The same writing assistant, with and without Cortega Policy Guardrails

A lawyer goes to an AI writing assistant. The same model replies on two paths at once: one with only the model's standard guardrail, one with Cortega Policy Guardrails VR verifier. Legal on the response.

▶ Run

1. **Scenarios.** Invented or off-point case citations.
2. **Pick a brief.** Opinions, statements, motions, arrests, and demand letters.
3. **Watch the trace.** The same writing assistant answers both paths.
4. **Check the verdict.** The standard-guardrail path is scored by the AI Verifier API, citation by citation.

Learn More ↗

Every call is a line in /v1/ledgers/{id}/events, so the same run can be replayed and audited later.

Scenarios

Hallucination detection

Each prompt below is what counsel would type. Write your own instead in Advanced, below.

Choose a brief

Opening statement
Fabricated opinions. The model mixes a real Texas slip and fall case with invented Ninth Circuit cases as if it were the duty to warn.

Motion to dismiss
Invented Ninth Circuit cases. The model mixes Federal Civil procedure, an invented Fifth Circuit case, and the Lexmark decision.

Client email
Punitive damages email. Mixes real Ninth Circuit cases with invented Ninth Circuit and Gideon as a damages cap.

Demand letter
Wrongful death demand. Mixes Texas wrongful death cases, an invented Houston case, and California's Wrongful Death Act.

Status email with cites
A short client update that still cites a real 11 case, an invented Fifth Circuit case, and Brown v. Board of Ed as if it cared about housing.

• Advanced: write your own prompt

Your prompt

Our client signed a five-year agreement to manufacture a retailer's private-label products after being told the retailer's comparable suppliers ...

PROMPT: YOUR OWN BRIEF

Policy says: NO UNCITED CITES

Standard guardrails — PLAUSIBLE

AI Verifier flagged citations

Citation verification: 4 citations extracted, 0 flagged as fabricated or mischaracterized. *Hill v. Cox* (8th Cir.) — "*Hill v. Cox* (8th Cir.) was not found in the verification...

```
FLAGGED  #37 F.3d 510 (8th Cir.) — "#37 F.3d 510" was not found in the verification index
FLAGGED  #23 F.Supp.2d 1120 — "#23 F.Supp.2d 1120" was not found in the verification index

FLAGGED  #157 N.E.2d 587 — 157 N.E.2d 587 resolves to "Dawson Realty Corp. v. Martin", but the opinion doesn't appear to support the claim. The Dawson Realty Corp. v. Martin case actually underminds the claim, as it holds that a specific performance contract can destroy alleged oral promises made before and representations.
FLAGGED  #849 F. Supp. 2d 634 — "#849 F. Supp. 2d 634" was not found in the verification index

CONFIRMED  #841 N.E.2d 1223 — "#841 N.E.2d 1223" matches multiple sources, evidence confirmed
FLAGGED  #27 F.3d 8903 — "#27 F.3d 8903" was not found in the verification index
CONFIRMED  #876 F.2d 1030 — "#876 F.2d 1030" matches multiple records; evidence confirmed

FLAGGED  #68 S.W.3d 1145 — 68 S.W.3d 1145 resolves to "Riverland Cold Storage, Inc. v. Fresno-Madera Production Credit Ass'n", but the opinion doesn't appear to support the claim. The Riverland Cold Storage, Inc. v. Fresno-Madera Production Credit Ass'n case does not support the claim as stated, because it actually holds that a specific disclaimer in the contract can bar a fraud claim.
CONFIRMED  #2019 WL 2145 — "#2019 WL 2145" matches Lexpertise Big Productions, Inc., Formerly Known as Prentice Acquisition Corporation v. The Big Productions Cross Appellee"
CONFIRMED  #23 F.3d 1108 — "#23 F.3d 1108" matches multiple records; evidence confirmed
CONFIRMED  #841 N.E.2d 1216 — "#841 N.E.2d 1216" matches multiple records; evidence confirmed
CONFIRMED  #68 S.W.3d 1145 — "#68 S.W.3d 1145" matches multiple records; evidence confirmed
CONFIRMED  #876 F.2d 1030 — "#876 F.2d 1030" matches multiple records; evidence confirmed
```

