

**CONTRACTS:
LAW IN ACTION**

CONTRACTS: LAW IN ACTION

Volume I
The Introductory Course
Fourth Edition

Stewart Macaulay
Professor of Law Emeritus
University of Wisconsin Law School

William Whitford
Professor of Law Emeritus
University of Wisconsin Law School

Kathryn Hendley
William Voss-Bascom Professor of Law and Political Science
University of Wisconsin Law School

Jonathan Lipson
Harold E. Kohn Chair and Professor of Law
Temple University Beasley School of Law



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2016
Carolina Academic Press, LLC
All Rights Reserved

Looseleaf ISBN: 978-1-52210-406-3
ISBN: 978-1-5221-0404-9

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016939504

Carolina Academic Press, LLC
700 Kent Street
Durham, NC 27701
Telephone (919) 489-7486
Fax (919) 493-5668
www.caplax.com

Printed in the United States of America

Preface to the Fourth Edition

New editions of *Contracts: Law in Action* allow us to offer new cases and statutes to keep our materials up to date. In this edition, we continue the philosophy and the coverage of the first three editions; once again, we are republishing the preface to the second edition, in which that philosophy is described.

As in previous editions, the cases have been edited to make them easier to read. We have used ellipses whenever substantive text has been omitted from the body of an opinion, but some case citations and many footnotes have been omitted without indication. The footnote numbers in our text do not match the footnote numbers in the cases, since we number our footnotes sequentially by chapter. When we reproduce footnotes from cases, we have indicated the original footnote number by putting it in brackets: []. When we have added our own footnote to a case, it is indicated by an “Eds. note,” also in brackets.

The list of authors has changed; we have added Kathryn Hendley and Jonathan Lipson to our group. Each of them brings something new to the enterprise. Professor Hendley is one of the foremost scholars of law in the transition from socialism to capitalism in Russia. Professor Lipson has long experience as a corporate lawyer and transaction planner. Each has used earlier editions of *Contracts: Law in Action* for a number of years.

Sadly, two of the authors of our third edition have died since it was published. John Kidwell’s participation in the creation and development of the book dates back to its earliest days. First and foremost, John was a great and award-winning teacher, and he insisted that the materials had to work in class. We knew that if John had a problem teaching something in the book, it had to be fixed.

John also wrote bar exam questions, and he insisted that our course had to play a real part in transforming beginners into skilled lawyers. John was sympathetic to the goal of fashioning a modern contracts course that emphasized law in action, but he worried about losing something important if and when we abandoned what had long been in the traditional course.

He was a wonderful colleague, always prepared to go above and beyond any possible call of duty to get the manuscript to the publisher in a timely manner, to get a jointly composed exam completed, or to help newly minted law school professors cope with their first classes. John wrote the following about himself for his law school profile: “He enjoys reading, listening to music,¹ idle conversation, and the game of poker. His favorite composer is J.S. Bach, and his favorite writer is John McPhee. He subscribes to too many magazines.”

Jean Braucher first used a photocopied version of *Contracts: Law in Action* in 1992 at the University of Cincinnati Law School, and she continued teaching from it when she

¹ John often opened class by playing a song that fit one or more of the cases for that day. For example, when he taught *Vokes v. Arthur Murray*, he treated students raised on rock and roll to an ancient Jimmy Dorsey big band recording of “Arthur Murray Taught Me Dancing in a Hurry.”

Jonathan Lipson carries on John’s tradition, albeit with a lower brow. He opens the class on *Hadley v. Baxendale* with the “Theme from Shaft,” for example.

Preface to the Fourth Edition

moved to the University of Arizona in 1998. We appreciated her kind words about the book when it was first published:²

[*Contracts: Law in Action*] weaves the history, philosophy, sociology, and doctrine of contract into a vibrant if troubling picture, confronting students with the conflicts, complexities, and above all, the limits of the subject. [The authors] challenge students to become “skeptical idealists” in the practice of law. Their approach is both theoretically sophisticated and thoroughly practical.

Jean had done empirical research on the practices of lawyers in consumer bankruptcy,³ and she worked on law reform in many places, including the American Law Institute and the Uniform Law Commission (formerly known as the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws).

