



INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE UNIFICATION OF PRIVATE LAW
INSTITUT INTERNATIONAL POUR L'UNIFICATION DU DROIT PRIVE

**Working Group for the preparation of
Principles of International Commercial Contracts (3rd)
Drafting Committee
Third session
Hamburg, 25 – 28 January 2010**

UNIDROIT 2009
Study L – WP 27
English only
December 2009

**Draft Rules
on
Restitution**

by

Professor Reinhard Zimmermann, Director at the Max-Planck-Institut für
ausländisches und internationales Privatrecht, Hamburg

CHAPTER 3: Validity

Article 3.18

(Restitution)

(1) On avoidance either party may claim restitution of whatever it has supplied under the contract, or the part of it avoided, provided that such party concurrently makes restitution of whatever it has received under the contract, or the part of it avoided.

(2) If restitution in kind is not possible or appropriate, an allowance has to be made in money whenever reasonable.

(3) The recipient of the performance does not have to make an allowance in money if the impossibility to make restitution in kind is attributable to the other party.

(4) Compensation may be claimed for the reasonable expenses linked to the performance received.

COMMENT

1. Entitlement of parties to restitution on avoidance

According to para. (1) of the present article either party may claim restitution of what it has supplied under the contract or the part of it avoided. The only condition for such restitution is that each party makes restitution of whatever it has received under the contract or the part of it avoided.

Illustration

1. A sells and transfers a painting to B for 600,000 Euro. He has made B believe that it is a Constable whereas in reality it is a copy. After he has discovered that B avoids the contract. B can claim back the purchase price of 600,000 Euro while himself having to return the painting that he has received.

Concerning the costs involved in making restitution Art. 6.1.11 applies.

2. Restitution in kind not possible or appropriate

Restitution must normally be in kind. There are, however, instances where instead of restitution in kind, an allowance in money has to be made. This is the case first of all where restitution in kind is not possible. The allowance will normally amount to the value of the performance received.

Illustration

2. A commissions B to paint his factory. B had fraudulently induced A to conclude the contract at a price that is much higher than the market price.

After having discovered the fraud, A avoids the contract. He can claim back the price demanded by B while himself being under a duty to pay for the value of having had his house painted.

An allowance is further envisaged by para. (2) of this article whenever restitution in kind would not be appropriate. This is so in particular when returning the performance in kind would cause unreasonable effort or expense. The standard, in that respect, is the same as under Art. 7.2.2(b).

Illustration

3. A fraudulently induces B to buy 100 hand-woven carpets. The carpets are reloaded onto one of B's ships. In a heavy storm that ship sinks in coastal waters. When B has discovered the fraud, he avoids the contract. He can recover the price that he has paid, while himself having to make an allowance representing the value of the carpets in view of the fact that recovery of the carpets from the sunken ship would involve him in expenses vastly exceeding their value.

The purpose of specifying that an allowance has to be made in money "whenever reasonable" is to make it clear that an allowance only has to be made if, and to the extent that, the performance received constitutes a benefit for the recipient.

Illustration

4. A has undertaken to decorate the entrance hall of B's business centre. After he has completed about half of the decorations B discovers that A is not the well-known decorator who he has held himself out to be. B avoids the contract. Since the decorations so far made cannot be returned, and have no value for B, A is not entitled to any allowance for the work done.

3. The allocation of risk

Obviously, the rule contained in para. (2) implies an allocation of risk: it imposes a liability on the recipient of the performance to make good the value of that performance if it is unable to make restitution in kind. The rule in para. (2) applies no matter whether the recipient has been responsible for the deterioration or destruction of what it had received. Such allocation of the risk of deterioration or destruction is justified, in particular, because there should be correspondence between risk and control. Of course, there is no liability to make good the value where the deterioration or destruction is attributable to the other party: either because it has been due to the other party's fault, or due to a defect inherent in the performance.

Illustration

5. A fraudulently induces an employee of B to buy a truck that is defective. As a result of the defect the truck is destroyed. B can avoid the contract on the ground of fraud. He can claim back the purchase price but does not have to make good the value of the car.

The recipient's liability to make good the value of the performance received is not excluded in cases where the deterioration or destruction would also have occurred had the performance not been rendered.