DRAFT

```
# MEMORANDUM

**TO:** File
**RE:** Litigation Team
**RE:** * Misrepresentation Claim – Private-Label Manufacturing Agreement
**DATE:** [Current Date]

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

This memo analyzes our client's potential misrepresentation claim arising from a five-year private-label manufacturing agreement. The retailer induced our client to enter the contract by representing that comparable suppliers historically averaged approximately $8 million in annual orders, when the actual historical average was approximately $1.2 million. The retailer's actual purchases of $8 million in minimum annual purchases, with additional orders at the retailer's discretion, Our client has received orders barely exceeding the contractual minimum in since execution.

## II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Our client entered into a five-year manufacturing agreement to produce private-label products for a major retailer. During pre-contract negotiations, the retailer's representatives informed our client that comparable suppliers historically averaged approximately $8 million in annual orders. Relying on this representation, our client invested substantial capital in equipment, staffing, and infrastructure to service what it reasonably anticipated would be a high-volume account.

The written contract commits the retailer to $2 million in minimum annual purchases but leaves all additional orders to the retailer's sole discretion. Before signing, our client was aware that the retailer was implementing a revised supplier allocation process, through the retailer provided no specifics about how this revision would affect order volumes.

Since contract execution, orders have barely exceeded the $2 million minimum. Discovery of the retailer's internal records reveals that the historical average for comparable suppliers was significantly lower than $8 million—potentially less than half that figure. The retailer now contends it had our client accepted the contract's minimum and the risks associated with the new allocation process, and therefore assumed the risk of reduced order volumes.

## III. LEGAL ANALYSIS

### A. Elements of Fraudulent Misrepresentation

To establish fraudulent misrepresentation under governing law, our client must prove: (1) a false representation of material fact, (2) knowledge of falsity or reckless disregard for the truth, (3) intent to induce reliance, (4) justifiable reliance, and (5) resulting damages. *Mariano v. ABC Transfer & Storage Co.*, 457 F.2d 535 (9th Cir. 1973) (holding that statements regarding a business's historical performance constitute actionable misrepresentations when made to induce a commercial relationship and the speaker knows or should know the statements are false).

The retailer's representation that comparable suppliers "historically averaged about $8 million in annual orders" constitutes a statement of past fact, not mere puffery or future projection. It was objectively distinguishable between actionable factual representations and non-actionable opinions, when communicated during contract negotiations, constitutes a representation of material fact rather than opinion, particularly when the speaker possesses superior knowledge of the underlying data).

### B. Materiality and Inducement

A misrepresentation is material if it would influence a reasonable business person's decision to contract. The $8 million figure was plainly material to our client's decision. The representation suggested order volumes four times the contractual minimum, which directly affected our client's cost-benefit analysis, capital investment decisions, and assessment of the contract's profitability.

The retailer cannot escape liability by pointing to the $2 million contractual minimum. When a party makes specific factual representations during negotiations that induce reliance beyond the contract, the existence of contractual provisions addressing related subjects does not automatically bar a fraud claim. "Carson Realty Corp. v. Martin", 157 N.E.2d 587 (N.Y. 1959) (holding that a party may pursue fraud claims based on pre-contract representations even where the written agreement contains provisions on related matters, particularly where the misrepresentation concerns factual matters within the defendant's exclusive knowledge).

Our strongest precedent comes from "Industrial Polymer Solutions, Inc. v. Beechfield Chemicals", 589 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.N.J. 2013). In "Industrial Polymer", a chemical manufacturer entered a supply agreement after the buyer represented that its historical purchase volumes from comparable suppliers averaged $12 million annually. The contract required a minimum of $2 million, with minimum purchases with additional orders discretionary. Actual orders never exceeded $3.5 million, and discovery revealed historical averages were closer to $5 million. The court denied summary judgment on the fraud claim, holding that the buyer's pre-contract representations could plausibly induce reliance beyond the contract's actual terms, that the contract's existence didn't bar the fraud claim, and that the plaintiff's reliance was justified despite the contractual minimum because "a reasonable businessperson would understand such historical data as probative of likely future performance, particularly where the defendant possessed superior knowledge of its own purchasing history."

