

University of Denver

**Digital Commons @ DU**

---

Sturm College of Law: Faculty Scholarship

University of Denver Sturm College of Law

---

7-1-2002

## Nit-picking or Significant Contract Choices?-Part III

K.K. DuVivier

*University of Denver*, [kkdvvivier@law.du.edu](mailto:kkdvvivier@law.du.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.du.edu/law\\_facpub](https://digitalcommons.du.edu/law_facpub)



Part of the [Legal Writing and Research Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

K.K. DuVivier, Nit-Picking or Significant Contract Choices?-Part III, 31 Colo. Law. 95 (July 2002).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Denver Sturm College of Law at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sturm College of Law: Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact [jennifer.cox@du.edu,dig-commons@du.edu](mailto:jennifer.cox@du.edu,dig-commons@du.edu).

---

## Nit-picking or Significant Contract Choices?-Part III

### Publication Statement

Copyright is held by the author. User is responsible for all copyright compliance.

### Publication Statement

Copyright is held by the author. User is responsible for all copyright compliance.



## THE SCRIVENER: MODERN LEGAL WRITING

# Nit-picking or Significant Contract Choices?—Part III

by K.K. DuVivier

©2002 K.K. DuVivier

In the March "Scrivener,"<sup>1</sup> I quoted three examples of revisions proposed in a lease negotiation that were characterized by one reader as "nit-picking." In the June article,<sup>2</sup> I summarized the general responses I received about nit-picking from a number of readers. Two of those readers were kind enough to give me very specific feedback about the three clauses listed in the March article.<sup>3</sup> This article addresses each clause individually to provide help to other readers with their negotiations. Overall, these readers concluded that each of the proposed revisions listed raised legitimate concerns for their clients that were worth discussing with opposing counsel.

—**Lease:** "At all times during the continuance of this Lease, Landlord shall . . ."

**Change:** Delete the word "continuance" and substitute therefor "term."

**Response 1:** "In the first example, I have no idea what the 'continuance' of a lease would be. 'Term' seems more appropriate because it is a term of art; it has legal significance. I would guess that elsewhere in the lease agreement, there is a specified 'term.' It may even be a defined term in the agreement. While one could infer that 'continuance' means the same thing as 'term,' it's better to be precise with the language so as to prevent later question and possible dispute."

**Response 2:** "I assume that the lease has a term clause, not a 'continuance' clause. (*Black's Law Dictionary* defines 'continuance' only in the sense of the adjournment or postponement of an action.) While the word 'continuance' in the lease clause is probably okay under the 'Like, yeah man, you know what I mean, Dude!' standard, there is nothing wrong with exercising a bit of craftsmanship and using the word 'term.'<sup>4</sup> But whether the change is made or not would seem to have no substantive effect on the meaning of the clause. (Still, a question may arise as to whether, in the case of a hold-over tenant, the lease may have a 'continuance' after the 'term' has expired. (*Cf. First Na-*

*tional Bank of Colorado Springs v. Struthers*, 121 Colo. 69, 215 P.2d 903 (1950)). But this should be addressed directly (*e.g.*, 'during the term of this Lease and any continuance or extension thereof'), and not by uncertain implication from the mere use of the word continuance standing alone.)"

—**Lease:** "Landlord shall make all structural repairs. . ."

**Change:** "Landlord shall make all structural repairs at Landlord's own and sole expense."

**Response 1:** "The second example is a very important point of clarification, as far as the would-be tenant's interests are concerned. Unless the lease agreement makes this point elsewhere, then I think it would be important to make clear that the landlord not only has to complete structural repairs, but also pay for them. Even if applicable state law is clear on this point, I think a good advocate for the tenant would want the agreement to be absolutely clear."

**Response 2:** "It seems to me that the questions of who is to do a certain act, and who is to pay for it, are two different questions. It is not out of the realm of possibility that the landlord would 'make all structural repairs' and then seek to recover the amount from the tenant on the theory that 'repairs fall to the expense of the tenant, unless otherwise provided by the lease' (*Denver Tramway Corp. v. Rumry*, 98 Colo. 24, 52 P.2d 396, 398 (1935))."

—**Lease:** "Tenant agrees to pay, as additional rental, 10% of the gross expense of lighting."

**Change:** Insert the word "reasonable" before the word "expense."

### DO YOU HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT LEGAL WRITING?

K.K. DuVivier will be happy to address them through the *Scrivener* column. Send your questions to: [kkduvivier@law.du.edu](mailto:kkduvivier@law.du.edu) or call her at (303) 871-6281.



