

Applicant Number

MPT[®]

Multistate Performance Test

In re Mills

By breaking the seal on this test booklet, I certify that I am taking the Multistate Performance Test (MPT) for admission to the bar and for no other purpose, and I affirm that I have read, understand, and agree to the following:

NCBE COPYRIGHT NOTICE AND PENALTIES. I will not copy or otherwise reproduce any MPT questions or answers by any means or disclose any MPT questions or answers to any unauthorized individual or entity before, during, or after the examination, whether orally, in writing, electronically, or otherwise. I acknowledge that the MPT is owned by NCBE and protected by US copyright laws, and that any unauthorized disclosure of its contents—in whole or in part—could result in civil liability, criminal penalties, cancellation of my test scores, denial of my bar application on character and fitness grounds, and/or other consequences, including disciplinary action if I have been admitted to practice law.

NCBE DATA USE. MPT testing information and data, including personally identifiable information, may be shared by your testing jurisdiction with NCBE for scoring, research, exam security, and statistical and other purposes. Such information and data are held by NCBE in accordance with the NCBE Privacy Policy (<http://www.ncbex.org/privacy-policy>), which also applies to information found in or provided by way of NCBE Accounts. NCBE may contact you via email after the test administration to ask you to participate in a voluntary survey regarding your testing experience.

NCBE LIMITATION OF LIABILITY. Each jurisdiction is responsible for handling test registration, test administration, requests for testing accommodations, and the reporting of scores for its bar examination. In the unlikely event that an error or mistake occurs or a claim arises relating to any of these activities, you agree that any remedy will be determined and provided under the exclusive authority and discretion of your jurisdiction. NCBE is not responsible for any such errors, mistakes, or claims.

If you do not agree to any of the above policies and procedures, do NOT break the seal on this test booklet and do not proceed with taking the MPT.

**Read the directions on the back cover.
Do not break the seal until you are told to do so.**



302 S. Bedford St. | Madison, WI 53703 | 608-280-8550 | www.ncbex.org

© 2021 by the National Conference of Bar Examiners.

All rights reserved.

In re Mills

FILE

Memorandum to examinee1
File memorandum2
Initial email correspondence4
Event proposal5
Additional email correspondence7

LIBRARY

Daniels v. Smith, Franklin Court of Appeal (2011)9
Jasper Construction Co. v. Park-Central Inc., Franklin Court of Appeal (2014)13
Thompson v. Alamo Paper Products Inc., Franklin Court of Appeal (2017)14

FILE

WARREN, SANCHEZ & BANKS LLP
Attorneys at Law
2500 Washington Blvd., Suite 160
Franklin City, Franklin 33075

MEMORANDUM

To: Examinee
From: Isabel Banks
Date: February 23, 2021
Re: Charlotte Mills matter

Our client, Charlotte Mills, owns an event planning business that organizes various social and athletic events in the city of Garden Grove. Mills was recently retained by the Ramble Group (Ramble) to plan its annual Springfest, a two-day event featuring a festival and a five-kilometer run. After Mills had already begun preparations for the event, she was informed that Ramble would be using another event coordinator.

Mills wants to know whether she has any legal recourse against Ramble. We have discussed the possibility of pursuing a claim against Ramble for breach of contract based on the communications and/or documents that were exchanged between Mills and Ramble's owner, Kathryn Burton.

I need you to draft a memorandum to me analyzing whether there is an enforceable contract between Mills and Ramble and what damages Mills might be entitled to if she were to sue Ramble for breach of contract. Another associate will assess other potential issues such as promissory estoppel and specific performance.

Do not include a separate statement of facts in your memorandum, but be sure to incorporate the relevant facts, analyze the applicable legal authorities, and explain how the facts and law support your conclusions.

