





The McAllisters had several serious problems with their house, including leaks in the ceiling, a buckling wall, and dampness throughout. They repaired the buckling wall by installing Ibeams to support it. They never resolved the leaks and the dampness. When they decided to sell the house, they said nothing to prospective buyers about the problems. They stated that the I-beams had been added for reinforcement. The Silvas bought the house for 2 million Baht. Soon afterward, they began to have problems with leaks, mildew, and dampness. Is the contract valid?



 $\circ$ 

Anita and Barry were negotiating, and Anita's attorney prepared a long and carefully drawn contract, which was given to Barry for examination. Five days later and prior to its execution, Barry's eyes became so infected that it was impossible for him to read. Ten days thereafter and during the continuance of the illness, Anita called upon Barry and urged him to sign the contract, telling him that time was running out. Barry signed the contract despite the fact he was unable to read it. In a subsequent action by Anita, Barry claimed that the contract was not binding upon him because it was impossible for him to read and he did not know what it contained prior to his signing it. Is the contract valid?







Ralph sold a motel to Steve by stating that he had paid 250,000 baht for it and that his net average annual profit from the business has been 40,000 baht. In reality he paid 100,000 baht for the motel and has earned a net average annual profit of only 30,000 baht. Steve made no attempt to verify the statements until after the transaction was completed. Is the contract valid?

## THANK YOU

Alessandro Stasi