

Contents

<i>Table of Cases</i>	xxix
<i>Table of Abbreviations</i>	xlvi

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION AND PREFATORY OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEMS CONSIDERED

1.1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.2. MAJOR DIFFERENCES IN APPROACH BETWEEN THE SYSTEMS CONSIDERED	6
1.3. CONSEQUENCES OF THE DIFFERENCES OF APPROACH FOR THE STRUCTURE OF THIS BOOK	8
1.4. THE INFLUENCE OF EUROPEAN UNION LAW	10
1.5. PREFATORY OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEMS CONSIDERED	12
1.5.1. ENGLAND	12
<i>The English system of civil courts</i>	12
<i>A common law system</i>	13
<i>The doctrine of precedent</i>	14
<i>Features of procedure</i>	14
<i>Mode of citation of cases</i>	14
1.5.2. FRANCE	15
<i>The French Court System</i>	15
<i>The Character of the arrêt</i>	17
<i>Mode of citation of cases</i>	18
1.5.3. GERMANY	19
<i>The role of case law</i>	19
<i>The Court system</i>	19
<i>The system of law reporting</i>	20
<i>Provisions of the BGB</i>	20
1.5.4. THE NETHERLANDS	20
1.5.5. SCOTLAND	21
<i>Scots law</i>	21
<i>The character of pleadings and judgements in Scottish cases (including precedent)</i>	23

CONTENTS

<i>Style of reporting of decisions and precedent</i>	25
<i>Mode of citation of cases</i>	26
1.5.6. SOUTH AFRICA	27

CHAPTER TWO

THE GENERAL APPROACH OF THE LAW OF UNJUSTIFIED ENRICHMENT

2.1. ENGLISH LAW	31
<i>Introductory note</i>	31
2.US.1. <i>Restatement of the law of restitution (1937, American Law Institute)</i>	34
2.E.2. House of Lords, <i>Lipkin Gorman v. Karpnale Ltd.</i> The Gambling solicitor	34
2.2. FRENCH LAW	35
2.2.1. INTRODUCTION	35
2.2.1.A. NO GENERAL LEGISLATIVE PROVISION	35
2.2.1.B. ANTECEDENTS OF THE MODERN LAW	36
<i>Gestion d'affaires</i>	36
<i>The action de in rem verso</i>	37
2.2.1.C. THE FOUNDATION OF THE MODERN LAW—THE BOUDIER CASE	38
<i>Absorption into quasi-contracts</i>	39
2.2.2. MATERIALS	39
2.F.3. Cass. Req., 15 June 1892, <i>Patureau-Miran v. Boudier</i>	39
2.3. GERMAN LAW	42
2.3.1. INTRODUCTION	42
2.3.1.A. THE RESTITUTIONARY OBLIGATIONS IN THE BGB	43
<i>Restitution in the owner-possessor relationship</i>	44
<i>Restitution following the termination of the contract owing to repudiation</i>	46
<i>Restitution according to the law on unjust enrichment</i>	48
<i>Other restitutionary obligations</i>	49
2.3.1.B. OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO THE REIMBURSEMENT FOR OUTLAYS	49
2.3.1.C. ENRICHMENT LAW ACCORDING TO §§ 812 SQQ.	51
2.3.2. MATERIALS	52
2.G.4. BS Markesinis, W Lorenz and G Danneman, <i>The Law of Contracts and Restitution: a Comparative Introduction</i>	52
2.G.5. E v. Caemmerer “ <i>Ungerechtfertigte Bereicherung und unerlaubte Handlung</i> ”	54
2.G.6. BGH, 12 July 1996. The House of Sylt	55

CONTENTS

2.4. DUTCH LAW	58
2.NL.7. E.J.H. Schrage, “ <i>Unjustified Enrichment</i> ”	58
2.NL.8. M.H. Bregstein, <i>Seven specific cases</i>	62
2.NL.9. Hoge Raad, 30 January 1959. <i>Quint v. te Poel</i> . One General Remedy or a Limited Number of Specific Remedies?	63
2.5. SCOTS LAW	68
2.5.1. INTRODUCTION	68
<i>No general legislative provision</i>	68
<i>Nomenclature</i>	68
<i>General action or specific remedies?</i>	68
2.5.2. MATERIALS	72
2.5.2.A. GENERAL PRINCIPLE AND TAXONOMY	72
2.SC.10. W.D.H. Sellar, “ <i>Unjust enrichment</i> ”	72
2.SC.11. Stair, <i>Institutions</i>	73
2.SC.12. Stair, <i>Institutions</i>	74
2.SC.13. Bankton, <i>Institute of the laws of Scotland</i>	74
2.SC.14. <i>Prescription and Limitation (Scotland) Act 1973</i>	75
2.SC.15. H.L. MacQueen, <i>Payment of another’s debt</i>	75
2.SC.16. R. Evans-Jones and P. Hellewege, “Some observations on the taxonomy of unjustified enrichment in Scots law”	76
2.SC.17. W.D.H. Sellar, “ <i>Unjust Enrichment</i> ”	77
2.SC.18. W.D.H. Sellar, “ <i>Shilliday v. Smith: unjust enrichment through the looking glass</i> ”	77
2.SC.19. Court of Session (Inner House), <i>Watson v. Shankland</i> . The charterparty which failed	78
2.SC.20. Court of Session (Inner House), <i>Morgan Guaranty Trust Co of New York v. Lothian Regional Council</i> . The “swaps” case	79
2.SC.21. Court of Session (Inner House), <i>Shilliday v. Smith</i> . The disappointed co-habitee	80
2.SC.22. House of Lords, <i>Dollar Land (Cumbernauld) Ltd. v. CIN Properties Ltd</i> . The irritated lease	83
2.5.2.B. “MARKS” OR “NOTES” OF RECOMPENSE	84
2.SC.23. W.D.H. Sellar, “ <i>Unjust Enrichment</i> ”	84
2.SC.24. A. Rodger, “ <i>Unjustified Enrichment</i> ”	85
2.SC.25. W.D.H. Sellar, “ <i>Unjust Enrichment</i> ”	85
2.SC.26. N. Whitty, “ <i>The Taxonomy of Unjust Enrichment in Scots law</i> ”	86
2.SC.27. Court of Session (Inner House), <i>Edinburgh and District Tramways Co Ltd. v. Courtenay</i> . The Edinburgh Tramcar	87
2.SC.28. Court of Session (Inner House), <i>Varney (Scotland) Ltd. v. Burgh of Lanark</i> . The burgh sewers	88
2.SC.29. Court of Session (Inner House), <i>Lawrence Building Co Ltd. v. Lanark County Council</i> . The council sewers	89

