

CONSUMER SALES REMEDIES IN US AND EU
COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

CONSUMER SALES REMEDIES
IN US AND EU
COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Sanne JANSEN



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Chicago

Intersentia Ltd
Sheraton House | Castle Park
Cambridge | CB3 0AX | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 370 170 | Fax: +44 1223 370 169
Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

Distribution for the UK and Ireland:

NBN International
Airport Business Centre, 10 Thornbury Road
Plymouth, PL6 7PP
United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1752 202 301 | Fax: +44 1752 202 331
Email: orders@nbninternational.com

Distribution for Europe and all other countries:

Intersentia Publishing nv
Groenstraat 31
2640 Mortsel
Belgium
Tel.: +32 3 680 15 50 | Fax: +32 3 658 71 21
Email: mail@intersentia.be

Distribution for the USA and Canada:

Independent Publishers Group
Order Department
814 North Franklin Street
Chicago, IL 60610
USA
Tel.: +1 800 888 4741 (toll free) | Fax: + 1312 337 5985
Email: orders@ipgbook.com

Consumer Sales Remedies in US and EU Comparative Perspective

© Sanne Jansen 2018

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

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means, without prior written permission from Intersentia, 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 Intersentia at the address above.

Artwork on cover: Giacometti, Augusto (1877–1947): Summer Night, 1917. New York, Museum of Modern Art (MoMA). © 2018. Photo SCALA, Florence

ISBN 978-1-78068-651-6

D/2018/7849/67

NUR 828

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

PREFACE

The primary purpose of this book is to provide an in-depth study of the US and EU approaches towards the organization of consumer sales remedies. Chapter 2 treats the comparison of the hierarchy of consumer sales remedies in a multitude of EU instruments, in US contract law, and the Uniform Commercial Code. In addition, the latest developments in EU law, namely the amended Proposal for a Directive on (online and other distance) sales of goods of 31 October 2017, are briefly discussed. In Chapters 3 and 4, the (extra)judicial application of remedies and notification duties are examined in the same EU/US instruments.

This book aims to contribute to the discussion of what the organization of remedies should look like to best protect consumers. Should we adopt the US system favoring the remedy of damages? Or is specific performance preferred? Or, is there another valuable alternative? How should we define 'consumer protection'? All these questions are raised at a time when the EU is considering a 'new' consumer sales directive, and US scholars have drafted a restatement of consumer contract law, which is intended for discussion at the Annual Meeting Agenda in 2019 (although, regrettably, it will not include all possible aspects of consumer contract law).

This book is designed for EU civil (and common) lawyers and US common lawyers to gain a better understanding of the remedial system and the logic behind it. Due to the differences between those systems, it is sometimes dangerous to use certain terms such as 'termination', 'damages' and 'specific performance'. Therefore, specific attention is paid to terminology. By giving a terminological overview, the most commonly used terms are framed and explained within their respective legal systems.

There is inevitably more work to be done in this area and it is ripe for further research by other scholars. The interaction of the remedies is fascinating, but also very complex, and many factors have to be taken into account. Not only their original set hierarchy, but their (extra)judicial application and the notification duties have an important role to play. Therefore, further research is required to unravel the correlation with examination duties, limitation rules, and the relation remedy and the nature of the shortcoming, for example. In addition, the theoretical

underpinning of the 'best' organization of remedies could be further food for thought. How should one, for example the EU lawmaker, deal with the spread of the law and economics logic and behavioral approaches? Which political ends are furthered by adopting one or the other policy? Should we, and if so how, take into account the emotions of consumers?

This book was mainly written during a postdoctoral research stay in the United States. This project has been made possible by a generous fellowship (2016–2017) from the Belgian American Educational Foundation (BAEF) and, more specifically, the Cabeaux-Jacobs Fund. Professor Boulpaep (Yale School of Medicine and President of the BAEF) and Ms Hayoit de Termicourt (Program Manager of the BAEF) deserve, in this regard, a special mention for combining their amazing organizational skills and enthusiastic commitment to helping and supporting young scholars and students. During this year, I was warmly welcomed by the East Coast BAEF community, and the staff and students of Yale Law School and Columbia Law School. More specifically, I must thank Professor Kronman for letting me attend his animated contract law course at Yale Law School and Professor Garro for being my sponsor at Columbia Law School. Without Professor Allemeersch's (KU Leuven) enthusiasm, kind recommendation and advice, the Yale experience would not have been possible. Also, Professor Wéry (UCL) and Professor Samoy (KU Leuven), mentors from the very beginning of my career, have to be thanked. Without their unremitting faith in my projects, this book would not have existed. Last, but not least, Professor Stijns (KU Leuven) deserves my deepest gratitude. She has guided me through this academic adventure from the very first moment. Patient and with eye for detail, she taught me every step. She encouraged me to push my limits and to broaden my academic horizon abroad. Therefore, I dedicate this book to her.

