Gramophone Co Ltd [1909] AC 488 (HL).	84, 134
Admiralty Commissioners v SS Chekiang [1926] AC 637 (HL).	216
Aerial Advertising Co v Batchelors Peas Ltd [1938] 2 All ER 788.	407
Agenor, The [1985] 1 Lloyd's Rep 155 (QB).	471
Aitken Lilburn v Ernsthause [1894] 1 QB 773 (CA)	333
Albacruz (Cargo Owners) v Albazero (Owners) [1977] AC 774 (HL).	89
Albazero, The see Albacruz (Cargo Owners) v Albazero (Owners)	
Alcoa Minerals of Jamaica plc v Broderick [2002] 1 AC 371 (PC)	481
Alfred McAlpine Construction Ltd v Panatown Ltd [2001] 1 AC 518 (HL)	89, 182, 216–17, 225, 453
Allied Maples v Simmons & Simmons [1995] 4 All ER 907	429
Ambrosi v Bane, unreported, 15 June 2006.	467
Amec Developments Ltd v Jury's Hotel Management (UK) Ltd (2000) 82 P & CR 286 (Ch)	167, 237
Anglia Television v Reed [1972] 1 QB 60 (CA).	129, 141, 420
Armorie v Delamirie (1722) 1 Str 505.	200
Arpad, The [1934] P 189 (CA)	282
Aruna Mills Ltd v Dhanrajmal Gobindram [1968] 1 QB 655 (QB).	487
Attorney General v Blake [2001] 1 AC 268, [2000] 4 All ER 385 (HL)	8–9, 92, 101, 129, 149–52, 165, 168–9, 177–9, 193, 198–9, 201, 205, 207–14, 217, 221–3, 226–42, 422
Baarn, The [1933] P 251 (CA)	462
Banco de Portugal v Waterlow [1932] AC 452 (HL).	332
Barclays Bank v Fairclough Building [1995] QB 214 (CA)	132
Barclays Bank International Ltd v Levin Bros (Bradford) Ltd [1977] QB 270 (QB)	471
Barings plc v Coopers & Lybrand [2003] EWHC 2371 (Ch).	469
Bartlett v Barclays Bank Trust Co Ltd (No 2) [1980] Ch 515 (Ch)	9
Baylis v Bishop of London [1913] 1 Ch 127 (CA).	158
Bear Sterns Plc v Forum Global Equity Ltd [2007] EWHC 1576 (Comm).	385–6, 443, 446, 452
Behrens v Richards [1905] 2 Ch 614 (Ch).	57
Bence Graphics International Ltd v Fasson UK Ltd [1998] QB 87 (CA)	183, 290, 344, 370–73, 385–6, 431, 437, 451–5
Beswick v Beswick [1968] AC 58 (HL).	89, 149, 232
Biggin & Co Ltd v Permanite Ltd [1951] 1 KB 422 (KB)	446, 449, 454

xii *Table of Cases*

Bishop v Cunard White Star Ltd [1950] P 242 (P).....	467
Boardman v Phipps [1967] 2 AC 46 (HL).....	177, 201, 228
Bonsor v Musician's Union [1956] AC 104 (HL)	84
Boomer v Muir (1933) 24 P 2d 570	161
Borders (UK) Ltd v Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis [2005] EWCA Civ 197 (CA)	201
Bracewell v Appleby [1975] Ch 408 (Ch)	167, 177, 210, 220
Braddon Towers Ltd v International Stores Ltd [1987] 1 EGLR 209.....	78
Bristol and West Building Society v Mothew [1998] Ch 1 (CA)	9
British Columbia and Vancouver's Island Spar, Lumber and Saw-Mill Co v Nettleship (1868) LR 3 CP 499 (CPP)	277
British Motor Trade Association v Gilbert [1951] 2 All ER 641 (Ch)	210
British Movietonews v London and District Cinemas [1952] AC 166 (HL)....	275
British Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co Ltd v Underground Electric Railways Co of London Ltd [1912] AC 673 (HL)....	22, 131, 182–3, 338, 341, 361–2, 365–7, 374, 381, 383, 442, 492
Brown v KMR Services Ltd [1995] 4 All ER 598 (CA)	293
Bunge NV v Tradax Export SA [1981] 1 WLR 711 (HL)	439
C & P Haulage v Middleton [1983] 1 WLR 1461 (CA)	129, 141, 420
Campbell Mostyn (Provisions) Ltd v Barnett Trading Co [1954] 1 Lloyd's Rep 65 (CA).....	340, 377–8, 493
Camdex International Ltd v Bank of Zambia (No 3) [1997] CLC 714 (CA).....	468, 494
Caparo v Dickman [1990] 2 AC 605 (HL)	294
Carbopego-Abastecimento de Combustiveis SA v AMCI Export Corp [2006] EWHC 72 (Comm), [2006] 1 Lloyd's Rep 736.....	376, 440
Carnegie v Giessen [2004] EWHC 1782 (Ch)	484
Carr-Saunders v Dick McNeil Associates Ltd [1986] 1 WLR 922 (Ch)	167
Cassell v Broome & Co Ltd [1972] AC 1027 (HL).....	56
CCC Films (London) v Impact Quadrant Films [1985] QB 16 (QB)	141, 420
Cehave NV v Bremer Handelgesellschaft mbH [1976] QB 44 (CA).....	240, 453
Celanese International Corp v BP Chemicals Ltd [1999] RPC 203 (Ch)	177
Chandris v Argo Insurance Co Ltd [1963] 2 Lloyd's Rep 65 (QB).....	490
Chaplin v Hicks [1911] 2 KB 786.....	428
Charter v Sullivan [1957] 2 QB 117 (CA).....	136, 333
Cia de Seguros Imperio v Heath (REBX) Ltd [2001] 1 WLR 112 (CA).....	9
Clydebank Engineering & Shipbuilding Co Ltd v Don Jose Ramos Yxquierdo Y Castaneda [1905] AC 6 (HL).....	225
CN Marine Inc v Stena Line A/B (The Stena Nautica) (No 2) [1982] 2 Lloyd's Rep 323 (CA)	57
Coastal International Trading v Maroil AG [1988] 1 Lloyd's Rep 92 (QB)....	446
Cohen v Roche [1927] 1 KB 169 (KB)	58
Cointat v Myham 7 Son [1913] 2 KB 220.....	416
Colburn v Simms (1843) 2 Hare 543 (Ch)	229
Cookson v Knowles [1979] AC 556 (HL).....	466

Co-operative Insurance Society Ltd v Argyll Stores (Holdings) Ltd [1998] AC 1, [1997] 2 WLR 898 (HL).....	65-6, 78, 81, 86, 88-9, 145, 205
Cope v Doherty (1858) 4 K & J 367 (Ch).....	51
Cressman v Coys of Kensington [2004] 1 WLR 2775 (CA).....	158, 163
Cutter v Powell (1795) 6 TR 320 (KB).....	157
Darbishire v Warran [1963] 1 WLR 1067 (CA).....	331
Darlington BC v Wiltshier Northern Ltd [1995] 3 All ER 895 (CA).....	135
Davidson v Barclays Bank [1940] 1 All ER 316.....	404
Decro-Wall International SA v Practitioners in Marketing [1971] 1 WLR 361 (CA).....	232
Despina R, The [1979] AC 685 (HL).....	476-7
Devine v Jefferys [2001] Lloyd's Rep PN 301 (QB).....	342, 378
Di Ferdinando v Simon Smits & Co Ltd [1920] 3 KB 409 (CA).....	468
Dies v British & International Mining and Finance [1939] 1 KB 724 (KB)...	158
Dione, The [1980] 2 Lloyd's Rep 577 (QB).....	479
Dodd Properties v Canterbury City Council [1980] 1 WLR 433, [1980] 1 All ER 928 (CA).....	424, 466
Dunkirk Colliery Co v Lever (1878) 9 Ch D 20 (CA).....	438
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co v New Garage & Motor Co [1915] AC 79 (HL).....	134, 259
Dynamics Corp of America, re [1976] 2 All ER 669 (Ch).....	485
Ebrahim Dawood Ltd v Heath (Est 1927) Ltd [1961] 2 Lloyd's Rep 512 (QB)...	156
Edmunds v Lloyd Italico SpA [1986] 1 Lloyd's Rep 326 (CA).....	51
Elena d'Amico, The see Koch Marine Inc v d'Amica Societa di Navigazione arl	
Erie County Natural Gas and Fuel Co v Carroll [1911] AC 105 (PC) 338, 362, 366	
Esso Petroleum Co Ltd v Niad Ltd [2001] EWHC 458 (Ch) ..	205, 207, 212, 231-2, 235, 241-2
Esteve Trading Corp v Agropec International [1990] 2 Lloyd's Rep 273 (QB)...	446
Evans Marshall & Co v Bertola SA [1973] 1 WLR 349 (CA).....	232
Experience Hendrix LLC v PPX Enterprises Inc [2003] EWCA Civ 323, [2003] 1 All ER (Comm) 830 (CA) ..	168, 175, 177-8, 180, 202, 204-5, 207-8, 212-13, 216, 221, 223, 225, 228-9, 234-7, 239, 241-2
Falcke v Gray (1859) 4 Drew 651, 62 ER 250 (Ch).....	232
Farley v Skinner (No 2) [2002] 2 AC 732 (HL).....	70, 92, 134
Federal Commerce & Navigation Co Ltd v Tradax Export [1977] QB 324 (CA).....	471
Federal Huron, The [1985] 2 Lloyd's Rep 189 (QB).....	477-9, 482
Folias, The [1979] AC 685 (HL).....	474-8, 494
Foskett v McKeown [2001] AC 102 (HL).....	189
Freja Scandic, The [2002] EWHC 79 (Comm).....	475
Fritz v Hobson (1880) 14 Ch D 542 (Ch).....	86
Gafford v Graham (1998) 77 P & CR 73 (CA).....	220, 225, 241
Gardner v Marsh & Parsons [1997] 1 WLR 489 (CA).....	341-2, 380-82
Gee v Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Co (1860) 6 H & N 211.....	295
Geest plc v Lansiquot [2002] UKPC 48, [2002] 1 WLR 3111 (PC).....	331-2

George Mitchell (Chesterhall) Ltd v Finney Lock Seeds Ltd [1983] QB 284 (CA)	240
GKN Centrax Gears Ltd v Matbro Ltd [1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep 555 (CA) ..	416, 453
Golden Rio, The see Esteve Trading Corp v Agropec International	
Golden Strait Corp v Nippon Yusen Kubishika Kaisha [2007] UKHL 12, [2007] 2 WLR 691 (HL)	16, 20, 23–24, 73, 140, 184, 344–6, 350–51, 356–60, 385, 388, 424–8, 430, 435–6, 460, 466, 481–2, 495
Golden Victory, The see Golden Strait Corp v Nippon Yusen Kubishika Kaisha	
Gondal v Dillon [2001] RLR 221 (CA)	226
Good Friend, The [1984] 2 Lloyd's Rep 586 (QB)	475
Gordon v Gonda [1955] 1 WLR 885 (CA)	227
Gregg v Scott [2005] 2 AC 176, [2005] 4 All ER 812 (HL)	429
Greta Holme, The [1897] AC 596	216
Groom v Crocker [1939] 1 KB 194 (CA)	299
Hadley v Baxendale (1854) 9 Ex 341, 156 ER 145 (Exch)	5, 72–3, 85–6, 133, 135, 252, 278, 283, 290, 293, 304–27, 370, 419–20, 431, 435, 437, 445, 452, 454, 466, 483, 486–8, 494–5
Halcyon the Great, The [1975] 1 All ER 882	471, 484
Hall (R & H) and Pim (WH) Junior & Co's Arbitration, re (1928) 30 Ll L Rep 159 (HL)	343, 433, 435, 444–6, 449, 455
Hambly v Trott (1776) 1 Cowp 371	188, 190–91
Hamilton Jones v David & Snape [2004] 1 WLR 924 (Ch)	70
Hammond & Co v Bussey (1888) 20 QBD 79 (CA)	445, 454
Hansa Nord, The see Cehave NV v Bremer Handelgesellschaft mbH	
Harding v Wealands [2006] UKHL 32, [2006] 3 WLR 83 (HL)	48, 51
Harlow & Jones Ltd v Panex (International) Ltd [1967] 2 Lloyd's Rep 509 (QB)	446
Harnett v Yielding (1805) 2 Sch & Lef 549	239
Harris v Williams-Wynne [2005] EWHC 151 (Ch); upheld on appeal [2006] EWCA Civ 104, [2006] 2 P & CR 27 (CA)	221, 236–7
Hedley Byrne & Co Ltd v Heller & Partners Ltd [1964] AC 465 (HL)	28, 278, 280, 290–94, 302–3
Heil v Rankin [2001] QB 272 (CA)	53, 59
Helmsing Schiffahrts GmbH v Malta Drydocks Corp [1977] 2 Lloyd's Rep 444 (QB)	469
Henderson v Merrett Syndicates Ltd [1995] 2 AC 145 (HL) 278–80, 284, 290, 294	
Hepburn v A Tomlinson (Hauliers) Ltd [1966] AC 451 (HL)	89
Herbert Clayton and Jack Waller v Oliver [1930] AC 209	417
Heron II, The see Koufos v C Czarnikow Ltd	
Heywood v Wellers [1976] QB 446 (CA)	299
Hill v Showell (1918) 87 LJBK 1106 (HL)	338
Hinde v Liddell (1875) LR 10 QB 265	447
Hogg v Kirby (1803) 8 Ves 215, 32 ER 336 (Ch)	229–30
Hooper v Rogers [1975] Ch 43 (CA)	36
Horabin v British Overseas Airways Corp [1952] 2 Lloyd's Rep 450 (QB)	270
Horne v Midland Railway Co (1873) LR 8 CP 131	443