CONTENTS

2.6. SOUTH AFRICAN LAW	90
<i>Introductory note</i>	90
2.SA.30. D Visser, “ <i>Unjustified Enrichment</i> ”	92
2.SA.31. Supreme Court of Appeal, <i>McCarthy Retail Ltd. v. Shortdistance Carriers CC</i> . McCarthy Retail.	96
2.SA.32. Supreme Court of Appeal, <i>Kommissaris van Binnelandse Inkomste v. Willers</i> . The <i>Willers</i> case	98

CHAPTER THREE ENRICHMENT

3.1. ENGLISH LAW	104
<i>The defendant has acquired a benefit</i>	104
3.E.1. P Birks “ <i>In defence of Free Acceptance</i> ”	107
3.US.2. <i>Restatement of Restitution (1937, American Law Institute)</i>	107
3.E.3. P Birks “Change of position and Surviving Enrichment” in Swadling (ed) <i>The Limits of Restitutionary Claims</i>	108
3.E.4. Court of Appeal, <i>Ministry of Defence v. Ashman</i> . The abandoned family	109
3.E.5. House of Lords, <i>BP Exploration Co (Libya) Ltd. v. Hunt (No 2)</i> . The Law Reform (Frustrated contracts) Act 1943	111
3.E.6. House of Lords, <i>Lipkin Gorman v. Karpnale Ltd</i> . The Gambling Solicitor	112
3.2. FRENCH LAW	115
3.2.1. INTRODUCTION	115
<i>How may the enrichment arise?</i>	115
<i>What constitutes enrichment?</i>	115
“ <i>Moral enrichment</i> ”	116
<i>Enrichment from a relationship</i>	117
<i>Time of enrichment</i>	117
<i>Indirect enrichment</i>	118
3.2.2. MATERIALS	118
3.F.7. Cass. Civ., 9 June 1979, <i>Jeanne Roelandt v. Philippe Lavillaugouet</i>	118
3.F.8. Cass. Com., 12 November 1967, <i>Amseblem v. Bank N</i>	119
3.F.9. Cass. Civ., 18 January 1960, <i>Commune de Freneuse-sur-Risle v. Fayolte</i>	119
3.F.10. Cass. Civ., 29 October 1982, <i>Perrin v. Chevrier</i>	122
3.3. GERMAN LAW	123
3.3.1. INTRODUCTION	123
<i>The “something” acquired</i>	124
<i>The enrichment</i>	126
<i>Change of position</i>	128

