

## **IMPACT OF DELIBERATE BREACH OF CONTRACT WITH FOCUS ON INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS**

**Mustafa Rashid Issa**

---

**ABSTRACT:** *It is necessary to differentiate among different types of breach bearing in mind that their legal belongings are not similar when breach of contract takes place. Various forms of Non-performance are taken like actual and anticipatory or non-fundamental and fundamental breach. Although, breach or non-performance may be divided into unintended and deliberate one at the standpoint of will. Who has behaved in bad-faith it cannot be indifferent to obligor by Law. In favor of oblige some legal systems have been changed and upgraded at this end. With special remedies, some of international tools like DCFR, PECL and UPICC deliberate breach have been encountered. This paper examines the fastidious effects of deliberate breach with prominence on above mentioned documents.*

**KEY WORDS:** Contract, Intentional Breach, Effects, International Instruments

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Commercial contracts are core to commercial and business life moreover national and international relation augmented its importance. An all domestic and international legal systems there is compensation for damages for not fulfilling the contract or legal obligations. There several or multiple types of remedies for breach of contract which depends on the type, intensity, and severity of violation of the contract. Deliberate breach of contract shows the violent and deviant attitude, however its legal effects are vary. Many domestic legal systems and international legal system take ill will as an integral element for development, weather non-performance basic or not. In international instruments and local legal system of many countries the impact of breach of the contract has on breaching party's accountability to unforeseeable loss too. In case of deliberate breach the effected party has all right to demolish the contract and can demand compensation and damages.

### **CONCEPTION OF BREACH OF INTENTIONAL CONTRACT**

In some international instrument we hardly find a clear definition of international or deliberate breach of contract. It must be considered that clear and complete definition of international breach is difficult task because there are many damages or compensations are associated with this term. It can be observed that international breach is associated with the will of breaching party. In this context, it is suggested that international act requires will to injure, so that is

deliberate action and deliberate injury. So we can say that deliberate breach is that in which breaching party wants to damage from non-breaching party or to reap benefits of breach which must have deliberate act and international injury<sup>1</sup>. In this context we can differentiate opportunistic and efficient breach.

## EFFECTS OF INTENTIONAL BREACH OF CONTRACT

Deliberate breaches have four important impacts. First, it is closely associated with basic breach, which is, it crucial factor to assess that nonperformance commit basic breach or not. Second, it includes non-performing party's accountability to unforeseeable loss too. Third, effected party has sight to demolishing contract. Fourth, affected party demand damages which have formulated in a legal system.

### Handling of deliberate breach as a core breach.

Breaching the contract is among those factors which can be used to determine, whether non-performance was fundamental/basic or not. For example obligor clearly states that he will not fulfill this obligation, this can lie in fundamental breach of contract. In this context an art 8:103 (c) of PECL states a non-performance of an obligation is fundamental to the contract. If the non-performance is international and gives the aggrieved party reason to believe that he can't rely on the other party future performance.<sup>2</sup>Very much the same art7-3-1(2) (c) of UPICC determined if the non-performance is actually intentional or sloppy it amounts with a fundamental breach. Likewise DCFR art. 3: 502(2)(b) inform you that the financial institution may threat the particular non-performance as fundamental if it was intentional or reckless and gives the creditor reason to trust that the debtor's future performance can't be relied on, even when non-performance of obligation does not substantially deprive the particular creditor of what he might have expected to get.<sup>3</sup>It deserves to observe that unlike UPICC containing, regarded intentional or even reckless non-performance in addition to aggrieved party's affordable belief in obligor's potential inability in performing with the contract as another grounds for standard breach, the PECL in addition to DCFR in skill 8: 103(c) in addition to 3: 502(2)(b) respectively usually do not take these like a different grounds for in connection with breach as standard and these factors with together constitute important non-performance. It may conduct like a fundamental if you experience an indication of purposeful, which gives the effected party a reason to believe which he cannot rely around the other party's potential performance.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Richard Craswell, When is a Willful Breach Willful? The Link between Definitions and Damages, 1509(Michigan Law Review 2009).

<sup>2</sup> LiueChengwei, *Remedies for Non-performance - Perspectives from CISG, UNIDROIT Principles and PECL* 118 (1<sup>st</sup>.ed.2003).