Horsford v Bird [2006] UKPC 3, [2006] 1 EGLR 75 (PC).....	226
Hotson v East Berkshire [1987] AC 750 (HL).....	429
Hussey v Eels [1990] 2 QB 227 (CA)	339, 378, 493
IM Properties Plc v Cape & Dalglish [1998] 3 WLR 457 (CA)	51
International Minerals & Chemical Corp v Karl O Helm AG [1986] 1 Lloyd's Rep 81 (QB)	491
Inverugie Investments Ltd v Hackett [1995] 1 WLR 713 (PC)... 74, 180, 192, 225	
Jackson v Horizon Holidays [1975] 1 WLR 1468.....	100
Jackson v Royal Bank of Scotland [2005] UKHL 3, [2005] 1 WLR 377 (HL)..	294
Jaggard v Sawyer [1995] 1 WLR 269, [1995] 2 All ER 189 (CA).....	53, 66, 80, 82, 167, 169, 181, 192, 200, 210, 217, 220-21, 225, 241
Jamal v Moolla Dawood Sons [1916] 1 AC 175 (PC) 340, 353-4, 359, 374-8, 385	
James Finlay & Co Ltd v NV Kwik Hoo Tong Handel Maatschappij [1929] 1 KB 400 (CA)	435
Jarvis v Swan Tours [1973] 2 QB 233.....	100
Jean Kraut AG v Albany Fabrics Ltd [1977] QB 182 (QB)	474
Jebsen v East and West India Dock Co (1875) LR 10 CP 300 (CP) ..	339, 361, 493
Jegon v Vivian (1871) LR 6 Ch App 742 (CA)	210
Jewelowski v Propp [1944] KB 510 (KB)	492
Jindal Iron and Steel Co Ltd v Islamic Solidarity Shipping Co Jordan Inc [2004] UKHL 49, [2005] 1 Lloyd's Rep 57 (HL).....	276
Johnson v Agnew [1980] AC 367 (HL) .. 85, 183, 333, 376, 440, 456, 465-6, 481	
Johnson v Gore Wood [2002] 2 AC 1 (HL).....	279
Jones v Just (1868) LR 3 QB 197	341
Jones v Stroud DC [1986] 1 WLR 1141 (CA).....	60
Jones Estate v Jones [1997] Ch 159 (CA)	189
Jordan II see Jindal Iron and Steel Co Ltd v Islamic Solidarity Shipping Co Jordan Inc	
Joseph v National Magazine Co Ltd [1958] 3 WLR 366.....	417
Joyner v Weekes [1891] 2 QB 31 (CA)	60, 362
Jugoslavenska Oceanska Plovidba v Castle Investment Co Inc [1974] QB 292 (CA)	469
Kasler and Cohen v Slavouski [1928] 1 KB 78 (KB)	451
Kleinwort Benson v Birmingham City Council [1996] 4 All ER 733 (CA).....	218
Knott v Cottee (1852) 16 Beav 77, 51 ER 705 (Rolls).....	227
Koch Marine Inc v D'Amica Società di Navigazione [1980] 1 Lloyd's Rep 75 (QB)	331, 340
Koufos v C Czarnikow Ltd [1969] 1 AC 350 (HL)	279, 288, 292-3, 300, 326, 432-3, 437-8, 447, 449
Kuwait Airways Corp v Iraqi Airways Co [2004] EWHC 2603 (Comm)	212
Kwei Tek Chao v British Traders & Shippers Ltd [1954] 2 QB 459 (QB) .	446, 448
La Pintada, The see President of India v La Pintada Compania Navigacion SA	
Lake v Bayliss [1974] 1 WLR 1073 (Ch).....	210
Langden v O'Connor [2004] 1 AC 1067 (HL)	87
Lash Atlantico, The [1987] 2 Lloyd's Rep 114 (CA)	477

Lavarack v Colchester [1967] 1 QB 278 (CA)	338, 343
Lesotho Highlands Development Authority v Impregilo SpA [2005] UKHL 43, [2006] 1 AC 221 (HL)	459, 470
Lesters Leather & Skin Co Ltd v Home and Overseas Brokers Ltd [1948] WN 437	447
Letang v Cooper [1965] 1 QB 232 (CA)	38
Lever v Goodwin (1887) 36 Ch D 1 (CA)	220, 229
Libyan Arab Foreign Bank v Bankers Trust Co [1989] QB 728 (QB)	474
Liesbosch, The see Owner of Dredger Liesbosch v Owners of Steamship Edison	
Lines Bros Ltd, re [1983] Ch 1 (CA)	485
Lips, The [1988] AC 395 (HL)	51
Livingstone Raywards Coal Co (1880) 5 App Cas 25 (HL)	215–16, 220, 436
Lodder v Slowey [1904] AC 442 (PC)	161
London Chatham & Dover Railway Co v South Eastern Railway Co [1893] AC 429 (HL)	486–7
Louis Dreyfus Trading Ltd v Reliance Trading Ltd [2004] 2 Lloyd's Rep 243 (Comm)	371, 446
Malik v Bank of Credit & Commerce International SA [1998] 1 AC 20 (HL)	84, 403
Malyon v Lawrence Messer and Co [1968] 2 Lloyd's Rep 539 (QB)	298–9, 301
Manners v Pearson [1898] Ch 581 (CA)	468
Martin v Porter (1839) 5 M & W 351 (Exch)	210
Mawman v Tegg (1826) 2 Russ 385, 38 ER 380 (Ch)	229
McCarey v Associated Newspapers Ltd (No 2) [1965] 2 QB 86	406
Mediana, The [1900] AC 113 (HL)	168, 174, 181, 210, 216, 225
Mehmet Dogan Bey v Abdeni & Co Ltd [1951] 2 KB 405 (KB)	487
Mertens v Home Freeholds Co [1921] 2 KB 526 (CA)	60
Metaalhandel Magnus BV v Ardfields Transport Ltd [1988] 1 Lloyd's Rep 197 (QB)	476, 483
Metelmann & Co v NBR (London) [1984] 1 Lloyd's Rep 614 (CA)	336
Miles v Wakefield MDC [1987] AC 539 (HL)	156
Miliangos v George Frank (Textiles) Ltd [1976] AC 443 (HL)	460, 465, 469–72, 484–5, 491
Ministry of Defence v Ashman [1993] 2 EGLR 102 (CA)	210, 226
Ministry of Defence v Thompson [1993] 2 EGLR 107 (CA)	210, 226
Ministry of Defence v Wheeler [1998] 1 WLR 637 (CA)	333
Mitchell v Mulholland (No 2) [1972] 1 QB 65 (CA)	467
Moschi v Lepp Air Services Ltd [1972] 2 WLR 1175 (HL)	52
Mosconici, The [2001] 2 Lloyd's Rep 313 (QB)	477
Mouat v Betts Motors Ltd [1959] AC 71, PC	60
Multiservice Bookbinding Ltd v Marden [1979] Ch 84 (Ch)	471
Murad v Al-Saraj [2005] EWCA Civ 959, [2005] WTLR 1573 (CA)	228, 231
Needler Financial Services Ltd v Taber [2002] 3 All ER 501, [2002] Lloyd's Rep PN 32 (Ch)	342, 379–80, 493

O'Brien Homes Ltd v Joan Eileen Lane [2004] EWHC 303 (QB)	167, 218, 221, 232, 236
Ocean Dynamic, The [1982] 2 Lloyd's Rep 88 (QB)	475
100 Old Broad Street v Sidley [1999] All ER (D) 432 (CA)	296, 301
Overseas Tankship (UK) Ltd v Miller Steamship Co Pty Ltd [1967] 1 AC 617 (PC)	279, 288, 290
Owner of Dredger Liesbosch v Owners of Steamship Edison [1933] AC 449 (HL)	87
Oxus Gold plc v Templeton Insurance Ltd [2007] EWHC 770 (Comm) . .	345, 387, 443, 452
Ozalid Group (Export) Ltd v African Continental Bank Ltd [1979] 2 Lloyd's Rep 231 (QB)	488
Pacific Colocotronis, The [1981] 2 Lloyd's Rep 40 (CA)	469
Pagnan & Fratelli v Corbisa Industrial Agropacuaria Ltd [1970] 1 WLR 1306 (CA)	378, 442
Parana, The (1876) 2 PD 118	436-7, 447
Parsons (H) (Livestock) Ltd v Uttley Ingham & Co [1978] QB 791 (CA)	278-9, 286-90, 303, 432-3, 466
Payzu v Saunders [1919] 2 KB 581 (CA)	335
Penarth Dock Engineering Co Ltd v Pounds [1963] 1 Lloyd's Rep 359 (QB) . .	170, 178, 210-11, 226
Photo Production Ltd v Securicor Transport Ltd [1980] AC 827 (HL)	52
Pickett v British Rail Engineering Ltd [1980] AC 136 (HL)	51
Pitt v Cholmondeley (1754) 2 Ves Sen 565, 28 ER 3601 (Ch)	227
Planché v Colburn (1831) 8 Bing 14 (CA)	156, 158
Platt v London Underground Ltd [2001] 2 EGLR 121 (Ch)	339
Polly Peck (No 2), re [1998] 3 All ER 812 (CA)	47
Powell v Braun [1954] 1 All ER 484 (CA)	156
President of India v La Pintada Compania Navigacion SA [1985] AC 104 (HL)	486
President of India v Lips Maritime Corp [1988] AC 395 (HL)	19, 481, 486, 489-90, 495
Primavera v Allied Dunbar Assurance Plc [2003] PNLR 276 (QB)	382-4
Radford v De Froberville [1977] 1 WLR 1262 (Ch)	60, 183, 352-3, 360
Randall v Newson (1877) 2 QBD 102	435
Ranelagh Earl v Hayes (1683) 1 Vern 189, 23 ER 405	232
Read v Brown (1889) 22 QBD 128 (CA)	38
Reading v Attorney General [1951] AC 507 (HL)	210
Regal (Hastings) Ltd v Gulliver [1967] 2 AC 134 (HL)	228
Reichman v Beveridge [2006] EWCA Civ 1659, [2007] Bus LR 412 (CA)	335
Reid Newfoundland Co v Anglo-American Telegraph Co Ltd [1912] AC 555 (PC)	210
Resultatet, The (1853) 17 Jur 353	201
Reynolds v Phoenix Assurance Co Ltd [1978] 2 Lloyd's Rep 440 (QB)	490
Robinson v Harman (1848) 1 Exch 850, 154 ER 363 (Exch)	66, 71-2, 139, 215-16, 239, 329, 334, 420, 461