Illustration

6. A caterpillar has been sold and transferred to the purchaser; it is subsequently destroyed by a hurricane flooding the properties of both the seller and the purchaser. The purchaser avoids the contract because of a relevant mistake. He can reclaim the purchase price but, at the same time, has to make an allowance for the value of the car.

Nor is the recipient's liability to make good the value of the performance excluded in cases where he has been led to conclude the contract by the other party's fraudulent representation.

Illustration

7. The antique dealer A has fraudulently induced the garage owner B to swap A's ramshackle car against a valuable ancient Greek vase belonging to B. The car is accidentally destroyed while standing in B's garage. If B avoids the contract, he can claim the vase back but has to make good the value of the car.

Art. 3.8 PICC (fraud) merely wants to make sure that B is not bound by the contract that he has entered into: that is why a right of avoidance is given to him; and to make sure that B is not saddled with the consequences of a bad bargain that A has induced him to make: that is why there has to be restitution. But the rule on fraud does not intend to protect B against accidents. It is not the substitute for an insurance policy.

4. Compensation for expenses linked to the performance

The recipient of a performance may have incurred expenses for the maintenance of the object of the performance. It appears to be reasonable to allow him to claim compensation for such expenses in cases where the contract is unwound and where, therefore, the parties have to return what they have received.

Illustration

8. A has sold and delivered a race horse to B. After some time B realizes that A has fraudulently concealed from him the true parentage of that horse. B avoids the contract. He can claim compensation for the costs that he has incurred in feeding the horse.

This rule applies only to reasonable expenses. What is reasonable depends on the circumstances of the case. In Illustration 8 it would matter whether the horse had been sold as a race horse or as an ordinary farm horse.

5. Benefits

The Principles also do not take a position concerning fruits that have been derived from the performance, or interest that has been earned. In commercial practice it will

often be difficult to establish the value of the benefits received by the parties as a result of the performance. In view of the fact that usually both parties will have received such benefits, the elaboration of specific restitution rules does not appear to be necessary.

CHAPTER 7: Non-Performance

Section 3: Termination

Article 7.3.6

(Restitution with respect to contracts to be performed at one time)

(1) On termination of a contract to be performed at one time either party may claim restitution of whatever it has supplied under the contract, provided that such party concurrently makes restitution of whatever it has received under the contract.

(2) If restitution in kind is not possible or appropriate, an allowance has to be made in money whenever reasonable.

(3) The recipient of the performance does not have to make an allowance in money if the impossibility to make restitution in kind is attributable to the other party.

(4) Compensation may be claimed for the reasonable expenses linked to the performance received.

COMMENT

1. Contracts to be performed at one time

The present article refers only to contracts to be performed at one time. A different regime applies to contracts under which the characteristic performance is to be made over a period of time (see Art. 2). The most common example of a contract to be performed at one time is an ordinary contract of sale where the entire object of the sale has to be transferred at one particular moment. But Article 1 also, e.g., refers to construction contracts, where the contractor is under an obligation to produce the entire work to be accepted by his customer at one particular time. A turnkey contract provides a practically particularly important example.

One party under a commercial contract will usually have to pay money for the performance received. That obligation is not the one that is characteristic for the contract. Thus, a contract of sale, where the purchase price has to be paid in instalments, will fall under the present article.

2. Entitlement of parties to restitution on termination

Para. (1) of this article provides for a right for each party to claim the return of whatever it has supplied under the contract provided that it concurrently makes restitution of whatever it has received.

Illustration

1. A sells a Constable painting to B for 600,000 Euro. B only pays 200,000 Euro for the painting when it is delivered, and A therefore terminates the contract. A can claim back the painting. At the same time, he has to return the 200,000 Euro received from B.

The rule also applies when the aggrieved party has made a bad bargain. If, in the case mentioned in illustration 1, the true value of the painting is 900,000 Euro, A may still require the return of the painting.

The present article also applies to the situation where the aggrieved party has supplied money in exchange for property, services, etc. which it has not received or which is defective.

Illustration

2. The facts are the same as in Illustration 1, except that the painting was not a Constable but a copy. On termination of the contract, B can claim back the money and must return the copy to A.

Concerning the costs involved in making restitution Art. 6.1.11 applies.

