

Washington University Law Review

Volume 10 | Issue 3

January 1925

Contracts—Fraudulent Representations

Follow this and additional works at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview



Part of the [Contracts Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Contracts—Fraudulent Representations, 10 ST. LOUIS L. REV. 220 (1925).

Available at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol10/iss3/8

This Comment on Recent Decisions is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington University Law Review by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

his opinion that a certain course of conduct would be proper, but if the attorney advises his client to do an illegal act, and if the client be guilty of contempt, the attorney is likewise guilty.

CONTRACTS—FRAUDULENT REPRESENTATIONS.

Holcomb & Jones Mfg. Co. v. Jones. Supreme Court of Oklahoma, September 1924. 228 Pacific Reporter 968.

Plaintiffs sue on a note given by defendant in payment for one pop-corn machine of plaintiff's manufacture. The defense is that the vendor in violation of agreement to sell defendant the only machine in Homing, Okla., made another sale the same day, and that the town of Homing is too small to support two pop-corn machines. No proof of plaintiff's bad faith is given, nor does the defendant offer to restore the machine, nor expressly to abide by the terms of the contract and sue for damages.

The court held, that the party defrauded must elect between recession or affirmance—if the former, the statutes require restoration of everything, and his failure so to do is fatal to his cause of action.

Either one, but not both recession and affirmance can be available to a defrauded party.

Such an alleged fraudulent representation as here presented cannot be treated as part of the contract but only grounds for awarding liability thereunder. A recognition of the terms of the contract amounts to a waiver of the right of recession, but not of the right to damages for the fraud. The making of a new agreement was held to amount to a waiver of the fraud involved in the original one.

Unless obvious, the question of a waiver is one for the jury.

Judgment was here given for the plaintiff on the note.

**EVIDENCE—CARE REQUIRED OF A DENTIST IN EXTRACTING TEETH
—ADMISSABILITY OF PATIENT'S TESTIMONY REGARDING HER
DISLOCATED JAW.**

Hill vs. Jackson, 265 S. W. 859.

This is a malpractice suit in which plaintiff alleges that defendant, a dentist, while treating her for pyorrhea negligently dislocated her jaw. The lower court had held that expert testimony was necessary to show that plaintiff's jaw was dislocated. This was reversed on appeal, the appellate