Rodocanachi Sons & Co v Milburn Bros (1886) 18 QBD 67 (CA) . . .	23, 60, 343–6, 365–9, 375, 386–8, 440, 442–3, 447
Ronex Properties Ltd v John Laing Construction Ltd [1982] 3 WLR 875 (CA).	50, 52
Roper v Johnson (1873) LR 8 CP 167 (CP).	331
Ruxley Electronics and Construction Ltd v Forsyth [1996] AC 344 (HL) . . .	13, 24, 60, 70–71, 73, 82, 84, 82, 94, 135, 184, 196, 215–16, 225, 349, 409
SAAMCO see South Australia Asset Management Corp v York Montague Ltd	
Sanix Ace, The [1987] 1 Lloyd's Rep 465 (QB).	475
Schorsch Meier GmbH v Hennin [1975] QB 416 (CA).	470
Scruttons Ltd v Midland Silicones Ltd [1962] AC 446 (HL)	306
Selvanayagam v University of the West Indies [1983] 1 WLR 585 (PC). . . .	331–2
Sempra Metals Ltd v Inland Revenue Commissioners [2007] UKHL 34, [2007] 3 WLR 354 (HL).	180, 207, 216, 226, 229, 239, 461, 486, 489, 495
Severn Trent Water Ltd v Barnes [2004] EWCA Civ 570, [2004] 2 EGLR 95 (CA)	167, 169
Shearson Lehman Hutton Inc v MacLaine Watson & Co Ltd (No 2) [1990] 3 All ER 723 (QB)	434, 436, 438
Simon v Pawsons and Leaf's Ltd (1932) 28 Com Cas 151 (CA).	453
Sky Petroleum v VIP Petroleum [1974] 1 WLR 576 (Ch)	149, 232
Slater v Hoyle & Smith [1920] 2 KB 11 (CA)	344, 367–73, 449–51
Smith v Leech Brain [1962] 2 QB 405 (QB)	477
Smith & Stott, re (1883) 29 Ch D 1009n	464
Smith New Court Securities Ltd v Scrimgeour Vickers (Asset Management) Ltd [1997] AC 254 (HL)	376
Solholt, The [1983] 1 Lloyd's Rep 605 (CA)	335, 491
South Australia Asset Management Corp v York Montague Ltd [1997] AC 191 (HL).	279, 294, 329
Staffordshire Area Health Authority v South Staffordshire Waterworks Co [1978] 1 WLR 1387 (CA)	464
Standard Chartered Bank v Pakistan National Shipping Corp [1999] 1 Lloyd's Rep 747; affirmed [2001] EWCA Civ 55, [2001] 1 All ER (Comm) 822 (CA). . .	331
Stanish v Polish Roman Catholic Union of America 484 F 2d 713 (1973). . . .	295
Stena Nautica, The see CN Marine Inc v Stena Line A/B	
Stoke-on-Trent City Council v W & J Wass Ltd [1988] 1 WLR 1406 (CA)	150, 168, 215
Strand Electric and Engineering Co Ltd v Brisford Entertainments Ltd [1952] 2 QB 246 (CA)	177–8, 192, 210–11, 220
Ströms Bruk Aktiebolag v Hutchison [1905] AC 515 (HL).	446
Sumpter v Hedges [1898] 1 QB 673 (CA).	156
Surrey CC v Bredero Homes Ltd [1993] 1 WLR 1361 (CA) 169–70, 211, 220, 226	
Tamares (Vincent Square) Ltd v Fairpoint Properties (Vincent Square) Ltd [2007] EWHC 212 (Ch), [2007] 1 WLR 2167.	167, 171–3, 222
Tang Man Sit v Capacious Investments Ltd [1996] AC 514 (PC)	230
Texaco Melbourne [1994] 1 Lloyd's Rep 473 (HL)	16, 461, 466, 474–5, 477, 480–82, 484, 488, 490, 495

Thompson v Robinson [1955] Ch 177 (Ch)	333
Tito v Waddell (No 2) [1977] Ch 106 (Ch)	196, 217
Trans Trust Sarl v Danubian Trading Co Ltd [1952] 2 QB 297 (CA)	486
Transfield Shipping Inc v Mercator Shipping Inc [2007] 1 Lloyd's Rep 19 (QB); affirmed [2007] EWCA Civ 901, [2007] 2 Lloyd's Rep 555 (CA)	277, 437, 444–8, 455
Transoceanica Francesca, The [1987] 2 Lloyd's Rep 155 (QB)	481
Travelers Casualty & Surety Co of Canada v Sun Life Assurance Co of Canada (UK) Ltd [2006] EWHC 2716 (Comm), [2007] Lloyd's Rep IR 619	489–90, 495
Treseder-Griffin v Co-operative Insurance Society [1956] 2 QB 127 (CA)	463–4
Ultraframe (UK) v Tailored Roofing Systems [2004] EWCA Civ 585, [2004] BLR 341 (CA)	132
United Railways of Havana and Regla Warehouses Ltd, re [1961] AC 1007 (HL)	467–71, 473, 494
Vacwell Engineering Co Ltd v BDH Chemicals Ltd [1971] 1 QB 88 (QB)	289
Victoria Laundry (Windsor) Ltd v Newman Industries Ltd [1949] 2 KB 528 (CA)	72, 133
Virani Ltd v Manuel Revert y Cia SA [2003] EWCA Civ 1651, [2004] 2 Lloyd's Rep 14 (CA)	479
Volturno, The [1921] 2 AC 544 (HL)	468
Wadsworth v Lydall [1981] 1 WLR 598 (CA)	486
Wagon Mound (No 2), The see Overseas Tankship (UK) Ltd v Miller Steamship Co Pty Ltd	
Walker v John McLean & Sons [1979] 1 WLR 760 (CA)	467
Watson, Laidlaw & Co Ltd v Pott, Cassels and Williamson (1914) 31 RPC 104 (HL)	168, 210, 216
Watts v Morrow [1991] 1 WLR 141 (CA)	84, 134
Wertheim v Chicoutimi Pulp Co [1911] AC 301 (PC)	23, 344, 346, 362–5, 367–9, 388, 447–8, 450–52, 455, 461
West (H) & Son Ltd v Shephard [1964] AC 326 (HL)	53, 59
Whincup v Hughes (1871) LR 6 CP 78 (CP)	157
White & Carter (Councils) Ltd v McGregor [1962] AC 413 (HL) 79–80, 87–8, 334	
Whitwham v Westminster Brymbo Coal & Coke Co [1896] 2 Ch 538 (CA)	210, 220
Williams Bros v Ed T Agius [1914] AC 510 (HL)	23, 60, 343–6, 364–9, 375, 386–8, 441–4, 446–7, 451
Wilson v Northampton and Banbury Junction Rly Co (1874) 9 Ch App 279 (CA)	232
Withers v General Theatre Corp Co Ltd [1933] 2 KB 536	417
WL Thompson Ltd v R Robinson (Gunmakers) Ltd [1955] Ch 177 (Ch)	136
Woolerton and Wilson Ltd v Richard Costain Ltd [1970] WLR 411 (Ch)	81
Wrightson, re [1908] 1 Ch 789 (Ch)	227
Wroth v Tyler [1974] Ch 165, [1973] 1 All ER 897 (Ch)	85, 89
Wrotham Park Estate Co Ltd v Parkside Homes Ltd [1974] 1 WLR 798 (Ch)	10–11, 27, 81–2, 150, 165–85, 200–1, 203, 208, 211–13, 216, 219–27, 230–2, 235–9, 241–2

xx *Table of Cases*

WWF World Wide Fund for Nature v World Wrestling Foundation Entertainment Inc [2006] EWHC 184 (Ch); reversed on appeal [2007] EWCA Civ 286, [2008] 1 All ER 74 (CA) . . . 27, 165, 168, 175, 203-4, 207-8, 212-14, 219, 222, 225-6, 228, 231, 234-7, 239, 241-2

Australian law

Barrell Insurance Pty Ltd v Pennant Hills Restaurants Pty Ltd (1981) 34 ALR 102 (HC) 467

Brickhill v Cooke [1984] 3 NSWLR 396 (NSW CA) 292-3

Cadoks Pty Ltd v Wallace Westley & Vigar Pty Ltd [2000] VSC 167 (Vic SC) 292, 298, 300-1

Commonwealth of Australia v Amann (1991) 174 CLR 64 421

Cusack v Federal Commissioner of Taxation [2002] FCA 1012 (FC) 464

Daewoo v Suncorp-Metway [2000] NSWLR 35 (NSW SC) 494

Griffiths, re [2004] FCAFC 102 (HC) 473, 485

Hospitality Group Pty Ltd v Australian Rugby Union Ltd (2001) 110 FCR 157 (FC) 212

Hungerfords v Walker (1989) 171 CLR 125 (HC) 461, 486

Hyundai Merchant Marine Co Ltd v Dartbrook Coal (Sales) Pty Ltd [2006] FCA 1324 (FC) 491

John Pfeiffer Pty Ltd v Rogerson (2000) 210 CLR 503 (HC) 51

Johnson v Perez (1988) 166 CLR 351 (HC) 467

Kollmann v Watts [1963] VR 396 295

O'Brien v McKean (1968) 119 CLR 540 467

Odyssey Re v Australian Reinsurance [2001] NSWSC 266 (NSW SC) 490

Roxborough v Rothmans of Pall Mall Australia Ltd [2001] HCA 68 (HC) 158, 162, 218

State Bank of New South Wales Ltd v Swiss Bank Corp (1995) NSWLR 350 (NSW CA) 469

Stuart Pty Ltd v Condor Commercial Insulation Pty Ltd [2006] NSWCA 334 (NSW CA) 277

Todorovic v Walker (1981) 150 CLR 402 (HC) 467

Westpac Banking Corp v 'Stone Gemini' [1999] FCA 917 (FC) 469, 484

Woodman v Rasmussen [1953] St R Qd 202 (Qd CA) 280-81

Canadian law

Abitibi-Price Inc v Westinghouse Canada Inc (1988) 73 Nfld & PEIR 271 (Nfld SC) 279

Air Canada v British Columbia (1989) 59 DLR (4th) 161 (SC) 218

Andrews v Grand Toy Alberta Ltd [1978] 2 SCR 229 (SC) 467

Asamera Oil Corp, re [1978] 89 DLR 3d 1 (SC) 467

Asamera Oil Corp v Sea Oil & General Corp [1979] 1 SCR 633 (SC) 279

Bank of America Canada v Mutual Trust [2002] SCR 601 (SC)	461
BDC Ltd v Hofstrand Farms Ltd [1986] 1 SCR 228 (SC)	279, 293
Brown & Root v Aerotech [2004] MBCA 63 (Manitoba CA)	466
Canlin Ltd v Thiokol Fibres Canada Ltd (1983) 40 OR (2d) 687 (Ont SC)	279
Kienzle v Stringer (1981) 130 DLR (3d) 272 (Ont CA)	279
Murano v Bank of Montreal (1998) 163 DLR (4th) 21 (Ont CA)	285, 298–301
Ontario Ltd v Rimes (1979) 100 DLR (3d) 350 (Ont CA)	355
Peter v Beblow [1993] 1 SCR 980 (SC)	46–7
Rawluk v Rawluk [1990] 1 SCR 70 (SC)	47
Royal Bank of Canada v W Got & Associate Electric Ltd (2000) 178 DLR (4th) 385 (SC)	233
Semelhago v Paramadevan (1996) 136 DLR (4th) 1 (SC)	354–6
Soulus v Korkontzilas [1977] 2 SCR 217 (SC)	47
Tolofson v Jensen (1994) 120 DLR (4th) 289 (SC)	51
Whiten v Pilot Insurance Co [2002] 1 SCR 595, (2002) 209 DLR (4th) 257 (SC)	56, 130, 233

French law

Dibaoui v Flamand, No 231, 19 June 2003 (Cass 2ème civ)	330
Xhaufaire v Decrept, No 230, 19 June 2003 (Cass 2ème civ)	330

German law

TranspR 2003, 467 (SC)	268, 271
----------------------------------	----------

Italian law

Cassazione civile decision, 24 June 1968 (SC)	307
---	-----

New Zealand law

Choon Sang Yoon v Cullen (1999) 4 NZ ConvC 192,973	354
Isaac Naylor & Sons Ltd v New Zealand Cooperative Wool Marketing Association Ltd [1981] 1 NZLR 361 (CA)	488
IT Walker Holdings Ltd v Tuf Shoes Ltd [1981] 2 NZLR 391 (CA)	366
Maori Trustee v Rogross Farms Ltd [1994] 3 NZLR 410 (CA)	362
McSherry v Coopers Creek (2005) 8 NZBLC 101,619 (HC)	372–4
Rochis Ltd v Chambers [2006] NZHC 524 (HC)	471, 488
Turner v Superannuation & Mutual Savings Ltd [1987] 1 NZLR 218 (HC)	351–4, 385

Volk v Hirstlens (NZ) Ltd [1987] 1 NZLR 385 (HC)	488
--	-----

Swedish law

Case, NJA 1960, 644 (SC)	271
Case, NJA 1986, 61 (SC)	270
Case, NJA 1992, 130 (SC)	270
Case, NJA 1992, 403 (SC)	271
Case, NJA 1998, 390 (SC)	267–8, 271