Sanne Jansen, April 2018

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	v
<i>List of Cases</i>	xi
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. Hierarchy of Remedies – So Different and Yet So Alike . . .	13
1. EU Consumer Sales <i>Acquis</i>	14
1.1. Priority of Repair and Replacement under the Consumer Sales Directive.	14
1.2. Priority of Repair and Replacement under the Proposal for a Consumer Rights Directive	30
1.3. Priority of Specific Performance under the Consumer Rights Directive	33
1.4. Withdrawn Proposal on a Common European Sales Law Which Would have Provided a Flat Hierarchy of Remedies in B2C Contracts	34
1.5. Priority of Repair and Replacement under the Commission Proposals	40
1.6. Conclusion on the Priority of Repair and Replacement	45
2. Common Law Approach	46
2.1. General.	46
2.2. Common Contract Law.	47
2.2.1. Priority of Damages	47
2.2.1.1. Irreparable Injury Rule, Adequacy, Discretion, and Equitable Defenses.	47
2.2.1.2. Critique on the Irreparable Injury Rule	56
2.2.1.3. Arguments Pro and Contra the Irreparable Injury Rule	58
2.2.1.4. Latest Developments of the Irreparable Injury Rule	67
2.2.2. Other Factors Influencing the Hierarchy of Remedies	69

2.2.3.	Conclusion on the Priority of Damages and Restriction of Termination.	73
2.3.	UCC Article 2.	73
2.3.1.	Priority of Damages	76
2.3.2.	Other Factors Influencing the Hierarchy of Remedies	81
2.3.3.	Conclusion on the Priority of Damages and Restriction of Termination.	88
2.4.	Influence of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act	89
2.5.	Conclusion on the Priority of Damages	91
3.	Comparative Analysis: In Favor of a Free Consumer Choice.	92
3.1.	Contrasting Systems?	92
3.2.	Proposal for a Free Consumer Choice while Respecting Good Faith	96
3.2.1.	A Free Choice	96
3.2.2.	Limited by Good Faith	100
3.3.	Influence of the Seller's Right to Cure?	102
Chapter 3. Self-Help		105
1.	EU Consumer Sales <i>Acquis</i>	105
1.1.	Consumer Sales Directive Provides No Clear Guidelines	105
1.2.	CESL Provides Several Extrajudicial Remedies	107
1.3.	ODSD/2017 Proposal Provides Several Extrajudicial Remedies	108
2.	Common Law Approach	109
2.1.	Suspension and Termination under Common Contract Law.	111
2.2.	Rejection, Revocation, and Cure under UCC Article 2	113
3.	Comparative Analysis: Moving Towards More Self-Help	115
Chapter 4. Notification Duties		117
1.	EU Consumer Sales <i>Acquis</i>	117
1.1.	Consumer Sales Directive	117
1.1.1.	Optional Duty to Notify of Shortcomings.	117
1.1.2.	No Regulation Governing the Duty to Notify of Remedies	118
1.2.	CESL.	120
1.2.1.	No Duty to Notify of Shortcomings.	120
1.2.2.	Duty to Notify in Case of Termination	121

1.3.	ODSD/2017 Proposal	123
1.3.1.	No Duty to Notify of Shortcomings	123
1.3.2.	Duty to Notify Only in the Case of Termination	123
2.	Common Law Approach	125
2.1.	Common Contract Law	125
2.1.1.	No General Duty to Notify of Shortcomings	125
2.1.2.	No General Duty to Notify of Remedies	126
2.2.	UCC Article 2	128
2.2.1.	General Duty to Notify of a Breach (Shortcomings) after Acceptance	128
2.2.2.	Notifying the Remedies of Rejection, Revocation, and Notifying Cure	135
3.	Comparative Analysis	142
3.1.	'Notification Light' for Shortcomings?	142
3.1.1.	EU Consumer Sales Approach Moving Towards an (Unjustified) Abolishment	142
3.1.2.	Common Law Approach and the UCC Standard.	143
3.1.3.	Relation with 'Mise en Demeure'	143
3.1.4.	Arguments in Favor of and Against a Notification Duty of Shortcomings.	145
3.1.4.1.	Opponents of a Notification Duty.	146
3.1.4.2.	In Defense of a Notification Duty	149
3.1.5.	Fair Balance under a 'Notification Light'	155
3.2.	Notification Required for Extrajudicial/Self-Help Remedies	160
3.2.1.	EU Consumer Sales Approach in the Case of Termination.	160
3.2.2.	Required for Self-Help Remedies under a Common Law Approach	161
3.2.3.	Notifying Extrajudicial Remedies for Fair Balance	163
	Chapter 5. Conclusion	165
	<i>Bibliography</i>	175
	<i>Index</i>	187
	<i>About the Author</i>	191

