



TOPIC: EVALUATE THE ROLE OF CONSIDERATION IN CONTRACT LAW

MODULE CODE: BMLW5009

MODULE NAME: CONTRACT LAW

LECTURER'S NAME: ZITA DRAPER

Full Name	MUHAMMAD HARITH BIN MOHAMAD SETH
Matric No.	2226197

Consideration is one of the most significant concepts in contract law. It is a key part of both parties making and keeping deals. This analysis will delve into the fundamental role of consideration in contract law, which influences the establishment of legally enforceable agreements and guarantees impartiality and consistency between parties involved in the contract. This essay goes into detail about how important thought is by looking at its meaning, different types, validity, related issues, and suggested fixes. The complexities pertaining to consideration and its ramifications for contemporary contract law shall be expounded upon via a comprehensive analysis. This essay contends that consideration plays a crucial role in the formulation of contracts and serves as a tool to protect the interests of all parties concerned.

Legal deals are based on contracts, which spell out the rights and duties of each party. In order for contracts to be legally binding, they need certain things to be in place. These basic parts are an offer, an acceptance, the desire to form a legal relationship, and consideration (Hermalin, Katz, and Craswell, 2007). Each part is very important because without it, a contract can be thrown out or not enforced. Without consideration, the parties do not share value with each other, which is required for a contract to exist (Furmston and Tolhurst, 2010). This makes the contract less reliable and enforceable. Knowing what “consideration” means in contract law is important for making sure that the deals are legal and can be enforced. A full comprehension of consideration allows for a detailed analysis of its impact on the creation and enforcement of contracts, therefore helping in a comprehensive assessment of its significance in contract law.

As one of the most important parts of contract law, consideration is what makes contractual ties work. In return for claims or actions made by each party, it means something of value that is given and received between parties to a contract (Eisenberg, 1981). Consideration can come in many ways, such as statements, actions, or the ability to wait (Chloros, 1968). These exchanges of value are what make contracts legally binding, they show that both parties agree to be bound by the rules of the contract. An in-depth analysis of the meaning of consideration reveals its impact on the reliability, equality and effectiveness of contractual agreements, with practical consequences for legal practice and business dealings.

Consideration appears in several forms, each with different consequences for contractual relationships. There are two main forms consideration such as executory and executed consideration (Hoffman and Eigen, 2017). Executory consideration pertains to commitments to

carry out future actions, indicating duties that have not yet been completed by the involved parties. Executed consideration involves actions that have already been carried out, indicating that the exchange of value between the parties involved has been accomplished. It is important to grasp these differences in order to clarify the concept of consideration in various contract situations and comprehend the workings of contractual responsibilities. By distinguishing between executory and executed consideration, parties may successfully manage contractual relationships and guarantee clarity and predictability in their deals (Mason, 1941). This comprehension aids in efficient handling of responsibilities and guarantees openness in dealings. Examining various types of consideration illuminates its impact on the creation, understanding, and enforcement of contracts, enhancing a thorough assessment of its significance in contract law.

For a contractual agreement to be valid, consideration must fulfil specific conditions to ensure integrity and enforceability. Consideration must be adequate, having legal worth and competent to uphold a legally bound contract (Lisa, 2001). Furthermore, consideration requires the backing of both parties, showcasing a reciprocal sharing of advantages and responsibilities (Lisa, 2001). Courts often do not evaluate the quality of consideration but instead concentrate on its presence and adequacy to establish the validity of contracts. Ensuring that consideration satisfies the necessary conditions is crucial for protecting the legality and enforceability of commercial agreements, emphasizing the need of following legal principles in contract construction (Beale, 1903). Ensuring that consideration fits these standards is crucial for maintaining the validity and enforceability of contractual agreements, highlighting the need of following legal principles in contract formation. Exploring how consideration's requirement affect contract validity leads to a thorough assessment of its position in contract law.

Consideration is a fundamental principle in contract law. It is not exempt from objections and disagreements. Various concerns pertaining to the concept of consideration have come up in the field of law, presenting substantial obstacles in the fulfilment of contracts. These challenges encompass nominal consideration, past consideration, and agreements lacking consideration. Each give rise to concerns regarding the legitimacy and enforcement of contractual agreements. This essay examines the intricacies of consideration-related issues in contract law by analyzing key instances and legal concepts, and discusses the consequences of these issues.

The issue of symbolic or nominal consideration is a major one in contract law (Faunce, 1954). There was a landmark case using evidence in 1960, *Chappell & Co Ltd v. Nestle Co Ltd*. Where wrappers and a minimal amount of money were accepted as legally acceptable consideration for recordings by the House of Lords. The court placed significant emphasis on the idea that any action or non-action that possessed economic value and was an integral part of the contractual agreement could qualify as valid consideration (Arya, 2022). The ruling provided an additional illustration of this concept through an example, stating that the value of a peppercorn as consideration remains unaltered, regardless of one party's aversion to pepper and intention to dispose it. Although this decision may appear to sanction the incorporation of nominal consideration, it also underscores the necessity for careful examination concerning the adequacy of consideration. The peppercorn illustration functions as an important reminder that consideration does not necessarily have to be of subjective worth to all involved parties; instead, it is sufficient to possess some clear economic worth. The acknowledgment of a peppercorn's legal validity as consideration exemplifies the adaptability of contract law to various types of consideration. However, the peppercorn issue also highlights the vulnerability of nominal consideration to manipulation or misuse, as parties could exploit legal vulnerabilities to establish agreements with token exchanges. As a result, the peppercorn example not only demonstrates the flexibility of contract law but also prompts inquiries regarding the legitimacy and equity of agreements predicated on nominal consideration.