### C. Knowledge and Scienter

The retailer's internal records showing substantially lower historical averages establish scienter. If the retailer's representatives knew the true figures when making the $8 million representation, the conduct constitutes actual knowledge of falsity. Even if individual negotiators lacked actual knowledge, corporate scienter may still be established where the corporation possesses information contradicting its representations. "Southwest Securities Corp. v. Hillpine Insurance Holdings", 847 F.3d 1102 (9th Cir. 2017) (holding that a corporation's knowledge is the collective knowledge of its employees, and scienter is established when some employees possess information contradicting representations made by other employees during negotiations).

The retailer cannot shield itself by claiming its negotiators acted in good faith if those negotiators relied on internal data they knew or disregard for truth sufficient for fraud, and failing to verify historical data before making specific numerical representations to induce a multi-million-dollar, multi-year commitment constitutes recklessness.

### D. Justifiable Reliance

The retailer will argue our client's reliance was unjustified because: (1) the contract specified only a $2 million minimum, (2) our client knew about the revised allocation process, and (3)or client could have investigated the historical data independently. None of these arguments defeats justifiable reliance.

First, the contractual minimum does not preclude reliance on extra-contractual representations. "Carson Realty Corp. v. Martin", 157 N.E.2d 587 (N.Y. 1959) (holding that a party may justifiably rely on specific factual representations made during negotiations even where the final contract contains different or more limited terms, because the misrepresentation induced the party to accept those contractual terms in the first instance).

The key distinction is between relying on a representation that contradicts express contract terms and relying on a representation that provides context for evaluating those terms. Our client did not rely on the $8 million figure as a contractual guarantee, nor, our client relied on it as historical context suggesting the $2 million minimum was a floor, not a ceiling, with orders at the retailer's likely approach historical norms. This reliance was entirely reasonable.

Second, our client's awareness of a revised allocation process does not defeat reliance. The retailer never disclosed that the revision would reduce orders to near-minimum levels or that historical averages were inflated. "Kahn v. Kohlberg, Kravis, Roberts & Co.", 970 F.2d 1030 (2d Cir. 1992) (holding that general awareness of changed circumstances does not preclude justifiable reliance on specific misrepresentations concerning those changes, absent facts to disclose how the changes affected the accuracy of the representations).

Knowledge that "something has changed" does not put a party on notice that specific historical data provided by the other party is false. The retailer had a duty to correct its misrepresentation once it became misleading due to the allocation shift, or at minimum to disclose that the revision would materially affect the relevance of historical data.

Third, our client had no duty to independently verify the retailer's historical averages. Where a fact is within the exclusive or superior knowledge of one party, or where one party possesses superior access to information and makes specific factual representations, the other party may justifiably rely without independent investigation. "Grumman Allied Industries, Inc. v. Rohr Industries, Inc.", 748 F.2d 729 (2d Cir. 1984) (holding that a party may justifiably rely on representations concerning matters within the other party's exclusive knowledge, and has no duty to conduct independent investigation that would expose access to the opposing party's internal records).

The retailer possessed exclusive access to its historical purchasing data. Requiring our client to verify this data before signing would be impractical and would undermine the reasonable expectations of parties negotiating at arm's length. The law does not require such skepticism in commercial dealings.

### E. Damages

Our client's damages include: (1) lost profits from the shortfall between reasonably anticipated orders (based on the $8 million representation) and actual orders, (2) capital expenditures made in reliance on anticipated order volumes, (3) opportunity costs from foregoing other business relationships, and (4) ongoing losses from underutilized capacity.

Damages in fraud cases are measured by the "out-of-pocket" rule or the "benefit-of-the-bargain" rule, depending on jurisdiction. Under either measure, our client has substantial damages. The out-of-pocket measure compensates for the difference between the value received and the value given up. Our client invested capital based on an expectation of $8 million in orders, worth a value of a $2 million minimum account. The benefit-of-the-bargain measure compares the value of what our client was promised and what was received—here, the difference between an $8 million

account and a $2 million account over five years.

### F. Punitive Damages

The retailer will likely invoke the parol evidence rule, arguing that our client cannot rely on representations that contradict the contract's representations. This argument fails for several reasons.

First, the parol evidence rule does not bar fraud claims. "Riverland Cold Storage, Inc. v. Fresno-Madera Production Credit Ass'n", 291 Cal.App.2d 1 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. 1969) (holding that the parol evidence rule bar extrinsic evidence offered to vary the terms of a written contract, but does not bar fraud claims based on representations that the contract itself was procured through misrepresentations). The fraud exception is nearly universal because allowing the parol evidence rule to shield fraud would enable bad actors to insulate fraudulent inducements simply by executing integrated agreements.