**WARREN, SANCHEZ & BANKS LLP
Attorneys at Law**

FILE MEMORANDUM

From: Isabel Banks
Date: February 12, 2021
Re: Charlotte Mills matter

This memorandum summarizes my meeting today with Charlotte Mills regarding a potential business dispute:

- Mills is the owner of Mills Event Management (MEM), an event planning and coordination business that handles approximately 20 events per year, including festivals, races, galas, and fundraisers. MEM is basically a “one-woman show”; Mills handles all aspects of the business, bringing in paid helpers as needed.
- Mills has been in the event planning business for three years. Her services are increasingly in demand because she brings a creative perspective to the events she organizes, which boosts event attendance and enhances public and media awareness of the events and their hosts.
- In June of 2020, Mills was contacted by Ramble Group, a company in Garden Grove that hosts the popular Springfest event.
- Springfest is a weekend event that kicks off with a five-kilometer “Fun Run” at 8 a.m. on Saturday, followed by a festival the rest of Saturday and all day Sunday. The festival includes live music, food and beverages, vendor booths featuring local artists, and kids’ activities such as face painting.
- Springfest is held in April, typically the first or second weekend of the month. Springfest 2021 will be the fourth annual Springfest.
- Mills’s first contact with Ramble Group was a phone call from Ramble’s owner, Kathryn Burton, on June 3, 2020. In that phone call, Burton asked about Mills’s availability to organize and coordinate Springfest 2021, explaining that the event planning company that Ramble had used in other years was not available.

- During the call, Mills and Burton also brainstormed ideas for Springfest 2021, including possible venues, musical groups, and ways to boost attendance and enhance Ramble’s marketing opportunities related to the event. The call ended with Burton saying that she was excited about the prospect of working with Mills.
- Mills and Burton exchanged several emails after the initial phone call, including an email from Mills to Burton that attached a written event planning proposal for Springfest 2021.
- The written proposal was never signed by either party, but Ramble paid the initial \$2,000 deposit outlined in the proposal.
- After Mills received the deposit, she began preparations for Springfest 2021, including the following:
 - contacting the city and county and securing the necessary permits for the event, which entailed filling out application forms and paying permitting fees
 - preparing a preliminary budget and master plan for the event
 - creating a new Springfest 2021 website to incorporate the themes and ideas discussed with Burton and paying related webhosting and domain fees
 - reserving Discovery Park and the Garden Grove Promenade as alternate venues for the festival portion of the event
 - designing a preliminary racecourse map for the five-kilometer run
 - contacting local musicians about performing at the event (no bands booked yet, but four bands confirmed to be available)
- In all, Mills’s out-of-pocket expenses totaled \$3,000.
- While working on these tasks, Mills gave regular updates to Burton, mostly by telephone. At no time did Burton express concerns about Mills’s event preparations.
- On August 10, 2020, Mills received a phone call from Burton stating that Burton had decided to use another event planning company for Springfest 2021.
- Mills tried to line up a replacement event planning engagement for around the same time as Springfest 2021 but was unable to do so.

Initial Email Correspondence between Charlotte Mills and Kathryn Burton

From: Kathryn Burton <kburton@ramblefranklin.com>
To: Charlotte Mills <cmills@memfranklin.com>
Subject: Springfest 2021
Date: June 4, 2020

Charlotte, it was a pleasure talking with you yesterday! I like the concepts you have for Springfest 2021, including your idea of inviting gourmet food trucks to serve food in addition to traditional food/beverage booths. I think your ideas for marketing and branding strategies would significantly increase event attendance and enhance Ramble's visibility as the event's host. For the last two years, we have nearly doubled attendance, and I'd like to see that trend continue this year.

Can you send me a proposal outlining the event planning, coordination, and oversight services you provide? We can decide on the event date and location later—it needs to be either the first or second weekend in April 2021, preferably in or near downtown Garden Grove.

From: Charlotte Mills <cmills@memfranklin.com>
To: Kathryn Burton <kburton@ramblefranklin.com>
Subject: Springfest 2021
Date: June 4, 2020

Hi, Kathryn. I'm very excited about the possibility of working with Ramble Group to make Springfest 2021 the best Springfest ever! As to potential event dates, I don't currently have any events booked for the first and second weekends in April 2021, so either weekend would be fine.

Some options for the venue would be the Garden Grove Promenade (which has green space and more room for food trucks), the Old Town Waterfront (across the bridge from downtown Garden Grove), and Discovery Park (probably the best option if you want the event to be in the heart of the downtown). All three venues could accommodate an event of this size. They all have adjacent roadways for the five-kilometer run, so it shouldn't be a problem to get the city permits for the run and police department approvals for road closures along the racecourse.

I'm attaching my proposal. Please review it and let me know if you have any questions.

