

INTERPRETATION AND GAP FILLING
IN INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL CONTRACTS

INTERPRETATION AND GAP
FILLING IN INTERNATIONAL
COMMERCIAL CONTRACTS

Ayşe Nihan KARADAYI YALIM



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Chicago

Intersentia Ltd
8 Wellington Mews
Wellington Street | Cambridge
CB1 1HW | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 736 170
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: +1 312 337 5985
Email: orders@ipgbook.com

Interpretation and Gap Filling in International Commercial Contracts

© Ayşe Nihan Karadayı Yalım 2019

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: Paul Klee, Ouverture © bpk – Nationalgalerie, SMB, Museum Berggruen – Jens Ziehe

ISBN 978-1-78068-808-4

D/2019/7849/122

NUR 822

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

To my parents Erhun and Handan Karadayi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Matthias Storme for his valuable guidance that shed a light on this research. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Marta Pertegas, Prof. Dr. Alois Van Oevelen, Prof. Dr. Filip De Ly, Prof. Dr. Christoph Van der Elst and Prof. Dr. Denis Philippe for providing their valuable comments and suggestions that improved the quality of my research.

I would like to thank Ms. Ingeborg Jongbloet for her administrative support.

Last but not the least, I would like to thank my parents, Erhun and Handan Karadayı, my husband Sarp Yalım, my daughter Jülide Lâl Yalım and the members of my family Raşan, Ferit, Erkut and Rukset Attar, Perihan and Behiç Ayrıl, Nalan, Cengiz and Dicle Mutel for their constant support, encouragement and endless love throughout my life and my research career.

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
<i>List of Cases</i>	xiii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1. General and Specific Rules on Interpretation	5
1. General Rules on Interpretation	5
1.1. Meaning and Intent	5
1.2. Intent: A Rather Controversial Term	7
1.3. Subjective and Objective Theories of Interpretation	12
1.3.1. Subjective Theory of Interpretation and the CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR	21
1.3.2. Objective Theory of Interpretation and the CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR	24
1.3.2.1. In General	24
1.3.2.2. Reasonable Person in the CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR	27
2. Relevant Circumstances	31
2.1. Introduction	31
2.2. Related Articles	33
2.2.1. CISG	33
2.2.2. PICC	33
2.2.3. PECL	34
2.2.4. DCFR	34
3. An Examination of the Relevant Circumstances Stated in CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR	35
3.1. Preliminary Negotiations	36
3.2. The Conduct of the Parties Even Subsequent to the Contract	38

3.3.	Other Relevant Circumstances.	42
3.3.1.	Practices Established between the Parties	44
3.3.2.	Usages on which the Parties Agreed.	49
3.3.3.	Usages not Agreed Upon	52
3.3.4.	Interpretation Already Given to Similar Clauses by the Parties	59
3.3.5.	The Meaning Commonly Given to Terms and Expressions in the Trade Concerned	59
3.4.	The Nature and the Purpose of the Contract	60
3.5.	Good Faith and Fair Dealing	61
4.	Contextualism v. Formalism	61
4.1.	Formalistic Rules and the CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR	61
4.2.	An Analysis of the Contextualist Approach Adopted by the CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR.	65
4.2.1.	The Controversy	65
4.2.2.	A Classification of the “Contexts”.	66
4.2.3.	Two “Competing”, “Specific” Contexts.	68
4.2.3.1.	The “Commercial” Context	68
4.2.3.2.	The “International” Context.	69
4.2.4.	Three Types of “General” Context	71
4.2.5.	The Highly Contextualist Interpretation Approach of the CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR.	75
Chapter 2. Specific Rules of Interpretation.		79
1.	<i>Contra Proferentem</i> Rule	79
1.1.	Defining the Rule	79
1.2.	<i>Contra Proferentem</i> Rule in the PECL, the UNIDROIT Principles, the DCFR and the CISG	81
1.3.	General Conditions of Contract, Standard Form Contracts and Contracts of Adhesion	86
1.4.	Case Law	89
2.	Reference to Contract or Statement as a Whole	92
3.	All Terms to be Given Effect	94
4.	Linguistic Discrepancies	95
5.	Preference for Negotiated Terms	96