<sup>3</sup>Paul Varul, *Performance and Remedies for Non-performance: Comparative Analysis of the PECL and DCFR*, XIV *Juridica International*, 110 (2008).

<sup>4</sup> Lars Meyer, *Non-performance and Remedies under International Contract Law Principles and Indian Contract*

Unlike to DCFR skill. 3: 502(2)(b) and UPICC art. 7-3-1(2)(c) are respect into a situation that non-performance is actually intentional or dangerous, PECL art. 8: 103(c) has restricted to intentional non-performance<sup>6</sup>. Even so, some authors have put forward that according to PECL art. 1: 303(3), intentionality in this particular concept includes recklessness and relevant illustrations show this term that will apply to a variety of situations ranging on the obligor's mere familiarity with the respective non-performance to fraudulent conduct<sup>7</sup>.

As we discussed above, one impact regarding deliberate breach of contract is, it turns the non-performance directly into fundamental one. Therefore, in examining the main topics intentional breach of the contract in your context of CISG it is appropriate to location to art 25 from the CISG which is due to the concept regarding fundamental breach. Unlike other several international instruments which have exploited different factors pertaining to determine the fundamentality in the breach, in the context of artwork 25 of CISG is incredibly concise. According to this article, breach in the contract is simple, if it results in such detriment towards other party as substantially to rob him of what he is entitled to expect within the contract. As it is usually seen from the context in the article there isn't a trace of intentional or reckless breach in the context of the actual CISG. In actuality, the CISG does not have any provision on intentional or reckless breach.<sup>5</sup> Subsequently, to focus on the issue that whether breach committed purposely or recklessly is incompatible with all the remedial system with the CISG that beneath it fault isn't a condition associated with contract liability and from the existence of either compensation isn't important. Therefore recourse to the approach in determining fundamental breach is not permissible.<sup>6</sup> Even so, some authors make a point that any deliberate breach in breaching the contract is relevant under CISG artwork. 49 (1) (a) along with 25 too. Non-conformity itself is not a reason, but the actual phenomenon behind this is losing trust in the opposite party with non-conforming distribution together.

### **Expansion of Liability for Unforeseeable Damages.**

It is commonly observed that non-performing party is only liable for loss which he foresaw or must have foreseen during the conclusion from the contract. This fundamental feature has a long history and roots back in Roman regulation. Much later it turned out to establish in the code napoleon, hence adopted by many of legal systems. The law has also been enshrined in common law. The law was established in a famous case Hadley versus. Baxendale and further restated throughout Victoria Laundry versus Newman Industries.

Foreseeability test is founded on the foresight connected with non-performing party, or the

---

*Law: A Comparative Survey of the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts, the Principles of European Contract Law, and Indian Statutory Contract Law* 166-67 (1st. ed. 2010).

<sup>5</sup> Christian von Bar, Eric Clive and Others,

*Principles, Definitions and Model Rules of European Private Law, Draft Common Frame of Reference (DCFR), Art.3:502, Note 12* (1st. ed. 2009).

<sup>6</sup> Chengwei, *supra* note 3, at 118.

foresight from the reasonable person inside position of non-performing party during the time of conclusion of long term contract. And the expertise of the effected party is not associated. The concept of the phrase "could realistically have foreseen" is exactly what a normally prudent particular person could reasonably have foreseen because consequences of non-performance inside ordinary course connected with things and inside particular circumstances from the contract, such as information supplied by parties or their particular previous dealings. Therefore in a case that harm flows from the ordinary of issues, it flows naturally from the non-performance, it is actually foreseeable.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, it must be noted that implacability of the law can be annihilated in which the non-performing party provides breached the long term contract deliberately.

In fact the extension connected with liability to unforeseeable losses runs unlike the general principle, which in line with, its celebration in breach is liable only for reduction which it foresaw or could reasonably have foreseen during conclusion of this contract. This common principle is also reflected in many international instruments. Article 9: 503 PECL declares: "The non-performing party is responsible only for damage which it foresaw or perhaps could reasonably have foreseen at the time of conclusion of the contract as likely result of its non-performance, except the non-performance had been intentional or grossly negligent." The last the main article lay down its own rule on deliberate failure in functionality or gross carelessness. In the event losses that non-performing party is likely for, has not tied to foreseeability rule along with the full damage needs to be compensated even when it is not foreseeable. Inside the similar way fine art. 3: 703 of DCFR established: "The debtor in the obligation which arises from a contract or perhaps other juridical act is likely only for loss which the debtor foresaw or perhaps could reasonably be expected to have foreseen at the time when the duty was incurred as a likely result with the non-performance, unless the non-performance was deliberate, irresponsible or abhorrently negligent.