Second, the misrepresentation here concerns collateral matters not addressed in the contract. The contract specifies minimum purchases but says nothing about the historical ordering patterns or the likelihood of orders exceeding the minimum. Representations about such collateral matters fall outside the scope of integration. "Carson Realty", 157 N.E.2d 587 (holding that integration does not bar fraud claims based on representations concerning matters not addressed in the written agreement, even where those matters relate to the subject matter of the contract).

Third, even if the contract contains a merger clause, such clauses do not automatically preclude fraud claims. While merger clauses generally bar claims that the parties agreed to integrate their entire contract, they cannot bar fraud claims based on pre-contract misrepresentations because a party cannot contract away liability for its own fraud. "Vigoritone AD Products, Inc. v. PM AD Products, Inc.", 318 F.3d 641 (7th Cir. 2002) (holding that merger clauses and disclaimers do not bar fraud claims because allowing parties to disclaim fraud liability would eviscerate fraud protections and encourage dishonesty in negotiations).

## IV. COUNTERARGUMENTS AND RESPONSES

**"Argument":** The representation was merely a prediction or

opinion about future orders, not a statement of historical fact.

**"Response":** The retailer specifically stated that comparable suppliers "historically averaged" $8 million—this is historical fact. This is not a prediction like "we expect to order $8 million" or an opinion like "this should be a lucrative account." Courts consistently hold that statements about past business performance are factual representations. "Bentley", 783 F.Supp.

**"Argument":** Our client assumed the risk by accepting a contract with discretionary ordering above the minimum.

**"Response":** Accepting contractual discretion does not mean accepting misrepresentations about the factual context for exercising that discretion. Our client agreed the retailer could order less than $8 million; our client did not agree to be deceived about historical patterns. The fraud claim challenges how the contract was procured, not the contract's terms". 783 F.Supp. 218,

**"Argument":** Our client was sophisticated and should have protected itself with higher minimums or conducted due diligence.

**"Response":** Sophistication does not eliminate the right to rely on specific factual representations, particularly concerning matters within the other party's exclusive knowledge. "Grumman Allied", 748 F.2d 729. The law does not require commercial parties to treat every negotiating partner as a liar. Moreover, sophisticated parties can both rely on sophisticated party would reasonably rely on specific historical data when evaluating a long-term supply relationship.

**"Argument":** The revised allocation process was disclosed, putting our client on notice.

**"Response":** Vague disclosure of process changes does not cure affirmative misrepresentations about historical data. The retailer never explained that the revision would reduce orders to near-minimum levels or that historical averages were inflated. "Kahn", 970 F.2d 1030. If the allocation revision made the historical representation misleading, the retailer had a duty to clarify or correct it.

## IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our client has a strong fraudulent misrepresentation claim. The retailer made a specific, material misrepresentation of historical fact that induced our client to enter a disadvantageous contract. The representation was false, the retailer knew or should have known it was false, and our client's reliance was entirely justified given the retailer's superior access to the underlying data.

The case is closely analogous to "Industrial Polymer Solutions", where a comparable buyer relied on pre-contract representations about minimum and discretionary ordering. The retailer's defenses—contractual integration, assumption of risk, and sophisticated party status—are unlikely to succeed given well-established exceptions for fraud claims.

**"Recommended next steps:"**

1. **"Demand letter":** Send a detailed demand letter outlining the misrepresentation, our client's damages, and demanding rescission of the contract and compensation for out-of-pocket losses or damages. This may prompt settlement discussions and preserve our client's position.

2. **"Discovery":** Immediately seek the retailer's internal records concerning historical supplier order volumes, communications about the allocation revision, and documents showing what information was available to negotiators when they made the $8 million representation.

3. **"Damages analysis":** Retain an expert to calculate lost profits, capital expenditure losses, and opportunity costs from foregone alternative relationships.

4. **"Parallel claims":** Consider whether our client also has claims for negligent misrepresentation (if scienter proves difficult) or breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing (if the retailer is deliberately minimizing orders to avoid the spirit of the agreement).

5. **"Remedies":** Evaluate whether rescission or damages better serves our client's interests. Rescission would unwind the contract but might not fully compensate for opportunity costs and investments. Damages would compensate our client while

potentially preserving the relationship if order volumes improve.

The strength of this claim, particularly given the "Industrial Polymer" precedent, positions us well for either settlement negotiations or litigation. The retailer's internal records will be crucial—if they show the $8 million figure was knowingly false, the case becomes even stronger.

### Cortega Policy Guardrails — ONLINE CHECKS

**Checked by Cortega Online AI Verifier Guardrails**

