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#### Abstract

ARGUMENT The Walsh's Appeal Brief does not answer this question: what facts or law fixed the contract price at everything Stroud billed except the last invoice? In other words, what facts or law set the agreed upon price for the home at $\$ 127,321.81$ less than what the construction company billed?

To allow the Walshes to withhold the last contract payment is to decide that there really was no enforceable contract ${ }^{1}$ price at all. It is to authorize the Walshes to determine what they deem reasonable payment for the home, regardless of what the contract may require.

The contract says something. It defines the payment obligation in some way. Yet as it stands, the Walshes simply walked away from the last payment of $\$ 127,321.81$.

Practically speaking, the Walshes moved in and were upset because their roof leaked. They responded to the roof leak by refusing to pay the final invoice, obviously justifying withholding payment (in their minds) because Stroud owed them a better roof.

The Walshes roof has now been repaired through their counterclaim. In other words, the jury awarded the Walshes money damages $(\$ 90,000)$ for the inadequate roofing work, which was paid by Stroud in coordination with the lawyers who represented Stroud at trial. ${ }^{2}$ The counterclaim for roof damage is not the subject of this appeal as the Walshes have been paid for that.


[^0]In their Brief, the Walshes focus on numerous issues that are not the subject of the appeal and do not relate to the meaning of the contract. They argue that the home was constructed in a "slipshod manner." (Walsh Appeal Brief, at 6-7.) They further contend that: "Stroud's lack of workmanship, failure to supervise the subcontractors and the construction in a reasonable manner, failure to complete the project in a timely manner, failure to pay the subcontractors timely, and the exorbitant overcharges resulted in damages to the Washes." (Id.) Arguing about these issues is a red herring. The issue on this appeal is defining the contract price and determining whether the Walshes paid it. The Walshes already asserted their counterclaim below and recovered $\$ 90,000^{3}$ on those "workmanship" counterclaims. So that aspect of the case is concluded.

The Walshes currently have a double recovery: they have the money damages from their counterclaim regarding the defective roof; plus they have the benefit of the withheld money ( $\$ 127,321.81$ ), the money they owed Stroud pursuant to the last invoice of the contract. It would be one thing to credit damages for the roof problems against the last invoice amount, but that is not what has occurred. The Walshes have been fully compensated for the roof, and they are enjoying the benefit of the funds that were owed to Stroud for the last contract payment.

In their Appeal Brief, the Walshes utterly fail to reconcile numerous inconsistencies with respect to their position(s) as to the payment terms of the contract. On the one hand, the Walsh's say they "understood" the house would be built for $\$ 752,145$, which is the "estimate" price written into the construction contract. ${ }^{4}$ (Walsh Appeal Brief, at 3.) On the other hand, the Walshes admit that

[^1]"[a]ltogether ... [they] paid more than $\$ 80,000$ in excess of the contract price." (Walsh Appeal Brief, at 5.) If the contract price was set/fixed at the "estimate" number on the contract, why did the Walsh's pay $\$ 80,000$ in excess of that price?

The Walshes similarly complain that Stroud did not complete the work efficiently, ${ }^{5}$ yet efficiency is irrelevant to the home owner where the contract price is fixed. The Walshes should have no concern about how efficiently Stroud completed the task if they enjoyed a fixed price contract for the sum certain of $\$ 752,145 .{ }^{6}$

Seeming to sense the inherent inconsistency in their position(s) as to the payment terms of the contract when measured against the undisputed record evidence, the Walshes eventually argue that "estimated cost" is by definition an ambiguous term. (Walsh Appeal Brief, at 10.) However, arguing that the payment terms are ambiguous seems to distill to a position that the jury's reasoning (whatever it was) cannot be vacated, no matter what. Herein lies the fundamental problem with the Walshes position - they (or a jury) hold all authority to decide the contract's payment terms, but they do not have to justify the contract's meaning to anyone. They simultaneously say: (a) the contract price was fixed at $\$ 752,145$, (b) yet they paid $\$ 80,000$ more than the contract fixed price, ${ }^{7}$ (c) and, moreover, the "estimate" term in the contract is ambiguous, and (d) so in the end we should simply

[^2]defer to the jury's judgment when the jury agreed that it was adequate for the Walshes to simply withhold payment for the last invoice after having paid all of the prior payments.

There is a contract. It means something, and it has some payment term. In the end, the Walshes cannot explain - factually or legally - how the contract could possibly mean that they pay every invoice up until the last and final $\$ 127,321.81$ invoice. ${ }^{8}$

Stroud did what the jury said - he paid money damages for the roof, which the jury determined was defective. The other side of the coin is that the completed house must be paid for pursuant to the payment terms of the contract. The Walshes cannot define contract payment terms as they go. Considering parol evidence or ignoring parol evidence does not change the analysis the contract sets a price that the Walshes are required to pay. That price is obviously a cost-plus price, ${ }^{9}$ and the Walshes' payment history alone validates that conclusion.

## CONCLUSION

The Walshes paid each invoice throughout the project until they moved in. (R. 250-268.) These total payments exceeded the claimed fixed price (which was an "estimate" according to the plain words of the contract) in the amount of $\$ 752,145.00$.

The objective language of the contract between Stroud and the Walshes indicated that the Walshes would be responsible for all costs of construction, and indeed their conduct was consistent

[^3]with this understanding. There is simply no record evidence that Stroud billed for something he did not do, and there is no legal justification for "capping" this construction contract at exactly what the Walshes had paid before they moved in. The contract did not entitle the Walshes to a $\$ 127,321.81$ credit. For all of these reasons, the trial court should have directed the verdict for Stroud, and the jury's verdict not allowing Stroud's recovery was against the overwhelming weight of the evidence. Stroud Construction respectfully requests that this Court reverse and render.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The copy of the contract in Stroud's Record Excerpts was inadvertently inserted as an unsigned copy. The fully signed and executed contract is in the Walshes Record Excepts at pages 0006-0008. The signed contract is contained in the Exhibits portion of the Record as document 000001-000003. The signed contract is also attached as an Addendum to this Reply Brief.
    ${ }^{2}$ There was also an indemnity claim pursued by Stroud's trial counsel against the roofing subcontractor.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ The Walshes also repeatedly reference "fraud" or "cheating" in their Brief, but again there is no fraud claim present on this appeal. (See Walsh Appeal Brief, at 6, 8.)

    4"Estimate price" was written into the contract, and where "contract price" was stricken through. (See Addendum, R. 000001.)

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ See Walsh Appeal Brief, at 5, saying Stroud failed to "reasonably supervise" and that Stroud failed to complete the job "within the budget."
    ${ }^{6}$ The trial evidence was further undisputed that the Walshes required numerous and substantial changes to the home during the construction process, which necessitated changes to the house plans, increases in material costs, and increased labor and oversight time. (See Stroud Appeal Brief.)
    ${ }^{7}$ The record reflects that the total payments by the Walshes were $\$ 659,009.08$ paid directly to Stroud and $\$ 196,059$ paid directly to vendors by the Walshes. (R. 620-622.) The total payments were, therefore, $\$ 855,068.08$. (R. 620-622.)

[^3]:    ${ }^{8}$ The Walshes also argue that an "estimate" tends to "preclude[] accuracy" almost as if to say the contract was so vague or so incapable of interpretation that it simply did not quantify a price that can be enforced. See Appeal Brief, at 13.
    ${ }^{9}$ Some of the construction plans - electrical and boathouse - were not even provided to Stroud until after the contract was signed and after construction began. (R. 380, 384.) A "fixed" contract could not and would not have been entered without specifications for important items having been finalized.