United States law

Agfa-Gevaert AG v AB Dick Co (No 88-2729) (CA 7th Cir)	472
Allied Cannery & Packers v Victor Packing Co 209 Cal Rptr 60 (1985) (Cal CA)	365
AM/PM Franchise Association v Atlantic Richfield Co 526 Pa 110 (1990) ...	400, 405–6
Armstrong Rubber Co Inc v Griffith 43 F 2d 689 (CA2 1930)	395
Barrett Co v Panther Rubber Mfg Co 24 F 2d 329 (CA1 1928)	394, 404
Blanchard v Ely 34 Am Dec 250 (1839) (NY)	319–20
Butler v Aeromexico 714 F 2d 429 (1985) (11th Cir); reversed sub nom Cortes v Am Airlines 177 F 3d 1272 (1999)	270
Clark v Brown 18 Wend 213 (1837) (NY)	319
Clark v Marsiglia 1 Denio 317 (NY 1845)	79
Crash Near Cali, Columbia, in re 985 F Supp 1106 (1997) (SD Fla)	270
Delano Growers' Cooperative Winery v Supreme Wine Co Inc 473 NE 2d 1066	404
Deutsche Bank Filiale Nuremberg v Humphreys 272 US 517 (1925)	472–3
Edwards v Lee's Administrator 265 Ky 418 (1935)	188
Evra Corp v Swiss Bank Corp 673 F 2d 951 (1982)	283
Freeman & Mills Inc v Belcher Oil Co 900 P 2d 669 (Cal 1995)	56, 149
Goddard v Barnard 16 Gray 205 (1860) (Mass)	323
Good Hope Chemical Corp, re 747 F 2d 806 (1st Cir 1984); cert denied 471 US 1102 (1985)	473
Hicks v Guinness 269 US 71 (1925)	472–3
H-W-H Cattle Co v Schroeder 767 F 2d 437 (8th Cir, 1985)	365
Hydraform Products Corp v American and Aluminium Corp 498 A 2d 339 (1985) (NH)	411
Jack Rardin v T & D Machine Handling Inc 890 F 2d 24 (1989) (7th Cir) ...	283
Jacob Roundhouse and Jay Roundhouse, Trout Pond v Owens-Illinois Inc 604 F 2d 990 (1979) (CA Mich)	401
Jones v George 61 Tex 345 (1884) (Tex)	323
Kassab v Central Soya 246 A 2d 848 (Pa 1968)	395

Kennon v Western Union Telegraph Co 126 NC 232 (1900), 35 SE 468.	283
Kerr SS Co v Radio Corp of America 245 NY 284 (1927), 157 NE 140.	283
Lobdell v Parker 3 La 328 (1832).	319
Manss-Owens Co v HS Owens & Sons 105 SE 543 (1921) (Va).	323
Marvin Lumber and Cedar Co, Marvin Windows of Tennessee Inc v PPG Industries Inc 401 F 3d 901 (2005) (CA8 (Minn))	404, 418
Murdock v Boston & AR Co 133 Mass 15 (1882).	283
O'Hare v Peacock Dairies Inc 79 P 2d 433 (1938).	79
Outboard Marine Corp v Babcock Industries Inc WL 296963 1 (1995) (ND Ill)	400, 405
Patterson v Illinois Cent R Co 97 SW 423 (1906).	294-5, 301
Peele v Merchants' Ins Co 19 F Cas 98 (1822) (CCD Mass).	319
Peevyhouse v Garland Coal & Mining Co 382 P 2d 109 (1962) (Okla SC).	196
Porous Media Corp v Pall Corp 173 F 3d 1109 (CA8 Minn 1999).	399
REB Inc v Ralston Purina Co 525 F 2d 749 (1975) (CA Wyo).	410
Reliastar Life Insurance Co v IOA Re and Swiss Re Life Canada, 13 June 2002 (CA 8th Cir).	473
Reo D Stott v Thomas Johnston 36 Cal 2d 864 (1951).	394, 399, 402
Richard v American Union Bank 253 NY 166, 170 NE 532 (1930).	494
Roanoke Hospital Association v Doyle & Russell Inc 214 SE 2d 155 (1975) (Virg SC).	297-8
Rockingham County v Luten Bridge Co 35 F 2d 301 (4th Cir 1929).	79
Rumely Products Co v Moss 175 SW 1084 (1915) (Texas CA).	323
Simpson v Restructure Petroleum Marketing Services 830 So 2d 480 (2002) (La App 2 Cir).	401, 404
Sinclair Refining Co v Hamilton & Dotson 164 Va 203 (1935) (Va).	323-4
Snepp v United States 444 US 507 (1980) (SC).	209
Sol-O-Lite Laminating Corp v Thos W Allen 223 Or 80, 353 P 2d 843 400, 404-5	
Teca-Print AG v Amacoil Machinery Inc 525 NYS 2d 523 (1988).	472-3
Toltec Fabrics v August Inc WL 3392801 2 (SDNY 1993).	397, 401
Verdi, The 268 Fed 908 (1920) (SDNY).	472
Vincent v Lake Erie 124 NW 221 (1910) (Minn SC).	78
Vitol Trading SA Inc v SGS Control Services Inc 874 F 2d 76 (1989) (NY).	323
Spang Industries Inc Ft Pitt Bridge Div v Aetna C & S Co 512 F 2d 365 (1975) (2nd Cir).	297
Western Union Telegraph Co v Green 153 Tenn 59 (1926), 281 SW 778.	283
Western Union Telegraph Co v Hall 287 F 297 (1923).	283
Western Union Telegraph Co v Hogue 79 Ark 33 (1906), 94 SE 924.	283
Williams v Barton 13 La 404 (1839).	319
Zimmerman v Sutherland 247 US 257 (1927).	472

CONVENTION ON CONTRACTS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL
SALE OF GOODS (CISG)

Argentina

Elastar Sacifia v Bettcher Industries Inc, 20 May 1991 (National Commercial Ct of First Instance)	122
---	-----

Australia

Ginza Pte Ltd v Vista Corp Pty Ltd, 17 January 2003 (WA SC)	403
Summit Chemicals Pty Ltd v Vetrotex España SA, 27 May 2004 (WA SC)	390

Austria

Case No 10 Ob 518/95, 6 February 1996 (SC)	310, 312–14
Case No 6 Ob 311/99Z, 9 March 2000 (SC)	310
Case No 1 Ob 292/99V, 28 April 2000 (SC)	311
Case No 7 Ob 301/01T, 14 January 2002 (SC)	92, 310–12, 314–15
Case No 4R 219/01K, 24 January 2002 (Graz CA)	313

Belgium

Maes Roger NV v Kapa Reynolds NV, 10 May 2004 (Gent CA)	402–4
---	-------

Finland

Case No S 00/82, 26 October 2000 (Helsinki CA)	403
--	-----

France

BRI Production ‘Bonaventure’ Sarl v Société Pan African Export, 22 February 1995 (Grenoble CA)	101
Flippe Christian v Sarl Douet Sport Collections, 19 January 1998 (Besançon DC)	403
Société Calzados Magnanni v Sarl Shoes General International, 21 October 1999 (Grenoble CA)	391
Société TCE Diffusion Sarl v Société Elettrotecnica Ricci, 29 March 2001 (Orléans CA)	416

Germany

Case No 5 O 543/88, 26 September 1990 (Hamburg DC)	117
Case No 2 U 7418192, 24 January 1992 (Berlin CA)	472
Case No 13 U 51/93, 20 April 1994 (Frankfurt CA)	306
Case No 17 U 146/93, 14 July 1994 (Regional CA)	483
Case No 22 U 4/96, 21 May 1996 (Köln CA)	313, 458
Case No VIII 2 R 300/96, 25 June 1997 (SC)	314
Case No 7 U 3771/97, 28 January 1998 (München CA)	314
Case No VIII 2 R 259/97, 25 November 1998 (SC)	314
Case No 3 U 83/98, 13 January 1999 (Bamberg CA)	313, 316
Case No 10 O 72/00, 9 May 2000 (Darmstadt DC)	391
Case No 12 HKO 5593/01, 30 August 2001 (Munich DC)	416
Case No 7 O 43/01, 20 September 2002 (Göttingen DC)	403
Case No 6 U 210/03, 22 July 2004 (Düsseldorf CA)	104
Case No 32 O 508/04, 10 December 2004 (Bayreuth DC)	104, 394
Case No 16 U 17/05, 3 April 2006 (Köln CA)	104
Case No 22 O 38/06, 12 December 2006 (Coburg DC)	104

Italy

Al Palazzo Sri v Bernardaud di Limoges SA, 26 November 2002 (Rimini DC) .	310
SO M AGRI sas di Ardina Alessandro & C v Erzeugerorganisation Marchfeldgemüse GmbH & Co KG, 25 February 2005 (Padova DC)	310

Switzerland

Case No C/12709/2001, 15 November 2002 (Geneva CA)	99
Case No HG 970238.1, 10 February 1999 (Zurich Commercial Ct)	403, 417
Case No T 171/95, 20 February 1997 (Saane DC)	99
EK, L & A v F (Case No 4C.179/1998/odi), 28 October 1998 (SC) . .	315–16, 397, 402, 416

United States

Delchi Carrier SpA v Rotorex Corp, 6 December 1995, 2d Cir (US Circuit CA)	98–9, 314, 324
Genpharm Inc v Pliva-Lachema AS, 19 March 2005 (NY DC)	308
Raw Materials Inc v Manfred Forberich GmbH & Co KG, 2004 WL 1535839 (ND Ill)	308
TeeVee Tunes Inc v Gerhard Schubert GmbH, 23 August 2006 (NY DC) .	309, 325

Travelers Property Casualty Co of America and Hellmuth Obata & Kassabaum Inc
v Saint-Gobain Technical Fabrics Canada Ltd, 31 January 2007 (Minn DC) 308
Zapata Hermanos Sucesores SA v Hearthside Baking Co Inc d/b/a/ Maurice Lenell
Cooky Co, 19 November 2002, US Ct App (7th Cir) 103–4

CONVENTION RELATING TO A UNIFORM LAW ON THE
INTERNATIONAL SALE OF GOODS (ULIS)

Germany

Case, 24 October 1979 (SC) 416

Israel

Adras Building Material Ltd v Harlow and Jones GmbH [1995] RLR 235 (SC)101,
238

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR SETTLEMENT OF
INVESTMENT DISPUTES (ICSID)

Azurix Corp v Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No ARB/0/12, 14 July 2006 . . 118
Compañía del Desarrollo de Santa Elena SA v Costa Rica, ICSID Case No
ARB/96/1 (2000) 118
Siemens AG v Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No ARB/02/8, 3 August 2004 . 118

Table of National Legislation and International Instruments

NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Belgium

Civil Code

Art 1150	318
----------------	-----

Canada

Civil Code of Quebec

Art 1613	251
----------------	-----

Commonwealth of Independent States

Azerbaijan Civil Code

Art 21	253
--------------	-----

Kazakhstan Civil Code

Art 9(4)	253
----------------	-----

Model Civil Code

	249
--	-----

Moldova Civil Code

Art 14	253
--------------	-----

Uzbekistan Civil Code

Art 14	253
--------------	-----

France

Civil Code

Art 1150	318
----------------	-----

Art 1151	250, 252, 255, 317–19
----------------	-----------------------

Art 1152	251
----------------	-----

Art 1152	258
----------------	-----

Art 1340(2)	255
-------------------	-----

Art 1373	330
----------------	-----

Art 1382	49
----------------	----

Art 1794	79
----------------	----

Germany

Civil Code (BGB)	249, 253, 260, 337
s 242	253
s 254	330
(2)	330
ss 339–45	258
s 340	259
s 649	79
s 651 f.	100
s 812(2)	46

Italy

Civil Code	
Art 1225	318

Netherlands

Civil Code	8, 255
Art 97	255

Russian Federation

Civil Code 1994	249–50, 253, 256, 258
Art 15	253
(1)	253
Art 333	258
Art 401(4)	259
Art 404	257

Switzerland

Code of Obligations	318
---------------------------	-----

United Kingdom

Arbitration Act 1996	
s 48(4)	470
Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999	88, 434