Chapter 3. Good Faith and Fair Dealing and Contract	
Interpretation	97
1. Party Autonomy as an Underlying Principle of CISG, PECL, PICC and DCFR	97
2. Limiting Party Autonomy	98
3. Limitations Existing in CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR	99
3.1. Good Faith and Fair Dealing	102
3.1.1. In General	102
3.1.2. Functions of Good Faith	103
3.2. Good Faith and Fair Dealing in CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR	105
3.2.1. Related Articles	105
3.2.2. PECL	107
3.2.3. DCFR	110
3.2.4. PICC	110
3.2.5. CISG	113
4. Case Law	121
5. Conclusion	128
Chapter 4. Gap Filling in the PICC, CISG, PECL and DCFR	131
1. Supplementation of Terms in Contracts	131
1.1. Terminological Issues	131
1.2. Sources of Implied Terms	135
1.3. Implied Terms and the CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR	137
1.3.1. Examples of Default Gap Fillers on Some Specific Issues	137
1.3.1.1. Determination of the Price CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR	137
1.3.1.2. Determination of the Quality of Performance	139
1.3.1.3. Remarks – Rules vs. Standards	142
1.3.2. Usages which are Impliedly Applicable	143
1.3.3. Rules on Gap Filling Provided by the CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR	144
1.4. Conclusion	149
2. <i>Force Majeure</i> and Hardship in the CISG, PICC, PECL and DCFR	149
2.1. Lack of Foresight in Drafting Contracts and its Consequences	149

2.2.	The Principle of <i>Pacta Sunt Servanda</i> and its Exceptions	151
2.2.1.	The Rule: <i>Pacta Sunt Servanda</i>	151
2.2.2.	Exceptions to the Rule	153
2.2.2.1.	<i>Force Majeure</i>	155
2.2.2.2.	Hardship	168
3.	Conclusion	184
	Conclusion	185
	<i>Bibliography</i>	199

LIST OF CASES

SUPRANATIONAL

<i>Arbitration award</i> No. 3383 ICC, 1979	152
<i>Arbitration award</i> No. 3493 ICC, 1983	152
<i>Arbitration award</i> No. 5485 ICC, 1987	152
<i>Arbitration award</i> No. 8261 ICC, 1996	92
<i>Arbitration award</i> No. 8324 ICC, 1995	22, 33, 58
<i>Arbitration award</i> No. 8908 ICC, 1998	91
<i>Arbitration award</i> No. 8611 ICC, 1997	49, 115
<i>Arbitration award</i> Ad Hoc Arbitration, Buenos Aires, 10 December 1997	92
<i>Arbitration award</i> , The Netherlands Arbitration Institute, 10 February 2005	48, 127
<i>Arbitration proceeding</i> 224/1993, Russia, 6 April 1994	41
<i>Arbitration proceeding</i> 95/2004, Russia, 27 May 2005	93
<i>Arbitration proceeding</i> 137/2004, Russia, 13 January 2006	125
<i>Arbitration proceeding</i> 105/2005, Russia, 13 April 2006	49, 123
<i>Australian Barley Case, China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission (CIETAC) Arbitration Award of March 2006, China</i>	90
<i>Cowhides case</i> , ICC Arbitration Case No. 7331 of 1994	26
<i>Cysteine case</i> , CIETAC Arbitration proceeding, 7 January 2000, China	91
<i>Ioannis Kardassopoulos v. Republic of Georgia</i> , ISCID case no: ARB/05/18 and ARB/07/15, Arbitral Award of 3 March 2010	38
<i>Liamco v. Libya</i> , Arbitration award, 12 April 1977	152
<i>Metallic silicon case</i> , CIETAC Arbitration proceeding, 9 January 2008, China ...	49
<i>Methyl methacrylate monomer case</i> , CIETAC Arbitration proceeding, 31 March 2000, China	122
<i>Natural gas case</i> , Arbitration proceeding 18/2007, 8 February 2008, Russia ...	124

