

## Question 5

Stan and Barb entered into a valid written contract whereby (1) Stan agreed to convey to Barb 100 acres of agricultural land and water rights in an adjacent stream, and (2) Barb agreed to pay Stan \$100,000. When Stan and Barb were negotiating the deal, Stan said, "You know I want to make sure that this property will still be used for farming and not developed." Barb replied simply, "Well, I can certainly understand your feelings." In fact, Barb intended to develop the land as a resort.

The conveyance was to take place on June 1. On May 15, Stan called Barb and told her the deal was off. Stan said that a third party, Tom, had offered him \$130,000 for the land. Stan also said that he had discovered that Barb intended to develop the land.

On May 16, Barb discovered that Stan has title to only 90 of the 100 acres specified, and that he does not have water rights in the adjacent stream.

Barb still wishes to purchase the property. However, it will cost her \$15,000 to purchase the water rights from the true owner of those rights.

What equitable and contractual remedies, if any, may Barb seek, what defenses, if any, may Stan assert, and what is the likely outcome on each? Discuss.

## Answer A to Question 5

5)

**Barb v. Stan**

### **Barb's Equitable and Contractual Remedies**

#### Contractual Rights - - Land-Sale Contract

Barb can sue Stan under contract rights for breach of the land-sale contract, for failing to deliver marketable title and for breach of a general warranty deed. She should assert that she is entitled to the remedy of specific performance, or alternately, damages under contract.

#### Specific Performance

Specific performance is an equitable remedy that is available when: 1) there is a valid contract, 2) the terms of the contract are clear and definite and were performed, 3) there is [sic] inadequate legal damages, 4) there [sic] mutuality, and 5) there are no valid defenses.

#### Valid Contract

A valid contract in a land-sale agreement requires a writing with all essential terms.

The contract between Barb and Stan was a valid written agreement, for the sale and purchase of 100 acres of agricultural land and water rights to a stream, to close on June 1<sup>st</sup>. Barb agreed to pay \$100,000 for the purchase of the land.

#### Clear and Definite Terms

Terms are clear and definite when a court is able to enforce the terms. For a land-sale contract, the contract must contain: 1) parties, 2) property defined, 3) time for performance, and 4) purchase price.

Here, the court can enforce the sale of land, since it defines 1) the parties are Barb and Stan, 2) the land to be sold is 100 acres of agricultural land and water rights, 3) the time for performance as June 1<sup>st</sup>, and 4) the purchase price of \$100,000. Therefore, this element is met.

#### Inadequate Legal Damages

Legal damages are inadequate when there is a contract for a subject matter that is unique. Land has been held as a unique subject matter, since no two lots of land are the same, even if they appear to be.

Since the contract between Barb and Stan is for 100 acres of land, the contract is for a unique subject matter and legal damages are inadequate. Therefore, this element is met.

### Mutuality

At common law, mutuality required that both parties be entitled to specific performance. However, modernly, mutuality only requires that the person seeking specific performance be ready and able to perform.

Here, as long as Barb, the person seeking the specific performance of the contract, is able to pay the purchase price, she should be entitled to specific performance.

### Abatement of Purchase Price

In a land-sale contract, a purchase price can be abated, or reduced when the title rendered is defective due to an encumbrance or unmarketable title, or a conveyance of less than promised.

If Barb succeeds on specific performance, subject to Stan's defenses (discussed below) then she should be entitled to abate the purchase price. Bob contracted for 100 acres of land and water right[s] to an adjacent stream. Barb later discovered that Stan only owned 90 acres and did not own the water rights he claimed to own. Since Barb contracted to pay \$100,000, she should be entitled to a reduction of the purchase price to reflect the value of the land, minus the 10 acres and the stream.

### Stream

The stream was not owned by Stan, but owned by another person who is willing to sell the stream to Barb for \$15,000. Therefore, the purchase price should be first reduced by the amount, to a total of \$85,000. This is fair since it would cost Barb that amount to correct the contract as agreed.