Damages Act 1996	53
Exchange Control Act 1947	468, 471
s 1.....	471
s 6(1).....	471
Human Rights Act 1998	
s 8.....	9
Inheritance (Provision for Family and Dependents) Act 1975	214
Law Reform (Frustrated Contracts) Act 1943.....	157
Lord Cairns's Act	85, 166, 211, 355
Limitation Act 1980	52
Misrepresentation Act 1967	
s 2(2).....	58
Sale of Goods Act 1893	
s 51(3).....	332
Sale of Goods Act 1979.....	41, 53, 332, 433-4, 446-7
s 14(3).....	432
s 29(6).....	53
s 50.....	20
(3).....	21, 332
ss 50-51	431
s 51.....	20, 465
(1).....	53
(3).....	21, 74, 131, 439
s 53.....	373, 431
(2).....	451
(3).....	20, 332, 370, 452
Supreme Court 1981	
s 50.....	232
Torts (Interference with Goods) Act 1977.....	45
s 3.....	58
Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1999	
Sch 1(j)	301
Sch 2(b).....	301

United States

Judiciary Law 1988	
s 27(b).....	473
Uniform Commercial Code 2003	455
s 2-706	455
s 2-715(2)(a).....	290, 316
s 712.....	455
Uniform Foreign-Money Claims Act.....	473

s 4.....	474, 485
s 7(f).....	474

INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS

Benelux Convention relating to Penalty Clauses 1973.....	262
Art 1.....	262
Bill of Lading Convention 1924 (Hague and Hague-Visby Rules).....	269
Art III r 1.....	276
r 2.....	276
Art 4(2)(a).....	273
(b).....	268
(5).....	269
Bill of Lading Convention (Hamburg Rules).....	269
Art 8(1).....	269
(2).....	269
Contracts for the International Sale of Goods Convention (CISG) 19802-7, 10, 18, 26, 91-122, 389-418, 431	
preamble.....	107
Art 4.....	392
Art 5.....	100, 113
Art 6.....	108, 274
Art 7.....	115-16, 306
(1).....	116-17, 120, 306, 414
(2).....	117-19, 392, 456
Art 8(2).....	99
(3).....	99
Art 9(1).....	110, 121
(2).....	110, 120-22
Art 18(2).....	99
Art 25.....	95, 99, 274
Art 33(3).....	99
Art 35(1)(b).....	99
Art 39(1).....	99
Art 43(1).....	99
Art 46.....	110
Art 47.....	99
Art 50.....	95
(3).....	95
(5).....	95
(8).....	95
(9).....	95
(20).....	95

Art 55	110
Art 60	99
Art 63	99
Art 64	99
Art 65	99
Art 72(2)	99
Art 73(2)	99
Art 74.. 5, 19, 91, 96-7, 102-5, 111-14, 118-20, 259-60, 305-27, 391-2, 408, 415, 432, 456-7	
(1)	98
(2)	92
(6)	91-2
(12)	92
(16)	101-2
(17)	102
(18)	92, 101-2
(20)	104
(22)	98
(26)	97
(31)	101-2, 104
(43)	104
(52)	104
(53)	99
(57)	99
(58)	98
(61)	99
(62)	99
Art 75	21, 99, 112-13, 415, 423, 456
(11)	97
Arts 75-6	431-2
Art 76	20-21, 94, 96, 112-13, 415, 423, 456-8
(1)	94, 112
Art 77	96, 99, 111, 261, 409, 457
(9)	96
Art 78	114-15, 118
Art 79(1)	99
(2)	272-4
Art 80	261
Art 85	99
Art 86	99
Art 88(2)	99
European Convention on Human Rights 1950	
Art 6(1)	38
International Carriage of Goods by Road Convention (CMR)	268-70

xxxii *Table of National Legislation and International Instruments*

Art 29(1)	271
(2)	269
Law Applicable to Contractual Obligations Convention 1980	306
Art 18	306
Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims Convention 1976	
Art 4	269
Montreal Convention 1999	270
Principles of European Contract Law (PECL)	2-3, 92
Art 2:104(1)	275
Art 5:103	275
Art 5:105	271
Art 8:107	272
Art 8:109	266, 274-5
Art 9:501	93
(1)	457
(2)(a)	93, 100, 391
(b)	97
Art 9:502	92
(2)(b)	99
Art 9:503	256
Art 9:504	257, 330
Art 9:505	257, 330
(1)	336
(2)	336
Art 9:506	21, 457
Art 9:507	20-21, 457
UN Convention on Multimodal Transport 1980	
Art 5(1)	269
Art 8(1)	269
Art 21(1)	269
(2)	269
UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration	
Art 28(1)	248
UNIDROIT Convention on International Factoring 1988	306
Art 4(1)	306
UNIDROIT Convention on International Financial Leasing 1988	306
Art 6(1)	306
UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts 2004 (UPICC) . 2-3,	
92, 107-22, 248, 431	
preamble	7
Art 1.9(1)	110
(2)	110
Art 4.4	271
Art 4.6	275

Art 5.1.5	272
Art 5.1.7	110
(1)	110
Art 7.1.6	274-5
Art 7.2.2	110
Art 7.4.1	112
Art 7.4.2	112-14, 392, 435, 457
(1)	92, 260
(2)	93, 100, 391
Art 7.4.3	93, 114, 120, 254, 260
(1)	97, 99, 457
(2)	415
(3)	260, 457
Art 7.4.4	113, 268, 432
Art 7.4.5	21, 113, 261, 431
(1)	423
Art 7.4.6	20-21, 113, 423, 431
Art 7.4.7	261
Art 7.4.8	261
Art 7.4.9	114-15, 118, 121-2
Art 7.4.12	114, 122
Art 7.4.13	264
Uniform Law of International Sales (ULIS)	
Art 82	91
Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969	423
Art 31	118
Warsaw Convention	
Art 25(1)	269
Protocol 4	270

Current Themes in the Law of Contract Damages: Introductory Remarks

DJAKHONGIR SAIDOV AND RALPH CUNNINGTON

I INTRODUCTION

The law of contract damages continues to fascinate and interest lawyers throughout the common and civil law world. The reasons for this are plenty, but perhaps three in particular stand out. First, much of the interest stems from the close connection between the law of damages and the wider policies and purposes pursued by the law of contract. In this respect, we would agree with Professor Farnsworth who argued that:

[n]o aspect of a system of contract law is more revealing of its underlying assumptions than is the law that prescribes the relief available for breach.¹

The better we understand the law of contract damages, the better we understand the policies and values that underlie the law of contract itself. Secondly, it is clear that the existence of remedies and, in particular, damages is vital for the effective operation of contract law. Without effective remedies,² the law of contract would lose much of its force and value,³ and the market economy, which it aims to support and facilitate,⁴

¹ EA Farnsworth, 'Damages and Specific Relief' (1979) 27 *American Journal of Comparative Law* 247.

² Professor Coote makes the important point that contractual obligations are legal obligations only to the extent that they are enforced by the law: B Coote, 'Contractual Damages, *Ruxley*, and the Performance Interest' [1997] *CLJ* 537, 541. See also F Dawson, 'Reflections on Certain Aspects of the Law of Damages for Breach of Contract' (1995) 9 *Journal of Contract Law* 125, 125–6.

³ See, eg AL Corbin, *Corbin on Contracts: A Comprehensive Treatise on the Working Rules of Contract Law* (2002) 2.

⁴ H Collins, *The Law of Contract* (London, Butterworths, 4th edn, 2003) 9; J Jackson, 'Global Economics and International Economic Law' (1998) 1 *Journal of International Economic Law* 1, 5; A Rosett, 'Unification, Harmonization, Restatement, Codification, and Reform in International Commercial Law' (1992) 40 *American Journal of Comparative Law* 683.

would be substantially undermined. Thirdly, in the context of commercial contracts, there can be little doubt that damages are the most commonly claimed remedy. This is due, in part, to the common law's position that damages are the primary remedy for breach of contract. But there is another, more general, reason for the primacy of damages that applies to civil law jurisdictions as well. Because commercial people are predominantly concerned with pecuniary matters they want to achieve the end results in monetary terms. For that reason, the monetary remedy of damages will usually be their remedy of choice.

In recent years, the challenge to understanding contract damages has increased significantly with the emergence and development of the law of international instruments such as the Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG),⁵ the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts (UPICC)⁶ and the Principles of European Contract Law (PECL).⁷ These instruments pursue the goal of harmonising (and, to some extent, unifying) sales and contract law at the international and, in the case of the PECL, regional levels. This goal adds complexity to the analysis of contract damages in the context of these instruments, as lawyers now have to consider the importance and relevance of additional factors and values which might not have been relevant to a discussion of contract damages in the context of domestic legal systems.

This book aims to contribute to the continuing discourse in this area of the law. The chapters are based on papers presented and discussed at the Contract Damages: Domestic and International Perspectives conference held at the University of Birmingham in June 2007. The essays reflect the central themes of the conference: the purpose and scope of damages, the measure of damages, issues of recoverability, the methods of limiting damages and the assessment of damages. Many of the chapters integrate an analysis of the common law position with a discussion from the perspective of the international contract law instruments. This reflects the contributors' conviction that, in an increasingly globalised world, lawyers should be ready and willing to learn from the experiences of other legal systems.

In the remainder of this introductory chapter we do not intend to follow the structure of the book (as many such essays tend to do) but instead focus on three themes that dominated discussion at the conference. In so doing, it is hoped that we will provide the reader with an insight into the discussion and debate that took place at the conference and enable the reader to see how the essays contained herein engage with that debate.

⁵ Available at <http://www.cisg.law.pace.edu/cisg/text/cisg-toc.html> (accessed 27 June 2007).

⁶ Available at <http://www.unidroit.org/english/principles/contracts/principles2004/blackletter2004.pdf> (accessed 27 June 2007).

⁷ O Lando and H Beale, *The Principles of European Contract Law* (The Hague, Kluwer, 2000).

II THE MERITS OF A COMPARATIVE APPROACH

A General

Although a substantial emphasis in this volume is placed on contract damages in the common law and under the international instruments, it is fair to say that the volume reflects an ongoing dialogue on contract damages by representatives of different legal systems and there is little doubt that its scope is truly comparative. We believe that, in an age characterised by the globalisation of commerce and markets and arguably by a gradual ‘transnationalisation’ of commercial law,⁸ a comparative approach is not only beneficial but also necessary. The benefits associated with a comparative method are well known⁹ and this is not a place to set them out fully. What we aim to do in this section is to highlight the importance and some possible merits of a comparative approach to the extent that they have special relevance to contract damages and the volume’s scope.

B The Benefits of a Comparative Approach for the International Instruments

While it is true that the starting point for any comparative exercise is to generate and disseminate knowledge,¹⁰ such an exercise will almost inevitably result in great practical benefits and will possibly lead to further legal development. Examining the experiences of different legal systems in the area of contract damages helps, in our view, to identify problems, questions and difficult factual situations that may arise and hence require treatment in any legal system. A comparative exercise will also provide a range of possible solutions to a particular problem, thereby broadening horizons for a lawmaker, a judge, a practitioner or a scholar. These potential benefits are particularly important so far as the international instruments are concerned. One reason is that neither the CISG nor the UPICC and PECL have yet had a degree of exposure and strength of experience comparable to those of well-developed legal systems. The CISG, for example, is often regarded as a ‘skeleton’ or a minimalist instrument¹¹ and, for such a legal

⁸ See, eg KP Berger, ‘Transnational Commercial Law in the Age of Globalization’, available at <http://w3.uniroma1.it/idc/centro/publications/42berger.pdf> (accessed 27 June 2007).

⁹ For a helpful introduction containing extracts and references to relevant sources, see R Goode, H Kronke and E McKendrick, *Transnational Commercial Law: Text, Cases, and Materials* (Oxford University Press, 2007) 133–89.

¹⁰ K Zweigert and H Kötz, *An Introduction to Comparative Law* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 3rd edn, 1998) 15.

¹¹ See, eg JS Ziegel, ‘The Remedial Provisions in the Vienna Sales Convention: Some Common Law Perspectives’ in N Galston and H Smit (eds), *International Sales: The United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods* (New York, Matthew Bender,

regime, knowledge of a range of problems and factual situations, which have not yet arisen but may potentially arise, will prove invaluable. Ingeborg Schwenzer and Pascal Hachem¹² also make an important point in their chapter by stating that the modern age has brought about a number of new challenges, both in law and outside of it, which cannot go unnoticed when the CISG is applied. In fact, the authors' point sends quite an alarming message:

If [the CISG] does not respond to current demands and continues to focus on the state of discussion prevalent in the 1970s (or more accurately the nineteenth century), it risks falling back into obscurity. The necessary adjustments will then be made by the concurrent application of domestic remedies to precisely those cases for which the CISG was originally designed. The battle for uniformity fought by the CISG would be lost.