In November 2007, Jean accepted our offer to become an author and editor for the third, and all subsequent, editions of *Contracts: Law in Action*. The publisher had insisted that the new edition of the book not be any longer than the previous one: if we added anything, we had to take something out. Jean enforced this rule, pushed us to bring the book up to date, and was always on the lookout for ways in which new statutes, new standard contracts clauses — and especially recent advances in technology — presented new settings for the classic problems dealt with in traditional contracts courses.

Jean used these materials for 22 years and edited them for seven. She concluded from this and other experiences: “The law does not march forward so much as stumble on . . . Law is about social struggle, and we never get neat, perfect conclusions.”⁴

We have missed, and will continue to miss, John and Jean. Both contributed so much to this project. In the preparation of both this edition and the third edition, we also had the extraordinary assistance of Ellen Vinz (J.D., University of Wisconsin Law School, 2011), a professional copyeditor as well as a former lawyer. We were also assisted by Erica Maier at Temple University Beasley School of Law and the following student research assistants: Andrew Brehm (J.D., University of Wisconsin Law School, 2015); Miranda Bullard (J.D., Temple University Beasley School of Law, 2017); and Nicholas Zuiker (J.D., University of Wisconsin Law School, 2015).

Stewart Macaulay
William Whitford
Kathryn Hendley
Jonathan Lipson

September 15, 2015

² Jean Braucher, *The Afterlife of Contract*, 90 NW. U.L. REV. 49, 52–53 (1995).

³ See Jean Braucher, *Lawyers and Consumer Bankruptcy: One Code, Many Cultures*, 67 AM. BANKR. L.J. 501 (1993).

⁴ See William Whitford, *Jean Braucher’s Contracts World View*, 58 ARIZ. L. REV. 13, 31 (2016).

Preface to the Second Edition

We revised our book for a number of reasons. Most importantly, our original book and this revision reject the idea that contract law is no more than a small collection of timeless principles. Contracts problems change as the society changes. Corporate lawyers also have been busy, seeking ways to use the form of contract to ward off liability to employees and consumers. Fashions in scholarly work reflect changes in the academy as we move through cycles of classical contract; realist judging in the grand style; dedication to the consumer movement; reductionist pursuits of efficiency, default rules, and formalism; and, perhaps, the coming new realism that reflects a law and society perspective. We have reviewed the entire book to see where we should reflect these changes and new developments, but the major effort has been devoted to bringing up to date our materials on such matters as unconscionability, form contracts printed in fine print or hidden in other ways (particularly in the area of computer programs), and the growing uses of arbitration to repeal the reform statutes of earlier decades. These are the interesting and important matters coming before the courts when this revision was prepared, and we expect these topics to have a fairly long shelf life.

At the same time, those who have used *Contracts: Law in Action* in the past will find much of the book unchanged or only slightly modified. After teaching *Contracts: Law in Action* and earlier photocopied versions for about 20 years, the authors think that the book works. Moreover, it has worked for instructors who emphasize very different approaches in their teaching. The original book and the revision both take the “Law in Action” part of the title seriously. Putting contract problems in context makes the course both more theoretical and more practical at the same time. Whatever a person’s theoretical outlook, there is a high price to be paid if he or she forgets such things as that law is not free; most disputes end in settlement; crafting nice-sounding legal standards is one thing but finding evidence to establish a cause of action is another; and that all institutions, including the market, are flawed. American contract law is messy and often contradictory. Even when the form of the rules stay more or less the same, their application varies from court to court over time. Yet the flaws in our contract law have not blocked great economic progress or caused recessions. We quote Wittgenstein near the beginning of the course: “Is it even always an advantage to replace an indistinct picture by a sharp one? Isn’t the indistinct one often exactly what we need?” At the very least, the answer to this question cannot just be assumed away. We also have been pleased to discover that many of our former students find that our course prepares them to hit the ground running when they begin practice. We have tried to focus on live contracts problems that our students will face when they become lawyers.

We are heavily in debt to contracts teachers at schools other than Wisconsin who have used *CLA*. We have had an e-mail list for those interested in the book. Our friends at other schools have contributed ideas and suggestions, and they have asked us to explain why we did certain things. Sometimes we have been able to explain choices we made long ago, and when we could not we rethought what we had done. We have learned a great deal from these friends. While we risk leaving out people who deserve mention, we wish to thank particularly Tom Russell, Tom Stipanowich, Bill Woodward, Sandy Meiklejohn, Alan Hunt, Jean Braucher, Peter Linzer, and Carolyn Brown. In addition, we staged a conference in the fall of 2001. We gathered many who had used the book and

Preface to the Second Edition

other friends whose contributions we wanted to hear. The papers were later published in 2001 *Wisconsin Law Review* 525–1006. The papers, discussions, and final articles helped us in the revision process.