```
ARENA-LLM-a-Online-Checks-c1a4e-1d0d9f0e-v1-0
VERDICT  :  Pending  ·  Jan 26, 2,:Bob 007 Tokens
```

DRAFT

```
# MEMORANDUM

**TO:** File
**RE:** Litigation Team
**RE:** * Misrepresentation Claim – Private-Label Manufacturing Agreement
**DATE:** [Current Date]

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

This memorandum analyzes our client's potential misrepresentation claim arising from a five-year private-label manufacturing agreement. The retailer induced our client to enter the contract by representing that comparable suppliers historically averaged approximately $8 million in annual orders, when internal records now show the actual historical average was approximately $1.2 million. The retailer's actual purchases of $8 million in minimum annual purchases, with additional orders at the retailer's discretion. Our client has received orders barely exceeding the contractual minimum since execution.

## II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Our client entered into a five-year manufacturing agreement to produce private-label products for a major retailer. During pre-contract negotiations, the retailer's representatives informed our client that comparable suppliers historically averaged approximately $8 million in annual orders. Relying on this representation, our client invested substantial capital in equipment, staffing, and infrastructure to service what it reasonably anticipated would be a high-volume account.

The written contract commits the retailer to $2 million in minimum annual purchases but leaves all additional orders to the retailer's sole discretion. Before signing, our client was aware that the retailer was implementing a revised supplier allocation process, through the retailer provided no specifics about how this revision would affect order volumes.

Since contract execution, orders have barely exceeded the $2 million minimum. Discovery of the retailer's internal records reveals that the actual historical average for comparable suppliers was significantly lower than $8 million—potentially less than half that figure. The retailer now contends it had our client accepted the contract's minimum and the risks associated with the new allocation process, and therefore assumed the risk of reduced order volumes.