LIST OF CASES*

BELGIUM

Antwerp 29 April 2013, <i>RW</i> 2014–15, 1067	18
Cass. 9 April 1976, <i>Arr. Cass.</i> 1976, 921.....	143
Cass. 14 April 2005, <i>Arr. Cass.</i> 2005, 868	1, 20–21
Cass. 23 January 2015, <i>RW</i> 2016–17, 503,.....	21
Ghent 27 May 2009, <i>NjW</i> 2010, 200,	18–19
Ghent 20 October 2010, <i>DCCR</i> 2012, 124,	19
Liège 28 May 2009, <i>JLMB</i> 2011, 447	18
Liège 25 March 2011, <i>DCCR</i> 2012, 83	18
Mons 22 December 2016, <i>DCCR</i> 2017	20
Rb. Antwerp 11 April 2008, <i>RW</i> 2010–11, 115,.....	18
Rb. Brussels 7 May 2009, <i>JT</i> 2009, 737, <i>RRD</i> 2009, 362,	18
Rb. Tongeren 14 June 2010, <i>T. Vred.</i> 2012, 298,.....	19

COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

CJEU Judgment of 6 June 2011, <i>Gebruder Weber v. Jürgen Wittmer and Ingrid Putz v. Medianess Electronics GmbH</i> , C-65/09 and 87/09, ECLI:EU:C:2011:396.....	15, 43
CJEU Judgement of 3 October 2012, <i>Soledad Duarte Hueros v. Autociba SA, Automóviles Citroën España SA</i> , C-32/12, ECLI:EU:C:2013:637	20

FRANCE

Cour d'appel Aix-en-Provence 26 April 2016, n° 15/03912.....	23
Cour d'appel Aix-en-Provence 12 March 2015, n° 2015/155	23
Cour d'appel Caen 22 January 2015, n° 13/02554.....	23
Cour d'appel Caen 8 December 2016, n° 15/01485	23
Cour d'appel Colmart 24 October 2016, n° 16/0771, 15/04722	23
Cour d'appel Douai 8 March 2010, n° 09/02507	22
Cour d'appel Douai 31 May 2010, n° 09/03522	22–23
Cour d'appel Douai 31 May 2010, n° 09/05514.....	22

* References are to page numbers.

Cour d'appel Lyon 24 September 2015, n° 13/06068	23
Cour d'appel Paris 13 April 2012, n° 09/18440	24
Cour d'appel Paris 27 Novembre 2014, n° 13/01912	23
Cour d'appel Paris 8 October 2015, n° 13/11820	23
Cour d'appel Paris 8 July 2016, n° 15/04619	23
Cour d'appel Poitiers 10 June 2016, n° 15/01159	23
Cour d'appel Rennes 20 September 2012, n° 396, 10/05996	23
Cour d'appel Versailles 9 June 2015, n° 14/02052	23