NATIONAL

EUROPE (EXCLUDING THE UNITED KINGDOM)

<i>Agricultural products case</i> , Supreme Court [1 Ob 49/01i], 22 October 2001, Austria	125
<i>Auto case</i> , Appellate Court Linz, 23 January 2006, Austria	24
<i>Automobile case</i> , Appellate Court Stuttgart, 31 March 2008, Germany	91

<i>Automobiles case</i> , Munich Court of Appeal, 8 February 1995, No. 7 U 1720/94, Germany	115
<i>Beer case</i> , Appellate Court Brandenburg, 18 November 2008, Germany	22
<i>Berries case</i> , Foreign Trade Arbitration Court attached to the Yugoslav Chamber of Commerce in Belgrade, 25 May 2001, Serbia	25
<i>Broadcasters case</i> , Appellate Court Celle, 24 July 2009, Germany	128
<i>Building materials case</i> , Canton Appellate Court Thurgau, 12 December 2006, Switzerland	24, 93, 122
<i>Café inventory case</i> , Appellate Court Hamburg, 25 January 2008, Germany	25
<i>Chemical product case</i> , Canton Court Freiburg, 11 October 2004, Switzerland	24
<i>Chemical products case</i> , Appellate Court Dresden, 27 December 1999, Germany	25
<i>Chinchilla furs case</i> , Supreme Court, 10 November 1994, Austria	40
<i>Circuit boards case</i> , Appellate Court Hamburg, 5 October 1998, Germany	58, 122
<i>Conveyor band case</i> , Appellate Court Linz, 23 March 2005, Austria	42, 48, 127
<i>Cooling system case</i> , Supreme Court, 14 January 2002, Austria	127
<i>Diesel oil case</i> , Canton Appellate Court Zug, 5 July 2005, Switzerland	126
<i>Electronic hearing aid case</i> , District Court Aachen, 14 May 1993, Germany	174
<i>Enterprise Alain Veyron v. Société E Ambrosio</i> , Appellate Court Grenoble, 26 April 1995, France	41
<i>Farm animals case</i> Appellate Court Köln, 16 July 2001, Germany	24
<i>Fiberglass composite materials case Tribunal cantonal</i> [Higher Cantonal Court] Valais, 28 January 2009, Switzerland	144
<i>Fresh-Life International B.V. v. Cobana Fruchtring GmbH & Co., KG</i> , District Court Rotterdam, 25 February 2009, The Netherlands	127
<i>Fruit and vegetables case</i> , Commercial Court Aargau, 26 November 2008, Switzerland	33, 124
<i>Gantry v. Research Consulting Marketing</i> , District Court Nivelles, 19 September 1995, Belgium	127
<i>Glass bottles case</i> , Federal Supreme Court, 27 November 2007, Germany	22
<i>Hoogenboom BVBA v. Nijmidon B.V.</i> , Appellate Court Arnhem, 14 October 2008, Netherlands	93
<i>Laser devices case</i> , Supreme Court, 14 December 2004, Austria	48
<i>Machinery case</i> , Supreme Court, 31 October 2001, Germany	127
<i>Marble slabs case</i> , Appellate Court Graz, 9 November 1995, Austria	55
<i>Marzipan case</i> , Supreme Court, 11 December 1996, Germany	24
<i>Memory module case</i> , Appellate Court Hamm, 12 November 2001, Germany	123
<i>Metallic slabs case</i> , District Court Landshut, 12 June 2008, Germany	124
<i>Modular wall partitions case</i> , Appellate Court Lugano, Cantone del Ticino, 29 October 2003, Switzerland	24
<i>Office furniture case</i> , Appellate Court Geneva, 12 May 2006, Switzerland	24
<i>Plants case</i> , District Court Coburg, 12 December 2006, Germany	127
<i>Plastic carpets case</i> , Helsinki Court of Appeals, 26 October 2000, Finland	124