C The Knowledge of Factual Situations and the Complexity of Modern Transactions

To return to our point about the importance of being aware of a range of possible factual situations, we believe that such awareness plays an essential role in our understanding of the law of damages. As Michael Bridge states,¹³ it is impossible to find 'the law on damages in the text of statutory rules', and for this reason we believe that a true knowledge of this area of law can only derive from a clear understanding of the complexity and variety of problems surrounding modern commercial transactions. This may also partly explain the prominent role played by the English commercial law today which, thanks to its long tradition and a well-developed culture of the reliance on judicial precedent, has accumulated a substantial body of case law from which commercial spirit and the intricacies of commercial life emanate. It is important, however, not to be blinded by the experience and relative successes of a particular system as legal development has often been driven by the movement of ideas from one system to another and, in our view, legal systems should exist in the atmosphere of mutual enrichment. Some of the contributions to this volume do provide relevant examples in this respect. Thus, Franco Ferrari traces the origin of the well-known 'foreseeability rule' and demonstrates that its establishment in the common law through the English case of

1984) 9–4; J Felemegas, 'Introduction' in *An International Approach to the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (1980) as Uniform Sales Law* (Cambridge University Press, 2007) (with further reference to Albert Kritzer), available at <http://www.cisg.law.pace.edu/cisg/biblio/felemegas14.html> (accessed 18 October 2007).

¹² See I Schwenzer and P Hachem, 'The Scope of the CISG Provisions on Damages', this volume.

¹³ See M Bridge, 'The Market Rule of Damages Assessment', this volume.

*Hadley v Baxendale*¹⁴ has roots in the civil law.¹⁵ Alexander Komarov,¹⁶ in turn, while also pointing out the civil law origin of the rule, states that the common law has been more successful than the civil law in developing this rule, largely due, once again, to a developed tradition of relying on case law.

The complexity and diversity of modern commercial practices and transactions, referred to in the previous paragraph, also make it necessary for lawyers to go beyond a legal discipline and to get acquainted with, and learn from, developments in other disciplines and sciences. This point is made by Komarov, who, from the standpoint of his experience in commercial practice, argues that the reliance on general rules of damages, many of which were formed in domestic legal systems a long time ago, may no longer be adequate against the background of modern commercial practices, sophisticated transactions and the ‘complex mathematical formulae used by economists in providing their calculation of damages’. Djakhongir Saidov’s contribution¹⁷ has attempted to do just that, by taking account of modern developments, both within and outside of the law, insofar as they can be relevant for measuring damages for injury to business reputation and goodwill.

D The Role of the International Instruments

Returning to the role played by the international instruments, despite the remarks made earlier about their possible lack of experience as compared with some more developed domestic counterparts, there is no doubt that the instruments deserve the most serious attention and examination. There are many reasons for this. First, the CISG has now been ratified by 70 states¹⁸ and its rules arguably represent an international consensus as to what rules should govern international sales transactions. Similarly, the UPICC not only contain rules which are common to many legal systems,

¹⁴ (1854) 9 Ex 341.

¹⁵ Professor Ferrari’s contribution is not only concerned with the origin of the rule. His central argument is that, while in cases where the Convention’s drafters intended a particular concept to be interpreted from the standpoint of its counterpart in a domestic legal system, resorting to the ‘domestic’ understanding of the concept should be allowed in interpreting the CISG; however, the foreseeability rule in Art 74 is no such rule. He suggests that ‘the mere fact that the wording of a particular CISG provision corresponds to that of a specific domestic rule (whether created by statute or case law) is *per se* insufficient to allow resorting to the interpretation of that domestic rule’ (F Ferrari, ‘*Hadley v Baxendale v Foreseeability under Article 74 CISG*’, this volume).

¹⁶ See A Komarov, ‘The Limitation of Contract Damages in Domestic Legal Systems and International Instruments’, this volume.

¹⁷ See D Saidov, ‘Damage to Business Reputation and Goodwill under the Vienna Sales Convention’, this volume.

¹⁸ See http://www.uncitral.org/uncitral/en/uncitral_texts/sale_goods/1980CISG_status.html (accessed 18 October 2007).

but also introduce solutions which were thought to be most suitable for the needs of international commerce.¹⁹ Secondly, these instruments are of a different legal nature than domestic regimes and they have undeniably marked a new stage in the development of truly international commercial law. Thirdly, notwithstanding a degree of skepticism still existing in legal circles regarding the movement to unify, harmonise and codify commercial law,²⁰ the international instruments have become firmly entrenched in the commercial and contract law world: they are regularly applied by judges and arbitrators, and used as models for legal reform in a number of states as well as for drafting international contracts.²¹ Fourthly, it can certainly be argued that, in a number of areas, the instruments are superior to even some of the leading domestic systems²² and for this reason domestic counterparts may have much to learn from them. Although the quality of many of the decisions under the CISG leaves a lot to be desired (for one thing, because it is applied in so many fora), there is now a substantial body of cases²³ (particularly in relation to damages) which, if comprehensively analysed,²⁴ may reveal and raise new problems and questions peculiar to international transactions with correspondingly novel solutions and analyses. Thus, while the instruments benefit from domestic regimes, the reverse is equally true.

Unfortunately (but not surprisingly), this mutual interaction has not been, in our opinion, entirely satisfactory. Courts applying the CISG not infrequently manifest what is known as the ‘homeward trend’, that is, the interpretation of the Convention from the standpoint of their own domestic system. One reason is, of course, the lack of knowledge of the Convention’s regime, purpose and spirit, together with the lack of desire to gain that knowledge. The latter, we believe, is a major obstacle to a potentially fruitful interaction between domestic regimes and the Convention. Nowhere is this criticism more relevant than in the context of English

¹⁹ *UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts 2004* (Rome, International Institute for the Unification of Private Law, 2004) xv.

²⁰ For a well-known exposition of this criticism, see JS Hobhouse, ‘International Conventions and Commercial Law: The Pursuit of Uniformity’ (1990) 106 *LQR* 530.

²¹ With respect to the UPICC, see, eg MJ Bonell, ‘UNIDROIT Principles 2004—The New Edition of the Principles of International Commercial Contracts Adopted by the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law’ (2004) 45 *Uniform Law Review* 5, 6–17.

²² See the quotation by Roy Goode reproduced in the main text below.

²³ For a constantly growing collection of cases under the CISG, see, eg www.cisg.law.pace.edu (accessed 18 October 2007).

²⁴ Some recent attempts to do so in the context of damages include H Stoll and G Gruber, ‘Arts 74–77 CISG’ in P Schlechtriem and I Schwenzer (eds), *Commentary on the UN Convention on the International Sale of Goods (CISG)* (Oxford University Press, 2nd edn, 2005) and CISG Advisory Council (CISG-AC) Opinion No 6 ‘Calculation of Damages under CISG Article 74’, available at <http://www.cisg.law.pace.edu/cisg/CISG-AC-op6.html> (accessed 18 October 2007). For a forthcoming work dedicated wholly to this subject, see D Saidov, *The Law of Damages in International Sales—The CISG and Other International Instruments* (Oxford, Hart Publishing, 2008).

commercial law, and Roy Goode's powerful argument is worth recalling here:

Nowhere is [a] chauvinistic approach better exemplified than in our attitude towards the Vienna Sales Convention . . . it is for the most part a good deal better than our own Sale of Goods Act . . . it may serve the English party much better than a foreign domestic law to which that party might otherwise be subject . . . Why cannot we give leadership and in so doing increase our influence on transnational commercial law?²⁵

E Final Remarks

A few final remarks remain to be made. First, so far as the comparison between the instruments themselves is concerned, it needs to be noted that such an exercise may involve more than just achieving the purposes set out above. Thus, the preamble to the UPICC provides that the Principles 'may be used to interpret or supplement international uniform law instruments', and the question as to the extent to which the UPICC can supplement the provisions of the CISG on damages is still unresolved. In his contribution to this volume, John Gotanda sets out his views as to the relationship between the two instruments.²⁶ His argument is that:

while the UPICC should not exert influence of their own force in interpreting the CISG, they can facilitate an understanding of the general principles and help support a gap filling rule derived from general principles of the CISG.

Secondly, some time ago, it was said that the law of damages is a field of contract law which is 'particularly fraught with national variation'.²⁷ This leads us to wonder whether, so far as most legal systems (both domestic and transnational) are concerned, there is now a common way of thinking about contract damages. It is difficult to give a definite answer. On the one hand, as Komarov has shown, the methods of limiting damages used in different systems do not present a great deal of diversity and the international instruments, by and large, contain rules and concepts which are known to many domestic systems, and this may point towards an affirmative answer.²⁸ It can also be argued that the fact that representatives of different legal systems manage to agree on a set of rules on damages is in itself evidence of the existence of a common way of thinking about damages. On the other hand, commercial law can be partly viewed as a

²⁵ R Goode, *Commercial Law in the Next Millennium* (London, Sweet & Maxwell, 1998) 95.

²⁶ J Gotanda, 'Using the UNIDROIT Principles to Fill Gaps in the CISG', this volume.

²⁷ See BM Cremandes, 'The Impact of International Arbitration on the Development of Business Law' (1983) 31 *American Journal of Comparative Law* 530.

²⁸ This is, of course, subject to the instruments' requirement that they be interpreted independently of domestic law and in accordance with the instruments' international character.

reflection of the level of economic and business development and culture to be found in a given country. In this regard, Komarov suggests that there is a link between the level of detail with which the law of damages is developed in a particular system, on the one hand, and the degree of economic development and the level and diversity of commercial turnover in a particular country, on the other. In particular, he states that:

[a]s a rule, less developed legal techniques are to be found in countries with a lower degree of industrialisation and an insufficient diversity of commercial turnover as well as where private legal relationships are underdeveloped.

Thus, while lawyers may naturally admire sophisticated and well-developed sets of rules and principles governing contract damages in a particular legal system, such a high level of sophistication and development may not necessarily be needed or, indeed, appropriate for some countries. However, a decision not to develop a detailed structure of the law of damages may flow not only from considerations linked to the country's economic and commercial development but also from some other considerations, and examples of such an approach can be found in systems with both a high level of economic development and a long-standing legal culture and tradition. Komarov refers to the new Dutch Civil Code, which contains no fixed or formal criteria for determining damages except some principles intended to provide general guidance.²⁹ It follows, from this discussion, that there is still a variety of ways in which the rules on contract damages are structured and the extent to which they are developed. And, perhaps, diversity is what is needed. If, in a global market place, various legal regimes (domestic and international) are viewed, in a way, as products on a market, then the potential consumers (that is, commercial people and their lawyers) would arguably want to have a choice.

III THE DEFINITION AND PURPOSE OF DAMAGES

A General

In this section, we examine four fundamental issues relating to the definition and purpose of damages: the first, that of the availability of non-compensatory measures of damages, is a relatively recent topic for debate stimulated by the House of Lords' decision in *Attorney General v Blake*; the second, concerning the nature and essence of the law of damages, is a relatively underexplored, and we would suggest much neglected, topic; the third and fourth issues are much more widely

²⁹ 'Thus, Article 97 simply gives the authority to a court to assess damages in a manner most appropriate to their nature' (Komarov, above n 16, with further references).

discussed in the literature and concern the age-old debates about the analytical structure and the normative basis of the law of contract. We believe that the essays contained in this volume make important contributions to each of these issues.

B The Definition of Damages and the Availability of Non-compensatory Awards

Given the large number of works on the law of damages,³⁰ one would have expected the definition of damages to be fixed and beyond dispute, but it appears that this is not so. Harvey McGregor opened the most recent edition of his work on damages with the following words:

A resounding definition of the term damages would make for a fitting opening of a work on the law of damages and in their first sentence earlier editions have done just this. But it has become more and more difficult, as time has moved on, to construct a definition of damages which is satisfactory and which is comprehensive. So many exceptions to, and qualifications upon, once solid, clear, unadulterated rules have appeared, perfectly sensibly, that a clear-cut definition is no longer feasible; the arrival of restitutionary damages and of human rights was the last straw. The impossible search for a clear-cut comprehensive definition is therefore abandoned.³¹

We would suggest that the problem is not so much with defining damages *per se* but more with defining damages in the specific terms that were characteristic of previous editions of *McGregor*. In the aftermath of *Attorney-General v Blake*, it is no longer possible to limit damages to compensation. Nor can it be said that damages are only available in actions based on common law wrongdoing.³² Perhaps the most specific definition we can give today is that ‘damages are a monetary award given for a wrong’.³³

³⁰ See, eg H McGregor, *McGregor on Damages* (London, Sweet & Maxwell, 17th edn, 2003); S Waddams, *The Law of Damages* (Toronto, Canada Law Book, 4th edn, 2004); AM Tettenborn, D Wilby and D Bennett, *The Law of Damages* (London, Butterworths Tolley, 2003); A Ogus, *The Law of Damages* (London, Butterworths, 1973).

