- A sale of the usufruct of a farm for a sum certain, but to be held for a period depending upon an uncertain event, is a contract "aléatoire," upon which an action will lie. Lagassé vs. Dionne, 1820, no. 1226.
- An action for money paid for the necessary repair of a mur mitoyen can be maintained on the implied contract of the co-proprietor of the wall with his neighbour. Latouche vs. Rollman, 1821, no. 1407.
- A penalty in a contract is not held to be stipulated damages, unless, upon the face of the contract it is declared to be so. Mure vs. Wiley, 1810, no. 264.
- Copartners, parties to a contract, must be co-plaintiffs. Morrogh vs. Huot, 1811, no. 141.
- A promise by three jointly and severally, is a promise solidaire. McNider vs. Whitney et al., 1817, no. 631.
- All parties jointly interested must join in an action ex contractu. McLeish vs. Lees, 1818, no. 371.
- A bond given for salvage in a court of admiralty in Nova Scotia can be recovered in Canada. Moore vs. Mure, 1818, no. 640,
- A contract of sale executed by a tutor on the behalf of his pupil, without an avis de parens, is null and void. Normandeau vs. Amblement, 1813, no. 590.
- A consignee is liable on an implied contract to pay the freight of goods which he receives. Oldfield vs. Hutton, 1812, no. 5:
- Breach of contract insufficiently alledged must be pleaded by exception d la forme. Pacaud vs. Hooker, 1811, no. 387.
- One who contracts as an agent for the public is not personally responsible. Perrault & Green vs. Baillargé, 1814, no. 321.
- One who binds himself with a vendor solidairement to defend the purchaser against all claimants is necessarily a garant formel. Peltier vs. Puize et al., 1818, no. 885.