

CONTRACTS I

Professor Tanya Monestier
Email: tmonestier@rwu.edu

Office Hours: T/Th 3:00-4:30 (sign up on TWEN)

I.	INTRODUCTION	1-18
II.	INGREDIENTS OF CONTRACT FORMATION: MUTUAL ASSENT, OFFER & ACCEPTANCE, CERTAINTY OF TERMS & CONSIDERATION	
A.	MUTUAL ASSENT	
1.	Intention to be Bound: Objective Theory of Contract	35-46
	<i>Ray v. William G. Eurice & Bros.</i>	
	<i>Lucy v. Zehmer</i>	TWEN
	<i>Morales v. Sun Constructors</i>	TWEN
	CALI Lesson: Mutual Assent	
B.	OFFER & ACCEPTANCE	
1.	Offer and Acceptance in Bilateral Contracts	46-60
	<i>Lonergan v. Scolnick</i>	
	<i>Normile v. Miller</i>	
	<i>Cantu v. Central Education Agency</i>	TWEN
2.	Offer and Acceptance in Unilateral Contracts	60-66
	<i>Petterson v. Pattberg</i>	TWEN
	<i>Cook v. Caldwell Banker</i>	
	CALI Lesson: Offer	
	CALI Lesson: Duration of Offers	
	CALI Lesson: Bilateral and Unilateral Contracts	
	CALI Lesson: Acceptance	
	CALI Lesson: The “Mailbox” Rule	
3.	Irrevocability of Offers in Bilateral Contracts	
a)	Option Contracts	265-266, 270-274
b)	Detrimental Reliance (general introduction provided in class; full discussion under Chapter III)	
c)	The Firm Offer Rule (Art. 2)	294-296 (Prob. 3-3)

CALI Lesson: Option Contracts and Firm Offers

- 4. Contract Formation Under the Uniform Commercial Code
 - a) Mutual Assent Under the UCC 147-154
Jannusch v. Naffziger
 - b) “Battle of the Forms” 163-193
Princess Cruises, Inc. v. General Electric Co.
Brown Machine, Inc. v. Hercules, Inc.
Paul Gottlieb & Co. v. Alps South Corp.

CALI Lesson: Battle of the Forms

CALI Lesson: Formation of Contracts under UCC Article 2

C. CERTAINTY OF TERMS

- 1. Uncertainty of Terms Generally TWEN
Baer v. Chase
- 2. Agreements to Agree 77-86
Walker v. Keith
- 3. Formal Contract Contemplated 86-95 (Omit Note 6)
Quake Construction v. American Airlines

CALI Lesson: Indefiniteness

CALI Lesson: Letters of Intent and Other Formal Preliminary Agreements

D. CONSIDERATION

- 1. Introduction & Defining Consideration 101-115
Hamer v. Sidway
Pennsy Supply v. American Ash Recycling Corp.
- 2. Applying the Consideration Doctrine 115-127; 129-139
 - Dougherty v. Salt*
 - Allegheny College v. National Chautauqua County Bank* TWEN
 - Dohrman v. Swaney*
 - De Los Santos v. Great Western Sugar Co.* TWEN
 - Plowman v. Indian Refining*
 - Fiege v. Boehm* TWEN

CALI Lesson: Bargained-For Exchange

CALI Lesson: Mutuality of Obligation

CALI Lesson: Agreements Lacking Consideration (Gifts)