³¹ McGregor, *ibid.*, 3 [1-001].

³² Damages are now available for statutory wrongdoing under s 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 and it is now quite common for judges to refer to equitable compensation as damages: *Bartlett v Barclays Bank Trust Co Ltd (No 2)* [1980] Ch 515 (Ch) 545 (Brightman LJ); *Bristol and West Building Society v Mothew* [1998] Ch 1 (CA) 17 (Millett LJ); *Cia de Seguros Imperio v Heath (REBX) Ltd* [2001] 1 WLR 112 (CA) 125 (Clarke LJ).

³³ See J Stapleton, ‘A New “Seascape” for Obligations: Reclassification on the Basis of Measure of Damages’ in P Birks (ed), *The Classification of Obligations* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1997) 193; R Cunnington, ‘The Measure and Availability of Gain-Based Damages for Breach of Contract’, this volume.

The nature and availability of non-compensatory measures of damages is addressed in a number of the essays in this volume. Stephen Smith,³⁴ Anthony Ogus³⁵ and Schwenzer and Hachem all address the availability of punitive damages. They all concede that such awards are not currently available in English law or under the CISG, but each proposes a role for punitive damages in certain exceptional cases.³⁶ Schwenzer and Hachem suggest that punitive damages should be awarded in cases where the breach of contract was intentional and in bad faith in order to provide full compensation for the aggrieved party. Ogus, on the other hand, suggests a more limited role, restricting punitive damages to cases where the party in breach sought to 'cover up the breach' or evade its contractual liability.³⁷

Several of the essays address the measure and availability of gain-based damages. Andrew Burrows³⁸ and Stephen Waddams³⁹ adopt contrasting analytical approaches to this topic. Waddams applies what he refers to as a historical approach, suggesting that 'considerations of justice, undue enrichment, restitution, and compensation were all in operation' in the cases where gain-based damages were awarded.⁴⁰ Burrows, on the other hand, argues that all attempts to analyse *Wrotham Park* damages as a form of compensation are unrealistic. He prefers a restitutionary analysis, viewing *Wrotham Park* damages as a partial disgorgement of a fair proportion of the contract breaker's profits. While Ralph Cunnington agrees with Burrows that *Wrotham Park* damages are gain-based rather than compensatory,⁴¹ he insists that a distinction must be drawn between damages that reverse a transfer of value (*Wrotham Park* damages) and damages that disgorge the contract breaker's profit (*Blake* damages).⁴²

Regarding the issue of when gain-based damages ought to be available, Waddams suggests that a number of factors ought to be taken into account, including:

³⁴ S Smith, 'The Law of Damages: Rules for Citizens or Rules for Courts?', this volume.

³⁵ A Ogus, 'The Economic Basis of Damages for Breach of Contract: Inducement and Expectation', this volume.

³⁶ Although Smith provides no view on the desirability of punitive damages for breach of contract in his chapter, see his earlier work: S Smith, 'Performance, Punishment and Contractual Obligations' (1997) 60 *MLR* 360.

³⁷ See also S Smith, 'Performance, Punishment and Contractual Obligations' (1997) 60 *MLR* 360, 375.

³⁸ A Burrows, 'Are "Damages on the *Wrotham Park* Basis" Compensatory, Restitutionary or Neither?', this volume.

³⁹ S Waddams, 'Gains Derived from Breach of Contract: Historical and Conceptual Perspectives', this volume.

⁴⁰ The question of whether gain-based damages can be treated as a proxy for compensation in circumstances where loss is difficult to measure is dealt with below in our consideration of the meaning and definition of loss.

⁴¹ R Cunnington, 'The Measure and Availability of Gain-Based Damages for Breach of Contract', this volume.

⁴² The importance of this distinction is discussed below in relation to the availability of these measures of damages.

- the availability of specific enforcement;
- the proprietary or quasi-proprietary nature of the interest infringed;
- whether the claimant has been deprived of a valuable opportunity to bargain;
- whether the claimant has a legitimate non-economic interest that is not adequately compensated by the ordinary measure of damages;
- whether the defendant is unjustly enriched by retaining the gain;
- whether the claimant would be perceived as receiving a windfall if the gain were transferred;
- whether the breach of contract is reprehensible; and
- whether there was a public interest in deterring it.

Cunnington prefers a single criterion and ties the availability of gain-based damages to the availability of specific relief. He does, however, draw a distinction between cases in which the court ‘cannot’ order specific relief (in which case, he suggests that account of profits is appropriate) and cases in which the court ‘will not’ order specific relief (in which only *Wrotham Park* damages should be available).

A substantial part of Burrows’s chapter is dedicated to examining Robert Stevens’s ‘rights-based’ approach to damages. Stevens argues that *Wrotham Park* damages are neither compensatory nor restitutionary but are instead awarded in substitution for the right infringed by the contract breaker.⁴³ Burrows rejects this approach, arguing that it is impossible for it to be reconciled with the current state of the law. In particular, he suggests that it contradicts the law on mitigation, is inconsistent with the rules on the date of assessment, is liable to lead to double recovery and renders nominal damages redundant. Burrows also questions whether we sensibly can, or would want to, put a value on the right infringed by the contract breaker without any consideration of the actual impact of the infringement.

C The Nature of the Law of Damages

Although there exists voluminous literature on the analytical structure of the law of damages and on the normative basis for damages, very little has been written on the nature of the law itself. Few commentators have asked the question: what precisely is the law of damages? Smith’s chapter analyses

⁴³ R Stevens, *Torts and Rights* (Oxford University Press, 2007) ch 4. Other commentators have adopted a similar analysis but within a compensatory framework: see M McInnes, ‘Gain, Loss and the User Principle’ (2006) 14 *Restitution Law Review* 76; J Edelman, ‘Gain-based Damages and Compensation’ in A Burrows and Lord Rodger (eds), *Mapping the Law* (Oxford University Press, 2006) 153–8. See also Cunnington’s chapter in this volume.

the kinds of rights that are dealt with by the law of damages and asks whether those rights are private law rights or public law rights. He suggests that there are three main categories of rights that the courts take into account when making damages orders: (i) the rights that citizens enjoy against other citizens prior to any action by the court ('ordinary rights'); (ii) the rights that citizens enjoy against courts ('remedial rights'); and (iii) the rights that citizens enjoy against other citizens by virtue of orders made by courts ('court-ordered rights'). The first and third categories constitute private law rights, while the second concerns public law rights. The relationship between the three categories is both complex and symbiotic. In some cases (eg an action for payment of a debt), the court-ordered right will be derived from the claimant's remedial right and its content will be derived from the creditor's ordinary right to payment. In other cases, however (eg orders of punitive damages), the court-ordered right will be non-derivative and created at the time of the order. The law of damages is correspondingly complex.

Smith suggests that there are four kinds of court orders. First, there are orders that have a mixed private/public law explanation. Here the claimant's court-ordered right is derived from a combination of the claimant's remedial and ordinary rights. An order to pay a debt is a classic example. Secondly, there are orders that have a pure private law explanation. In this category, the content of the order is fixed by the claimant's ordinary right but the claimant has no remedial right to the order. Smith suggests that an order of specific performance would be an example, but admits that this is by no means uncontroversial. Thirdly, there are orders with a pure public law explanation. This category comprises orders to which the claimant has a remedial right but whose content is not dictated by the claimant's ordinary right. Smith suggests that monetary restitution in a *quantum valebant* claim would fall into this category. Fourthly, there are orders with no legal explanation. The existence and content of these orders is completely within the discretion of the court. A remedial constructive trust is a possible example.

Smith suggests that this reconceptualisation of court orders is of importance at both a theoretical and a moral level. It determines when the moral obligation to pay damages arises (which inevitably has important practical implications as well) and is important to judges (and other lawmakers) who have the responsibility of determining what morality requires them to do in their particular office. The reconceptualisation is also important for legal scholars who strive to better understand and explain the law of damages. Smith concludes that the law as it stands lumps together qualitatively different kinds of monetary orders under the heading of 'damages'. These groups, he suggests, need to be disentangled, although the question as to which group should retain the label 'damages' must remain a question for the future.

D The Interests Protected by an Award of Damages

There has been a lot of debate in the academic literature about the nature of the interests protected by an award of damages. Perhaps the best known article is that of Fuller and Perdue, in which they argued that an award of damages pursued three purposes: (i) protection of the restitution interest; (ii) protection of the reliance interest; and (iii) protection of the expectation interest.⁴⁴ The writers contended that it was the reliance interest rather than the expectation interest that deserved the protection of the courts, and that expectation damages are only justified because they provide a proxy for reliance loss and operate as a deterrent to losses incurred through detrimental reliance. Almost 60 years after Fuller and Perdue's article was published, Daniel Friedmann wrote a devastating response.⁴⁵ He reasserted the primacy of the 'performance interest' (his preferred term for the expectation interest) and suggested that it was only the terminology and not the substantive content of Fuller and Perdue's thesis that has exercised influence over the development of the law.

Friedmann's chapter in this volume⁴⁶ examines the distinct roles played by damages and specific performance in the protection of the performance interest. His central thesis is that an order of specific performance protects the subjective value of the promised performance whereas an award of damages protects its objective value. This has a number of significant implications. First, the assessment of damages will generally not take into account subjective elements such as distress, vexation and aggravation, whereas specific performance will ordinarily remedy those harms. Secondly, specific performance will be more advantageous to the aggrieved party where the subjective value that she places upon the promised performance exceeds its objective value (eg the *Ruxley* case⁴⁷). Thirdly, damages will be more advantageous in situations where the subjective loss to the aggrieved party is lower than the objective loss assessed for the purpose of damages. Fourthly, the contractual rules of remoteness are irrelevant to an order of specific performance and the burden of mitigation has only a limited role to play. Fifthly, specific performance may benefit third parties for whom damages may not be available. Friedmann maintains that both damages and specific

⁴⁴ LL Fuller and WR Perdue, 'The Reliance Interest in Contract Damages' (1936) 46 *Yale Law Journal* 53. Although some commentators have equated the restitution interest with awards of gain-based damages, it is clear from what Fuller and Perdue actually wrote that what they had in mind was the action for autonomous unjust enrichment.

⁴⁵ D Friedmann, 'The Performance Interest in Contract Damages' (1995) 111 *LQR* 628.

⁴⁶ See D Friedmann, 'Economic Aspects of Damages and Specific Performance Compared', this volume.

⁴⁷ *Ruxley Electronics and Construction Ltd v Forsyth* [1996] AC 344 (HL).

performance operate to protect the performance interest of the contract but that they do so in vastly differing ways.

Peter Jaffey, in his contribution to the volume,⁴⁸ prefers a reliance-based account of contracting, insisting that the basic measure of contract damages is the reliance measure. He recognises that the orthodox promissory analysis provides a simpler account if one looks at damages alone, but suggests that the promissory analysis fails to explain other aspects of the law of contract remedies, such as the absence of a general right to specific performance or disgorgement. Jaffey argues that the reliance theory explains all of these rules. The expectation measure rule is justified on the ground that expectation damages quantify the opportunity cost of the contract that the aggrieved party made with the contract breaker. The inadequacy requirement limiting the availability of specific relief and disgorgement is explained on the grounds that those remedies are only available in situations where actual performance, as opposed to pecuniary compensation, is necessary to ensure that the aggrieved party is protected against reliance loss. Jaffey also contends that the reliance analysis provides a better explanation of the actions that are traditionally assigned to the law of unjust enrichment. He criticises the attempts made by unjust enrichment theorists to assign these actions to the unjust factors of ‘failure of basis’ or ‘failure of condition’, arguing that these very labels demonstrate that the claim is in essence a contractual one. Jaffey suggests that his agreement-based reliance theory provides a much more plausible account of such claims, explaining why recovery is capped by the expectation measure and why losses are redistributed evenly following the frustration of a contract.