GERMANY

AG Köln, <i>Urteil</i> vom 28.01.2010, 137 C 436/09, <i>NJOZ</i> 2011, 148	27
BGH, <i>Urteil</i> vom 23.02.2005, <i>BB</i> 2005, 909, <i>WM</i> 2005, 945	26
BGH, <i>Urteil</i> vom 23.02.2005, n° VIII ZR 100/04, <i>BGHZ</i> 162, 219–230	28
BGH, <i>Urteil</i> vom 21.12.2005, <i>WM</i> 2006, 1355, n° 18	26
BGH, <i>Urteil</i> vom 13.07.2016, Az. VIII ZR 49/15, <i>OpenJur</i> 2016, 9351	27
BGH, <i>Urteil</i> vom 26.10.2016, VIII ZR 240/15, <i>NJW</i> 2017, 153	27
LG Ansbach, <i>Urteil</i> vom 31.10.2016, 2 O 226/16, <i>Juris</i>	28
LG Arnsberg, <i>Urteil</i> vom 24.03.2017, 2 O 254/16, <i>BeckRS</i> 2017, 106864	27
LG Braunschweig, <i>Urteil</i> vom 25.04.2017, 11 O 4/17, <i>Juris</i>	29
LG Bückeburg, <i>Urteil</i> vom 11.01.2017, 2 O 39/16, <i>BeckRS</i> 2017, 102958	28
LG Düsseldorf, <i>Urteil</i> vom 23.08.2016, 6 O 413/15, <i>MMR</i> 2017, 198, <i>BeckRS</i> 2016, 15047	28
LG Ellwangen, <i>Urteil</i> vom 14.11.2016, 5 O 2/16, <i>Juris</i>	28
LG Essen, <i>Urteil</i> vom 16.09.2016, 16 O 165/16, <i>Juris</i>	28
LG Hamburg, <i>Urteil</i> vom 16.11.2016, 301 O 96/16, <i>Justiz-Portal</i>	28
LG Kleve, <i>Urteil</i> vom 31.03.2017, 3 O 252/16, <i>BeckRS</i> 2017, 106026	28
LG Köln, <i>Urteil</i> vom 02.03.2017, 2 O 317/16, <i>BeckRS</i> 2017, 103462	29
LG Krefeld, <i>Urteil</i> vom 14.09.2016, 2 O 83/16, <i>Juris</i>	28
LG Lüneburg, <i>Urteil</i> vom 02.06.2016, 4 O 3/16, <i>BeckRS</i> 2016, 17486	27–28
LG Meiningen, <i>Urteil</i> vom 06.12.2012, 1 O 201/12, <i>BeckRS</i> 2015, 02613 (ECLI:DE:LGMEINI:2012:1206.1O201.12.0A)	27
LG Münster, <i>Urteil</i> vom 04.10.2016, 02 O 1/16, <i>BeckRS</i> 2016, 112062	28
LG Regensburg, <i>Urteil</i> vom 15.06.2016, 3 O 2161/15, <i>Juris</i>	28
LG Stuttgart, <i>Urteil</i> vom 02.11.2016, 18 O 21/16, <i>Juris</i>	28
LG Traunstein, <i>Endurteil</i> vom 10.10.2016, 3 O 709/16, <i>BeckRS</i> 2016, 117540 (ECLI:DE:LGTRAUN:2016:1010.3O709.16.0A)	28
OLG Düsseldorf, <i>Urteil</i> vom 24.10.2004, I-1 U 84/05, <i>SVR</i> 2006, 330	28
OLG Hamm, <i>Urteil</i> vom 27.08.2008, n° 11 U 143/05, <i>BeckRS</i> 2010, 01835	26
OLG Köln, <i>Urteil</i> vom 09.09.2003, 10 O 113/02, 19 u 80/03, <i>BeckRS</i> 2004, 01038 ...	28