CONTENTS

3.3.2. MATERIALS	129
3.3.2.A. THE “SOMETHING” ACQUIRED	129
3.G.11. E v. Caemmerer, “ <i>Ungerechtfertigte Bereicherung und unerlaubte Handlung</i> ”	129
3.G.12. H-G Koppensteiner, E Kramer, <i>Ungerechtfertigte Bereicherung</i>	129
3.G.13. BGH, 2 November 1988. Fire Insurance	130
3.3.2.B. THE ENRICHMENT	132
3.G.14. H-G Koppensteiner, E Kramer, <i>Ungerechtfertigte Bereicherung</i>	132
3.G.15. St. Schauhoff, <i>Die Bereicherungshaftung wegen der Nutzung rechtsgrundlos erlangten Geldes</i>	133
3.G.16. BGH, 6 March 1998. Saved interests.	134
3.G.17. BGH, 17 June 1992. Maintenance payments	136
3.4. DUTCH LAW	139
3.NL.18. WHM Reehuis and EE Slob, <i>NBW art. 5.14, Parlementaire Geschiedenis van het nieuwe burgerlijke wetboek, Invoering Boeken 3,5 en 6, Zakelijke Rechten</i>	139
3.NL.19. EJM Schrage, “ <i>Unjustified Enrichment</i> ”	140
3.NL.20. Asser-Hartkamp, <i>Verbintenissenrecht</i>	142
3.NL.21. EFD Engelhard and GE van Maanen, “ <i>De vordering uit de ongerechtvaardigde verrijking</i> ”	143
3.NL.22. Hoge Raad, 5 September 1997. <i>Collector v. Hamm</i> Mistaken Payment by Collector of Taxes	143
3.NL.23. Hof Amsterdam, 24 October 1956. <i>Scheringa v. De Geus</i> The Disappointed Father in Law	146
3.NL.24. Hoge Raad, 29 January 1993. <i>Van Rijswijk v. Vermobo</i> The piggery on father’s land	147
3.5. SCOTS LAW	148
<i>Measure of enrichment and measure of recovery</i>	149
<i>The time of enrichment</i>	150
<i>Accession</i>	150
3.SC.25. Stair, <i>Institutions</i>	151
3.SC.26. Court of Session, <i>Findlay v. Monro</i> . The salted ox	152
3.SC.27. Court of Session, <i>Walker v. Spence and Carfrae</i> . The slaughtered sheep	152
3.SC.28. Court of Session, <i>Faulds v. Townsend</i> . The boiled horse	154
3.SC.29. Court of Session, <i>Royal Bank of Scotland plc v. Watt</i> . The trusted stranger	154
3.6. SOUTH AFRICAN LAW	155
<i>What constitutes enrichment?</i>	155
<i>The calculation of the time and extent of the enrichment: the defence of loss of enrichment</i>	157
3.SA.30. Supreme Court of Appeal, <i>B&H Engineering v. First National Bank of South Africa Ltd</i> . B&H Engineering	159

CONTENTS

3.SA.31. DH van Zyl, “ <i>Unauthorised Payment and Unjust Enrichment in Banking Law</i> ”	162
3.SA.32. Supreme Court of Appeal, <i>African Diamond Exporters (Pty.) Ltd. v. Barclays Bank International Ltd.</i> African Diamond Exporters	165

CHAPTER FOUR IMPOVERISHMENT

4.1. ENGLISH LAW	171
<i>Introductory note</i>	171
4.E.1. P Birks, <i>Restitution—The Future</i>	173
4.E.2. <i>Court of Appeal, Kleinworth Benson Ltd. v. Birmingham City Council.</i> The hedged void swaps	174
4.2. FRENCH LAW	176
<i>What constitutes impoverishment?</i>	176
<i>Effect of a “liberal intention”</i>	176
4.F.3. 25 June 1924, <i>Jouffrey v. Laurent</i>	177
4.3. GERMAN LAW	179
4.3.1. INTRODUCTION	179
<i>The criterion “at the expense”</i>	180
<i>The concept of performance in claims of enrichment by performance</i>	180
<i>The criteria “at the expense” in relation to the claim of enrichment by non-performance</i>	184
<i>A uniform definition of enrichment?</i>	185
4.3.2. MATERIALS	186
4.G.4. W Wilburg, <i>Die Lehre von der ungerechtfertigten Bereicherung nach österreichischem und deutschem Recht. Kritik und Aufbau</i>	186
4.G.5. R Zimmerman and J du Plessis, “ <i>Basic Features of the German Law of Unjustified Enrichment</i> ”	187
4.G.6. BGH, 20 June 1990. Invalid assignment	188
4.G.7. BGH, 9 March 1989. Research costs	190
4.4. DUTCH LAW	192
4.NL.8. EJM Schrage, “ <i>Unjustified Enrichment</i> ”	192
4.NL.9. Asser-Hartkamp, <i>Verbintenissenrecht</i>	196
4.NL.10. EFD Engelhard and GE van Maanen, “ <i>De vordering uit ongerechtvaardigde verrijking</i> ”	197
4.NL.11. Hoge Raad, 12 June 1987. <i>Kriek v. Smit</i> Divorce and Fair Calculation	198
4.NL.12. Hoge Raad, 11 April 1986. <i>Baartman v. Huijbers</i> The D-I-Y Husband	199
4.NL.13. Hoge Raad, 26 January 2001. <i>Standard Group Holland B.V. v. ING Bank N.V.</i> The Defence of Unjust Enrichment	200

CONTENTS

4.5. SCOTS LAW	204
<i>Introductory note</i>	204
4.SC.14. Gloag, <i>Contract</i>	204
4.SC.15. Court of Session (Inner House) <i>Edinburgh and District Tramways Ltd. v. Courtenay</i> . The Edinburgh Tramcar	204
4.6. SOUTH AFRICAN LAW	205
<i>Introductory note</i>	205
4.SA.16. S Eiselen and G Pienaar, <i>Unjustified Enrichment: A Casebook</i>	205

