

# Its unfair to weaver

[Environment](#), [Air](#)



“ Its Unfair to Weaver “ , Weaver Because Young was a minor, the key issues

they must resolve is that whether lodging was a necessity to Young or not,

which means if she was legally bound by a lease. Weaver appealed

requesting damages for the unpaid rent and the damage done by Youngs

<https://assignbuster.com/its-unfair-to-weaver/>

dog to the apartment. At first, the trial court entered a judgement in favor of

Weaver.

According to Callaway v. E. H. Smith Elec. Contractors, Inc., 814 So. 2d 893 (Ala. Civ.

App. 2001), if it is shown to be unsupported by substantial evidence and plainly and palpably wrong, it can be reviewed. Young appealed that in the law of the state, she was a minor and lodging was not a necessity, because she could go home whenever she wanted, his father also assured that. As 42 Am. Jur.

2d Infants ?§ 71 (2000) and 42 Am. Jur. 2d Infants ?§ 75 (2000) states, the lodging is not necessities to the infant if he has a parent or guardian who is willing and able to supply them. Although she was employed during her renting time, she also kept working when she went back home, that is to say, she did not need lodging to maintain her employment. From 184 Ala. at 234, 63 So. at 162, “ The lease representing nothing that was necessary for the infant, and he, in fact, derived no benefit whatever from it.

” thus as the common-law rule says infants do not have the capacity to bind themselves absolutely to a contract unless it is one for necessities. Finally, as Alabama Supreme Court in Ragan v. Williams, 220 Ala. 590, 127 So. 190 (1930) indicates, the lodging is not a necessity to Young, as an infant, she did not have the capacity to bind herself to the lease, that is, the contract she signed before was void. Therefore, the judgment of the trial court was reversed, and the cause was remanded for the trial court to enter a judgment in favor of Young.

As far as I am concerned, the case seems a little unfair to Weaver. Apparently, whose apartment was damaged by Young™s dog, but the outcome was in favor of Young. It is weird that when someone does damage to our property and we cannot get the compensation just because he or she is a minor and they don™t need to take the responsibility. Therefore, I disapprove of the judgement.-w ;,?