## III. LEGAL ANALYSIS

### A. Elements of Fraudulent Misrepresentation

To establish fraudulent misrepresentation under governing law, our client must prove: (1) a false representation of material fact, (2) knowledge of falsity or reckless disregard for the truth, (3) intent to induce reliance, (4) justifiable reliance, and (5) resulting damages. *Mariano v. ABC Transfer & Storage Co.*, 457 F.2d 535 (9th Cir. 1973) (holding that statements regarding a business's historical performance constitute actionable misrepresentations when made to induce a commercial relationship and the speaker knows or should know the statements are false).

The retailer's representation that comparable suppliers "historically averaged about $8 million in annual orders" constitutes a statement of past fact, not mere puffery or future projection. Historical performance is objectively verifiable and, when communicated during contract negotiations, constitutes a representation of material fact rather than opinion, particularly when the speaker possesses superior knowledge of the underlying data).

### B. Materiality and Inducement

A misrepresentation is material if it would influence a reasonable business person's decision to contract. The $8 million figure was plainly material to our client's decision. The representation suggested order volumes four times the contractual minimum, which directly affected our client's cost-benefit analysis, capital investment decisions, and assessment of the contract's profitability.

The retailer cannot escape liability by pointing to the $2 million contractual minimum. When a party makes specific factual representations during negotiations that induce reliance beyond the contract, the existence of contractual provisions addressing related subjects does not automatically bar a fraud claim. "Carson Realty Corp. v. Martin", 157 N.E.2d 587 (N.Y. 1959) (holding that a party may pursue fraud claims based on pre-contract representations even where the written agreement contains provisions on related matters, particularly where the misrepresentation concerns factual matters within the defendant's exclusive knowledge).

Our strongest precedent comes from "Industrial Polymer Solutions, Inc. v. Beechfield Chemicals", 589 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.N.J. 2013). In "Industrial Polymer", a chemical manufacturer entered a supply agreement after the buyer represented that its historical purchase volumes from comparable suppliers averaged $12 million annually. The contract required a minimum of $2 million, with minimum purchases with additional orders discretionary. Actual orders never exceeded $3.5 million, and discovery revealed historical averages were closer to $5 million. The court denied summary judgment on the fraud claim, holding that the buyer's pre-contract representations could plausibly induce reliance beyond the contract's actual terms, that the contract's existence didn't bar the fraud claim, and that the plaintiff's reliance was justified despite the contractual minimum because "a reasonable businessperson would understand such historical data as probative of likely future performance, particularly where the defendant possessed superior knowledge of its own purchasing history."

### C. Knowledge and Scienter

The retailer's internal records showing substantially lower historical averages establish scienter. If the retailer's representatives knew the true figures when making the $8 million representation, the conduct constitutes actual knowledge of falsity. Even if individual negotiators lacked actual knowledge, corporate scienter may still be established where the corporation possesses information contradicting its representations. "Southwest Securities Corp. v. Hillpine Insurance Holdings", 847 F.3d 1102 (9th Cir. 2017) (holding that a corporation's knowledge is the collective knowledge of its employees, and scienter is established when some employees possess information contradicting representations made by other employees during negotiations).

The retailer cannot shield itself by claiming its negotiators acted in good faith if those negotiators relied on internal data they knew or disregard for truth sufficient for fraud, and failing to verify historical data before making specific numerical representations to induce a multi-million-dollar, multi-year commitment constitutes recklessness.

### D. Justifiable Reliance

The retailer will argue our client's reliance was unjustified because: (1) the contract specified only a $2 million minimum, (2) our client knew about the revised allocation process, and (3)or client could have investigated the historical data independently. None of these arguments defeats justifiable reliance.

First, the contractual minimum does not preclude reliance on extra-contractual representations. "Carson Realty Corp. v. Martin", 157 N.E.2d 587 (N.Y. 1959) (holding that a party may justifiably rely on specific factual representations made during negotiations even where the final contract contains different or more limited terms, because the misrepresentation induced the party to accept those contractual terms in the first instance).

