

Unit 2



Title:	Contract Law
Level:	3
Credit Value:	7

Learning outcomes	Assessment criteria	Knowledge, understanding and skills
The learner will:	The learner can:	
1 Understand the concept of contract	<p>1.1 Define a contract</p> <p>1.2 Explain the legal requirements for the formation of an enforceable contract</p> <p>1.3 Explain the factual indicators of the existence of agreement</p> <p>1.4 Explain who can enforce a contract</p> <p>1.5 Apply an understanding of privity to a given situation</p>	<p>1.1 A contract is an agreement giving rise to obligations which are enforced or recognised by law.</p> <p>1.2 Agreement, intention, consideration.</p> <p>1.3 Offer and acceptance.</p> <p>1.4 Doctrine of privity: eg, <i>Tweddle v Atkinson (1861)</i> and <i>Dunlop v Selfridge (1915)</i>, and the Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999 (ie, ss1(1)(a) and (b); s1(2))</p> <p>1.5 Application to a scenario</p>
2 Understand the rules for establishing whether a valid offer and acceptance have taken place	2.1 Describe what constitutes a valid offer	2.1 An offer is a promise by the offeror to do or abstain from doing something, provided the offeree will accept the offer and pay or promise to pay the 'price' of the offer.

This specification is for 2012 examinations

	<p>2.2 Distinguish an offer from an invitation to treat</p> <p>2.3 Explain the requirements of communication of offer</p> <p>2.4 Describe how an offer is terminated</p> <p>2.5 Explain the nature and effect of counter offer</p> <p>2.6 Explain how, and in what circumstance, the passage of time may terminate an offer</p> <p>2.7 Explain the nature of, and requirements for, revocation of offer</p> <p>2.8 Describe a valid acceptance of an offer</p> <p>2.9 Explain the rules governing communication of acceptance and the exceptions to that rule</p>	<p>2.2 Definition of 'invitation to treat': an attempt to solicit offers; the differences between offers and invitations to treat: eg, <i>Partridge v Crittenden (1968)</i> and <i>Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Co (1892)</i>.</p> <p>2.3 The offer must be communicated to the offeree: eg, <i>Taylor v Laird (1856)</i>.</p> <p>2.4 Counter offer, revocation, passage of time; acceptance.</p> <p>2.5 Counter offer destroys original offer eg, <i>Hyde v Wrench (1840)</i> but see, by contrast, <i>Stevenson, Jacques Co v McLean (1880)</i> ; only the original offeror can reinstate the original offer.</p> <p>2.6 See, for example, <i>Ramsgate Victoria Hotel v Montefiore (1866)</i>.</p> <p>2.7 Withdrawal of offer by offeror, must be done before acceptance by the offeree (eg, <i>Payne v Cave (1789)</i>); must be communicated (but see, for example, <i>Dickinson v Dodds (1876)</i>); revocation is not valid in unilateral contracts once acceptance has begun: eg, <i>Errington v Errington & Woods (1952)</i>.</p> <p>2.8 Final and unqualified assent to an offer.</p> <p>2.9 Acceptance must be communicated to offeror; acceptance must be communicated; silence is not valid</p>
--	---	--

	a given situation	
4 Understand the rules for determining a party's intention to enter into a contract	<p>4.1 Explain how an intention to enter into an agreement might be determined</p> <p>4.2 Explain the presumption in social and domestic situations and how it may be rebutted</p> <p>4.3 Explain how the presumption in social and domestic situations may be rebutted</p> <p>4.4 Explain the presumption in commercial situations</p> <p>4.5 Explain how the presumption may be rebutted in commercial situations</p> <p>4.6 Apply an understanding of the rules for determining intention to a given situation</p>	<p>4.1 The meaning and use of rebuttable presumptions.</p> <p>4.2 The presumption is that there is no intention to contract in social and domestic situations: eg, <i>Balfour v Balfour (1919)</i>.</p> <p>4.3 See, for example, <i>Merritt v Merritt (1970)</i>, <i>Simpkins v Pays (1955)</i>.</p> <p>4.4 The presumption is that there is an intention to create legal relations.</p> <p>4.5 For rebutting the presumption in commercial situations: eg, <i>Rose & Frank v J R Crompton (1925)</i>.</p> <p>4.6 Application to a scenario.</p>
5 Understand how terms are incorporated into a contract	<p>5.1 Explain the meaning of 'representation'</p> <p>5.2 Distinguish a mere representation from a term of the contract</p> <p>5.3 Identify express terms of a contract</p>	<p>5.1 Statements normally made outside the contract which may induce a party to enter into the contract but which do not constitute a term of the contract.</p> <p>5.2 Importance attached to representation, reduction into writing, passage of time between statement and entering into the contract: eg, <i>Bannerman v White (1861)</i>, <i>Routledge v McKay (1954)</i>, <i>Birch v Paramount Estates Ltd (1956)</i>, <i>Oscar Chess v Williams (1957)</i>.</p> <p>5.3 Terms that are distinctly or overtly stated rather than implied.</p>