CHAPTER FIVE CAUSAL CONNECTION

5.1. ENGLISH LAW	208
<i>Introductory note</i>	208
5.2. FRENCH LAW	209
<i>Introductory note</i>	209
<i>The measure of recovery</i>	210
5.F.1. Cass. Civ., <i>Oustry v. Lestrade</i> 19 January 1953	210
5.3. GERMAN LAW	211
5.3.1. INTRODUCTION	211
<i>The “immediateness” of the transfer of assets and the “principle of subsidiarity”</i>	212
<i>Enrichment and mutuality</i>	215
<i>The causal connection between “enrichment” and “loss of enrichment”</i>	217
<i>“Aufgedrängte Bereicherung” (Enforced Enrichment)</i>	218
5.3.2. MATERIALS	219
5.G.2. W Fikentscher, <i>Schuldrecht</i>	219
5.G.3. M Lieb in <i>Münchener Kommentar zum BGB</i>	220
5.G.4. BGH, 14 April 1992. Joachim Fuchsberger	221
5.G.5. BGH, 14 October 1971. Used car (“Gebrauchtwagen-Fall II”)	223
5.4. DUTCH LAW	227
5.NL.6. EJH Schrage, “ <i>Unjustified Enrichment</i> ”	227
5.NL.7. EFD Engelhard and GE van Maanen, “ <i>De vordering uit de ongerechtvaardigde verrijking</i> ”	229
5.5. SCOTS LAW	230
<i>Introductory note</i>	230
5.SC.8. Kames, <i>Principles of Equity</i>	231
5.SC.9. N Whitty, “ <i>Indirect Enrichment in Scots Law</i> ”	232
5.SC.10. D Visser and S Miller, “ <i>Between Principle and Policy: Indirect Enrichment in Subcontractor and ‘Garage Repair’ Cases</i> ”	233

CONTENTS

5.SC.11. Sheriff Court, <i>Kirklands Garage (Kinross) Ltd. v. Clark.</i> The Garage Repair	234
5.SC.12. Court of Session, <i>Cran v. Dodson.</i> The bankrupt stevedore	235
5.6. SOUTH AFRICAN LAW	235
<i>Introductory note</i>	235
5.SA.13. Supreme Court of Appeal, <i>Buzzard Electrical (Pty) v. 158 Jan Smuts Investments (Pty) Ltd.</i> Buzzard Electrical	238
5.SA.14. Cape High Court, <i>ABSA Bank t/a Bankfin v. CB Stander t/a CAW Paneelkloppers.</i> CB Stander	242
5.SA.15. S Eiselen and G Pienaar, <i>Unjustified Enrichment: A Casebook</i>	249

CHAPTER SIX ABSENCE OF JUSTIFICATION OR CAUSE

6.1. ENGLISH LAW	252
6.1.1. THE GROUNDS OF RESTITUTION	252
<i>Introductory note</i>	252
6.E.1. P Birks and R Chambers, <i>The Restitution Research Resource</i>	254
6.1.2. MISTAKE	255
<i>Introductory note</i>	255
6.E.2. <i>Torts (Interference with Goods) Act 1977, section 6</i>	260
6.E.3. Queen's Bench Division, <i>Barclays Bank Ltd. v. WJ Simms Son & Cooke (Southern) Ltd.</i> Payment on a stopped cheque	260
6.E.4. House of Lords, <i>Kleinwort Benson Ltd. v. Lincoln City Council.</i> The void swaps	263
6.E.5. Court of Appeal, <i>Greenwood v. Bennett.</i> Fixing a stolen car	269
6.1.3. PRACTICAL COMPULSION OR DURESS	270
<i>Introductory note</i>	270
6.E.6. Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, <i>Barton v. Armstrong.</i> Threat to murder	273
6.E.7. Court of King's Bench, <i>Astley v. Reynolds.</i> The pawned plate	274
6.E.8. Court of Appeal, <i>B&S Contracts and Design Ltd. v. Victor Green publications Ltd.</i> Trouble at the building site	275
6.E.9. House of Lords, <i>Dimiskal Shipping Co SA v. International Transportworkers' Federation.</i> "Blacking" of ship during industrial dispute	276
6.E.10. Probate, Divorce and Admiralty Division, <i>The Port Caledonia and the Anna.</i> "£1000 or no rope"	277
6.E.11. Court of Appeal, <i>CTN Cash and Carry Ltd. v. Gallaher.</i> The missing cigarettes	278
6.E.12. King's Bench Division, <i>Mutual Finance Ltd. v. John Wetton & Sons Ltd.</i> Threat to tell father	281