E The Economic Basis of Contract Damages

Much ink has been spilt, especially on the other side of the Atlantic, on analysing contract law from a law-and-economics perspective.⁴⁹ The best known theory is, of course, the efficiency theory of contract, which regards contract law as an instrument for promoting economically efficient behaviour. From this perspective, the justification for contract remedies is not that they recognise or vindicate rights, but that they provide incentives for economically efficient behaviour. According to this approach, contract remedies should never operate to deter economically efficient breaches. This, the legal economists argue, explains why specific performance

⁴⁸ P Jaffey, ‘Damages and the Protection of Contractual Reliance’, this volume.

⁴⁹ Leading examples of such economic analyses include: R Posner, *Economic Analysis of Law* (New York, Aspen Publishers, 6th edn, 2003); R Cooter and T Ulen, *Law and Economics* (Boston, MA, Pearson/Addison Wesley, 5th edn, 2007); AM Polinsky, *An Introduction to Law and Economics*, 3rd edn (New York, Aspen Publishers, 3rd edn, 2003).

remains an exceptional remedy in Anglo-American law,⁵⁰ and why gain-based damages are unnecessary except where they can be used to deter opportunistic breaches of contract.⁵¹

A number of essays in this volume address the law-and-economics approach to damages. Ogus accepts the orthodox formulation of the efficient breach theory and shows how the goal of allocative efficiency justifies awarding expectation damages as the default remedy for breach of contract. He does, however, suggest that the default rule requires a number of modifications if the law is to consistently induce economically appropriate behaviour. First, he identifies the problem of imperfect monitoring and enforcement (ie situations where the defendant is able to conceal the breach and evade liability), and suggests that in such cases gain-based or even punitive damages may be appropriate. Secondly, he argues that the courts should be willing to reduce damages on the grounds of contributory negligence if it can be shown that it would be cheaper for the promisee to take precautions to avert, or reduce the risk of, a breach. This, he argues, would provide an incentive for promisees to engage in economically efficient behaviour pre-breach and would mirror the function performed by the doctrine of mitigation in relation to post-breach behaviour. Thirdly, Ogus suggests that the rules on the availability of damages for non-pecuniary loss may have been too narrowly drawn. He suggests that the reason for this is the difficulty encountered by judges when attempting to formulate rules as to their availability. He further argues that economic reasoning can assist here, and that damages for non-pecuniary loss should be available whenever it can be shown that the promisee was willing to pay, and perhaps did pay, an additional premium in order to have the promisor insure him against the loss.⁵²

Jaffey's contribution to this volume also engages with the economic analysis of contract damages. He suggests that the expression 'efficient breach' is self-contradictory. It implies that at one and the same time a contracting party has a duty to perform and also a liberty not to perform. Jaffey suggests that this paradox can be avoided if the argument for efficient breach abandons the idea that agreements ordinarily generate duties of performance and instead adopts the view that agreements create merely liabilities, rather than duties (the agreement-based reliance theory that Jaffey proposes).

⁵⁰ A Kronman, 'Specific Performance' [1978] *University of Chicago Law Review* 351; A Schwartz, 'The Case for Specific Performance' (1979) 89 *Yale Law Journal* 271; W Bishop, 'The Choice of Remedy for Breach of Contract' (1985) 14 *Journal of Legal Studies* 299.

⁵¹ Posner, above n 49, 119.

⁵² A similar argument is made by Schwenzer and Hachem in their contribution to this volume. Adam Kramer also notes that the price paid for the promise will reflect the content of the allocation of risks under the contract: A Kramer, 'Remoteness: New Problems with the Old Test', this volume.

Friedmann, who is a well-known critic of the efficient breach theory,⁵³ suggests, in his chapter, that there is a role for the concept of ‘tolerated breach’ within the law of contract.⁵⁴ This concept would apply in situations where the parties have entered into a wasteful contract, that is, a contract in which the loss to one party that would result from its performance exceeds the benefit that would be acquired by the other party. Friedmann gives the example of a contract for the construction of a four-storey building on a plot of land where, shortly after the contract is agreed, a change in the zoning laws makes it possible to build up to 30 stories on the site. Completion of the contract would lead to significant waste since the four-storey building would need to be torn down in order to enable the construction of a 30-storey structure. In such cases Friedmann suggests there is no room for specific performance or gain-based damages. Tolerated breach differs from efficient breach in three fundamental ways: (i) it examines the economic rectitude of the contract from the point of view of both parties, whereas the efficient breach theory examines the situation from the point of view of the party in breach alone; (ii) it compares the actual losses and actual gains derived from the performance of the contract, whereas efficient breach compares the gains derived from the breach with the sum that would be payable in damages; and (iii) it leaves the decision whether to enforce the contract down to the court (there is no ‘right’ to breach the contract), whereas efficient breach assumes that the decision whether to perform or breach lies with the promisor alone.

Finally, one further chapter touches on an important economic aspect of damages, that is, on the currency of the award. Charles Proctor traces the demise of the ‘sterling only’ rule in relation to debt and liquidated damages claims.⁵⁵ He recognises that the issue is much more complex in relation to unliquidated damages claims because of the difficulty of implementing the principle that damages are to be awarded in the currency in which loss has been suffered or which truly expresses the loss. While taking the view that this principle was probably implemented correctly in *Texaco Melbourne*⁵⁶, Proctor suggests that the House of Lords erred in two important respects: (i) by insisting that the date for assessment should be the date of breach (Proctor recognises that the law has already started to evolve in this area—see the discussion of the *Golden Victory*⁵⁷ below); and (ii) by failing to appreciate that a loss in one currency can be felt by reference to its value in relation to another currency. Proctor suggests that if awards of

⁵³ See, eg D Friedmann, ‘The Efficient Breach Fallacy’, (1989) 18 *Journal of Legal Studies* 1.

⁵⁴ According to Friedmann, a breach is ‘tolerated’ if it is ‘acceptable, even though it is not condoned’.

⁵⁵ C Proctor, ‘Changes in Monetary Value and the Assessment of Damages’, this volume.

⁵⁶ [1994] 1 Lloyd’s Rep 473 (HL).

⁵⁷ [2007] UKHL 12 (HL).

damages are really to reflect the economic value of the loss sustained by the aggrieved party a more flexible approach needs to be adopted.

IV THE MEANING AND DEFINITION OF LOSS

A General

We believe that the meaning and definition of loss are issues which lie at the very heart of the law of contract damages. One reason for this assertion is that the compensatory purpose of damages cannot be satisfactorily implemented unless there is clarity as to what constitutes a loss. Another reason is that, by discussing the meaning of loss, we inevitably enter the debate about the values, policies and purposes that the law of contract should protect. It is also inevitable that this debate, like a wave, spills over the boundaries beyond those delineating the territory of compensatory damages.⁵⁸ The questions of meaning and definition of loss are therefore of great complexity, and in order to fully expose and address this complexity, the questions will have to be dealt with on a number of different levels.

One level is that of the different heads of loss and the question of whether a particular type of loss should be recognised by the law as sufficiently real, serious or important to qualify for legal protection. Another level is that of the dilemma every legal system faces between the so-called 'abstract' and 'concrete' approaches to the calculation of damages. This dilemma also poses, in a particularly acute form, other problems relating to the application of some of the methods of limiting damages, such as the mitigation rule.⁵⁹ The next level, which is not amenable to an easy separation, is that of the nature, meaning and role of the protection of the 'performance interest' of the contract. Yet another level, which is once again interlinked with some of the previous ones, relates to the extent to which the law can take into account the gains made by the defaulting party in the calculation of the loss sustained by the aggrieved party. Finally, there is a connection between the meaning of loss and, more broadly, various aspects of the law of damages, on the one hand, and the issue of contractual distribution of risk, on the other. While this volume does not aim to provide an exhaustive treatment of all these issues, many of them are touched upon in the essays contained herein.

⁵⁸ See the above discussion on the availability of non-compensatory measures of damages.

⁵⁹ For the recognition, in some of this volume's contributions, of the relationship between the foreseeability rule and the issues of 'abstract' calculation, see below.

B The Recoverability of Losses

The recoverability of various heads of loss is addressed in several contributions to this volume. Two essays address the question of whether injury to business reputation and goodwill constitutes a recoverable loss under the CISG. Schwenger and Hachem argue that this loss should be recoverable as business reputation and goodwill have an economic value in which substantial investments are made. Similarly, Saidov, having examined the nature and the existing definitions of reputation and goodwill, concludes that these phenomena often constitute ‘business assets’ performing a number of important commercial functions and, for this reason, damage to these assets should be recognised as a recoverable loss under the Convention. Saidov also highlights, drawing on the developments in the law and outside it, some possible methods of proving and calculating this loss, with a special emphasis on its relationship with other potentially related losses, such as loss of custom, loss of a chance to enhance reputation and loss of profit. Michael Furmston⁶⁰ addresses the issue of the recoverability of damages for loss of a chance in the common law. He believes that, in comparison with contract cases, a different line of reasoning has been taken by the courts in medical negligence cases. He suggests that this is wrong and that the same rules ought to apply in relation to both contract and tort.

The recoverability of legal fees under the CISG is another issue which has received a large amount of attention (perhaps undeservedly so, considering the number of other unresolved issues that exist in the law of damages).⁶¹ Schwenger and Hachem consider this issue by, first of all, drawing a distinction between litigation costs and pre-litigation costs. They argue that the former should not be recoverable as damages under the Convention, despite the support that the contrary position may derive from the principle of full compensation. The argument follows the premise that recognising litigation costs as recoverable losses would contravene the principle of equality (symmetry) between the buyer and the seller: while the claimant will be able to recover those costs in the event that it wins the case, the respondent will not. So far as pre-litigation costs are concerned, the authors suggest that, while some such costs (eg those incurred in an attempt to mitigate losses) should be recoverable, others, such as those which cannot be neatly separated from litigation costs (eg those incurred to assess the party’s legal position, prospects of litigation and/or settlement negotiations), should not be recoverable.

Schwenger and Hachem also address the question of whether damages for loss of a chance are recoverable—a matter still shrouded by uncertainty

⁶⁰ See M Furmston, ‘Actual Damages, Notional Damages and Loss of a Chance’, this volume.

⁶¹ See sources referred to in nn 51–8 in Schwenger and Hachem’s chapter in this volume and n 31 in Gotanda’s.

under the CISG. Similar to their argument in relation to damage to reputation, the authors submit that a chance has an economic value in the light of the substantial sums often invested in it (eg in taking part in a bid), and therefore damage to it should be treated as a loss. They also argue that, because the sole difference between loss of a chance and loss of profit lies in the level of certainty with which they can be proven (ie loss of a chance involving a greater degree of speculation), the recoverability of loss of a chance can be inferred from Article 74 of the CISG, which expressly allows damages for 'loss of profit'. In the authors' view, this wording 'naturally encompasses' the recoverability of damages for loss of a chance.

In the age of constantly fluctuating exchange rates, the question of whether exchange rate losses arising from a breach of contract are recoverable is of great practical importance. Charles Proctor's chapter is a helpful contribution in this respect. It addresses, amongst other issues, the recoverability of exchange rate losses arising from delay in payment. Having analysed the relevant body of case law, Proctor demonstrates that currency exchange losses are in principle recoverable as damages for breach of contract, subject to the usual rules of foreseeability (remoteness). However, as Proctor notes, in *President of India v Lips Maritime Corporation*,⁶² exchange rate losses arising from the late payment of demurrage was held not to be recoverable as damages. Proctor regards this result as somewhat unfortunate considering that:

damages may be awarded for late payment of freight, but not for late payment of demurrage, in spite of the fact that they will both be expressed as liquidated amounts which are payable under the same contract.

C 'Concrete' v 'Abstract' Calculation

As noted above, at the heart of the current debate on the meaning of loss is the question of whether a 'concrete' or an 'abstract' approach to the calculation of damages ought to be applied.⁶³ The former approach aims to assess damages by reference to the injured party's actual circumstances, while the latter, in its pure form, does not look at the party's actual position but is instead based on the presumption that loss consists of the amount determined on the basis of a fixed formula, thereby awarding damages 'in abstract'. For example, these formulae include those which, in cases of non-delivery or non-acceptance of goods, assess damages by reference to

⁶² [1988] AC 395.

⁶³ Although there is a degree of controversy surrounding such terms as 'abstract/concrete' or 'subjective/objective' approaches to calculation (see n 57 in Cunningham's chapter), considering the international and comparative scope of this volume the terms 'concrete' and 'abstract' are used as they appear to be more widely used in legal literature relating to the international instruments (particularly, in relation to the CISG).