MILLS EVENT MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL

[attached to Mills's email of June 4, 2020]

Mills Event Management (MEM) is pleased to offer its professional management services for the Springfest 2021 event hosted by Ramble Group (Client). Services include event logistics, venue and course design, event consultation and guidance, and event marketing and branding. MEM will also oversee the hiring of necessary services, equipment rentals and deliveries, apparel ordering, and merchandise and awards if needed.

SCOPE OF WORK

MEM proposes to work alongside Client by providing professional event management services. This proposal outlines the pre-event and event-day services necessary to produce a smooth, safe, and professionally staged event.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF MILLS EVENT MANAGEMENT

Pre-Event Logistics and Planning

- Research and provide guidance on event date and location
- Prepare preliminary budget and master plan including venue and racecourse maps
- Reserve venue(s) and pay initial venue deposit(s) subject to reimbursement by Client
- Obtain necessary approvals and permits from the police department, city, and county
- Website assistance or design if needed
- Coordinate with city officials on necessary road closures, detours, parking areas, etc.
- Assist with selecting an emcee, DJ, and bands, if applicable

* * *

Event-Day Site Logistics

* * *

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CLIENT

- All financial obligations and expenses stemming from the event, including reimbursement of any expenses incurred by MEM. Such expenses may include but are not limited to (1) special event fees and permits, (2) facility rental fees, (3) website hosting, and (4) advertising and marketing.
- Solicitation and recruitment of all volunteers

- Acquisition and purchase of event insurance
- Neighborhood notification of residences and businesses as required by city
- Setup, breakdown, and removal of equipment rented or donated for event

EVENTS INCLUDED IN AGREEMENT

NAME	VENUE	DATE
Springfest 2021	To Be Determined	To Be Determined

It is understood that any event not yet determined or outlined with name, venue, and date will be scheduled according to the availability of MEM.

PAYMENT

Client shall pay MEM \$15,000 for up to the first 1,000 registrations or tickets sold and \$2 per additional registration or ticket sold. Client shall pay \$2,000 of this fee as a nonrefundable deposit before commencement of services.

Client shall reimburse MEM for any event-related expenses incurred by MEM.

All payments and reimbursements are due to MEM no later than seven days following completion of the event.

Should the event be canceled, a minimum payment of \$2,500 will be due at cancellation, plus reimbursement of any event-related expenses incurred by MEM. Work will begin after initial deposit is received. Please make checks payable to Mills Event Management.

ACCEPTANCE OF TERMS

We the undersigned accept the terms of payment and scope of work outlined in this agreement.

Ramble Group
Name/Title:
Date: _____

Mills Event Management
Name/Title:
Date: _____

Additional Email Correspondence between Charlotte Mills and Kathryn Burton

From: Kathryn Burton <kburton@ramblefranklin.com>
To: Charlotte Mills <cmills@memfranklin.com>
Subject: Springfest 2021
Date: June 7, 2020

I've reviewed your proposal—everything looks good. One question about your fees. Your fees include a lump sum of \$15,000 for the first 1,000 registrations or tickets sold plus \$2 for every ticket or registration sale above 1,000. Last year we had general admission ticket sales of about 2,500. However, we also generated about 500 registration fees from people who participated only in the 5K fun run and did not buy tickets for the festival. Does the \$2 per ticket fee in your proposal apply only to general admission tickets or would it also include fun-run-only registrations?

From: Charlotte Mills <cmills@memfranklin.com>
To: Kathryn Burton <kburton@ramblefranklin.com>
Subject: Springfest 2021
Date: June 7, 2020

Good question! Most festivals I handle have general admission ticketing—attendees pay a set price and receive a wristband allowing access to all areas of the event. Since Springfest is a combination festival and run, with some attendees participating only in the run, I'm willing to reduce the fee for fun-run registrations to \$1 per registration. So, if you had 2,500 general admission ticket purchasers and 500 fun-run participants, the first 1,000 general admission tickets would be included in my \$15,000 base fee, the remaining 1,500 general admission tickets would be charged at a rate of \$2 per ticket, and the 500 fun-run-only registrations would be billed at \$1 per ticket.

From: Kathryn Burton <kburton@ramblefranklin.com>
To: Charlotte Mills <cmills@memfranklin.com>
Subject: Springfest 2021
Date: June 8, 2020

That sounds fair. Are you still available the first weekend in April? That's the date we've chosen.