CALI Lesson: Past Consideration & Moral Obligations

CALI Lesson: Illusory Contracts, Satisfaction Clauses, Implied Obligations

III. LIABILITY IN THE ABSENCE OF BARGAINED-FOR EXCHANGE

A. PROMISSORY ESTOPPEL

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1. Promises within the Family | 225-236 |
| <i>Kirksey v. Kirksey</i> | |
| <i>Harvey v. Dow</i> | |
| <i>Wright v. Newman</i> | TWEN |
| 2. Charitable Subscriptions | 236-246 |
| <i>King v. Trustees of Boston University</i> | |
| 3. Promises Within the Commercial Context | 247-248 |
| a) Detrimental Reliance as a Substitute for Consideration | 248-255 |
| <i>Katz v. Danny Dare, Inc.</i> | |
| <i>Shoemaker v. Commonwealth Bank</i> | TWEN |
| b) Promises Made Irrevocable Because of Reliance | 274-293 |
| <i>James Baird Co. v. Gimbel Bros., Inc.</i> | |
| <i>Drennan v. Star Paving Co.</i> | |
| <i>Pop's Cones, Inc. v. Resorts Int'l</i> | |

CALI Lesson: Promissory Estoppel (NOTE, Only 'Restatement 90 Reliance')

B. RESTITUTION

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 1. Restitution Generally | 296-297, 307-308 |
| <i>Nursing Care Services Inc. v. Dobos</i> | TWEN |
| <i>Bailey v. West</i> | TWEN |
| <i>Commerce Partnership 8098 v. Equity Contracting</i> | 309-315 |
| <i>Watts v. Watts</i> (Note: read only Intro, Part I, V, VI) | 315-327 |
| <i>Lewis v. Lewis</i> (read critically with a view to seeing where the court strayed from the doctrine of restitution) | TWEN |
| 2. Promissory Restitution/Moral Obligation | 327-340 |
| <i>Mills v. Wyman</i> | |
| <i>Webb v. McGowin</i> | |

CALI Lesson: Restitution

IV. THE STATUTE OF FRAUDS (CHAPTER 4)

A. GENERALLY

345-368

Crabtree v. Elizabeth Arden Sales Corp.

Beaver v. Brumlow

B. STATUTE OF FRAUDS & THE UCC 380-390

Buffaloe v. Hart

[CALI Lesson: The Statute of Frauds](#)

V. THE MEANING OF AGREEMENT: PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION AND THE PAROL EVIDENCE RULE (CHAPTER 5)

A. THE PAROL EVIDENCE RULE

1. Generally 427-429
Thompson v. Libby 429-437
Myskina v. Conde Nast TWEN
2. Exceptions to the Parol Evidence Rule
Sherrodd, Inc. v. Morrison-Knudsen 451-460
Mitchell v. Lath TWEN
Ritter v. Grady Auto Group TWEN

[CALI Lesson: The Parole Evidence Rule](#)

[CALI Lesson: The Parole Evidence Rule Podcast](#)

B. INTERPRETATION OF CONTRACTS 396-398

1. Ambiguity, Plain Meaning & the Contextual Approach
Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. Thomas Drayage & Rigging TWEN
Trident Center v. Connecticut General Life Insurance TWEN
2. The Process of Interpretation and Maxims of Interpretation 404 (Note 3), 405-416
Frigalment Importing v. B.N.S. Int'l Sales Corp.
White City Shopping Center v. PR Restaurants TWEN
Is a Burrito a Sandwich? Article TWEN
3. The Doctrine of Reasonable Expectations 416-427
C & J Fertilizer Inc. v. Allied Mutual Insurance Co.

Exercise: Contract for Nanny Services

[CALI Lesson: Interpretation](#)

V. SUPPLEMENTING THE AGREEMENT: IMPLIED TERMS, THE OBLIGATION OF GOOD FAITH AND WARRANTIES

- A. IMPLIED TERMS 481-492
Wood v. Lucy, Lady Duff-Gordon
Leibel v. Raynor Manufacturing Co.

CALI Lesson: Implied Terms

- B. THE IMPLIED OBLIGATION OF GOOD FAITH 492-523
Indiana-American Water Company v. Town of Seelyville TWEN
Morin Building Products v. Baystone Construction, Inc.
Locke v. Warner Bros.

CALI Lesson: Implied Obligation of Good Faith

NOTE: Parts of the course are presented in a different order than presented in the book; this is deliberate and intended to facilitate better comprehension of the material. Note that this syllabus is subject to modification at the Professor's discretion.