



MILLER THOMSON LLP

Barristers & Solicitors, Patent & Trade-Mark Agents

CONSTRUCTION LAW NEWSLETTER



Fall 2003

*A publication of
Miller Thomson LLP's
Construction Law Group*

OWNER GUILTY OF INTIMIDATION FOR THREATENING NON-PAYMENT & EVICTION FROM SITE

Anthony D. Scane

Toronto

Tel. 416.595.2661

ascane@millerthomson.ca

Inside

Owner Guilty of Intimidation
for Threatening Non-Payment
& Eviction from Site

Consequential Damages

Achievements, Publications
and Seminars

In a recently published British Columbia case called *Golden Hill Ventures v. Kemess Mines*, the general earth works contractor won a \$7 million judgment against the mine owner, which included validation of a claim for lien of just over \$6.5 million. The balance of the judgment was for damages for both breach of contract and for breach of duty to provide adequate site description in the tender documents, which resulted in allowance for delay damages, an acceleration claim, and a loss of productivity claim.

Golden Hill bid the "cut and fill" job for airport earthworks based upon the tender documents. Although those documents and the subsequent contract purported to exclude claims based upon a contractor's reliance on the tender documents, the judge cut through these "exclusion clauses" by finding that the owner owed a duty to accurately describe the site conditions.

Of perhaps even more interest in this case is Golden Hill's successful claim that threats made on site by the owner constituted the tort of intimidation. From a review of the lengthy reasons, it is fair to say that the owner's intimidation helped the judge in accepting the contractor's other claims for acceleration and loss of productivity because the owner's threats forced the contractor to dramatically increase its workforce in very difficult conditions without any compensation in time or money. A representative of the owner had also threatened to seize Golden Hill's equipment, kick them off the site and withhold certified progress payments unless they followed his (unreasonable) directions. The trial judge found that the contract did not specifically permit Kemess Mines to do any of the things it threatened since Golden Hills was not in default of any of its obligations, and that the making of the threats led directly to additional costs incurred. In the end, the judge found that the owner had breached its duty to exercise its right to give directions reasonably (a duty of good faith), had misrepresented the actual state of the site, and unreasonably refused to extend the completion date (another breach of good faith and constructive acceleration), and that it had, without basis or justification, threatened to terminate the contract

for the purpose of causing Golden Hills to do more work than the contract reasonably required (the tort of intimidation) in an accelerated time frame.

While the published report does not set out the award of costs, the trial took some 126 days, so one can well expect a cost award significantly in excess of \$1 million in favour of Golden Hills. Certainly, the owner's conduct as found by the trial judge will not favour any reduction in any costs awarded against it.

CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES

E. Jane Sidnell

Calgary

403.298.2435

jsidnell@millerthomson.ca

William J. Kenny, Q.C.

Edmonton

780.429.9784

wkenny@millerthomson.ca

"There have been various cases on this subject, and in one a man was going to be married, and his horse cast a shoe, and the smith having injured the horse in putting it on the man was late, and the lady refused to marry him; and it was held that the smith was liable for the damages resulting from the loss of the marriage." (unidentified case quoted, with disapproval, by Willes J. in *British Columbia and Vancouver's Island Spar, Lumber and Saw Mill Co. Ltd. v. Nettleship*).

This quote from a case heard on June 2, 1868 raises a number of questions, one in particular: what are consequential damages?

If your office burns down, there would be direct damages in relation to the loss of the building and the contents, but there would also be losses because the business is temporarily not operating. In addition, you would probably incur on-going overhead costs such as salaries, professional fees and office costs, notwithstanding that none of these costs are contributing to business income while the business is suspended.