From: Charlotte Mills <cmills@memfranklin.com>
To: Kathryn Burton <kburton@ramblefranklin.com>
Subject: Springfest 2021
Date: June 8, 2020

Yes, I don't have anything booked for that weekend, but I am already getting inquiries about other events that month, so please let me know as soon as possible if you want me to move forward with

planning the event. If so, we should probably lock in a venue soon because they tend to book up quickly, especially for spring and summer events. I think our best bets are Discovery Park and the Garden Grove Promenade, which have the most flexibility in terms of the number of attendees they can accommodate as well as more space for vendor booths and a stage for the bands. I'd suggest submitting a reservation fee to hold both venues until you're ready to make a final decision.

From: Kathryn Burton <kburton@ramblefranklin.com>
To: Charlotte Mills <cmills@memfranklin.com>
Subject: Springfest 2021
Date: June 9, 2020

I agree that we really need to get going on this. Can you please check on the availability of both sites? Also, I think it's important to freshen up the Springfest website and give it a real facelift this year. Is that something you can help with?

From: Charlotte Mills <cmills@memfranklin.com>
To: Kathryn Burton <kburton@ramblefranklin.com>
Subject: Springfest 2021
Date: June 9, 2020

Absolutely! I've got some great ideas for the website.

From: Kathryn Burton <kburton@ramblefranklin.com>
To: Charlotte Mills <cmills@memfranklin.com>
Subject: Springfest 2021
Date: June 9, 2020

Fantastic! Please get started on the website design. I'll get you Ramble's initial deposit by the end of this week. I'm looking forward to working with you to make Springfest 2021 a huge success!

From: Charlotte Mills <cmills@memfranklin.com>
To: Kathryn Burton <kburton@ramblefranklin.com>
Subject: Springfest 2021
Date: June 9, 2020

Sounds great! Once I receive your deposit, I'll take care of securing the two potential venues and you can reimburse me later, per our agreement.

LIBRARY

Daniels v. Smith
Franklin Court of Appeal (2011)

Plaintiff Sam Daniels sued defendant Angela Smith for breach of an oral agreement to construct a warehouse for Smith. The trial court entered judgment for Daniels in the amount of \$57,500. Smith appealed on two grounds—first, the parties’ agreement was never reduced to writing and hence no binding agreement resulted, and second, the trial court erred in calculating the amount of damages. We affirm.

In August 2009, Smith sought Daniels’s advice regarding the demolition of certain structures on Smith’s land where she wanted to build a warehouse. Thereafter, Smith delivered to Daniels a set of plans and specifications, together with an “Invitation to Bid” that contained a “Bid Form.” The “Invitation to Bid” included the following sentence: “Selected bidder shall execute a contract for construction of the work within five days of notice of selection.”

On September 1, 2009, Daniels delivered his Bid Form to Smith. At meetings on various dates in September and early October, Daniels and Smith discussed proposed changes to the plans and specifications for the warehouse, and Daniels submitted a revised Bid Form on October 5. On October 9, Daniels and Smith met and agreed that there would be no further changes to the plans set forth in the revised Bid Form, which were complete and specific as to the type and grade of materials. The parties also agreed on the method of compensating Daniels and agreed that construction would begin no later than November 1 and be completed within 60 days thereafter.

The next morning, October 10, Smith telephoned Daniels. It is undisputed that during the call, Daniels stated that he could build the warehouse for \$227,000 and Smith replied, “If you can do the job for \$220,000, you have it.” Daniels responded: “I accept your offer, and I thank you very much for the job.” Smith then told Daniels to proceed, saying: “Let’s get this thing rolling.” Daniels replied: “Fine, I will get right on the phone now and start.” Immediately thereafter, Daniels began ordering supplies for the project and lining up plumbing and electrical subcontractors. Daniels also sent an email to Smith that day stating, in relevant part, “I am pleased to be awarded this work and hope to produce a warehouse we can both be proud of.”