CONTENTS

6.1.4. LEGAL COMPULSION	282
<i>Introductory note</i>	282
6.E.13. Court of Appeal, <i>Brooks Wharf & Bull Wharf Ltd. v. Goodman Brothers</i> . Tax on stolen squirrel skins	282
6.E.14. House of Lords, <i>Esso Petroleum Ltd. v. Hall Russell & Co Ltd.</i> The polluted sheep	284
6.1.5. EXPLOITATION	285
<i>Introductory note</i>	285
6.E.15. Court of Appeal, <i>Allcard v. Skinner</i> . The novice nun	286
6.E.16. House of Lords, <i>Barclays Bank PLC v. O'Brien</i> . The surety wife or sexually transmitted debt	288
6.E.17. House of Lords, <i>Royal Bank of Scotland v. Etridge</i> . Beyond surety wives	291
6.E.18. Privy Council, <i>Boustany v. Pigott</i> . The “quite slow” rich old lady	295
6.1.6. FAILURE OF CONSIDERATION	296
6.1.6.A. INTRODUCTION	296
<i>Breach of contract</i>	297
<i>Frustration of contract</i>	300
<i>Non-contractual failure of consideration</i>	301
<i>Anticipated contracts which do not eventuate</i>	301
<i>Unenforceable or void contracts</i>	303
6.1.6.B. MATERIALS	305
6.E.19. Court of Appeal, <i>Rowland v. Divall</i> . Sale of stolen car	305
6.E.20. Court of Appeal, <i>Sumpter v. Hedges</i> . Claim for incomplete building work	306
6.E.21. Court of Common Pleas, <i>Planche v. Colburn</i> . The unfinished book	307
6.E.22. Queen’s Bench Division, <i>BP Exploration Co (Libya) Ltd. v. Hunt (no. 2)</i> . The expropriated oil field	307
6.E.23. Court of Appeal, <i>Chillingworth v. Esche</i> . The reneging buyer	313
6.E.24. Queen’s Bench Division, <i>William Lacey (Hounslow) Ltd. v. Davis</i> . Redevelopment scheme shelved	314
6.E.25. Queen’s Bench Division, <i>British Steel Corp v. Cleveland Bridge and Engeneering Co Ltd</i> . Steel nodes supplied	316
6.E.26. House of Lords, <i>Westdeutsche landesbank Girozentrale v. Islington London Borough Council</i> . The void swaps agreement	317
6.E.27. Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, <i>Goss v. Chilcott</i> . The loaned out loan	318
6.1.7. ULTRA VIRES DEMANDS BY PUBLIC AUTHORITIES	320
<i>Introductory note</i>	320
6.E.28. House of Lords, <i>Woolwich Equitable Building Society v. Inland Revenue Commissioners</i> . The Greedy Tax Authority	320

CONTENTS

6.1.8. NECESSITY	322
<i>Introductory note</i>	322
6.E.29. Court of Common Pleas, <i>Jenkins v. Tucker</i> . Deceased's father recovers burial expenses from deceased's husband	324
6.E.30. Court of Appeal, <i>Falcke v. Scottish Imperial Insurance</i> . The Volunteer Payer	325
6.E.31. House of Lords, <i>China Pacific SA v. Food Corporation of India, The Winson</i> . Storage of cargo from stranded ship	325
6.E.32. Court of Appeal, <i>Matheson v. Smiley</i> . Unsuccessful rescue from suicide	327
6.E.33. House of Lords, <i>Re F (Mental Patient: Sterilisation)</i> . Sterilisation of handicapped woman	327
6.1.9. ILLEGALITY	329
<i>Introductory note</i>	329
6.E.34. Queen's Bench Division and Court of Appeal, <i>Taylor v. Bowers</i> . Deception of creditors not carried through	331
6.E.35. Court of Appeal, <i>Tribe v. Tribe</i> . Needless deception and the bad son	332
6.2. FRENCH LAW	332
6.2.1. INTRODUCTION	332
<i>The first restriction on the Boudier case</i>	332
<i>Definition of cause</i>	333
<i>Justification by a rule of law</i>	333
<i>Justification by a bilateral juridical act</i>	334
<i>Justification by a unilateral juridical act</i>	334
<i>Justification in cases of indirect enrichment</i>	335
<i>Analysis of situations in which indirect enrichment may occur</i>	336
<i>Cause of impoverishment?</i>	338
6.2.2. CASES AND MATERIALS	338
6.F.36. Flour and Aubert, <i>Les Obligations. 2. Le Fait Juridique</i>	338
6.F.37. Cass. Req., <i>Leloup v. Lutier</i> 18 October 1898	339
6.F.38. Cass. Req., <i>Chagnon v. de Choudens</i> 12 February 1923	340
6.F.39. Cass. civ., <i>Demoiselle d' Astugue de Sinceny v. Grumbach & Co</i> 11 February 1931	340
6.F.40. Cass. Req., <i>Bank of Guadeloupe v. Giescher and others</i> 7 February 1905	342
6.3. GERMAN LAW	343
6.3.1. INTRODUCTION	343
<i>"Without legal cause" in claims of enrichment by performance</i>	343
<i>"Without legal basis" in view of claims of enrichment by non-performance</i>	345
6.3.2. MATERIALS	346
6.G.41. D König, <i>Ungerechtfertigte Bereicherung. Tatbestände und Ordnungsprobleme in rechtsvergleichender Sicht</i>	346