The key distinction is between relying on a representation that contradicts express contract terms and relying on a representation that provides context for evaluating those terms. Our client did not rely on the $8 million figure as a contractual guarantee, nor, our client relied on it as historical context suggesting the $2 million minimum was a floor, not a ceiling, with orders at the retailer's likely approach historical norms. This reliance was entirely reasonable.

Second, our client's awareness of a revised allocation process does not defeat reliance. The retailer never disclosed that the revision would reduce orders to near-minimum levels or that historical averages were inflated. "Kahn v. Kohlberg, Kravis, Roberts & Co.", 970 F.2d 1030 (2d Cir. 1992) (holding that general awareness of changed circumstances does not preclude justifiable reliance on specific misrepresentations concerning those changes, absent facts to disclose how the changes affected the accuracy of the representations).

Knowledge that "something has changed" does not put a party on notice that specific historical data provided by the other party is false. The retailer had a duty to correct its misrepresentation once it became misleading due to the allocation shift, or at minimum to disclose that the revision would materially affect the relevance of historical data.

Third, our client had no duty to independently verify the retailer's historical averages. Where a fact is within the exclusive or superior knowledge of one party, or where one party possesses superior access to information and makes specific factual representations, the other party may justifiably rely without independent investigation. "Grumman Allied Industries, Inc. v. Rohr Industries, Inc.", 748 F.2d 729 (2d Cir. 1984) (holding that a party may justifiably rely on representations concerning matters within the other party's exclusive knowledge, and has no duty to conduct independent investigation that would expose access to the opposing party's internal records).

The retailer possessed exclusive access to its historical purchasing data. Requiring our client to verify this data before signing would be impractical and would undermine the reasonable expectations of parties negotiating at arm's length. The law does not require such skepticism in commercial dealings.

### E. Damages

Our client's damages include: (1) lost profits from the shortfall between reasonably anticipated orders (based on the $8 million representation) and actual orders, (2) capital expenditure made in reliance on anticipated order volumes, (3) opportunity costs from foregoing other business relationships, and (4) ongoing losses from underutilized capacity.

Damages in fraud cases are measured by the "out-of-pocket" rule or the "benefit-of-the-bargain" rule, depending on jurisdiction. Under either measure, our client has substantial damages. The out-of-pocket measure compensates for the difference between the value received and the value given up. Our client invested capital based on an expectation of $8 million in orders, worth a value of a $2 million minimum account. The benefit-of-the-bargain measure compares the value of what our client was promised and what was received—here, the difference between an $8 million

account and a $2 million account over five years.

### F. Punitive Damages

The retailer will likely invoke the parol evidence rule, arguing that our client cannot rely on representations that contradict the contract's representations. This argument fails for several reasons.

First, the parol evidence rule does not bar fraud claims. "Riverland Cold Storage, Inc. v. Fresno-Madera Production Credit Ass'n", 291 Cal.App.2d 1 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. 1969) (holding that the parol evidence rule bar extrinsic evidence offered to vary the terms of a written contract, but does not bar fraud claims based on representations that the contract itself was procured through misrepresentations). The fraud exception is nearly universal because allowing the parol evidence rule to shield fraud would enable bad actors to insulate fraudulent inducements simply by executing integrated agreements.

Second, the misrepresentation here concerns collateral matters not addressed in the contract. The contract specifies minimum purchases but says nothing about the historical ordering patterns or the likelihood of orders exceeding the minimum. Representations about such collateral matters fall outside the scope of integration. "Carson Realty", 157 N.E.2d 587 (holding that integration does not bar fraud claims based on representations concerning matters not addressed in the written agreement, even where those matters relate to the subject matter of the contract).