Although normally the obligor is responsible only for loss which the obligor foresaw or even could reasonably be likely to have foreseen at the time of contract, the last article shoes a particular law in conditions of deliberate or even reckless failure to performance or major negligence. In this event the losses for that the obligor is responsible are not restricted to the foreseeability law plus the full damage should be compensated, even in the condition of unforeseeable.

In these cases it seems more reasonable to place the risk of a non-foreseeable loss on the obligor rather than on the innocent obligee. A person is reckless if the person knows of an obvious and

---

<sup>7 12</sup>Stefan Vogenauer & Jan Kleinheisterkamp, *Commentary on The Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts (PICC) 886-87* (1st. ed. 2009).

serious risk of proceeding in a certain way but nonetheless voluntarily proceeds to act without caring whether or not the risk materializes; there is gross negligence if a person is guilty of a profound failure to take such care as is self-evidently required in the circumstances.<sup>8</sup>

Not like UPICC and DCFR which make differentiation in recoverable damages where the breach is deliberate and where it is accidental, as far as to help recoverability of loss is concerned the CISG and also the UPICC make zero differentiation between these two types of breaches. Under CISG art 74 liability pertaining to remedy to damage is restricted to losses the party could or even should foresee during conclusion of the contract within the light of condition that they knew or even ought to know. Apparently the role involving intentional breach of the contract in the light of UPICC is, it works as an issue for determining the nature of the breach. That is always to say, where it is known that the non-performing party has breached the contract deliberately after which fundamental breach of the contract has occurred, the effected party can demolish the contract. Moreover, its basic function in the context of UPICC is, it paws the way for demolish the contract or deal.

But in terms of the role of deliberate breach of the contract in the context of CISG, it should be noted that art 74 from the CISG has a clear rule in this regard. According to art 74, the CISG Damages intended for breach of contract by one party incorporate a sum comparable to the loss, including loss of profit, suffered by other party as a consequence of the breach. Such damages may not exceed the loss how the party in infringement foresaw or have to have foreseen at the time of the conclusion of the deal or contract. As it is evident from current article, there is no limitation on recoverable damages when it comes to deliberate breach for the reason that PECL and DCFR. This restriction is not discovered by thinking about to four corners from the CISG since the particular remedial system from the CISG is dependent on no fault concept. As a result it doesn't matter whether the breach of the contract is deliberate or not.

But it must be noted that your role of ill will just isn't ineffective in your CISG Entirely since in some instances it diminishes your effected party's tasks in resorting to its remedies. For instance, in cases the spot that the effected party deals with an additional time frame of reasonable length for performance through the seller of the obligations he cannot resort to sporadic remedies with such a fixing of longer. However, according to art 49(2)(b)(ii), in the event, seller has declared that they will not accomplish his obligations within this kind of additional period, the customer can avoid your contract despite fixing an extra period for functionality.

### **Contract termination due to deliberate breach of the Contract**

As discussed above the particular deliberate breach involving contract may likely to involve in assessing, if the non-performance amounts to necessarily fundamental or not. In this value, art. 9: 301 with the PECL has set forth that a get together may terminate the contract if the other

---

<sup>8</sup>*Id. At comment A.*

party's non-performance volumes to fundamental go against the contract along with under art. 8: 103(c) deliberate non-performance treats to be a fundamental breach. Subsequently, even if the particular deliberate non-performance will be insignificant, the breach involving contract is fundamental plus the effected party could terminate the contract under art. 9: 301. Although the good faith rule enshrined in skill. 1: 201 may be given operation if the non-performance is insignificant. it is unreasonable for effected party to get together to terminate the particular contract, he has no right to do so<sup>10</sup>. UPICC art. 7-3-1(1) states, a party can demolish the deal in which the failure of other party to perform an obligation under the contract amounts with a fundamental non-performance as well as under art. 7-3-1(2)(c) if the non-performance is deliberate or reckless, your breach of contract is fundamental, effected part can demolish the deal.