<i>Plastic filter plate case</i> , District Court Memmingen, 13 September 2000, Germany	89
<i>Powdered milk case</i> , Supreme Court, 9 January 2002, Germany	160
<i>Powdered tantalum case</i> , Appellate Court Innsbruck, 1 February 2005, Austria	127
<i>Rynpoort Trading v. Meneba Meel</i> , Appellate Court-Gravenhage, 23 April 2003, The Netherlands	123
<i>Rubber sealing parts case</i> , Appellate Court Düsseldorf, 25 July 2003, Germany	89
<i>Scafom International B.V. & Orion Metal BVBA v. Exma CPI S.A.</i> , Commercial Court Tongeren, 25 January 2005, Belgium	41
<i>Scafom International B.V. v. Lorraine Tubes S.A.S.</i> , Supreme Court, 19 June 2009, Belgium.	175
<i>Siemens Telephone Booths case</i> , Foreign Trade Court attached to the Serbian Chamber of Commerce, 28 January 2008, Serbia	123
<i>Sluiter Ellwood II et al. v. Blumenerdenwerk Stender GmbH</i> . 17 March 2004, District Court Arnhem, The Netherlands	47
<i>Société Harper Robinson v. Société Internationale de Maintenance et de Réalisation Industrielle</i> Cour d'appel de Grenoble, 24 January 1996, France	91
<i>Société Romay A.G. v. SARL Behr France</i> , Supreme Court, 30 June 2004, France	123
<i>Spacers for insulation glass case</i> , Appellate Court Linz, 8 August 2005, Austria	127
<i>Used automobiles case</i> , Supreme Court, 17 January 2008, Spain	24
<i>Vine Wax case</i> , the Federal Supreme Court, 24 March 1999, Germany	160
<i>Welding devices case</i> , Appellate Court Valais/Wallis, 27 May 2005, Switzerland	144
<i>Wine case</i> , Appellate Court Madrid, 10 March 2009, Spain.	125
<i>Wood case</i> , Supreme Court, 21 March 2000, Austria	51

UNITED KINGDOM

<i>Antaios Compania SA v. Salen AB</i> [1985] AC 191, 201.	7
<i>Arnold v Britton</i> [2015] UK SC 36	14
<i>Belize v. Belize Telecom Ltd.</i> , [2009] UKPC 10, [2009] 1 W.L.R. 1988	134
<i>Chandler v. Webster</i> [1904] 1 K.B. 493.	153
<i>Chartbrook Limited v. Persimmon Homes Limited et al.</i> , [2009] UKHL 38	36
<i>Clark v. Lindsay</i> (1903) 19 T.L.R. 202	150
<i>Cofacredit S.A. v. Clive Morris & More UK Ltd. (in liquidation)</i> [2006] EWHC 353	7
<i>Great Western Railway Co. v. Bristol Corp.</i> (1918) 87 L.J. Ch. 414.	66
<i>Griffith v. Brymer</i> (1903) 19 T.L.R. 434	150
<i>Herne Bay Steamboat & Co. v. Hutton</i> [1903] 2 K.B. 683	150
<i>Hobson v Pattenden & Co</i> (1903) 19 T.L.R. 186.	150