Consequential damages are frequently excluded from contracts in the construction and engineering fields. If you are the person who cannot claim consequential damages, you may be out-of-pocket a considerable sum that cannot be recovered. If you are the person benefiting from a clause that excludes consequential damages, you are obtaining a potentially huge protection from loss. Consider the situation where a gas plant is destroyed by fire due to a design error. If the contract excludes consequential damages, then the person who made the design error may be liable for the loss of the plant, but is that person protected from a claim for the owner's loss of production from the gas plant during the period of reconstruction? Who bears the loss relating to the owner's overhead during the reconstruction period? What if the owner has further losses because it can no longer fulfil contracts for the supply of gas? Who bears that loss?

In *Syncrude Canada Ltd. v. Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.*, a decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal in 1997, that court considered the following exclusion clause relating to consequential damages:

"49 CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES: The Subcontractor will not be liable in any event for loss of anticipated profits, loss by reason of plant shutdown, non-operation or increased expense of operation of other equipment, or other consequential loss or damage of any nature arising from any cause whatever."

The case dealt with the damages that Syncrude could recover as a result of three defective boilers designed and built by Babcock & Wilcox. The trial judge awarded \$6 million in relation to the cost of repairing the boilers. However, the trial judge also awarded \$4 million in relation to the extra cost of energy as a result of the boilers being inefficient, from the time of the defect becoming apparent to the date by which Syncrude could have had the boilers repaired. Babcock & Wilcox appealed this decision and argued that the \$4 million portion of the award to Syncrude was covered by the exclusion clause and not recoverable by Syncrude.

The Court of Appeal did not agree with the argument that anything beyond the direct cost of repairing the boilers was excluded by clause 49. In upholding the award to Syncrude, the Court of Appeal stated that damages should be calculated based on the difference in value between what was contracted for, and what was delivered. In making this calculation, the capitalized value of the extra energy expenses was taken into account. The court found that the additional cost of energy, because the defective boilers were inefficient, were not consequential to the damage incurred and were not excluded by clause 49.

The English Court of Appeal also considered consequential damages in *Deepak Fertilisers and Petrochemical Corporation v. Davy McKee (London) Ltd.*, a 1998 case, which arose after an explosion destroyed a low pressure methanol plant. The process was licensed to the owner by the designer of the plant, who also constructed the plant through a subsidiary (referred to as the "Design-Builder"). The exclusion clause in the contract between the owner and the Design-Builder provided as follows:

"... and in no event shall [the Design-Builder] by reason of its performance or obligation under this CONTRACT be liable ... for loss [of] anticipated profits, catalyst, raw-material and products or for indirect or consequential damages."

As a result of the plant exploding, the owner suffered a number of losses in addition to the cost to re-construct the plant. In particular, the owner claimed for (1) fixed costs and overheads incurred during the period from the explosion to the resumption of commercial production (referred to as "Overheads") and (2) increased costs due to the re-constructed plant requiring more catalyst to operate than the original plant configuration (referred to as "Catalyst Cost").

The English Court of Appeal concluded that losses which "clock up at once" (namely the cost of idle men and plant etc.) are direct losses and not consequential losses. The Court of Appeal followed another English Court of Appeal decision: *Croudace Construction Limited v. Cawoods Concrete Products Ltd.* Since the Overheads started to accrue as soon as the explosion occurred, they were considered direct and not consequential damages. The result was that the owner was entitled to pursue the claim for Overheads against the Design-Builder, notwithstanding the exclusion clause cited above. The court stated "[w]asted Overheads incurred during the reconstruction of the plant, as well as profits lost during that period, are no more remote as losses than the cost of reconstruction." This conclusion meant that the Overheads were not consequential damages and were not excluded by clause 49.

It is to be noted that the court would have allowed the claim for lost profits during the reconstruction period, except for the specific exclusion in the clause cited above. This means that the general exclusion as to "consequential damages" was not broad enough to cover lost profits.