The authors are not the only people at Wisconsin who have taught from the book. We have a small-group program in which each first-year student gets one class of around 20 students, and Contracts 1 often has been that class. This means that we have many contracts teachers at Wisconsin. Those teaching the course have met for lunch once a week during the semester. The authors have been challenged by the experiences and questions of their colleagues. In addition to Joe Thome, who was thanked in our original preface and who continued to teach from the materials until recently, we should acknowledge the many contributions of Kathryn Hendley, Lawrence Bugge, Gordon Smith, and Lori Ringhand (now at the University of Kentucky Law School). Lori was a beginning law teacher when she joined us, and she helped us rewrite the employment-at-will material and paid particular attention to the teaching notes that we have made available to those who use the book. She has revised them, pulling together the one set created by John Kidwell and the other by Stewart Macaulay. Our colleague Marc Galanter decided not to participate in the second edition of *Contracts: Law in Action*. He has not taught contracts for some time. However, he did present a paper at our 2001 contracts conference, and the revision still reflects his many contributions to the original version of the book. Also, Nicole Denow (J.D., Wisconsin, 2001) was a talented and hard-working research assistant in the revision of the materials dealing with policing contracts, and Nora Kersten (J.D., Wisconsin, 2002) did many memos that were helpful in expanding some of the notes, or in verifying that no changes were required.

We also owe a debt to the thousands of law students who have worked their way through *Contracts: Law in Action* and its photocopied predecessors. For example, Donovan Bezer, then a student at Rutgers Law School, sent us his reactions, which we found provocative. Other students have known one or more of the parties who appear in the cases in the book, or they have known much about the kinds of transactions involved. We have been reassured that the book has prompted students to see the hard choices lurking behind what seem to be the simple rules of contract law.

Americans, of course, always want to have their cake and eat it too. One student, who identified herself as a liberal, sent us an e-mail saying, “This class has put me in touch with my inner Republican, and I am not sure that I like *him*.” Students have also reminded us that most of them are twenty-something, and what we see as things “everyone knows” are but ancient history to them. Students stay about the same age while authors age. Thus, we have tried to change examples so that they will not date too fast and explain a little about such “commonplace things” as the Vietnam conflict, OPEC, the consumer movement, and other manifestations of pre-Reagan politics — as well as what were ice houses, dial telephones, and typewriters. While we find it hard to believe, many of our students have never heard of Shirley MacLaine, Lee Marvin, or Bette Davis. We, on the other hand, are not great followers of River Phoenix. All of these stars, of course, play the parts of litigants in contracts cases.

During the past decade or so, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law and the American Law Institute have attempted to revise Article 2 of the Uniform Commercial Code. We debated what to do with the proposed revisions. Then our friend Richard Speidel found the process intolerable and felt that he had to resign as the Reporter after twelve years of work. At the time this is being written, it seems

Preface to the Second Edition

unlikely that there will be ambitious changes to Article 2, with the possible exception of the addition of a highly controversial separate statute dealing with computer-related transactions. There is a risk that states may end up moving in the direction of creating “Un-Uniform Commercial Codes.” As a result, we decided not to include material on the proposed revisions. Instructors, of course, may want to offer their classes particular proposals as a way to raise policy questions about the current law. However, we think that it is hard enough finding your way around Article 2 without having to navigate two or more versions.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	OVERVIEW OF LAW IN ACTION	1
B.	STUDYING LAW: WHAT AM I HERE FOR?	2
1.	Classical Legal Education	2
2.	Criticism of Classical Legal Thought: Other Perspectives	6
3.	Law School Examinations	12
C.	CONTRACTS COURSES	15
1.	The Goals of the Law-in-Action Approach to the Contracts Course	15
2.	The Law-in-Action Course in Historical Perspective	19
3.	Law in Action — Building on this History	25
Chapter 2	REMEDIES FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT	31
A.	PROTECTING THE EXPECTATION INTEREST	31
1.	A Long, But Necessary, Digression: Of Two Codes, Reading Statutes, and the Application of Article 2 of the Uniform Commercial Code	32
	Robert Braucher, <i>Legislative History of the Uniform Commercial Code</i>	35
	Jean Braucher, <i>New Basics: 12 Principles for Fair Commerce in Mass-Market Software and Other Digital Products, in Consumer Protection in the Age of the “Information Economy”</i>	39
	LUDWIG WITTGENSTEIN, PHILOSOPHICAL INVESTIGATIONS	45
2.	The Expectation Interest: The Substitute Contract as the Preferred Means to the End	46
B.	THE EXPECTATION INTEREST: OF INFERIOR SUBSTITUTES, OTHER ENDS, AND OTHER MEANS	47
	<i>Parker v. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.</i>	48
	Notes and Questions	54
	<i>Neri v. Retail Marine Corp.</i>	61
	Notes and Questions	65
	<i>In re Worldcom (Jordan v. Worldcom)</i>	74
	Notes and Questions	82
C.	THE EXPECTATION INTEREST: PERFORMANCE RATHER THAN DAMAGES	85
	<i>Copylease Corp. of America v. Memorex Corp.</i>	85
	Notes and Questions	88
D.	THE EXPECTATION INTEREST: BREACH DETERRENCE VERSUS LIQUIDATED DAMAGES	95