<i>Investors Compensation Scheme v. West Bromwich Building Society</i>	
[1998] 1 W.L.R. 896	14, 36
<i>Krell v. Henry</i> [1903] 2 K.B. 740	150
<i>L. Schuler AG v. Wickman Machine Tool Sales Ltd.</i> , [1974] A.C. 235	39
<i>Liverpool City Council v. Irwin</i> [1977] A.C. 239	136, 145
<i>National Commercial Bank Jamaica Ltd. v. Guyana Refrigerator Ltd.</i>	
(1998) 53 W.I.R. 229	133
<i>Paragon Finance plc. v. Nash</i> [2001] EWCA Civ. 1466, [2001] 1 W.L.R. 685	
(pet. dis. [2002] 1 W.L.R. 2263)	121
<i>Pioneer Shipping Ltd. v. BTP Tioxide Limited</i> [1982] A.C. 724	6
<i>Polpen Shipping Co. v. Commercial Union Assurance Co.</i> [1943] 1 K.B. 161	
(1942)	11
<i>ProForce Recruit Ltd. v. Rugby Group Ltd.</i> , [2006] EWCA Civ. 69,	
17 February 2006	36
<i>Raffles v. Wichelhaus</i> (1864) 2 H. & C. 906	67
<i>Sappire v. National Iranian Oil Company</i> (1963) 35 I.L.R. 136,	
15 March 1963	152
<i>The Square Mile Partnership Ltd. v. Fitzmaurice McCall Ltd.</i> 18 December 2006,	
Court of Appeal (Civil Division)	36
<i>Watcham v. Attorney-General of the East African Protectorate</i>	
[1919] A.C. 533	66

UNITED STATES

<i>Alpha Prime Development Corporation v Holland Loader</i> District Court	
[Colorado] 6 July 2010, United States	64
<i>Becky Jo Hartell v. Roy Joseph Hartell</i> , Kentucky Supreme Court	
2007-CA-000498, United States	62
<i>Beijing Metals v. American Business Center</i> , Federal Appellate Court	
[5th Circuit] 15 June 1993, United States	63
<i>Calzaturificio Claudia s.n.c. v. Olivieri Footwear Ltd.</i> , U.S. District Court,	
(S.D. N. Y., 6 April 1998), United States	46
<i>ECEM European Chemical Marketing B.V. v. The Purolite Company</i> ,	
Federal District Court [Pennsylvania], 29 January 2010, United States	64
<i>Filanto v Chilewich</i> Federal District Court [New York] 14 April 1992,	
United States	63
<i>First National Bank of Lawrence v Methodist Home for Aged</i> , 181 Kan 100,	
309 P.2d 389 (1957), United States	132
<i>Hanwha Corporation v. Cedar Petrochemicals, Inc.</i> Federal District Court	
[New York], 18 January 2011, United States	24
<i>Hotchkiss v. National City Bank</i> , 200 F. 287, 293 (S.D.N.Y. 1911),	
United States	9
<i>Howard Thompson and Aileen Thompson et al. v. Walter Sullivan and Effie</i>	
<i>Sullivan et al.</i> , Kentucky Supreme Court 1995-CA-001813, United States	62
<i>MCC-Marble Ceramic Center v. Ceramica Nuova D'Agostino</i> , Federal Appellate	
Court [11th Circuit], 29 June 1998, United States	63

<i>Miami Valley Paper, LLC v. Lebbing Engineering & Consulting GmbH</i> , Federal District Court [Ohio], 26 March 2009, United States	64
<i>Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. G.W. Thomas Drayage etc., Co.</i> 69 Cal.2d 33 (1968), United States	72
<i>Supermicro Computer v. Digitechnic</i> , Federal District Court [California], 30 January 2001, United States	33
<i>TeeVee Tunes, Inc. et al. v. Gerhard Schubert GmbH</i> , Federal District Court [New York], 23 August 2006, United States	64
<i>Treibacher Industrie, A.G. v. Allegheny Technologies, Inc.</i> , 12 September 2006, Federal Appellate Court [11th Circuit], United States	59
<i>White City Shopping Center, LP v. PR Restaurants, LLC</i> , 2006 WL 3292641, United States	10

OTHER JURISDICTIONS

<i>Codelfa Construction Pty. Ltd. v. State Rail Authority of New South Wales</i> (1982) 149 C.L.R. 337, Australia	133
<i>Electro-erosion machine case</i> , Tribunal de Justiça Rio Grande do Sul [Appellate Court], 20 May 2009, Brazil	122
<i>Mazzetta Company, l.l.c. v. Dégust-Mer inc.</i> , 2011 QCCA 717 (CanLII), Canada	49
<i>Vetreria Etrusca Srl v. Kingston Estate Wines Pty Ltd.</i> [2008] SASC 75, Australia	90

