



CHARLOTTE MEARS

Senior Associate

London

初级律师 建设工程诉讼，新加坡

E: charlotte.mears@bcplaw.com

T: [+44 \(0\) 20 3400 3639](tel:+442034003639)

BIOGRAPHY

Charlotte是博闻国际建设工程诉讼团队律师。

她主要处理建设工程权利主张和争议，拥有多个领域的复杂国际仲裁和建设争议的工作经验（包括能源、油气和混合用途地产）。

2016年加入博闻新加坡办公室之前，Charlotte曾在博闻阿布扎比办公室工作。她近期在新加坡办公室完成了带薪实习。

Charlotte具有英格兰和威尔士律师执业资格。

ADMISSIONS

- England and Wales

RELATED PRACTICE AREAS

- Construction Disputes
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Real Estate

RELATED INSIGHTS

Insights

Aug 25, 2022

Cladding and fire safety: more reaction to Martlet v Mulalley

Martlet Homes Ltd v Mulalley & Co Ltd is the first decision from the TCC on fire safety defects following the Grenfell Tower tragedy. This decision is highly significant for the construction industry, given the number of similar cases which are either progressing through the courts or at the pre-action stage. Although the judge emphasised the fact-specific nature of the dispute, this decision provided some insight on the court's likely approach to some of the significant issues that affect cladding disputes. This blog considers some of the key takeaways from that decision in further detail.

Insights

Mar 25, 2021

Limitation periods for breach of contract claims: where to begin?


On the face of it, the law of limitation seems fairly straightforward. The law in England and Wales specifies that anyone bringing a breach of contract claim has six years from the date of the breach in which to do so. This period is extended to 12 years from the breach of contract if the contract has been executed as a deed. But what happens when a provision such as the one below is added into the mix? Does this work to extend the limitation period? If not, what exactly does this provision, which I'll refer to as the Proposed Clause, mean?

Insights

Sep 04, 2019

Biting off more than you can chew: no oral modification and entire agreement clauses

The Court of Appeal recently considered the application of, and relationship between, no oral modification (NOM) and entire agreement clauses. While this was not a construction case (the appeal in question concerned a contract for the provision of dental services), both types of clause are commonly included in construction contracts. The judgment also restates a number of rules of contractual interpretation, which serve as a useful reminder, and perhaps a warning, of the potential pitfalls when seeking to administer and vary contracts.

 Cookiebot session tracker icon loaded