Table of Contents

	<i>Lake River Corp. v. Carborundum Co.</i>	95
	Notes and Questions	101
E.	THE EXPECTATION INTEREST: LOST ANTICIPATED PROFITS AND CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES	108
1.	The Foreseeability Test	108
	<i>Hadley v. Baxendale</i>	108
	Notes and Questions	110
2.	Proof of Damages with Reasonable Certainty: Of New Businesses and Experts	115
	<i>Chung v. Kaonohi Center Co.</i>	116
	Notes and Questions	123
F.	THE EXPECTATION INTEREST: SOME CONCLUDING PERSPECTIVES	125
1.	Should the Expectation Interest Always Be Fully Protected?	125
	Notes and Questions	130
2.	Does It Make Any Difference Whether the Law Protects the Expectation Interest?	131
	Karl N. Llewellyn, <i>What Price Contract? — An Essay In Perspective</i>	131
	Stewart Macaulay, <i>The Use and Non-Use of Contracts in the Manufacturing Industry</i>	132
G.	THE RELIANCE INTEREST	133
	<i>Security Stove & Manufacturing Co. v. American Railways Express Co.</i>	135
	Notes and Questions	140
	<i>L. Albert & Son v. Armstrong Rubber Co.</i>	142
	Notes and Questions	145
H.	RESTITUTION AND EXIT AS ALTERNATIVE CONTRACT REMEDIES	148
1.	Introduction	148
2.	Walking Away From a Deal: Exit and Restitution	149
a.	Sales of goods	149
	BERTELL OLLMAN, CLASS STRUGGLE IS THE NAME OF THE GAME: TRUE CONFESSIONS OF A MARXIST BUSINESSMAN	150
	Notes and Questions	154
	<i>Colonial Dodge, Inc. v. Miller</i>	156
	Notes and Questions	159
	<i>Colonial Dodge, Inc. v. Miller</i>	160
	Notes and Questions	164
b.	Substantial performance in building contracts	166
	Notes and Questions	168

Table of Contents

3.	Restitution and <i>Quantum Meruit</i> as an Alternative Remedy for Breach of Contract	168
a.	The remedy and its impact	168
	<i>Paffhausen v. Balano</i>	169
	Notes and Questions	172
	<i>United States ex rel. Coastal Steel Erectors v. Algernon Blair, Inc.</i>	174
	Notes and Questions	176
I.	RESTITUTION FOR THE PLAINTIFF IN DEFAULT	180
	<i>De Leon v. Aldrete</i>	181
	Notes and Questions	185
J.	MEASURING DAMAGES FOR SUBJECTIVE LOSSES	186
	<i>Peevyhouse v. Garland Coal & Mining Co.</i>	187
	Notes and Questions	194
	<i>Hawkins v. McGee</i>	202
	Notes and Questions	205
	<i>Sullivan v. O'Connor</i>	211
	Notes and Questions	216
K.	SOME REVIEW PROBLEMS	216
Chapter 3		CONTRACT AND CONTINUING RELATIONS 221
A.	INTRODUCTION	221
1.	The Vocabulary of Contract Formation	226
a.	An introduction to the rules of offer and acceptance	226
	A Doctrinal Note — Contract Formation	226
b.	Some practice problems	234
2.	A Policy Approach to Judicial Intervention	237
B.	CONTRACT IN THE FAMILY SETTING	238
1.	Which Promises Should the Law Enforce? Illustrations and Issues	238
a.	Courts and contracts between husband and wife	238
	<i>Balfour v. Balfour</i>	239
	Notes and Questions	241
	<i>Ansin v. Craven-Ansin</i>	242
	Notes and Questions	245
b.	Marriage and cohabitation contracts	252
	<i>Marvin v. Marvin</i>	252
	Notes and Questions	263
2.	Which Promises Should the Law Enforce? — The Response of Contract Doctrine and the Role of Form	276
a.	“Bait”: promises by a family member with money to influence the lives of those without it	276
	<i>Hamer v. Sidway</i>	280