### **Likelihood of assert for Punitive Damages**

Punitive damages stated in the Black's law that additional damage reward due to defendant act of recklessness, malice and deceit. it is also associates with penalize the wrongdoer to set example for others..<sup>9</sup>The opportunity of demanding punitive damages include a deep root in the history of legislations. The concept connected with punitive damages had been recognized in rules of some ancient civilizations just like the Babylonian Hammurabi Rule in 2000 W. C the Hindu Rule of Manu throughout 200 B. D. and the Scriptures. Imposition of multiple damages as a way of punishing egregious misconduct.<sup>10</sup>Not long ago, art 1371 involving reforming the The french language Law of Obligations has recognized this concept. According to this article A person, that commits a manifestly planned fault, and notably a fault with a view to attain, can be condemned as well as compensatory damages to cover punitive damages, component of which the courtroom may in its discretion allocate for the Public Treasury. A court's decision to order repayment of damages with this kind must possibly be supported with particular reasons and their particular amount distinguished from any other damages awarded to the victim. Punitive damages most likely are not the object involving insurance.

“This concept is regarded as an appropriate method of punishing and removing aggressive acts. Awarding such damages had become a well-established perhaps the American legal technique. In 1851, the particular U. S. Supreme Court had written that “in activities of trespass along with all actions about the case for torts, a jury may inflict what are called exemplary, punitive, or even vindictive damages about a defendant, having in view the enormity regarding his offence as opposed to the measure of payment.”<sup>11</sup>

One more definition of punitive damages is pertinent in oxford dictionary of law which defines punitive damages as being a " Damages provided to punish the defendant as opposed to (or as

<sup>9</sup>Bryan A. Garner, *Black's Law Dictionary* 448 (9th.ed. 2009).

<sup>10</sup> Emily Gottlieb, *What You Need to Know About... Punitive Damages*, Center for Justice & Democracy, 4 (2011).

<sup>11</sup>Gottlieb, *supra* note 20, at 4.

well as) to pay the claimant for harm done."<sup>12</sup>

The PECL plus the UPICC took much more liberal approach simply by emphasizing the compensatory function. This was also the truth for ancient Romans in which enacted laws with 450 B. H. that mandated the particular of damages and won't provide for the particular payment of punitive problems.<sup>13</sup> Where the possibility regarding demanding punitive damages inside the CISG is anxious advisory council consider it impossible in the context in the CISG.<sup>14</sup> Professor graves furthermore view awarding regarding "punitive damages over a party's genuine loss is contrary to the basic principle of Article 74" that has confined recoverable injuries to actual loss.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, some authors talk about although such awards are certainly not currently available underneath the CISG, but one can presuppose a role for punitive damages using some exceptional cases. Schwenger and Hachem claim that punitive damages should be awarded where the breach regarding contract was purposive and in bad faith in order to provide full compensation for that aggrieved party.<sup>16</sup>

### **The Non-breaching Party's Compensation Is Not Limited to Liquidated Damages**

The spot that the contract has a clause which has determined the volume of damages in move forward (in our presumption liquidated damages) among the effects of intentional breach of contract is which the aggrieved party's compensation seriously isn't limited to pre-determined amount plus the aggrieved party can recover the total amount which exceed the particular liquidated damages. It will, of course, be noted which the court's award cannot exceed the actual damages. In this interconnection art 225 regarding Egyptian Civil Code has lay out that where the particular obligor breaches the particular contract in awful faith which in truth is a sort of intentional breach on the contract the judge has the ability to increase the number of liquidated damages around actual damages. The same is true below art 267 regarding Lebanon Code regarding Obligations and Contracts.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, in Hexion case 29<sup>th</sup> court held that the intentional breach means they could be exposed to problems far beyond just about any liquidated damages inside contract.

<sup>12</sup>Elizabeth A. Martin, *Oxford dictionary of law* 191 (5th.ed. 2003).

<sup>13</sup>Thomasz Ganyst, *The influence of the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods on the Chinese Contract Law: damages for breach of contract*, 18.

<sup>14</sup>CISG Advisory Council Opinion No. 6, available at:<http://www.cisg.law.pace.edu/cisg/CISG-AC-op6.html>.

<sup>15</sup>Bruno Zeller, *When is a Fixed Sum not a Fixed Sum but a Penalty Clause?*, *Journal of law and commerce*, 184 (2012).