Third, even if the contract contains a merger clause, such clauses do not automatically preclude fraud claims. While merger clauses generally bar claims that the parties agreed to integrate their entire contract, they cannot bar fraud claims based on pre-contract misrepresentations because a party cannot contract away liability for its own fraud. "Vigoritone AD Products, Inc. v. PM AD Products, Inc.", 318 F.3d 641 (7th Cir. 2002) (holding that merger clauses and disclaimers do not bar fraud claims because allowing parties to disclaim fraud liability would eviscerate fraud protections and encourage dishonesty in negotiations).

## IV. COUNTERARGUMENTS AND RESPONSES

**"Argument":** The representation was merely a prediction or

opinion about future orders, not a statement of historical fact.

**"Response":** The retailer specifically stated that comparable suppliers "historically averaged" $8 million—this is historical fact. This is not a prediction like "we expect to order $8 million" or an opinion like "this should be a lucrative account." Courts consistently hold that statements about past business performance are factual representations. "Bentley", 783 F.Supp.

**"Argument":** Our client assumed the risk by accepting a contract with discretionary ordering above the minimum.

**"Response":** Accepting contractual discretion does not mean accepting misrepresentations about the factual context for exercising that discretion. Our client agreed the retailer could order less than $8 million; our client did not agree to be deceived about historical patterns. The fraud claim challenges how the contract was procured, not the contract's terms". 783 F.Supp. 218,

**"Argument":** Our client was sophisticated and should have protected itself with higher minimums or conducted due diligence.

**"Response":** Sophistication does not eliminate the right to rely on specific factual representations, particularly concerning matters within the other party's exclusive knowledge. "Grumman Allied", 748 F.2d 729. The law does not require commercial parties to treat every negotiating partner as a liar. Moreover, sophisticated parties can both rely on sophisticated party would reasonably rely on specific historical data when evaluating a long-term supply relationship.

**"Argument":** The revised allocation process was disclosed, putting our client on notice.

**"Response":** Vague disclosure of process changes does not cure affirmative misrepresentations about historical data. The retailer never explained that the revision would reduce orders to near-minimum levels or that historical averages were inflated. "Kahn", 970 F.2d 1030. If the allocation revision made the historical representation misleading, the retailer had a duty to clarify or correct it.

## IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our client has a strong fraudulent misrepresentation claim. The retailer made a specific, material misrepresentation of historical fact that induced our client to enter a disadvantageous contract. The representation was false, the retailer knew or should have known it was false, and our client's reliance was entirely justified given the retailer's superior access to the underlying data.

The case is closely analogous to "Industrial Polymer Solutions", where a comparable buyer relied on pre-contract representations about minimum and discretionary ordering. The retailer's defenses—contractual integration, assumption of risk, and sophisticated party status—are unlikely to succeed given well-established exceptions for fraud claims.

**"Recommended next steps:"**

1. **"Demand letter":** Send a detailed demand letter outlining the misrepresentation, our client's damages, and demanding rescission of the contract and compensation for out-of-pocket losses or damages. This may prompt settlement discussions and preserve our client's position.

2. **"Discovery":** Immediately seek the retailer's internal records concerning historical supplier order volumes, communications about the allocation revision, and documents showing what information was available to negotiators when they made the $8 million representation.

3. **"Damages analysis":** Retain an expert to calculate lost profits, capital expenditure losses, and opportunity costs from foregone alternative relationships.

4. **"Parallel claims":** Consider whether our client also has claims for negligent misrepresentation (if scienter proves difficult) or breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing (if the retailer is deliberately minimizing orders to avoid the spirit of the agreement).

5. **"Remedies":** Evaluate whether rescission or damages better serves our client's interests. Rescission would unwind the contract but might not fully compensate for opportunity costs and investments. Damages would compensate our client while

potentially preserving the relationship if order volumes improve.

The strength of this claim, particularly given the "Industrial Polymer" precedent, positions us well for either settlement negotiations or litigation. The retailer's internal records will be crucial—if they show the $8 million figure was knowingly false, the case becomes even stronger.
```
```