This specification is for 2012 examinations

	<p>5.4 Explain how express terms may be incorporated into the contract</p> <p>5.5 Explain how terms may be implied by statute</p> <p>5.6 Explain how terms are implied by custom</p> <p>5.7 Explain how terms are implied by the courts</p> <p>5.8 Apply an understanding of contractual terms to a given situation</p>	<p>5.4 Requirement, on an objective test that reasonable notice be given.</p> <p>5.5 Examples of terms implied under s13(1), 14(2), 14(3) of the Sale of Goods Act 1979; and ss. 3 and 4, and ss. 13, 14 and 15 Supply of Goods and Services Act 1982</p> <p>5.6 Implied by the custom of location or trade practice; criteria for implying a term by custom: long duration, reasonable and not inconsistent with an express term; for implying by trade use: existence of usage and it is acceptable to the court.</p> <p>5.7 The business efficacy test: eg, <i>Moorcock (1889)</i>; the officious bystander test: eg, <i>Shirlaw v Southern Foundries (1926) Ltd (1939)</i>.</p> <p>5.8 Application to a scenario.</p>
<p>6 Understand the classification of different provisions of a contract, and the implication of categorisation</p>	<p>6.1 Define a condition</p> <p>6.2 Define warranty</p> <p>6.3 Define an innominate term</p>	<p>6.1 Term going to the root of the contract, the breach of which entitles the innocent party to repudiate the contract and claim damages: eg, <i>Poussard v Spiers & Pond (1876)</i>.</p> <p>6.2 Less important term, breach of which entitles the party to a claim for damages only: eg, <i>Bettini v Gye (1876)</i>.</p> <p>6.3 Cannot be classified at time of formation of contract; remedy depends on effect of breach: eg, <i>Hong Kong Fir Shipping v Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha (1962)</i>.</p>

This specification is for 2012 examinations

	<p>6.4 Apply an understanding of the classification of innominate terms, warranties and conditions to a given situation</p>	<p>6.4 Application to a given scenario.</p>
<p>7 Understand misrepresentation and its consequences</p>	<p>7.1 Identify what constitutes misrepresentation</p> <p>7.2 Explain the different types of misrepresentation</p> <p>7.3 Explain the effects of the Misrepresentation Act 1967 on actions for negligent and innocent misrepresentation</p> <p>7.4 Explain the remedies available in respect of misrepresentation</p> <p>7.5 Apply an understanding of misrepresentation to a given situation</p>	<p>7.1 Untrue statement of fact made by one party to the other, inducing the other to enter the contract; must be actual and reasonable reliance on the misrepresentation.</p> <p>7.2 Fraudulent, Negligent (under the Misrepresentation Act 1967) and Innocent.</p> <p>7.3 Ss 2(1) and (2) Misrepresentation Act 1967: see <i>Howard Marine & Dredging Co Ltd v Ogden & Sons (Excavations) Ltd (1978)</i></p> <p>7.4 Fraudulent misrepresentation: rescission and damages based on deceit; negligent misrepresentation: rescission (subject to court's discretion) and damages based on tort of deceit eg <i>Royscot Trust v Rogerson</i> (1991) innocent misrepresentation: rescission or damages in lieu of rescission.</p> <p>7.5 Application to a scenario.</p>
<p>8 Understand the ways in which a contract might be discharged</p>	<p>8.1 Explain how a contract may be discharged by performance</p>	<p>8.1 Contracts must be performed strictly; eg, <i>Cutter v Powell</i> (1795); exceptions: severable obligations, preventing performance, part performance and substantial performance</p>