3. Restitution in kind not possible or appropriate

Restitution must normally be in kind. There are, however, instances where instead of restitution in kind, an allowance in money has to be made. This is the case first of all where restitution in kind is not possible. The allowance will normally amount to the value of the performance received.

Illustrations

3. A who has contracted to excavate B's site, leaves it after only part of the work has been done. B, who then terminates the contract, will have to pay A a reasonable sum for the work done, measured by the value that work has for B. At the same time he will have a claim against A for whatever damages he may have suffered as a result of A's breach of contract (Art. 7.3.5 (2)).

4. A books a cruise which is to take him around the coast of South America. In Santiago de Chile the cruise ship breaks down and cannot continue the cruise. A terminates the contract with B, the owner of the business organizing the cruise, and decides to fly home. If he had already paid the price he can now claim it back. At the same time, he owes B an allowance amounting to the value of the cruise so far. In addition, he can claim damages for having had to buy the ticket for his flight home (Art. 7.3.5 (2)).

An allowance is further envisaged by para. (2) of this article whenever restitution in kind would not be appropriate. This is so in particular when returning the performance in kind would cause unreasonable effort or expense. The standard, in that respect, is the same as under Art. 7.2.2(b).

Illustration

5. A, an artist, sells 200 silver-plated rings to B. B fails to pay for the rings and A thereupon terminates the contract. It turns out that B had, in the meantime, attempted to ship the rings to his business premises. However, the boat on which they had been stored, has sunk. Although it would be possible, at great expense, to rescue the rings from the wrecked ship, this cannot be expected of B. B has to pay a reasonable sum to A, measured by the value of the rings.

The purpose of specifying that an allowance has to be made in money “whenever reasonable” is to make it clear that an allowance only has to be made if, and to the extent that, the performance has conferred a benefit on its recipient. That is not the case, for example, where the defect which gives the recipient of the performance a right to terminate has only become apparent in the course of processing the object of that performance.

Illustration

6. A sells to B, who wants to paint his house, ten litres of paint. While B is using the paint it becomes apparent that it does not stick to the wall of the house. B can terminate and reclaim the purchase price but it would not be reasonable to expect him to make good the value of the paint.

4. The allocation of risk

Obviously, the rule contained in para. (2) implies an allocation of risk: it imposes a liability on the recipient of the performance to make good the value of that performance if it is unable to make restitution in kind. The rule in para. (2) applies no matter whether the recipient has been responsible for the deterioration or destruction of what it had received. Such allocation of the risk of deterioration or destruction is justified, in particular, because there should be correspondence between risk and control. Of course, there is no liability to make good the value where the deterioration or destruction is attributable to the other party: either because it has been due to the other party’s fault, or due to a defect inherent in the performance.

Illustration

7. A sells and delivers to B a luxury car. The car has defective brakes; it therefore crashes into another car and is destroyed as a result of this accident. Since the car was unfit to be used for its intended purpose, B can terminate the contract and reclaim the purchase price. He does not have to make an allowance for not being able to return the car.

The recipient’s liability to make good the value of the performance received is not excluded in cases where the deterioration or destruction would also have occurred had the performance not been rendered.

Illustration

8. A car has been sold and transferred to the purchaser; it is subsequently destroyed by a hurricane flooding the properties of both the seller and the purchaser. The purchaser terminates the contract because of a defect attaching to the car. He can reclaim the purchase price but, at the same time, has to make an allowance for the value of the car.

Obviously, the question of risk allocation only arises in cases where the deterioration or destruction occurs *before* termination of the contract. If what has been performed deteriorates or is destroyed *after* termination of the contract, the normal rules on non-performance apply. For after termination, the recipient of the performance is under a duty to return what he had received. Any non-performance of that duty gives the other party a right to claim damages according to Art. 7.4.1, unless the non-performance is excused under Art. 7.1.7 (*force majeure*).

Illustration

9. A sells and delivers to B a limousine with a leaking roof. Since the limousine is unfit to be used for its intended purpose, B can terminate the contract. As a result, he can reclaim the purchase price but is under a duty to return the limousine. Before he can return the car it is destroyed by a thunderstorm. A cannot claim damages because B is excused under Art. 7.1.7.