As for the Catalyst Cost, the Court of Appeal found this to be a valid claim for damages. On this point the court said:

"The extra cost claimed is the cost which has now become necessary in order to ensure and enable the plant safely to produce methanol in those quantities which the plant was supposed to. In other words, we would hold that this extra cost is akin to any other cost (such as an additional piece of plant or part), which achieved the same result. This could not be categorised as an indirect or consequential loss or damage nor could its cost be categorised as constituting a loss of profit."

Consequential damages are not simply damages beyond direct property damages. Consequential damages are those damages foreseeable with special knowledge. When negotiating a contract the parties should consider those damages which they expect to be recoverable, and those which will be excluded, or limited, in the event of a loss. Exclusion clauses must be drafted clearly as courts will only enforce the narrow meaning of the words used to exclude or limit responsibility. Where the parties agree to exclude or limit damages for overheads, loss of profit, or additional costs to bring the project back to the level it was contracted to operate at (for instance the boiler specifications in the Alberta case or the use of catalyst in the English case) then those potential losses should be specifically and clearly excluded or limited by the terms of the contract. Relying on a general exclusion as to consequential damage will not exclude damages for all losses beyond direct losses and care should be taken in drafting consequential damage clauses.

The Construction Owners Association of Alberta (COAA) has prepared a standard form stipulated price contract for industrial projects. For further information on the COAA and to obtain a copy of the standard form stipulated price contract, visit the COAA website at www.coaa.ab.ca. It contains a clause limiting damages, including consequential damages, to the limit of insurance carried. Not only does the clause limit damages for consequential loss, it also specifically limits damages for loss of use, loss of product, loss of revenue, overhead and profit and loss of any contract:

"Notwithstanding anything else in this Contract, the Contractor, its Subcontractors, Suppliers, and their respective officers, directors, employees, consultants and agents shall not be liable to the Owner, or anyone claiming through or under it, whether by way of indemnity or by reason of breach of contract or in tort, including liability for negligence and breach of statutory duty, or on any other legal or equitable basis, for:

- 26.4.1 special or consequential loss or damage;
- 26.4.2 loss of use, whether complete or partial, of the Work or existing facilities of the Owner or third parties;
- 26.4.3 loss of product;
- 26.4.4 loss of revenue, overhead and profit; or
- 26.4.5 loss of any contract that may be suffered by the Owner, except to the extent of amounts recoverable under a policy or policies of insurance required to be maintained by the Contractor, or provided by the Owner, pursuant to the provisions of this Contract, provided however that in the event of the failure by the Contractor to complete the Work by the Contract Time the liability of the Contractor under this GC 26.4 shall be limited only to the greater of the insurance recoverable and \$_____."

The COAA consequential damages clause can be used as a starting point for considering those damages which should be limited or excluded from a contract, depending on the underlying business deal. Any damages relating to a particular project that the parties wish to limit, or exclude, should be done so specifically in the contract terms.

ACHIEVEMENTS, PUBLICATIONS AND SEMINARS

On October 9, **Jane Sidnell** is a moderator of panel discussing design build vs. construction management methods of project delivery at Construct Alberta. Ms. Sidnell will teach a session at the *Law for Project Managers Course on Construction Contracts* on October 20 and will also be speaking at the National Institute of Facility Management Symposium on Healthy Buildings in Burnaby, Edmonton, Calgary and Saskatoon on October 27, 29, November 3 and 5 respectively. In addition, she is a speaker at Insight Conference on *Regulatory Framework and Potential Liability under Occupational Health and Safety and Environmental Legislation* on December 1.

Paige Coulter and **Jane Sidnell** will be presenting a seminar on *Product Liability* to Construction Specifications Canada on November 18.

