PERFORMANCE ■ CONDITIONS: Effects on whether Duty Exists / Breached ■ FULL PERFORMANCE: Discharged from Performance ■ SUBSTANTIAL PERFORMANCEPERFORMANCE NEED NOT BE PERFECT - ELEMENTS ■ IN GOOD FAITH ■ PERFORMANCE THAT DOES NOT VARY GREATLY FROM THAT – DETERMINED BY ASKING, "CAN THE GOALS OF THE K BE ACHIEVED?" - EFFECTS ■ SUBSTANTIALLY PERFORMING PARTY IS DISCHARGED FROM PERFORMANCE ■ BUT MUST PAY DAMAGES CAUSED BY THE BREACH **BREACH OF CONTRACT** ■ MATERIAL BREACH: - BREACH THAT IS SIGNIFICANT - DEPRIVES THE INNOCENT PARTY OF THE BENEFIT OF THE - DETERMINED BY: BREACH THAT DOES NOT SATISFY SUBSTANTIAL PERFORMANCE TEST - OTHER PARTY IS EXCUSED FROM PERFORMANCE ■ ANTICIPATORY REPUDIATION - PARTY REPUDITATES OBLIGATIONS PRIOR TO THE TIME FOR PERFORMANCE - REMEDIES CAN BE SOUGHT IMMEDIATELY - CAN ALSO WAIT TO SEE IF REPUDIATION IS WITHDRAWN **ALTERNATIVES TO PERFORMANCE** (Discharge by Agreement) **■** MUTUAL RESCISSION - AGREEMENT TO CANCEL A **CONTRACT ■** NOVATION

SUBSTITUTION OF PARTIES
ACCORD AND SATISFACTION
SUBSTITUTED PERFORMANCE
SUBSTITUTED CONTRACT

IMPOSSIBILITY

- MUST BE OBJECTIVE IMPOSSIBILITY
 - SUBJECTIVE IMPOSSIBILITY IS NOT A DEFENSE
- EXAMPLES
 - DESTRUCTION OF SUBJECT MATTER WITHOUT FAULT OF EITHER PARTY
 - DEATH OF A PARTY OBLIGATED TO PERFORM PERSONAL SERVICES
 - UNFULFILLED EXPRESS CONDITION

ECONOMIC FRUSTRATION & COMMERCIAL IMPRACTICABILITY

- TWO RELATED DEFENSES WITH ONE COMMON ELEMENT
- UNFORSEEABLE EVENT BEYOND THE CONTROL OF EITHER PARTY
- ELIMINATES ("FRUSTRATES") THE PURPOSE OF THE CONTRACT OR FORCES ONE PARTY TO INCUR UNREASONABLE COSTS TO PERFORM IT (MAKING IT "IMPRACTICABLE")

Cases on Performance & Discharge

- Jacob & Youngs v. Kent
 - What was the old rule here?
 - What did Cardozo come up with for this case?
 - Why did Cardozo do this?
- Northern Corporation v. Chugach Electrical Association
 - What happened here?
 - What category of "Discharge by Law" is this? Why?
 - Did the facts in this case meet the requirements for this category? Explain.