ITALY

Tribunale Ordinaria di Venezia, 25 May 2017, RG n.3711/2016	3
---	---

THE NETHERLANDS

Gerechtshof Amsterdam 1 March 2007, n° 1818/05, (ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2007:BA9978).....	25
Gerechtshof Arnhem 22 March 2012, n° 200.084.819/01, <i>rechtspraak.nl</i> (ECLI:NL:GHARN:2012:BV9647)	25
Gerechtshof Arnhem-Leeuwarden 25 November 2014, n° 200.128.340, <i>rechtspraak.nl</i> , RCR 2015/39 (ECLI:NL:GHARL:2014:9065).....	25
Gerechtshof Arnhem-Leeuwarden 17 May 2016, n° 200.118.541/01, <i>Prg.</i> 2016/180 (ECLI:NL:GHARL:2016:3808).....	25
Rechtbank Arnhem 27 November 2009, n° 613122 CV Expl. 09-3350, <i>rechtspraak.nl</i> , RCR 2010, 10, <i>Prg.</i> 2010, 10 (ECLI:NL:RBARN:2009:BK4878).....	25
Rechtbank Dordrecht 18 March 2010, n° 240769 CV EXPL 788/08, <i>rechtspraak.nl</i> (ECLI:NL:RBDOR:2010:BM0772)	25
Rechtbank 's-Gravenhage 11 November 2009, n° 329751 – HA ZA 09-410, <i>rechtspraak.nl</i> , <i>NJF</i> 2010, 55 (ECLI:NL:RBSGR:2009:BK5204).....	25
Rechtbank Haarlem 15 February 2012, n° 182745 – HA ZA 11-769, <i>rechtspraak.nl</i> (ECLI:NL:RBHAA:2012:BV8727)	25
Rechtbank Limburg 4 December 2013, n° 2175464\CV EXPL 13-5925, <i>rechtspraak.nl</i> , <i>Prg.</i> 2014/42 (ECLI:NL:RBLIM:2013:9404)	25
Rechtbank Oost-Brabant 26 June 2014, n° 2796388, <i>rechtspraak.nl</i> , <i>TvC</i> 2014, 289, note M.B.M. Loos, <i>Prg.</i> 2014/208 (ECLI:NL:RBOBR:2014:3396).....	25
Rechtbank Rotterdam 22 January 2008, n° 829679, (ECLI:NL:RBROT:2008:BC4859).....	24
Rechtbank Rotterdam 13 May 2016, n° 4336461/CV EXPL 15-33620, <i>Prg.</i> 2016/178, (ECLI:NL:RBROT:2016:3579).....	25
Rechtbank Zwolle-Lelystad 16 May 2012, n° 18329/HZ ZA 11-358, <i>rechtspraak.nl</i> , (ECLI:NL:RBZLY:2012:BW8222)	24

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

<i>Accord Web Press Services Corp. v. New London Motors, Inc.</i> , 203 Conn. 342 (1987).....	87
<i>American Broadcasting Companies v. Warner Wolf</i> , 52 N.Y.2d 394 (1981).....	49
<i>American Manufacturing Co. v. United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corp.</i> , 7 F.2d 565 (2d Cir. 1925).....	133
<i>Armco Steel Corp. v. Isaacson Structural Steel Co.</i> , 611 P.2d 507 (Alaska 1980)	132
<i>Asciolla v. Manter Oldsmobile-Pontiac</i> , 117 N.H. 85 (1977)	87
<i>Berry v. G.D. Searle & Co.</i> , 56 Ill. 2d 548, (Ill. 1974).....	130
<i>Boies v. Norton</i> , 526 S.W.2d 651 (Tex. Civ. App. 1975).....	82
<i>Bonebrake v. Cox</i> , 499 F.2d 951 (8th Cir. 1974)	82
<i>Brookings Mun. Utils., Inc. v. Amoco Chem. Co.</i> , 103 F. Supp. 2d 1169 (D.S.D. 2000).....	153
<i>C.R. Daniels, Inc. v. Yazoo Mfg. Co.</i> , 641 F. Supp. 205 (S.D. Miss. 1986).....	134
<i>Chadwell v. English</i> , 652 P.2d 310 (Okla. App. 1982).....	78–79