Table of Contents

	Notes and Questions	283
3.	An Introduction to the Doctrine of Consideration	288
	A Doctrinal Note — Consideration	288
4.	The Conditional Gift Revisited	297
	<i>Kirksey v. Kirksey</i>	297
	Notes and Questions	298
	<i>Ricketts v. Scothorn</i>	298
	Notes and Questions	301
5.	The Statute of Frauds and Family “Bait” Promises	307
	Notes and Questions	316
6.	Family Bait: Reaching the Right Result by Manipulating Doctrines of Contract Formation	322
	<i>Davis v. Jacoby</i>	322
	Notes and Questions	327
7.	Contracts to Provide for the Old: Contract and Restitution as a Substitute for an Extended Family	335
8.	If Law Is to Intervene, What Remedies Are Appropriate?	345
a.	Reliance and the expectation interest in the family context	345
b.	Specific performance and “shotgun marriages”	347
	<i>Brackenbury v. Hodgkin</i>	348
	Notes and Questions	350
9.	Alternatives to Litigation in Family Matters	352
a.	Stories from other societies	353
b.	“Alternatives” in American society	356
c.	Calls for new approaches and the practice of law	356
i.	<i>Calls for mediation rather than adjudication</i>	357
ii.	<i>Alternative dispute resolution and the practice of law</i>	359
	Marc Galanter, <i>Worlds of Deals: Using Negotiation to Teach</i> <i>About Legal Process</i>	361
iii.	<i>Compensating care for the old</i>	362
C.	FRANCHISE AND EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS	364
1.	The Franchise	365
a.	Creating the relationship	365
	<i>Hoffman v. Red Owl Stores, Inc.</i>	365
	Notes and Questions	374
b.	Ending the relationship	383
	<i>Collins Drugs, Inc. v. Walgreen Co.</i>	389
	Notes and Questions	399
2.	Grievance Processes Under Collective Bargaining	406
a.	Grievance systems	407
b.	Arbitration versus adjudication	408

Table of Contents

	<i>In re Trans World Airlines, Inc.</i>	408
	Notes and Questions	411
c.	Judicial review of arbitration	415
3.	Employment Relations	417
a.	Proving employment contracts and gaining meaningful remedies . . .	418
	<i>McIntosh v. Murphy</i>	419
	Notes and Questions	424
4.	Employment-at-Will	425
a.	Introduction	425
b.	Development of the at-will doctrine	427
c.	Attempts to provide meaningful protections to employees-at-will . . .	430
	<i>Wagenseller v. Scottsdale Memorial Hospital</i>	436
	Notes and Questions	446
d.	The “covenant of good faith” exception	454
e.	Reflecting on the struggle over employment-at-will	454
i.	<i>Restatement § 90 to the rescue?</i>	455
ii.	<i>Employment-at-will and the free market</i>	456
iii.	<i>Employment-at-will and the idea of “consent”</i>	457
iv.	<i>Farber and Matheson on the employer’s need to build “trust”</i> . .	458
v.	<i>Employment-at-will as protecting the already-protected</i>	459
vi.	<i>The costs of limiting the at-will rule</i>	460
vii.	<i>The American rule(s) contrasted with other industrialized</i> <i>nations</i>	461
f.	In conclusion . . . a hypothetical	462
D.	LONG-TERM RELATIONSHIPS IN COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS	463
1.	“Braiding”: Relational Norms and Sanctions Intertwined with Legal Ones	464
2.	Contract Law in Action: Vindicating Rights or Provoking Compromise and Settlement?	471
3.	Commercial Relationships and Private Governments	472
a.	Negotiation and mediation	473
b.	Arbitration	476
	Marvin T. Fabyanske & Steven T. Halverson, <i>Arbitration: Is It an Acceptable Method of Resolving Construction and Contract Disputes?</i>	477
Chapter 4	SOCIAL CONTROL OF FREE CONTRACT	481
A.	SOCIAL CONTROL AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST	483
1.	Illegal Contracts	483
a.	Introduction	483