### 10 Acres

Stan agreed to sell Barb 100 acres, but only owned 90 acres of the land. The ten acres of land should be subtracted from the remaining \$85,000. One method of doing this would be to divide \$85,000 by 100 and value each acre at \$850. Then multiply \$850 x 10 acres for a reduction of \$8,500 credited to Barb.

### Legal Damages

If Barb is unsuccessful in her attempt to obtain specific performance, she could sue Stan for breach of contract and obtain legal damages.

### Breach of the Contract—Anticipatory Repudiation

Anticipatory repudiation is a clear and unambiguous statement that a party will not perform before performance comes due under the contract.

Since Stan called off the sale of the land on May 15, which was two weeks before the closing date of June 1<sup>st</sup>, Stan anticipatorily repudiated the contract, which is a major breach. This entitles Barb to suspend her performance and sue for breach of contract.

### Expectancy Damages

A major breach entitles the aggrieved party to damages to make them whole. These are called expectancy damages. In these contracts, the appropriate measure of damages is the fair market value of the land - - the contract price.

Here, Barb contracted for the sale of land for \$100,000. Stan was later offered \$130,000 for the land by a third party. If indeed this contract reflects fair market value and if the contract was also for the 100 acres and the water rights, then Barb should be granted \$30,000. Otherwise, Barb should get \$30,000 plus \$15,000 for the water rights plus \$8,500 to reflect the additional 10 acres.

### 2) Stan's Defenses

Stan should assert defenses that Barb is not entitled to an equitable remedy and that specific performance was inappropriate since there was not a valid contract which Barb had performed.

### Laches

Laches bars equitable remedies when a party unreasonably delays and this causes prejudice.

Here, there is no indication that Barb delayed in filing her suit. Therefore, this defense will fail.

### Unclean Hands

Under the Clean Hands Doctrine, equity will not come to the aid of a person with unclean hands. The Clean Hands Doctrine bars equitable relief to a person who engages in wrongful, fraudulent or unconscionable conduct with regard to the subject matter at hand.

Here, Stan could argue that Barb knew of Stan's firm desire to keep the land as agricultural land to be used for farming and prevent its development. In fact, Barb said, "I can certainly understand your feelings," but in reality had intended all along to develop the agricultural land as a resort. Barb did not disclose this information to Stan, which is material omission and one that probably would have terminated the contract. On the other hand, Stan did not include this statement in the contract, and if it were truly a deal-breaker, he probably should have. Since courts tend to favor the free alienation of property and prefer that material agreements be in the writing, if there is one, the court will likely side with Barb, unless they find that she committed fraud against Stan. Therefore, this defense, although a close call, will not likely bar Barb's relief in equity.

### Contract Invalid

Stan can also claim the contract is invalid, which would refute one of the elements necessary to enforce an agreement with specific performance.

### Unconscionability

Stan should argue that the contract was unconscionable since there was unfair surprise in Barb's intent to develop the land.

However, this argument will likely fail as Barb and Stan appear to be at arm's length and Stan should have included his restriction on the land.

### Terms of the Contract Not Met

Stan can also argue that the contract terms were not met and Barb breached the contract by having the intent to develop the land although there was a condition that Barb use the land with the restriction on the land for agricultural purposes. However, the parole evidence rule will bar this argument.

### Parol Evidence

Parol evidence bars introduction of oral or written agreements made [sic] before or contemporaneously with a completely integrated writing.

Therefore, Barb will argue that the oral statements by Stan that he preferred the property be used for farming and not be developed is barred.

### Stan's Bad Faith/Unclean Hands

Since Stan also acted in bad faith and with unclean hands by accepting an offer from another purchaser for more money, he will probably lose on his defense arguments.

## Answer B to Question 5

5)

**Barb (B) v. Seller (S)**

**Breach of the Land Sale Contract**

Valid, Enforceable Contract

The facts tell us that B and S entered into a valid written contract for the sale of 100 acres of agricultural land and water rights in exchange for \$100K.