<i>Chainworks, Inc. v. Webco Indus.</i> , 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9194 (W.D. Mich. 2006).....	133
<i>Champion Ford Sales, Inc. v. Levine</i> , 49 Md. App. 547 (1981)	87
<i>Christopher v. Larson Ford Sales</i> , 577 P.2d 1009 (Utah 1976)	138
<i>Cities Serv. Helix, Inc. v. United States</i> , 211 Ct. Cl. 222 (Fed. Cl. 1976).....	127
<i>City Center One Associates v. Teacher Insurance & Annuity Association</i> , 656 F. Supp. 658 (D. Utah 1987).....	55
<i>Cole v. Keller Indus.</i> , 872 F. Supp. 1470 (E.D. Va. 1994).....	152–153
<i>Colonial dodge, Inc. v. Miller</i> , 420 Michigan 452 (1984)	87
<i>Colorado-Ute Electric Asso. v. Envirtech Corp.</i> , 524 F. Supp. 1152 (D. Colo. 1981)	79
<i>Connecticut Inv. Casting Corp. v. Made-Rite Tool Co.</i> , 382 Mass. 603 (1981)	139–140
<i>Cooley v. Big Horn Harvestore Systems, Inc.</i> , 813 P.2d 736 (Colo. 1991)	130–131
<i>Copylease Corp. of America v. Memorex Corp.</i> , 408 F. Supp. 758 (SD NY 1976).....	78
<i>Cumbest v. Harris</i> , 363 So. 2d 294 (Miss. 1978).....	78
<i>Da Silva v. Musso</i> , 428 N.E.2d 382, 53 N.Y.2d 543 (1981)	49
<i>Dairy Queen v. Wood</i> , 369 U.S. 469 82 S.Ct. 894 (1962).....	51
<i>Davis v. Beury</i> , 134 Va. 322 (1922)	127
<i>DeVoe Chevrolet-Cadillac, Inc. v. Cartwright</i> , 526 N.E.2d 1237 (Ind. App. 1988)	138–139
<i>Dexter Bishop Co. v. B. Redmond & Son, Inc.</i> , 58 A.D. 2d 755 (1st Dept. 1977).....	78
<i>Dunkin' Donuts of America, Inc. v. Minerva, Inc.</i> , 956 F.2d 1566 (11th Cir. 1992)	127–128
<i>Dunleavy v. Paris Ceramics USA, Inc.</i> , 47 Conn. Supp. 565 (2002).....	82
<i>Duval & Co. v. Malcom</i> , 233 Ga. 784 (1974)	80
<i>Eastern Air Lines Inc. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp.</i> , 532 F.2d 957 (5th Cir. 1976)	129, 134, 151–154
<i>Eastern Air Lines, Inc. v. Gulf Oil Corp.</i> , 415 F. Supp. 429 (US Court of Appeals, 5th Cir. 1976)	78
<i>EBay v. MercExchange</i> , 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006)	68
<i>ESPN, Inc. v. Office of the Comm'r of Baseball</i> , 76 F. Supp. 2d 383 (S.D.N.Y. 1999)	127
<i>Federal Life Ins. Co. v. Maxam</i> , 70 Ind. App. 266 (1919)	126
<i>Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. v. Cannon</i> , 53 Md. App. 106 (1982)	130–131
<i>Gappelberg v. Landrum</i> , 666 S.W.2d 88, 27 Tex. Sup. J. 260 (1984).....	84
<i>Gillard v. Martin</i> , 13 A.3d 482 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2010).....	127
<i>Golden Needles Knitting & Glove Co. v. Dynamic Marketing Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 766 F. Supp. 421 (W.D.N.C. 1991).....	139–140
<i>Grayson-Robinson Stores Inc. v. Iris Constr. Corp.</i> , 8 N.Y.2d 133 (1960).....	210
<i>Hays Merch. v. Dewey</i> , 78 Wn.2d 343 (Wash. 1970)	138
<i>Hays v. General Elec. Co.</i> , 151 F.Supp.2d 1001 (N.D. Ill. 2001).....	133
<i>Head v. Phillips Camper Sales & Rental, Inc.</i> , 234 Mich. App. 94 (1998).....	84
<i>Henry v. Don Wood Volkswagen, Inc.</i> , 526 S.W.2d 483 (Tenn. Ct. App. 1974)	139
<i>Hill v. Raffone</i> , 103 Conn. App. 737 (2007).....	126
<i>Hilmor Sales Co. v. Helen Neushaefer Division of Supronics Corp.</i> , 1969 WL 11054 (N.Y.Sup. 1969)	78, 80