CONTENTS

6.G.42. BGH, 8 July 1982. Failure of marriage	348
6.G.43. BGH, 11 January 1971. Young bulls (“Jungbullen- Fall”)	351
6.4. DUTCH LAW	353
6.NL.44. EJM Schrage, “ <i>Unjustified Enrichment</i> ”	353
6.NL.45. Asser-Hartkamp, <i>Verbintenissenrecht</i>	354
6.NL.46. EFD Engelhard and GE van Maanen, “ <i>De vordering uit ongerechtvaardigde verrijking</i> ”	357
6.NL.47. HCF Schoordijk, <i>Het algemeen gedeelte van het verbintenissenrecht naar het Nieuw Burgerlijk Wetboek</i>	358
6.NL.48. Hoge Raad, 18 April 1969. <i>Katwijk v. Westdijk</i> Precontractual enrichment	360
6.NL.49. Hoge Raad, 25 October 1991. <i>Cornelissen v. Groningen</i> Windfall in social welfare	361
6.NL.50. Hoge Raad, 12 September 1997. <i>Receiver of Revenue v. R</i> Erroneous tax authorities	362
6.NL.51. Hoge Raad, 30 June 2000. <i>Ermer Management N.V. v. ABN Amro Bank N.V.</i> Black Hole Systems Software	363
6.5. SCOTS LAW	364
6.5.1. INTRODUCTION	364
6.5.1.A. NO PURPOSE OF DONATION?	364
6.5.1.B. THE ROLE OF ERROR	365
<i>Error in fact and error in law: repetition</i>	365
<i>Excusable error</i>	366
<i>Error as a “mark” or “note” of recompense?</i>	366
<i>Error: private citizens and public authority</i>	367
<i>Error in the levying of tax; a Constitutional argument</i>	367
<i>Illegal Contracts (Pacta illicita)</i>	367
6.5.2. MATERIALS	368
6.5.2.A. ABSENCE OF CAUSE; NO PURPOSE OF DONATION?	368
6.SC.52. Stair, <i>Institutions</i>	368
6.SC.53. Bankton, <i>Institute</i>	368
6.SC.54. Court of Session, <i>Varney (Scotland) Ltd. v. Burgh of Lanark.</i> The burgh sewers	368
6.SC.55. Court of Session, <i>Lawrence Building Company v. Lanark County Council.</i> The council sewers	369
6.SC.56. Court of Session, <i>Shilliday v. Smith.</i> The disappointed co-habitee	369
6.SC.57. House of Lords, <i>Dollar Land (Cumbernauld) Ltd. v. CIN Properties Ltd.</i> The irritated lease	369
6.5.2.B. ERROR	370
6.SC.58. Bankton, <i>Institute</i>	370
6.SC.59. Erskine, <i>Institutes</i>	370

CONTENTS

6.SC.60. Whole Court of Session, <i>Stirling v. E of Lauderdale</i> . The earl paid in error	370
6.SC.61. Whole Court of Session, <i>Carrick v. Carse</i> . The careless cautioner	371
6.SC.62. Court of Session, <i>Taylor v. Wilson's Trs</i> . The incautious liquidator	371
6.SC.63. Court of Session, <i>Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York v. Lothian Regional Council</i> . The "swaps" case	372
6.5.2.C. ILLEGAL CONTRACT	374
6.SC.64. Laura Macgregor, "Illegal Contracts and Unjustified Enrichment"	374
6.SC.65. Court of Session, <i>Cuthbertson v. Lowes</i> . Potatoes by the "Scotch" acre	375
6.SC.66. Court of Session, <i>Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. Of New York v. Lothian Regional Council</i> . The "swaps" case	376
6.6. SOUTH AFRICAN LAW	376
6.6.1. INTRODUCTION	376
6.6.1.A. ENRICHMENT DUE TO TRANSFER	377
<i>Transfer of money or property on an obligation when there is in fact no obligation to make the transfer</i>	377
<i>Enrichment in the context of failed contracts</i>	379
6.6.1.B. ENRICHMENT DUE TO UNAUTHORISED EXPENDITURE	383
<i>The unauthorized administration of the affairs of another</i>	383
<i>Improvement of the physical property of another</i>	384
6.6.1.C. ENRICHMENT DUE TO ENCROACHMENT	388
6.6.2. MATERIALS	389
6.SA.67. S Eiselen and G Pienaar, <i>Unjustified Enrichment: A Casebook</i>	389
6.SA.68. <i>The Alienation of Land Rights Act, 68 of 1981, section 28</i>	391
6.SA.69. JE du Plessis, <i>Compulsion and Restitution</i>	392
6.SA.70. Supreme Court of Appeal, <i>Willis Faber Enthoven v. Receiver of Revenu</i> . Willis Faber	394
6.SA.71. Supreme Court of Appeal, <i>Bowman, De Wet and Du Plessis NNO v. Fidelity Bank Ltd</i> . Bowman, De Wet	402
6.SA.72. Durban and Coast Local Division, <i>Henry v. Branfield</i> . Henry	404
6.SA.73. Supreme Court of Appeal, <i>Visser v. Rousseau</i> . Visser	405
6.SA.74. Supreme Court of Appeal, <i>Thompson v. Scholtz</i> . Thompson	408
6.SA.75. Cape Provincial Division, <i>Standard Bank Financial Services v. Taylam</i> . Taylam	415