Anticipatory Repudiation

B will argue that S breached the agreement when he anticipatorily repudiated the agreement on May 15. In order to have an anticipatory repudiation, the breaching party must unequivocally indicate an intent not to perform. In this case, S called B and told her the deal was off. This qualifies as an unequivocal repudiation and S would be free to pursue all remedies available to her for the breach.

B has four options available to her after S's repudiation. She is free to: (1) treat the contract as repudiated and sue for damages, (2) treat the contract as discharged; (3) await the time for performance (June 1) and sue when performance does not occur; or (4) urge S to perform. In this case, we know that B still wishes to purchase the property; thus, her best option is to treat the contract as repudiated and sue immediately for all contractual remedies available to her.

Unmarketable Title

B will also argue that S breached the land sale contract by being unable to provide marketable title. This is because she discovered on May 16 that S only had title to 90 of the 100 acres he was purporting to sell B and because he did not have any water rights in the adjacent stream.

Although S might try to argue that his inability to provide marketable title discharges him from the contract, this will not be a successful defense because only the buyer to a land sale contract has a right to terminate the contract if the seller cannot provide marketable title. If the buyer still wants to purchase the property, the seller must perform under the contract. In addition, the buyer has a right to sue for damages incurred under the contract. This could include abatement of the purchase price.

## Remedies

### Compensatory Damages

#### Expectancy Damages

In order to be awarded damages, B must prove that they are foreseeable and certain to result. The usual measure of damages in a contract action is for B's expectancy; that is, B is entitled to recover the amount that she would need to purchase a replacement. In this case, it would be very difficult for B to establish how much it would cost her to purchase comparable property since she specifically wants S's property. Thus, there does not appear to be any way to provide B with an amount that would allow her to buy an adequate substitute. If, however, there were other comparable nearby [sic] for sale, and if S could not obtain specific performance, then she might be able to prove expectancy damages by establishing how much it would cost to purchase that other property. If she could do that, she would be entitled to the difference between what it cost to purchase the replacement property and the contract price (\$100K).

#### Consequential Damages

In addition to expectancy damages, consequential damages are sometimes available in contract actions. These are damages that are unusual, but that were foreseeable to both parties at the time the contract was formed. B will try to argue that S should be liable to her for any lost profits she will suffer as a result of the delay in developing the land for a resort. She'll argue that the substantial delay that will occur because she has to either bring suit to obtain S's land or because she'll have to go find an alternative property will result in significant lost profit damages. Moreover, she will argue that S knew on May 15, before the June 1 performance date, that she intended to develop the land as a resort and that he thus should be liable for all lost profits that she will incur as a result of his breach.

S will successfully argue that B is not entitled to consequential damages for two reasons. First, he will prove that he was not aware of B's plans at the time the contract was formed. The contract was formed at the time the parties signed the agreement, and at that time, S was under the impression B would be using the land for farming. This is evidenced by his statement that he wanted the property to remain undeveloped and to be used for farming and B's response of "Well, I can certainly understand your feelings." S will argue that this did not put him on any kind of notice as to B's intentions and thus he isn't liable for her lost development profits. Second, S will successfully argue that the lost development profits can't be proven with certainty since it is a new business with no prior history of profits. Since courts are loathe to award lost profits to new businesses, S will also succeed in this argument.

Accordingly, B is entitled to receive the amount it would take to allow her to purchase a new piece of replacement property. However, since land is unique, this is inadequate compensation for B. B will not be able to prove that she is entitled to consequential

damages since they are uncertain and since S was unaware of B's plans at the time the contract was formed.

### Incidental Damages

B is always entitled to recover for incidental damages suffered as a result of the breach. In this case, to the extent she can prove what it cost her to search for new property, etc[.], she can recover from S.

### Restitutionary Damages

Restitution is an alternative remedy to compensatory damages when the defendant received a benefit and compensatory damages are not the best measure of damages. In this case, S has not actually received any benefit yet. However, B may be able to succeed in her argument that if B is allowed to sell his property to Tom because the court refuses to grant specific performance, then she should be entitled to receive the \$30K S was receiving from Tom that was in excess of the amount S was entitled to receive under the contract with B. She can argue that allowing S to retain the additional sum would result in unjust enrichment.