<i>Homeland Training Ctr., LLC v. Summit Point Auto. Research Ctr.</i> , 594 F.3d 285 (4th Cir. 2010)	126
<i>In re Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc. v. Wilderness Tires Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 155 F. Supp. 2d 1069, (S.D. Ind. 2001)	132
<i>In re Frite-Lay N. Am., Inc.</i> , 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 123824 (E.D.N.Y. 2013)	133
<i>In re IBP S' Holders Litig. v. Tyson Foods, Inc.</i> , 789 A.2d 14 (Del. Ch. 2001)	66
<i>In re Volkswagen 'Clean Diesel' Mktg., Sales Practices, & Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 148374 (N.D. Cal. 25 October 2016)	2
<i>In re Volkswagen 'Clean Diesel' Mktg., Sales Practices & Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 76092, (N.D. Cal. 17 May 2017)	2
<i>Indianapolis v. Twin Lakes Enterprises, Inc.</i> 568, N.E.2d 1073 (Ind. Ct. App. 1991)	126
<i>Industrial Fiberglass v. Jandt</i> , 361 N.W.2d 595 (N.D. 1985)	134
<i>Jacob & Youngs, Inc. v. Kent</i> , 230 N.Y. 239 (1921)	70
<i>Jensen v. Seigel Mobile Homes Group</i> , 105 Idaho 189 (1983)	84, 140
<i>Jorgensen v. Pressnall</i> , 274 Ore. 285 (1976)	87
<i>K & G Constr. Co. v. Harris</i> , 223 Md. 305 (1960)	71
<i>K & M Joint Venture v. Smith International, Inc.</i> , 669 F.2d 1106 (6th Cir. 1982)	131, 134, 154
<i>Kasarsky v. Merit Sys. Prot. Bd.</i> , 296 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	128
<i>King Aircraft Sales v. Lane</i> , 68 Wn. App. 706 (1993)	78–79
<i>Laclede Gas Co. v. Amoco Oil Co.</i> , 522 F.2d 33 (CA8 Mo 1975)	78
<i>Linscott v. Smith</i> , 3 Kan. App. 2d 1 (1978)	82
<i>Luson Int'l Distributors, Inc. v. Fabricating & Production Machinery, Inc.</i> , 966 F.2d 9 (1st Cir. 1992)	138–140
<i>Lynx, Inc. v. Ordnance Products, Inc.</i> , 273 Md. 1, 327 A.2d 502 (1974)	132, 140
<i>Madariaga v. Morris</i> , 639 S.W.2d 709 (Tex. App. 12th Dist. 1982)	78–79
<i>Malul v. Capital Cabinets, Inc.</i> , 191 MISC. 2d 399 (2002)	140
<i>Marshall v. Bryant Air Conditioning Co.</i> , 650 F.2d 724 (5th Cir. 1981)	150
<i>Maybank v. S.S. Kresge Co.</i> , 302 N.C. 129 (1981)	150
<i>Mercury Marine v. Clear River Constr. Co.</i> , 839 So. 2d 508 (2003)	84
<i>Midwest Generation, LLC v. Carbon Processing & Reclamation, LLC</i> , 445 F. Supp. 2d 928, (N.D. Ill. 2006)	136
<i>Miron v. Yonkers Raceway, Inc.</i> , 400 F.2d 112 (2d Cir. 1968)	136
<i>Morrow v. New Moon Homes, Inc.</i> , 548 P.2d 279 (Alaska 1976)	130
<i>Munch v. Sears Roebuck & Co.</i> , 2007 WL 2461660 (N.D. Ill. 2007)	133
<i>National Fleet Supply, Inc. v. Fairchild</i> , 540 N.E.2d 1015 (Ind. App. 1983)	142
<i>Northern Indiana Public Service Co. v. Carbon County Coal Co.</i> , 799 F.2d 265 (7th Cir. 1986)	54
<i>Northern States Power Co. v. ITT Meyer Industries, Div. of ITT Grinnell Corp.</i> , 777 F.2d 405 (8th Cir. 1985)	133
<i>O.W. Grun Roofing & Constr. Co v. Cope</i> , 529 S.W.2d 258 (Tex. Civ. App. 1975)	71
<i>Oil Trading Co. v. Amerada Hess Trading Co.</i> , 1993 US Dist. LEXIS 10801 (S.D.N.Y. 1993)	84
<i>Old Stone Corp. v. United States</i> , 450 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	127
<i>Owen v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.</i> , 273 F.2d 140 (9th Cir. 1959)	152
<i>Owens v. Glendale Optical Co.</i> , 590 F. Supp. 32 (S.D. Ill. 1984)	132