Table of Contents

b.	Illegality: form and substance	484
	<i>Carroll v. Beardon</i>	485
	Notes and Questions	486
c.	Comparative fault	488
	<i>Coma Corp. v. Kansas Department of Labor</i>	489
	Notes and Questions	496
	<i>Karpinski v. Collins</i>	497
	Notes and Questions	499
2.	Contracts Against Public Policy	501
a.	Introduction	501
b.	Covenants by employees not to compete	501
	<i>Fullerton Lumber Co. v. Torborg</i>	502
	Notes and Questions	508
B.	SOCIAL CONTROL, CONTRACT, AND CHOICE	512
1.	Introduction	512
2.	Capacity to Contract	515
a.	Mental incapacity to contract	515
	Notes and Questions	517
b.	Contracts made under the influence of drugs	519
c.	Contracts made with minors — infancy	520
3.	Duress	522
a.	The search for a standard	522
	<i>Mitchell v. C.C. Sanitation Co.</i>	524
	Notes and Questions	529
b.	The Wisconsin rule?	532
	<i>The Selmer Co. v. Blakeslee-Midwest Co.</i>	532
	Notes and Questions	535
4.	Undue Influence	543
5.	Misrepresentation	545
	<i>Obde v. Schlemeyer</i>	549
	Notes and Questions	552
6.	Good Faith	557
	<i>Market Street Associates v. Frey</i>	557
	Notes and Questions	563
7.	Most of the Theories at Once: A Review	565
	<i>Vokes v. Arthur Murray, Inc.</i>	566
	Notes and Questions	569
C.	SOCIAL CONTROL IN THE GUISE OF SEEKING CHOICE: FORM CONTRACTS AND CHOICE	574
	Stewart Macaulay, <i>Private Legislation and the Duty to Read — Business Run by IBM Machine, the Law of Contracts, and Credit Cards</i>	574

Table of Contents

	<i>McCutcheon v. David MacBrayne Ltd.</i>	575
	Notes and Questions	582
	<i>Yauger v. Skiing Enterprises, Inc.</i>	582
	Notes and Questions	586
	<i>ProCD, Inc. v. Zeidenberg</i>	590
	Notes and Questions	595
	<i>Hill v. Gateway 2000, Inc.</i>	599
	Notes and Questions	602
	<i>C & J Fertilizer, Inc. v. Allied Mut. Ins. Co.</i>	608
	Notes and Questions	615
D.	WARRANTY, DISCLAIMERS, AND REMEDY LIMITATIONS: THE UCC PATTERN	620
1.	Warranties as a Tool to Guard Expectations	620
2.	Warranties, Express and Implied	622
a.	The buyer's expectations and fair dealing: creating warranties	622
b.	The seller's free contract and fair dealing — warranty disclaimers and remedy limitations	624
c.	The necessary steps	625
3.	Conspicuous Disclaimers and Conscionable Remedy Limitations	626
	<i>Hunt v. Perkins Machinery Co., Inc.</i>	626
	Notes and Questions	629
4.	Parol Evidence, Warranties, and Standard Forms	633
	<i>Boud v. SDNCO, Inc.</i>	635
	Notes and Questions	640
5.	Regulating Warranties in Consumer Transactions	642
E.	UNCONSCIONABILITY	650
1.	The Origins	653
	<i>Williams v. Walker-Thomas Furniture Co.</i>	653
	Notes and Questions	657
2.	Challenges to Unconscionability: Ambiguity and Arbitration	663
a.	Ambiguity	663
b.	Arbitration	665
	Notes and Questions	668
3.	Public Enforcement and the Resurrection(?) of Unconscionability: The Field of Consumer Financial Protection	670
a.	State intervention in consumer financial services contracts	670
	<i>State of New Mexico ex rel. King v. B&B Investment Group, Inc.</i>	670
	Notes and Questions	683
b.	Dodd-Frank and the consumer financial protection bureau	685
	Notes and Questions	689

Table of Contents

Table of Cases **TC-1**

Table of Statutes **TS-1**

Index **I-1**