This specification is for 2012 examinations

	<p>8.2 Explain how a breach of a condition entitles the innocent party to repudiate the contract</p> <p>8.3 Explain how parties might agree to the discharge of a contract</p> <p>8.4 Explain how a contract may be discharged by frustration</p> <p>8.5 Explain statutory interventions relating to frustrated contracts</p> <p>8.6 Apply an understanding of the ways in which a contract may be discharged to a given situation</p>	<p>8.2 See, for example, <i>Poussard v Spiers & Pond (1876)</i>.</p> <p>8.3 Waiver and accord, subject to existence of agreement and consideration.</p> <p>8.4 Definition/explanation of common law position on frustration; eg <i>Krell v Henry</i> effect of frustration at common law; eg, <i>Fibrosa Spolka Akcyjna v Fairborn Lawson Combe Barbour Ltd (1943)</i>.</p> <p>8.5 Statutory intervention: Law Reform (Frustrated Contracts) Act 1943: s1(2) the payee rule, the payer rule, eg, <i>Gamerco S.A. v I.C.M.(1995)</i></p> <p>8.6 Application to a scenario.</p>
<p>9 Understand the remedies available where a contract has been breached</p>	<p>9.1 Identify the remedies available when a contract has been breached</p> <p>9.2 Explain the purpose and meaning of damages in contract</p> <p>9.3 Explain the requirements for claiming damages</p>	<p>9.1 Repudiation, damages, specific performance, injunction.</p> <p>9.2 Monetary compensation aimed at putting the innocent party in position he would have been had the contract not been breached: eg, <i>Robinson v Harman (1848)</i>.</p> <p>9.3 The Claimant needs to show (a) the breach caused the loss, (b) the loss was not too remote: see, for eg, <i>Hadley v Baxendale (1854)</i>, <i>Victoria Laundry (Windsor) Ltd v Newman Industries Ltd (1949)</i>, <i>The Heron II (1969)</i>, and (c) that the innocent party has attempted to</p>

	<p>9.4 Explain, in outline, heads of damages</p> <p>9.5 Explain the remedies of specific performance and injunction</p> <p>9.6 Apply an understanding of remedies available to a given situation</p>	<p>mitigate the losses claimed.</p> <p>9.4 Explanation of: damages for non-pecuniary loss: loss of enjoyment, inconvenience, distress, eg, <i>Jarvis v Swans Tours Ltd (1973)</i>, <i>Farley v Skinner No. 2 (2001)</i>; damages for pecuniary loss: reliance loss, eg, <i>Anglia TV v Reed (1972)</i> expectation loss (cost of cure, cost of replacement etc eg, <i>Ruxley Electronics and Construction Ltd v Forsyth (1996)</i>), loss of bargain; consequential loss.</p> <p>9.5 Definitions of the remedies; equitable nature of the remedies, discretionary, granted where damages inadequate; outline of criteria used when granting these remedies.</p> <p>9.6 Application to a scenario.</p>
--	---	--

Additional information about the unit	
Unit aim(s)	The learner will understand key concepts, terms and processes in the area of Contract Law
Unit expiry date	31 March 2015
Details of the relationship between the unit and relevant national occupational standards (if appropriate)	This unit may provide relevant underpinning knowledge and understanding towards units of the Legal Advice standards; specifically, Unit 47 First Line Consumer Legal Advice and Unit 48 Consumer Legal Advice and Casework
Details of the relationship between the unit and other standards or curricula (if appropriate)	Courses of study leading towards the achievement of the unit may offer the learner the opportunity to satisfy requirements across a number of Level 3 Key Skill areas; most specifically, Communication, Improving own learning and performance, Problem solving and Working with others
Assessment requirements specified by a sector or regulatory body (if appropriate)	N/A
Endorsement of the unit by a sector or other appropriate body (if required)	N/A
Location of the unit within the subject/sector classification	15.5 Law and Legal Services
Name of the organisation submitting the unit	ILEX (Institute of Legal Executives)
Availability for use	Only available to owning awarding body
Availability for delivery	1 September 2011

This specification is for 2012 examinations