CONTRACTS--ISSUE OF COMMON LAW REMEDY--DIRECT DAMAGES--
CONTRACTOR'S MEASURE OF RECOVERY FOR AN OWNER'S BREACH OF A
CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR OR SERVICES CONTRACT WHERE THE CONTRACTOR
HAS FULLY PERFORMED.

Direct damages are the economic losses that usually or
customarily result\(^1\) from a breach of contract. In this case, you
will determine direct damages, if any, by determining the price\(^2\)
agreed upon by the parties in the contract (less any previous
payment by the defendant to the plaintiff under the contract.\(^3\))

\(^1\)"In awarding damages, compensation is given for only those injuries
that the defendant had reason to foresee as a probable result of his breach
when the contract was made. If the injury is one that follows the breach in
the usual course of events, there is sufficient reason for the defendant to
foresee it; otherwise, it must be shown specifically that the defendant had
reason to know the facts and to foresee the injury." Stanley v. Stanback,
297 N.C. 181, 187, 254 S.E.2d 611, 616 (1979) (quoting the RESTATEMENT OF THE
LAW OF CONTRACT, § 330, p. 509). The foreseeability limitation on recovery
was first enunciated in Hadley v. Baxendale, 156 Eng. Rep. 145 (1854).

\(^2\)Note that in the absence of stipulation as to price, when services are
rendered under an agreement that compensation is to be paid, the measure of
recovery is the reasonable value of the services rendered. Thorne v.
Lexington Mail Order Co., 241 N.C. 249, 251, 85 S.E.2d 140, 142 (1954). The
reasonable value of the services is based on the time and labor expended,
skill, knowledge and experience involved, and other attendant circumstances,
rather than on the use to be made of the result or the benefit to the party
for whom the services are rendered. Turner v. Marsh Furniture Co., 217 N.C.
695, 697, 9 S.E.2d 379, 380 (1940).

\(^3\)In a suit for damages arising out of a breach of contract the party
injured by the breach is entitled to full compensation for the loss and to be
placed, to the extent possible, in the position which he would have occupied
had the contract not been breached. Harris v. Harris Constr. Co. v. Crain &
Goodman, 225 N.C. 406, 412, 35 S.E.2d 277, 281 (1945)).