<sup>16</sup>D Saidov & R Cunnigton, *Current Themes in the Law of Contract Damages: Introductory Remarks, Contract Damages Domestic and International Perspectives*, Hart, 15 (2008).

<sup>17</sup>AbdolRazzag Ahmad Al-Sanhouri, *Alvasit*, Beirut, 877, (1974). 29Hexion Specialty Chem. Corp., et al. v. Huntsman Corp

**CONCLUSION**

In this posting it has been showed which the intentional breach on the contract has been recognized in certain legal systems and also some international instruments. It has also established that in the instance of intentional breach on the contract the aggrieved party may have wide range associated with remedies. He/she can recover damages regardless of the fact the maintained losses were unforeseeable to the obligor in the time conclusion of your contract. Furthermore the aggrieved party will be able to terminate the contract regardless of the fact that the breach will be fundamental or not. In some legal systems, the aggrieved party might also demand punitive damages at the same time. Also in some regulations and options, the non-breaching get together may claim with regard to full-compensation despite associated with determining the degrees of damages under liquidated damage agreement ahead of time.

**REFERENCES**

- Al-Sanhouri, AbdolRazzag Ahmad, *Alvasit*, Vol.1, Beirut, 1974.
- Cartwright, John&Vogenauer, Stefan& Whittaker, Simon (eds) ,*Reforming the French Law of Obligations*, GB, Hart pub, 2009.
- Chengwei, Liue, *Remedies for Non-performance - Perspectives from CISG, UNIDROIT Principles and PECL*, 2003.
- Craswell, Richard, *When is a Willful Breach Willful? The Link between Definitions and Damages*, Michigan Law Review, 2009.
- Ganyst, Thomasz, *The influence of the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods on the Chinese Contract Law: damages for breach of contract*.
- Garner, Bryan A., *Black's Law Dictionary*, 9th.ed, West, 2009.
- Gotanda, John Y., *Calculation of Damages under CISG Article 74*, CISG-AC Opinion, NO. 6, 2006.
- Gottlieb, Emily, *What You Need to Know about...Punitive Damages*, Center for Justice & Democracy, 2011.
- Hoynak, Bryan, *Filling in the Blank: Defining Breaches of Contract Excepted from Discharge as Willful and Malicious Injuries to Property Under 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(6)*, 67 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 693, 2010.
- Janssen, André & Meyer, Olaf, *CISG Methodology*, 1st.ed, European Law Publishers, 2009.
- Lando, Ole &Beals, Hugh, *Principles of European Contract Law*, Hauge, Kluwer pub., 2000.
- Leisinger, Benjamin K., *Fundamental Breach Considering Non-Conformity of the Goods*, 1st.ed, European Law Publishers, 2007.
- Martin, Elizabeth A., *Oxford dictionary of law*, 5th.ed, Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Meyer Lars, *Non-performance and Remedies under International Contract Law Principles and Indian Contract Law: A Comparative Survey of the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts, the Principles of European Contract Law, and Indian Statutory Contract Law*, 1st.ed, Peter Labg, 2010.
- Saidov D &Cunnington R, *Current Themes in the Law ofContract Damages: Introductory*



- Remarks, Contract Damages Domestic and International Perspectives*, Hart, 2008.
- Schwenzer, Ingeborg & Hachem, Pascal and Kee, Christopher, *Global Sales and Contract Law*, 1st.ed, New York, Oxford University Press, 2012.
- [17] *Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts 2010*, Rome, International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT).
- Varul, Paul, *Performance and Remedies for Non-performance: Comparative Analysis of the PECL and DCFR*, *Juridica International*, XIV, 2008.
- Vogenauer, Stefan & Kieinheisterkamp, Jan (eds), *Commentary on The Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts (PICC)*, 1ed, New York, Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Von Bar, Christian & Barendrecht, Maurits and others, *The Private Law Systems in the EU: Discrimination on Grounds of Nationality and the Need for a European Civil Code*, 6th.ed, European Parliament, 2000.
- Von Bar, Christian & Clive, Eric and Others, *Principles, Definitions and Model Rules of European Private Law, Draft Common Frame of Reference (DCFR)*, Study Group on a European Civil Code and the Research Group on EC Private Law (Acquis Group), Sellier, Volume 3, 2009.
- Zeller, Bruno, *When is a Fixed Sum not a Fixed Sum but a Penalty Clause?*, *Journal of law and commerce*, 2012.