CHAPTER SEVEN SUBSIDIARITY

7.1. ENGLISH LAW	425
<i>Introductory note</i>	425

CONTENTS

7.2. FRENCH LAW	427
7.2.1. INTRODUCTION	427
<i>Meaning and basis</i>	427
<i>Refinement of the principle</i>	427
<i>Distinction between obstacles of law and obstacles of fact</i>	428
<i>Criticism of the distinction</i>	429
<i>Recent developments</i>	430
<i>Subsidiarity and Cause</i>	430
7.2.2. MATERIALS	431
7.F.1. Cass. Req., 12 May 1914. <i>Clayette v. Liquidator of the Congregation of the Missionaries of La Salette</i> The Clayette case	432
7.F.2. Cass. civ., 2 March 1915. <i>Ville de Bagnères-de-Bigorre v. Brianhant</i>	432
7.F.3. Cass. Req., 11 September 1940. <i>Soc. des Habitations à bon marché de Saint-Servan v. Gorge</i>	433
7.F.4. Flour and Aubert, <i>Les Obligations</i> , 2. <i>Le Fait Juridique</i>	434
7.F.5. Jacques Mestre, <i>Case-note on the subsidiary character of the action de in rem verso</i>	436
7.F.6. Cass. civ., 3 June 1997. <i>Vallet v. Cie La Préservatrice Foncière</i>	437
7.F.7. B Nicholas, <i>Modern Developments in the French Law of Unjust Enrichment</i>	438
7.3. GERMAN LAW	440
7.3.1. INTRODUCTION	440
<i>Enrichment law and the owner-possessor relationship</i>	441
<i>Enrichment law and reversal of legal transactions according to §§ 346 sqq</i>	443
<i>Enrichment law and unauthorised management</i>	445
7.3.2. MATERIALS	446
7.G.8. D Reuter and M Martinek, <i>Ungerechtfertigte Bereicherung</i>	446
7.G.9. W Lorenz, “ <i>Inhalt und Umfang der Herausgabepflicht bei der Leistungskondiktion in rechtsvergleichender Sicht</i> ”	447
7.G.10. BGH, 29 September 1995. <i>Building on another’s land</i>	448
7.G.11. OLG München, 10 December 1987. <i>Ambulance</i>	449
7.4. DUTCH LAW	452
7.NL.12. EJM Schrage, “ <i>Unjustified Enrichment</i> ”	452
7.NL.13. Asser-Hartkamp, <i>Verbintenissenrecht</i>	455
7.NL.14. EFD Engelhard and GE van Maanen, “ <i>De vordering uit ongerechtvaardigde verrijking</i> ”	457
7.NL.15. JBM Vranken, <i>De strijd om het nieuwe verrijktingsrecht; literatuur versus rechtspraak</i>	460
7.NL.16. MH Bregstein, <i>Ongegronde vermogensvermeerdering</i>	461
7.NL.17. HCF Schoordijk, <i>Het algemeen gedeelte van het verbintenissenrecht naar het Nieuw Burgerlijk Wetboek</i>	466

CONTENTS

7.NL.18. Hoge Raad, 15 March 1996. <i>Van der Tuuk Adriani v. Batelaan</i> The Deprived GP.	466
7.NL.19. Hoge Raad, 2 February 2001. <i>Halsman v. Van der Graaf</i> The Deprived GP (2)	470
7.5. SCOTS LAW	470
<i>General Principle</i>	470
<i>Unjustified enrichment and contract</i>	470
7.SC.20. WDH Sellar, “Unjust Enrichment”	472
7.SC.21. Glog, <i>Contract</i>	474
7.SC.22. HL MacQueen, “Contract, unjustified enrichment and concurrent liability: a Scots perspective”	475
7.SC.23. R Evans-Jones, “Unjust Enrichment, Contract and the Third Reception of Roman Law in Scotland”	476
7.SC.24. Court of Session, <i>Varney (Scotland) Ltd. v. Burgh of Lanark.</i> The burgh sewers	477
7.SC.25. Court of Session, <i>Lawrence Building Co. v. Lanark County Council.</i> The council sewers	478
7.SC.26. House of Lords, <i>Dollar Land (Cumbernauld) Ltd. v. CIN Properties Ltd.</i> The irritated lease	479
7.SC.27. Court of Session, <i>Watson v. Shankland.</i> The charterparty which failed	479
7.SC.28. House of Lords, <i>Cantiere San Rocco v. Clyde Shipbuilding and Engineering Company Ltd.</i> Marine engines for Trieste	480
7.SC.29. Court of Session, <i>Ramsay & Son v. Brand.</i> The badly constructed cottage	481
7.SC.30. Court of Session, <i>Graham & Company v. United Turkey Red Company Limited.</i> The commission agent	482
7.SC.31. Court of Session, <i>Zemhunt (Holdings) Ltd. v. Control Securities plc.</i> The ten per cent deposit	483
7.SC.32. Court of Session, <i>Connelly v. Simpson.</i> The transfer of shares	484
7.6. SOUTH AFRICAN LAW	486
<i>Introductory note</i>	486
7.SA.33. Witwatersrand Provincial Division, <i>ABSA Bank Ltd. v. De Klerk.</i> ABSA Bank	487

CHAPTER EIGHT INTEREST, FAULT AND RISK

8.1. ENGLISH LAW	490
<i>Introductory note</i>	490
8.E.1. Court of Appeal, <i>Owen v. Tate.</i> The Generous Friend and the Nervous Guarantor	491
8.E.2. Court of Appeal, <i>Falcke v. Scottish Imperial Insurance.</i> The Volunteer Payer	492