The next day, October 11, Smith emailed Daniels an unsigned, standard form construction contract containing all the terms and conditions reached at previous meetings. Daniels signed the contract and emailed it back to Smith, requesting that Smith execute the agreement as well. Smith, however, did not reply. After trying unsuccessfully to reach Smith for more than a week, Daniels

drove by the site and saw a warehouse under construction by a different contractor. The warehouse was eventually completed at a cost of \$205,000 by the other contractor.

DISCUSSION

At the outset, we note that the statute of frauds does not apply here. Under Franklin Civil Code § 20, an agreement that by its terms is not to be performed within one year from the date of its making is invalid unless it is memorialized in writing and executed by the party to be charged. Smith and Daniels agreed that the warehouse contract would be completed in less than three months after the parties made their contract. Clearly, the parties intended the agreement to be completed in less than one year. Even if they had not agreed on a specific completion date, a reasonable amount of time would be inferred. Thus, there was no statutory requirement that the contract be in writing.

Contract Formation

We now turn to whether the evidence establishes the formation of a contract. The essential elements for formation of a contract are (1) offer, (2) acceptance, (3) the intention to create a legal relationship, and (4) consideration. Here, it is undisputed that an offer was made—specifically, Daniels’s revised Bid Form, which was submitted to Smith on October 5, 2009. Nor is it disputed that the alleged contract contained adequate consideration—namely, the construction of a warehouse in exchange for payment of \$220,000, which was Smith’s counteroffer. However, Smith claims that there was no acceptance (element #2) or intention to create a legal relationship (element #3).

In support of her contention that there was no binding contract, Smith erroneously relies upon *Green v. Colimon* (Fr. Ct. App. 2005), which stated the well-settled rule that “if the parties intend to reduce their proposed agreement to writing before it can be considered complete, there is no contract until the formal agreement is signed.” However, in *Green*, there was evidence that the parties intended to be bound only by a written contract, and the preliminary negotiations never reached the point where there was a meeting of the minds on all material matters. As the court noted in *Green*, “[t]here is no meeting of the minds while the parties are merely negotiating as to the terms of the agreement to be entered into. To be final, the agreement must extend to all terms that the parties intend to introduce, and material terms cannot be left for future settlement.” Smith’s brief fails to identify any further negotiations that might have been necessary to effect a mutual understanding of the parties. Instead, Smith merely argues that the parties intended that neither party would be bound until both signed the written contract.

In *Alexander v. Gilligan* (Fr. Sup. Ct. 2008), we rejected a similar argument in circumstances closely analogous to those here. The parties in *Alexander* finally (through email exchanges) agreed upon the terms of a six-month business consulting agreement after several meetings. But when the plaintiff presented a written contract for the defendant's signature, the latter refused to sign. The *Alexander* court held that the formal written contract was not *the agreement* of the parties but only *evidence of that agreement*. The court cited numerous cases to the effect that when parties agree, either orally or via email, upon all the terms and conditions of an agreement with the mutual intention that it shall thereupon become binding, the mere fact that a formal written agreement has yet to be prepared and signed does not alter the binding validity of the agreement. Whether parties intend that an oral or email-based agreement should be binding is to be determined by the trier of fact from the surrounding circumstances, giving effect to the mutual intention of the parties as it existed at the time of contracting. *Alexander*.

Here, the agreement between Smith and Daniels for the construction of a warehouse is not the type of contract that by its very nature indicates that the parties intended to be legally bound only if a formal written contract was executed. *See* 1 CORBIN ON CONTRACTS § 2.9, at 152 (rev. ed. 1993) (“[t]he greater the complexity and importance of the transaction, the more likely it is that the informal communications are intended to be preliminary only”); *Haviland v. Magnolia Sec. Inc.* (Fr. Ct. App. 2009) (parties did not intend oral agreement for creation of multi-million-dollar venture capital fund to be legally enforceable given unusual complexity and size of transaction).

Justice and fair dealing also support the above principle. Otherwise, a party who has entered into a contract through a combination of telephone conversations, in-person discussions, and email correspondence would be able to avoid the contract by claiming that the contract had not been reduced to another written form. Contracts would never be enforceable if parties could avoid the obligations by refusing to sign a written document memorializing the terms of an oral or email-based agreement and thereby evade obligations incurred in the ordinary course of business.