5. Compensation for expenses linked to the performance

The recipient of a performance may have incurred expenses for the maintenance of the object of the performance. It appears to be reasonable to allow him to claim compensation for such expenses in cases where the contract is unwound and where, therefore, the parties have to return what they have received.

Illustration

10. A has sold and delivered a race horse to B. Some time later it becomes apparent that the horse is not, as A had promised, a descendant of a particular stallion. B terminates the contract. He can claim compensation for the costs that he has incurred in feeding the horse.

The rule applies only to reasonable expenses. What is reasonable depends on the circumstances of the case. In Illustration 9 it would matter whether the horse had been sold as a race horse or as an ordinary farm horse.

6. Benefits

The Principles do not take a position concerning fruits that have been derived from the performance, or interest that has been earned. In commercial practice it will often be difficult to establish the value of the benefits received by the parties as a result of the performance. In view of the fact that usually both parties will have received such benefits, the elaboration of specific restitution rules does not appear to be necessary.

7. Rights of third persons not affected

In common with other articles of the Principles, the present article deals with the relationship between the parties and not with any rights which third persons may have acquired on the goods concerned. Whether, for instance, an obligee of the buyer, the buyer's receivers in bankruptcy, or a purchaser in good faith may oppose the restitution of goods sold is to be determined by the applicable national law.

Article 7.3.7

(Restitution with respect to contracts to be performed over a period of time)

(1) On termination of a contract to be performed over a period of time restitution can only be claimed for the period after termination has taken effect, provided the contract is divisible.

(2) As far as a restitution has to be made, the rules of Art. 1 (2)-(4) apply.

COMMENT

1. Contracts to be performed over a period of time

Contracts to be performed over a period of time are at least as important, commercially, as contracts to be performed at one point, such contracts of sale where the object of the sale has to be transferred at one particular moment. They include leases (e.g. equipment leases), contracts for services (e.g. involving distributorship, outsourcing, franchising, licensing and commercial agency). The present rule also covers contracts of sale where the goods have to be delivered in instalments. Performances under such contracts can have been made over a long period of time before the contract is terminated, and it may thus be inconvenient to unravel these performances. Also, termination is a remedy with merely prospective effect. Restitution can, therefore, only be claimed in respect of the period after termination.

Illustration

1. A contracts to service B's computer hardware and software for a period of five years. After three years of regular service A is obliged by illness to discontinue the services and the contract is terminated. B, who has paid A for the fourth year, can claim return of the advance payment for that year but not for the money paid for the three years of regular service.

Since the contract is terminated only for the future, any outstanding payments for part performances can still be claimed. Art. 2 also, of course, does not prevent a claim for damages being brought.

Illustrations

2. A leases equipment to B for three years at a rental of 10,000 Euro a month. B pays punctually for the first two months but then fails to make any further payments despite repeated requests by A. After the lapse of five months A terminates the lease. A is entitled to retain the 20,000 Euro already received (Art. 2) and to recover the 30,000 Euro accrued due (on the basis of the contract of lease which is terminated only for the future), together with whatever damages for breach he may have sustained (Art. 7.3.5 (2)).

3. H, a hospital, engages C to carry out cleaning services for the hospital, the contract to run for three years. After a year C informs H that it cannot continue with the cleaning services unless the price is doubled. H refuses to agree and C ceases to provide the service. On terminating the contract H can recover damages for any additional expense it incurs in hiring another cleaning firm (Art. 7.4.1 in conjunction with Art. 7.3.5 (2)), while C is entitled to retain the payments it has received for services already provided (Art. 2).

The rule that restitution can only be claimed for the period after termination has taken effect does not apply if the contract is indivisible.

Illustration 4

A undertakes to paint ten pictures depicting one and the same historical event for B's festival hall. After delivering and having been paid for five paintings, A abandons the work. In view of the fact that the decoration of the hall is supposed to consist of ten paintings to be painted by the same painter and showing different aspects of one historical event, B can claim return of the advances paid to A and must return the five paintings to A.

2. Restitution

The present article is a special rule excluding restitution, with regard to contracts to be performed over a period of time, for performances made in the past. As far as there is restitution under Art. 2, it follows the rules under Article 1.