MILLER THOMSON LLP CONSTRUCTION LAW GROUP

In Toronto / Markham

T. Keith Billings	416.595.8517	kbillings@millerthomson.ca
Drazen F. Bulat	416.595.8613	dbulat@millerthomson.ca
Lloyd D. Cadsby, Q.C.	416.595.8639	lcadsby@millerthomson.ca
Patricia M. Conway	416.595.8507	pconway@millerthomson.ca
Peter K. Foulds	416.596.2112	pfoulds@millerthomson.ca
Brett-David Moldaver	416.595.2642	bmoldaver@millerthomson.ca
William M. Pigott	416.595.8179	wpigott@millerthomson.ca
Franklin T. Richmond	416.595.8180	frichmond@millerthomson.ca
Anthony D. Scane	416.595.2661	ascane@millerthomson.ca
Michael L. Shell	905.415.6709	mshell@millerthomson.ca
Michael T. Tamblyn	416.595.2660	mtamblyn@millerthomson.ca
Thomas R. Whitby	416.595.8561	twhitby@millerthomson.ca

In Vancouver

Wendy A. Baker	604.643.1285	wbaker@millerthomson.ca
Charles W. Bois	604.643.1224	cbois@millerthomson.ca
Terrance A. Kowalchuk	604.643.1222	tkowalchuk@millerthomson.ca
Owen D. Pawson	604.643.1254	opawson@millerthomson.ca
Michael J. Percival	604.643.1230	mpercival@millerthomson.ca
Brian T. Ross	604.643.1216	btross@millerthomson.ca
Stephen R. Ross	604.643.1205	srross@millerthomson.ca
Donald J. Sorochan, Q.C.	604.643.1214	dsorochan@millerthomson.ca
Erin M. Tully	604.643.1279	etully@millerthomson.ca
Mari A. Worfolk	604.643.1240	mworfolk@millerthomson.ca

In Calgary

Mary Jayne Assaly	403.298.2439	massaly@millerthomson.ca
Michael J. Bailey	403.298.2411	mbailey@millerthomson.ca
Andrea E. Beckwith	403.298.2405	abeckwith@millerthomson.ca
Kent W. Jesse	403.298.2441	kjesse@millerthomson.ca
Joe O. Pfaefflin	403.298.2465	jpfaefflin@millerthomson.ca
E. Sigurd Ruud	403.298.2459	sruud@millerthomson.ca
E. Jane Sidnell	403.298.2435	jsidnell@millerthomson.ca
Nicole T. Taylor-Smith	403.298.2453	ntaylor-smith@millerthomson.ca

In Edmonton

Kent H. Davidson	780.429.9790	kdaavidson@millerthomson.ca
Scott J. Hammel	780.429.9726	shammel@millerthomson.ca
Darin J. Hannaford	780.429.9714	dhannaford@millerthomson.ca
Sandra L. Hawes	780.429.9787	shawes@millerthomson.ca
William J. Kenny, Q.C.	780.429.9784	wkenny@millerthomson.ca
Todd Allen Paul Nahirnik	780.429.9771	tnahirnik@millerthomson.ca
Daniel C.P. Stachnik, Q.C.	780.429.9761	dstachnik@millerthomson.ca
Donald V. Tomkins, P.Eng.	780.429.9744	dtomkins@millerthomson.ca

In Waterloo-Wellington

F. Stephen Finch, Q.C.	519.579.3660	sfinch@millerthomson.ca
------------------------	--------------	-------------------------

In Whitehorse

Murray J. Leitch	867.633.2075	mleitch@millerthomson.ca
------------------	--------------	--------------------------

Note:

Miller Thomson LLP's Construction Law newsletter is provided as an information service to clients and is a summary of current legal issues of concern to business persons and their advisors. These articles are not meant as legal opinions and readers are cautioned not to act on the information provided without seeking specific legal advice with respect to their unique circumstances. Your comments and suggestions are most welcome and should be directed to Construction_Law_ON@millerthomson.ca.

If you no longer wish to receive newsletters regarding this topic, please send an email to that effect to Construction_Law_ON@millerthomson.ca.

Miller Thomson LLP uses your contact information to send you information on legal topics that may be of interest to you. It does not share your personal information outside the firm, except with subcontractors who have agreed to abide by its privacy policy and other rules.

www.millerthomson.com