*K.K. DuVivier is an Assistant Professor and Director of the Lawyering Process Program at the University of Denver College of Law.*

**Response 1:** “The third example, in my opinion, is the most tenuous edit, because simply adding the word ‘reasonable’ does not seem to advance the ball at all. It would only lead to an argument down the road of whether the lighting expenses were ‘reasonable’—an argument that probably would have ensued regardless of whether the word ‘reasonable’ appeared in the agreement or not. Perhaps the better thing to do would be to place a cap on the amount the tenant would pay on the gross expense of lighting, or draft some other mechanism that makes clear exactly what the tenant’s obligations would be.”

**Response 2:** “I think that a lawyer who relies upon the court implying the term ‘reasonable’ in any particular covenant of a lease is taking the risk that the court will not do so. After all, it is possible, contractually, to give the landlord *carte blanche* to spend money that the tenant must reimburse, in whole or in part.”

## Conclusion

Several readers have contacted me about these articles on nit-picking. While many voiced their frustrations about pro-

posed revisions in the negotiation phase of a contract, most have confided to me that they would much prefer spending the time to make revisions during this initial phase rather than litigating these issues down the road—when the handshakes have turned to fist-shakes.

## NOTES

1. DuVivier, “Nit-picking or Significant Contract Choices?—Part I,” 31 *The Colorado Lawyer* 43 (March 2002).
2. DuVivier, “Nit-picking or Significant Contract Choices?—Part II,” 31 *The Colorado Lawyer* 65 (June 2002).
3. The first response in each of the comments to follow is from Chuck Sensiba, of Van Ness Feldman, P.C. in Washington, D.C.; the second response is from George Reeves of Denver, Colorado. Also, Stanton Rosenbaum submitted a letter to *The Colorado Lawyer* regarding the March article. See “From Our Readers,” 31 *The Colorado Lawyer* 57 (June 2002).
4. See Reeves, “Learning How to Practice Law in the Real World,” 21 *The Colorado Lawyer* 947 (May 1992). ■

### Law Student Assistance Available from University of Colorado School of Law

Attorneys working *pro bono* or reduced fee cases or with nonprofit organizations should be aware that the University of Colorado Law Student Volunteers are available to help with brief writing, research, and case compilation. Contact Professor Norm Aaronson at the Legal Aid and Defender Program at (303) 492-8126, or Robert Wolf, Student Coordinator, at wolfrc@colorado.edu. More information is available at [www.colorado.edu/law/lendstudent.html](http://www.colorado.edu/law/lendstudent.html).

## Agricultural Tax and Law Seminars

Holiday Inn I-25, Fort Collins, CO

August 13, 2002

FARM & RANCH INCOME TAX

by Dr. Neil E. Harl

August 14, 2002

FARM & RANCH ESTATE PLANNING

by Dr. Neil E. Harl

August 15, 2002

FARM & RANCH BUSINESS PLANNING & TAX

by Prof. Roger A. McEowen

August 16, 2002

FARM & RANCH CONTRACTS

by Prof. Roger A. McEowen

The seminars will run from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. each day with an hour for lunch. Registrants may attend one, two, three or all four days, with separate pricing for each combination.

The registration fee includes comprehensive annotated seminar materials for the days attended which will be updated just prior to the seminar

For a brochure or more information, contact Robert Achenbach, Agricultural Law Press, P.O. Box 50703, Eugene, OR 97405 541-302-1958 or e-mail [robert@agrilawpress.com](mailto:robert@agrilawpress.com)

See also [www.agrilawpress.com](http://www.agrilawpress.com)

Mention this ad and receive a 5% discount on registration fees.

## “African American Women in Business”

Second Annual Conference  
Will Be Held In Baltimore, Maryland  
August 15–17, 2002

The African American Women in Business Conference (“AAWIBC”) will hold its second annual conference at the Sheraton Inner Harbor Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland, August 15–17, 2002. This year’s theme is: “I Am Beautiful, Prosperous, and Successful: I Am an African American Woman in Business!”

Keynote speaker at the conference will be Monique Greenwood, author of “Having What Matters,” and owner of Akwaaba Mansion, Cafe and Akwaaba by the Sea. The conference will include a three-part technology program, as well as a financial workshop where business loans, venture capital, and investor strategies will be discussed. A three-hour program will exclusively deal with “The Business of Getting Published” and there will be an empowerment program entitled “And the Women Gather.”

AAWIBC is committed to educating and supporting the African American woman-entrepreneur. For additional information about AAWIBC and the conference, visit AAWIBC’s website at: <http://aawibc.com> or call (310) 680-0870.