When Daniels submitted his revised Bid Form, Smith counteroffered by stating that she would accept the revised Bid Form if Daniels could do the work for \$220,000 instead of \$227,000. When Daniels stated, “I accept your offer, and I thank you very much for the job,” acceptance occurred, despite Smith's argument to the contrary. In addition, Smith's statement “Let's get this thing rolling” made clear that both parties intended to be legally bound by their agreement, again despite Smith's argument to the contrary. Accordingly, we find that all four elements required for

formation of a contract exist in this case, including specifically Daniels's acceptance of Smith's counteroffer and statements by both parties that evidence an intention to be bound.

Damages

Smith claims that the \$57,500 damages award was erroneous due to uncertainty as to Daniels's cost of performance. Statutory damages for breach of contract include damages for all detriment "proximately caused thereby, or which, in the ordinary course of things, would be likely to result therefrom." FR. CIVIL CODE § 100. Unascertainable damages cannot be recovered for breach of contract. *Id.* However, § 100 has been liberally construed to prevent defendants from avoiding the consequences of their actions. Thus, it has been repeatedly held that where there is no uncertainty as to the *fact* of damage (i.e., as to its nature, existence, or cause), the same certainty as to its *amount* is not required. *See, e.g., Alexander* (although parties had not identified a specific fee, no uncertainty existed on whether fees would be paid). One whose wrongful conduct has made it difficult to ascertain damages cannot complain because the amount of damages must be estimated, provided that the estimate is reasonable. *Id.* If damages can be calculated with reasonable certainty, they will be upheld.

Here, Daniels sought to recover the expenses he incurred prior to Smith's breach, as well as the benefit of the bargain or the profit that he would have made had Smith not breached the contract and Daniels had been allowed to build the warehouse. Daniels submitted receipts for \$7,500 in expenses and a cost breakdown showing lost profits of \$50,000, both of which were received into evidence at trial. Because not all the items in the cost analysis breakdown were supported by subcontractor bids, Smith claims that the lost profit damages were uncertain. Daniels testified, as a contractor with 13 years of experience, that the difference between the contract price and his cost of construction was \$50,000. It was for the trier of fact to determine whether Daniels's valuation of the items unsupported by bids was fair and reasonable. Daniels's testimony and documentation were uncontradicted and appear to have been the best evidence available. Thus, the trial court did not err in awarding damages of \$57,500.

Affirmed.

Jasper Construction Co. v. Park-Central Inc.
Franklin Court of Appeal (2014)

Defendant Jasper Construction Co. (Jasper) appeals from a trial court judgment finding that Jasper breached a contract to construct and lease a parking garage to Park-Central Inc., which leases and operates public parking garages. We hold that the contract is sufficiently specific to be enforceable and that the trial court properly awarded damages for breach of contract.

In March 2008, Jasper and Park-Central signed a standard commercial lease (Lease) under which Jasper agreed to construct a parking garage on property it owned and to then lease the garage to Park-Central for 20 years. Under the terms of the Lease, Jasper would “proceed diligently” with the construction of the parking garage and give Park-Central the right to terminate the Lease if construction was not completed by July 1, 2010. The Lease set forth the monthly rent to be paid by Park-Central to Jasper and specified the square footage, numbers of floors and parking spaces, and locations of entrances and exits for the parking garage. The Lease further provided that the parking garage “shall be constructed in accordance with certain plans and specifications (Plans) to be prepared and approved by the parties” and gave Jasper the right to terminate the Lease if the Plans were not approved by January 1, 2009. Plans were prepared by Jasper’s architect and approved by both parties before the January deadline. When Jasper subsequently refused to construct the parking garage, Park-Central sued.

Jasper contends that the parties’ failure to incorporate the Plans into the Lease means that, as a matter of law, the Lease was not sufficiently definite and certain to give rise to a legal obligation. That contention is without merit. Case law does not support the notion that specifications are an essential condition of an enforceable contract. To the contrary, the specificity required for an enforceable contract depends upon the circumstances. Thus, in *Stark v. Huntington* (Fr. Ct. App. 2003), a contract was enforced notwithstanding the defendant’s assertion that “neither design specifications, nor price, nor time of performance have been agreed upon.” Jasper places great weight on the fact that the parking garage was not to be built until the parties had approved plans and specifications. There is, of course, nothing unusual in a contract containing a right of prior approval, which is construed as implying a covenant of reasonableness.

