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Select Goal

- G1 Special
- G2 Special
- G3 Special
- G4 Special
- G5 Special
- ADVICE Boolean
- defect Boolean
- ct1 Special
- ct2 Special
- ct3 Special
- ct4 Special
- p_p1 Special
- p_p2 Special
- p_p3 Special
- p_p4 Special

Home
Question: Do you think that performance of the contract is possible but the party is not performing intentionally.

Certainty Factor: 1.0
Select Value: 
Continue

Why | Show Rule | Show Attribute Value | Box | Revoke | Save Response | Abort

Home
Question: Do you think that performance of the contract is possible but the party has refused to perform the contract?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value: YES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why | Show Rule | Show Attribute Values | How | Revoke | Save Response | About |

Home
Question: do you think that the performance of the contract is impossible due to any unavoidable reason?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value: YES

Continue

Why | Show Rule | Show Attribute Value | How | Revoke | Save Response | Abort

Home
Question: Is it the case of frustration of purpose?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value: 
- YES
- NO

Continue

Why | Show Rule | Show Attribute Value | How | Revoke | Save Response | Abort

Home
Question: is it a case of force majeure?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value: YES

Continue

Why Show Rule Show Attribute Value How Revolve Save Response Abort

Home
Question: Is that contract type a building contract?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value: YES

Continue: YES
NO

Home
Question: Is that contract type a plan preparation contract?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Selected Value: YES

Continue:

Why | Show Rule | Show Attribute Value | Help | Revoke | Save Response | Abort

Home
Result

Goal Attribute: ADVICE
Value-OF Pairs:

- true: 0.263

Notes:
- This case falls under fault ground. Impossibility to perform contract. You can take these actions: Action on repetition of work performed. Action on suspension. Action on petition for deadline extension. Claim for damages.
- Action on improper completion of plans. Action on improper technical building consultancy by the ROC consultant.

Show Result

Show Rule  Show Attribute Value  How  What-If  Save Responses  Generate Report  Abort

Home
## Select Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contract</td>
<td>MultiA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damage</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consent</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competent_to_contract</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lawful_consideration</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>registered</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>void</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>BoolA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound_mind</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified_by_law</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coercion</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undue_influence</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraud</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aqpt</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consideration</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promisor</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promise</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signal_enforce</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal_ens_relation</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certain_vague</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicated</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mode</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concern_person</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolute</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_media</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_o</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major1</td>
<td>Boolean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major2</td>
<td>Boolean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apr</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ape</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bypr</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byepe</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: The NIKKAY system verifies the validity of the contract made between two parties. According to you, does the contract satisfy all conditions?

Certainty Factor: 1.0
Select Value: YES

Continue

Home
Question: The NIKMAT system verifies the validity of the contract made between two parties. According to you does the contract satisfy all conditions?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value:
- YES
- YES
- NO
- UNKNOWN

Future Actions:
- Why
- Show Rule
- Show Attribute Value
- How
- Revolve
- Save Response
- Abort

Home
Question: Do you think that agreement between the parties is valid?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Selected Value: YES

- YES
- NO
- UNKNOWN

[Buttons: Why, Show Rule, Show Attribute Value, How, Revoke, Save Response, Abort]

Home
Question: Is there a valid consideration between two pairs?

Certainty Factor: 1.0
Select Value: YES
Continue

Home
Question: Does the Contract have a party who plays the role of promisor in the contract?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value:

YES

NO

Continue

Why | Show Rule | Show Attribute Value | Help | Revoke | Save Response | Abort

Home
Question: Does the Contract have a party who plays the role of promisee in the contract?

Certainty Factor: 1.0
Select Value: [YES, NO]

Continue

Why  Show Rule  Show Attribute Value  How  Revoke  Save Response  Abort

Home
Question: Is the agreement enforceable by law?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value: [YES, NO]

Continue

Why, Show Rule, Show Attribute Value, How, Revoke, Save Response, Abort

Home
Question: Do you think the offer given by promisor of the contract is valid?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value:

YES

Continue
Question: Do you think that promise has accepted the offer properly?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value:
- YES
- NO
- UNKNOWN

Options:
- Why
- Show Rule
- Show Attribute Value
- How
- Revoke
- Save Response
- Abort

Home
Question: Do you know that both the parties have agreed upon the same thing in the same sense?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value:

- YES
- NO
- UNKNOWN

Continue

Why | Show Rule | Show Attribute Value | How | Revoke | Save Response | Abort

Home
Question: Do you know that Every person is competent to contract?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value: YES

Continue

Why | Show Rule | Show Attribute Value | How | Revoke | Save Response | Abort

Home
Question: Do you think the promise of the promise is lawful? Is it not forbidden by any other law?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value: YES [ ] NO [ ]

[Continue, Why, Show Rule, Show Attribute Value, How, Revoke, Save Response, Abort]

Home
Question: Is purpose of the contract lawful that is it is not forbidden by any other law?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value: YES

Continue

Home
Question: Is the contract registered if it needs to be registered in your case.

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value: 

YES

Continued
Question: Are you sure that contract is not void in nature?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value: YES

Continue

Home
Question: Is the premise exist and given by promisor to promise?

Certainty Factor: 1.0

Select Value:  
- YES
- NO

Buttons: Why, Show Rule, Show Attribute Value, How, Revoke, Save Response, Abort

Home
Result

Goal Attribute contract
Value-CF Points:

- void: 1

Notes:

- The agreement is not enforceable by law hence contract is not valid
Result

Goal Attribute contract
Value-CF Points:

- valid: 1

Notes:

- According to your Contract is Valid
Result

Goal Attribute: contract
Value: CF Points

- void: 1

Notes:

- According to you, Contract is Void

Show Result

Show Rule  Show Attribute Value  How  What-IF  Save Response  Generate Report  About

Home