<i>Paloukos v. Intermountain Chevrolet Co.</i> , 99 Idaho 740 (1978).....	78, 80
<i>Pay Tel Sys. v. Seiscor Technologies</i> , 899 F. Supp. 152 (S.D.N.Y. 1995).....	131
<i>Peavey Elecs. Corp. v. Baan U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 10 So. 3d 945 (Miss. App. 2009).....	134
<i>PEKham v. Larsen Chevrolet-Buick Oldsmobile</i> , 99 Idaho 675 (1978).....	138
<i>PHL Variable Ins. v. Charter Oak Trust</i> , 2011 Conn. Super. LEXIS 610 (2011)	126
<i>Plante v. Jacobs</i> , 10 Wis. 2d 567 (1960)	70
<i>Pollard v. Saxe & Yolles Dev. Co.</i> , 12 Cal. 3d 374 (1974).....	153
<i>Pomerantz Paper Corp. v. New Community Corp.</i> , 207 N.J. 344 (2011).....	136
<i>Precision Pine & Timber, Inc. v. United States</i> , 72 Fed. Cl. 460 (Fed. Cl. 2006).....	127
<i>Q. Vandenberg & Sons, v. Siter</i> , 204 Pa. Super. 392 (1964)	132
<i>Quaker Alloy Casting Co. v. Gulfco Industries, Inc.</i> , 686 F. Supp. 1319 (N.D. Ill. 1988).....	134
<i>Quality Components Corp. v. Kel-Keef Enters</i> , 316 Ill. App. 3d 998 (2000)	126
<i>R.L. Kimsey Cotton Co. v. Ferguson</i> , 233 Ga 962 (1975)	78
<i>Ripple v. Wold</i> , 1996 SD 68 (1996).....	126
<i>Rockland Exposition, Inc. v. Alliance of Auto. Serv. Providers of N.J.</i> , 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 39931 (S.D.N.Y. 2009)	49
<i>Roth Steel Products v. Sharon Steel Corp.</i> , 705 F.2d 134 (6th Cir. 1983).....	134
<i>Sadat v. American Motors Corp.</i> , 104 Ill. 2nd 105 (1984).....	54, 90–91
<i>Sedmak v. Charlie's Chevrolet, Inc.</i> , 622 S.W.2d 694 (Mo. Ct. App. 1981)	78–79
<i>Seymour v. Delancy</i> , 3 Cow. 445 (N.Y. 1824)	49
<i>Shooshanian v. Wagner</i> , 672 P.2d 455 (Alaska 1983)	132, 152
<i>Singleton v. Fifth Generation, Inc.</i> , U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14000 (N.D.N.Y. 2016)	133
<i>Southern Illinois Stone Co. v. Universal Engineering Corp.</i> , 592 F.2d 446 (8th Cir. 1979)	134
<i>Standard Alliance Industries, Inc. v. Black Clawson Co.</i> , 587 F.2d 813 (1978).....	133
<i>Stephan's Machine & Tool, Inc. v. D & H Machinery Consultants, Inc.</i> , 65 Ohio App. 2d 197 (1979)	78, 81
<i>Stofman v. Keenan Motors, Inc.</i> , 1973 Pa. Dist. & Cnty. Dec. LEXIS 289 (1973).....	138
<i>Stroh v. American Recreation & Mobile Home Corp.</i> , 35 Colo. App. 196 (1975).....	139
<i>T&S Brass & Bronze Works, Inc. v. Pic-Air, Inc.</i> , 790 F.2d 1098 (4th Cir. 1986)	142
<i>T. J. Stevenson & Co. v. 81,193 Bags of Flour</i> , 629 F.2d 338 (5th Cir. 1980)	131, 134, 151
<i>Tiger Motor Co. v. McMurty</i> , 284 Ala. 283 (1969)	84
<i>Tower City Grain Co. v. Richman</i> , 232 N.W.2d 61 (1975).....	80
<i>Transact, Inc. v. D'Errico (In re Transact, Inc.)</i> , 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 109746, (C.D. Cal. 2014).....	127
<i>Traynor v. Walters</i> , 342 F. Supp. 455 (M.D. Pa 1972)	142
<i>United Nuclear Corp. v. Gen. Atomic Co.</i> , 96 N.M. 155 (1980).....	78
<i>United States ex rel. Conroy v. Southern Contracting</i> , 862 F. Supp. 107 (D.S.C. 1994).....	133
<i>Van Dorn Co v. Future Chem. & Oil Corp.</i> , 753 F.2d 565, 575 (7th Cir. 1985).....	136
<i>Walgreen Co. v. Sara Creek Property Co.</i> , 966 F.2d 273 (7th Cir. 1992)	56
<i>Walton v. Walton</i> , 31 Cal. App. 4th 277 (1995).....	51
<i>Weathersby v. Gore</i> , 556 F.2d 1247 (1977)	78, 80
<i>Western Conference Resorts, Inc. v. Pease</i> , 668 P.2d 973 (Colo.App. 1983).....	136
<i>Westlands Water Dist. v. United States</i> , 109 Fed. Cl. 177 (Fed. Cl. 2013)	127–128

<i>Whitesell Corp. v. Whirlpool Corp.</i> , 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 95111 (W.D. Mich. 2009).....	132
<i>Wiles v. Wiles</i> , 134 W. Va. 81 (1950).....	54
<i>Willard v. Tayloe</i> , 75 U.S. 557 (1870).....	49
<i>Wilson v. Scampoli</i> , 228 A.2d 848 (1967).....	84
<i>Youell v. Grimes</i> , 217 F. Supp. 2d 1167 (D. Kan. 2002).....	71

