

Chapter 1 : Business law - blog.quintoapp.com

This item: Contract Law 9th edition by Elliott, Catherine, Quinn, Frances () Paperback by Catherine Paperback \$ Only 1 left in stock - order soon. Ships from and sold by croresbooks.

In the case of *Scamell v Ouston* [3] the House of Lords found that vague statements by the both parties as to a hire purchase arrangements for the sale did not amount to a binding contract. In this case Viscount Maugham stated: Counter-offer has an effect of canceling the original offer and so the original offeror can decide whether to sell it to somebody else at the price he has stated and the terms of the original offer. Therefore there was no contract between Anton and Bernard and Anton was free to sell the boat to Celine. This means that the original offer was not destroyed, but due to the fact that his reply was vague it can be considered not enforceable, as offerees should explain them clearly as well as the offerors. Therefore no contract took place in this situation. However, Postal rule is a well-known legal principle in contract law. The postal rule of acceptance of an offer became entrenched in the common law of contract in the English courts and therefore in the Australia courts during the nineteenth century. And the postal rule is an exception to the general rules of contract law in common law countries that acceptance takes place when communicated. The posting rule states, by contrast, that acceptance takes effect when a letter is posted. The rule was established by Anthony in the 19th century cases, starting with *Adams v Lindsell* [4], which was later confirmed in *Dunlop v Higgins* [5]. In *Adams v Lindsell* it was held that once a letter of acceptance is posted, a contract comes into existence immediately. Moreover, it makes no difference whether the offeror actually receives the letter. This was demonstrated in *Byrne v Van Tienhoven* [6], where the letter of revocation reached the claimant too late to be effective. If a letter of acceptance were to be lost, acceptance has still taken place. Moreover, it has been always possible for offerors to avoid the postal rules either by specifying a different method of communication, or by stating that they would not be bound until receipt of an acceptance letter. In this scenario Anton in his offer requested a reply by return of post, therefore as a reasonable person he should have understood that there might be any delays and that it takes time to deliver a postal letter. The relevance of this early 19th century rule to modern conditions, when many quicker means of communication are available has been highly criticised and questioned, however the rule remains for the time being. Until and unless the acceptance is so communicated, no contract comes into existence. However offeror has a right to expressly require a particular method of communication. *Holwell Securities Ltd v Hughes* [7]. It is uncertain whether precise observance of these conditions is necessary in order to make the acceptance binding. However, it is clear from the scenario that Anton required specifically a reply by return of post. Generally if acceptance does not occur in the way, specified by an offeror generally there is no agreement. This means that in this scenario no contract was formed. In this case, acceptance was required by return of post. It was held that this could mean by telegram or verbally, or by any other means that were not later than a letter written by return of post. If the court accepts his argument that telephone call is as equal as a reply in post, then the court may held that he accepted the original offer, therefore contract was formed between Bernard and Anton

Word Count 67 words
Bibliography Textbooks 1. Stefan Fafinski, Emily Finch, Contract Law, 2nd edition, Pearson.
Networked Knowledge, Contract Law Homepage. Law of Contract resources. Hughes [] 1 W.

does not entitle the plaintiff to sue him, it has to be proved that the defendant owed a duty of care to the plaintiff. The plaintiff may rebut these claims on the basis of vicarious liability, i. The master is vicariously liable for the wrongful act done by his servant in the course of employment. Since for the wrongdoer by the servant the master can also be made liable vicariously the plaintiff has a choice to bring an action against either or both of them. If a servant is not careful in the performance of his duties and his conduct causes any loss to a third party the master would be liable for the same. This is illustrated well in the case Williams Vs Jones. But here it is to be remembered that an employer will only be liable for torts which the employee commits in the course of employment. An employer will usually be liable

Thomas Vs Thomas 2 Q. In Donogue Vs Stevenson the defendant pleaded the defense that the plaintiff was a stranger to the contract and her action was not maintainable. But this fallacy was done away by allowing the consumer of drink an action against the manufacturer, between whom there was no contract. In nutshell, we can say that the plaintiffs have valid reasons to sue the defendant for negligent act because the injury caused to the plaintiffs purely due to the omission of duty of care on the part of the defendant. They can file a complaint against both the council as the master and the workers as the servants. In contrary to this, the defendant can raise valid defenses like non contractual relationship with the plaintiff and also the defense on the basis of privity of contract which may entitle the defendants to be released from the liability

Bibliography
1. Koffman, L Law of Contract 6th ed. C and Quinn F. J, Tort law, Oxford University Press, , 5.

Chapter 3 : Wildy & Sons Ltd The World's Legal Bookshop Search Results for isbn: "

Home» Ebook Contract Law 10th Edition by Elliott & Quinn Contract Law 10th Edition. Ebook Contemporary Management 9th Edition by Jones & George.

Chapter 4 : Pearson - Tort Law 9e, 9/E - Catherine Elliott & Frances Quinn

Find Catherine Elliott books from Pearson Education's online bookshop. Contract Law 11th Edition Catherine Elliott, Frances Quinn 9th Edition Catherine.

Chapter 5 : The Student Law Journal | Reviews | Contract Law

Catherine Elliott, Frances Quinn: Contract Law Catherine Elliott, Frances Quinn: Criminal Law, 10th edition Here you can download '.Catherine Elliott; Frances.

Chapter 6 : Exclusion Clauses in Contract Law - Other bibliographies - Cite This For Me

Catherine Elliott has 21 books on Goodreads with ratings. Catherine Elliott's most popular book is Contract Law.

Chapter 7 : Exclusion Clauses in Contract Law - Other bibliographies - Cite This For Me

Contract Law MyLawChamber Premium Pack by Catherine Elliott, Frances Quinn starting at \$ Contract Law MyLawChamber Premium Pack has 1 available editions to buy at Alibris.

Chapter 8 : Books by Catherine Elliott (Author of Contract Law)

This package includes a physical copy of Contract Law, 10e by Elliott & Quinn as well as access to the eText and MyLawChamber. Elliott and Quinn's Contract Law provides an accessible introduction to the essential concepts of this core subject, and continues to be the book of choice for undergraduate students year after year.

Sign In. Main menu.