### Specific Performance

Specific performance is available only if B can establish that: (1) damages are inadequate; (2) the terms of the contract are definite and certain; (3) it is feasible to enforce the contract; (4) there is mutuality of remedy/performance; and (5) there are not equitable defenses.

### Inadequacy

As discussed above, since land is unique and since B can't prove her damages with certainty, damages are an inadequate remedy in this case.

### Definite and Certain Terms

Courts do not award specific performance unless the terms are very definite and certain. Here, B will argue the terms are quite certain since she was entitled to receive 100 acres of land and water rights in exchange for \$100K. She will succeed in her argument.

### Feasibility of Enforcement

A court will not award specific performance unless it is feasible to enforce the injunction. Here, a court presumably has jurisdiction over the land and S. In addition, the court would be able to use its contempt power to force S to convey the land to B. Thus, the injunction is feasible to enforce.



### Mutuality of Remedy/Performance

In the past, courts would not award specific performance if there was no mutuality of remedy (if the party asking for specific performance could not be made to specifically perform in the event of her breach). Courts today have modified this requirement so that they grant specific performance if it is possible to ensure mutuality of performance. In this case, mutuality of performance is possible since the court can require S to convey the deed to the property at the same time B tenders \$100K to S.

### No Equitable Defenses

#### *Laches*

B has not waited an unreasonable length of time to bring suit such that S can argue that he detrimentally relied on B's failure to bring suit. Accordingly, this is no defense.

#### *Unclean Hands*

S will assert that B has acted with unclean hands with regard to this particular transaction. He will point to B's statement in response to his request that he would like the property to remain undeveloped. S will claim the statement, while not explicitly false, was deceptive since it induced S into believing that B would not develop the property when, in fact, B planned all along to develop it as a resort. S will argue it was a misstatement by omission since B knew at the time the contract was formed that she would develop the property despite S's desire for her not to, yet she did not volunteer this information to S.

B may counter that her evasion was not an actual false statement and that she cannot be held responsible for whatever S may have interpreted her statement to mean beyond its actual literal meaning – that she did, in fact, understand that he'd like the property to remain undeveloped. B will argue that since there was no actual false statement, she does not have unclean hands and[,] thus, is fully entitled to specific performance.

If S is successful in making his argument, the court will deny B specific performance, and award her damages only.

### Conclusion

A court will not award B specific performance of the contract since she had unclean hands with respect to the contract. Accordingly, it will grant her whatever damages can be proven would be certain to occur. In this case, B will likely be entitled to the \$30K that S will get from Tom that is in excess of the contract price they had agreed on. In addition, she can receive incidental damages and, in the unlikely event she can prove how much it would cost to obtain replacement property, she can receive any amount in excess of the contract price from S as well.

If, however, the court did award specific performance, it would require that S convey the 90 acres of land S actually owns to B. B would only have to pay \$90K for the 90 acres. In addition, since it would cost B \$15K to purchase the water rights from the true owner, B is also entitled to deduct this from the purchase price. Accordingly, if a court does award B specific performance, it will only require B to tender \$75K to S in exchange for S's 90 acres of property.

#### S's Defense - Contract was Subject to a Condition

S will argue in his defense that he did not actually breach the contract because the contract was subject to a condition (an agreement not to develop the land). He'll argue this condition was not satisfied because he discovered that B fully intended to develop the land. Thus, he will argue, he was discharged from his own duty to perform under the contract by B's failure to abide by the condition and was free to terminate the contract.

B will successfully defend against this argument by proving that there was no explicit agreement to create a condition to the contract. The parol evidence rule doesn't apply to extrinsic evidence used to demonstrate the existence of a condition precedent to the contract. B will introduce the statement S made: "You know I want to make sure this property will still be used for farming and not developed." Next, she'll introduce her response: "Well, I certainly understand your feelings." Her response did not state that she would agree not to develop the property; thus, there is no condition precedent and B's argument that his duty to perform was discharged will not succeed.