CONTENTS

8.2. FRENCH LAW	493
8.2.1. INTRODUCTION	493
<i>The case of the genealogis</i>	494
<i>A different view</i>	495
<i>The plaintiff who is at fault</i>	495
8.2.2. MATERIALS	496
8.F.3. G Viney, <i>note on Cass. civ., 3 June 1997</i>	496
8.F.4. J Mestre, Extracts from two case-notes on the effect of the plaintiff's fault	497
8.3. GERMAN LAW	498
8.3.1. INTRODUCTION	498
<i>Awareness of the non-existing obligation</i>	498
<i>Own interest</i>	499
<i>Own risk</i>	500
<i>Violation of statutory prohibition or good morals</i>	501
8.3.2. MATERIALS	503
8.G.5. BS Marquesinis, W Lorenz and G Danneman, <i>The Law of Contracts and Restitution: a comparative introduction</i>	503
8.G.6. BGH, 7 May 1997. Insurance premiums.	504
8.G.7. BGH, 5 October 1993. Honorary counsel of Sierra Leone	506
8.4. DUTCH LAW	508
8.NL.8. EJH Schrage, " <i>Unjustified Enrichment; Recent Dutch developments from a comparative and historical perspective</i> "	508
8.NL.9. JBM Vranken, <i>De strijd om het nieuwe verrijkingsrecht; literatuur versus rechtsspraak</i>	510
8.NL.10. Hoge Raad, 28 June 1996. <i>M-Group v. The Collector of taxes on income, profits and net wealth</i> Location of tax assessments	514
8.5. SCOTS LAW	515
<i>Introductory note</i>	515
8.SC.11. Gloag, <i>Contract</i>	516
8.SC.12. Court of Session, <i>Varney (Scotland) Ltd. v. Burgh of Lanark.</i> The burgh sewers	517
8.SC.13. Court of Session, <i>Lawrence Building Co. v. Lanark County Council.</i> The council sewers	518
8.SC.14. Court of Session, <i>Newton v. Newton.</i> The disappointed husband	519
8.SC.15. Court of Session, <i>Shilliday v. Smith.</i> The disappointed co-habitee	520
8.6. SOUTH AFRICAN LAW	521

CONTENTS

CHAPTER NINE RESTITUTION FOR WRONGS

9.1. ENGLISH LAW	524
9.1.1. INTRODUCTION	524
<i>Torts, intellectual property infringements and equitable wrongs</i>	525
<i>Breach of contract</i>	527
9.1.2. MATERIALS	530
9.E.1. House of Lords, <i>United Australia Ltd. v. Barclays Bank Ltd.</i> Conversion of cheque	530
9.US.2. Court of Appeals of Kentucky, <i>Edwards v. Lee's administrators.</i> The Great Onyx Cave	532
9.E.3. Queen's Bench Division, <i>Penarth Dock Engineering Co Ltd. v. Pounds.</i> The floating pontoon	533
9.E.4. Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, <i>Inverugie Investments Ltd. v. Hackett.</i> The hotel rooms	533
9.E.5. Court of Appeal, <i>Stoke-on-Trent City Council v. W and J Wass Ltd.</i> The rival market	535
9.E.6. Court of Appeal, <i>Halifax Building Society v. Thomas.</i> The lying mortgager	537
9.E.7. House of Lords, <i>Attorney-General v. Blake.</i> Profits from the spy's book	538
9.2. FRENCH LAW	543
<i>Introductory note</i>	543
9.F.8. Cass. Req., 21 December 1926. <i>Chemin de fer du Nord v. Soc. anon. des Mines d'Alais</i>	543
9.3. GERMAN LAW	544
9.3.1. INTRODUCTION	544
<i>Punitive elements in the law of enrichment</i>	544
<i>The law of delict instead of the law of enrichment?</i>	546
9.3.2. MATERIALS	548
9.G.9. M Lieb, <i>Münchener Kommentar zum Bürgerlichen Gesetzbuch</i>	548
9.G.10. BGH, 7 January 1971. Air journey ("Flugreise-Fall")	549
9.G.11. BGH, 15 November 1995. Caroline of Monaco	553
9.G.12. P Schlechtriem, " <i>Anmerkung zu BGH, Urteil v. 15.11.1995</i> "	555
9.4. DUTCH LAW	556
<i>Introductory note</i>	556
9.NL.13. Hoge Raad, 24 December 1993. <i>Waeyen-Scheers v. Naus</i> Restitution for wrongdoing	558
9.NL.14. Hoge Raad, 14 April 2000. <i>HBS Trading BV and Spendax BV v. Danestyle Leisure Accessories A/S</i> Forged headrests	561

CONTENTS

9.5. SCOTS LAW	563
<i>Introductory note</i>	563
9.SC.15. John Blackie, “Enrichment and Wrongs in Scots Law”	564
9.SC.16. John Blackie, “Enrichment, Wrongs and Invasions of Rights in Scots Law”	564
9.6. SOUTH AFRICAN LAW	565
<i>Introductory note</i>	565
9.SA.17. DH van Zyl, <i>Enrichment and Wrongs in South African Law</i>	566
9.SA.18. Transvaal Provincial Division <i>Montres Rolex SA v. Kleynhans</i> . Montres Rolex	569
Provisions of the Dutch Civil Code	573
Provisions of the BGB	576