Jasper also challenges the damages award. We conclude that the trial court’s finding of damages is supported by the evidence.

Affirmed.

Thompson v. Alamo Paper Products Inc.
Franklin Court of Appeal (2017)

This appeal involves an employment contract. The trial court granted summary judgment to defendant Alamo Paper Products Inc. (Alamo). Plaintiff Marie Thompson appeals, contending that her alleged oral contract with Alamo is not barred by the parol evidence rule. We affirm.

The parties entered into a written employment agreement whereby Alamo hired Thompson to serve as its chief financial officer at an annual salary of \$150,000. The agreement was silent as to any salary increases or bonuses. When Thompson did not receive a bonus, she sued Alamo, alleging that the parties had orally agreed before executing the written contract that after a six-month probationary period, Alamo would increase Thompson's salary and pay her a bonus.

Thompson argues that the parol evidence rule does not bar her claim based on Alamo's alleged breach of the oral contract. We disagree. When contracting parties have entered into a valid written agreement dealing with the particular subject matter, and the evidence indicates that the parties intended that written agreement to be the final expression of their agreement (as by both parties having signed it), the written contract supersedes all negotiations concerning its matter that preceded or accompanied the execution of the contract.

The parol evidence rule prevents a court from considering prior or contemporaneous agreements that are inconsistent with the terms in the written agreement. *Bradley v. Ortiz* (Fr. Sup. Ct. 1998). Thus, when the parties intend to reduce the entire agreement to writing, the terms of the agreement are to be ascertained from the writing alone, if possible. In such a case, extrinsic evidence is admissible only to interpret contract terms that are ambiguous or uncertain. *Id.* In contrast, when the parties do not intend to reduce the entire agreement to writing, both written and oral communication may be relevant to prove the terms of the contract. *Id.*

The alleged oral agreement between Thompson and Alamo concerns exactly the same subject matter as the underlying written employment contract, and it directly contradicts a specific provision in the agreement (i.e., Thompson's salary) and would add a material term that the parties did not reduce to writing (i.e., Thompson's eligibility for a bonus). The written employment agreement contains no ambiguous or uncertain terms. Because the alleged oral agreement is inconsistent with the written employment agreement and the written agreement contains no ambiguous or uncertain terms, the alleged oral agreement is unenforceable.

Affirmed.

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

MULTISTATE PERFORMANCE TEST DIRECTIONS

You will be instructed when to begin and when to stop this test. Do not break the seal on this booklet until you are told to begin. This test is designed to evaluate your ability to handle a select number of legal authorities in the context of a factual problem involving a client.

The problem is set in the fictitious state of Franklin, in the fictitious Fifteenth Circuit of the United States. Columbia and Olympia are also fictitious states in the Fifteenth Circuit. In Franklin, the trial court of general jurisdiction is the District Court, the intermediate appellate court is the Court of Appeal, and the highest court is the Supreme Court.

You will have two kinds of materials with which to work: a File and a Library. The first document in the File is a memorandum containing the instructions for the task you are to complete. The other documents in the File contain factual information about your case and may include some facts that are not relevant.

The Library contains the legal authorities needed to complete the task and may also include some authorities that are not relevant. Any cases may be real, modified, or written solely for the purpose of this examination. If the cases appear familiar to you, do not assume that they are precisely the same as you have read before. Read them thoroughly, as if they all were new to you. You should assume that the cases were decided in the jurisdictions and on the dates shown. In citing cases from the Library, you may use abbreviations and omit page references.

Your response must be written in the answer book provided. If you are using a laptop computer to answer the questions, your jurisdiction will provide you with specific instructions. In answering this performance test, you should concentrate on the materials in the File and Library. What you have learned in law school and elsewhere provides the general background for analyzing the problem; the File and Library provide the specific materials with which you must work.

Although there are no restrictions on how you apportion your time, you should allocate approximately half your time to reading and digesting the materials and to organizing your answer before you begin writing it. You may make notes anywhere in the test materials; blank pages are provided at the end of the booklet. You may not tear pages from the question booklet.

Do not include your actual name anywhere in the work product required by the task memorandum.

This performance test will be graded on your responsiveness to the instructions regarding the task you are to complete, which are given to you in the first memorandum in the File, and on the content, thoroughness, and organization of your response.