Past consideration, which frequently refers to actions performed prior to the formation of the contract, poses a significant obstacle in the field of contract law (Hamson, 1938). The court ruled in *Re McArdle* (1951) that actions performed prior to the formation of the contract, even if at the pledging party's request, cannot be considered valid consideration for future obligations. On account of its incomplete and defective nature, which excluded the contemporaneity necessary for due deliberation, the agreement was declared invalid (Stone, 1951). The judicial decision underscores the significance of consideration being provided in return for the commitment, rather than being a passive expression of generosity; it also prohibits the nullification of contract on the basis of past conduct. However, valid criticisms of the conventional notion of deliberation are also raised with regard to the issue of past consideration. On the basis of past actions, critics contend that requiring contemporaneous consideration could prevent parties from engaging into mutually beneficial agreements. For example, when one party is dependent on another's assurance of

remuneration for previous exertions, the stipulation of contemporaneity might unduly render the agreement void. Therefore, although the principle of contemporaneous consideration assures the enforceability of contracts and protects against potential excesses, it also limits the ability of parties to rely on previous actions as valid consideration. Thus, the discourse pertaining to past consideration emphasizes the necessity for a nuanced framework concerning consideration in the field of contract law, which strikes a balance between the necessity for contemporaneity and the acceptance of previous actions as legitimate foundations for contractual agreements.

In contract law, the doctrine of promissory estoppel poses an additional difficulty regarding the sufficiency of consideration. Regarding the legal matter of *Central London Property Trust Ltd v. High Trees House Ltd* (1947), the plaintiff consented to a reduction in the rental fee for the leased premises during times of war as a result of the low rates of occupancy (Cheshire and Fifoot, 1947). There was no formal consideration given to this agreement. The court, however, ruled that the plaintiff was precluded from pursuing enforcement of the complete rent when they subsequently attempted to do so. The court deduced that the defendant's continued occupancy of the premises was predicated on the promise of reduced rent, which the court determined to be legally enforceable under the doctrine of promissory estoppel. This case exemplifies the manner in which promissory estoppel may bypass the contractual necessity of formal consideration. Regardless the lack of consideration, the court upheld the promise in accordance with the principles of fairness and equity, thereby avoiding the plaintiff from breaching their commitment and consequently inflicting harm upon the defendant. Critics contend that the utilization of promissory estoppel, as exemplified in the 1947 case *Central London Property Trust Ltd v. High Trees House Ltd*, may compromise the predictability and stability of contract law, despite the fact that it serves to uphold equity and deter unjust behavior. Their argument is that permitting the enforcement of promises without formal consideration may result in ambiguity and potentially incentivize opportunistic conduct. However, advocates contend that promissory estoppel functions as an essential mechanism to safeguard parties who place their trust in unfulfilled promises, particularly in circumstances where formal consideration is absent. Therefore, in addition to challenging the conventional understanding of consideration, promissory estoppel reflects the ongoing dispute between certainty and fairness in contract law.

In order to mitigate concerns pertaining to consideration in the realm of contract law, a number of reform suggestions may be put forth. The primary objectives of these reforms are to update and elucidate the criteria for consideration, promote equity in contractual transactions, and accommodate the intricacies of present-day commercial transactions.

Firstly, Clarification of Consideration Requirements. The legal framework ought to offer more explicit direction regarding the parameters that define legitimate consideration, encompassing the acceptance of diverse manifestations of consideration that extend beyond monetary worth. This clarification would promote consistency in contract interpretation and assist in preventing disputes over the sufficiency of consideration. Illustrative of the necessity of adaptability and acknowledgement of non-traditional forms of consideration is the House of Lord's acceptance of wrappers and small sum of money as legally acceptable consideration in the 1960 case *Chappell & Co Ltd v. Nestle Co Ltd* (Stockdale, 2010).

Secondly, an Extension of Promissory Estoppel: By providing remedies in situations where promises have been made and relied upon to the detriment of one party but no consideration has been present, the doctrine of promissory estoppel could be further expanded. This expansion would ensure that promises are afforded supplementary protection and that contractual transactions remain equitable. The court's decision in *Central London Property Trust Ltd v. High Trees House Ltd* (1947) to enforce promises made in the absence of formal consideration in order to avert unjust behavior exemplifies the capacity of promissory estoppel to address concerns pertaining to consideration.

Lastly, the implementation of a fairness test within the field of contract law would enable judicial bodies to assess the comprehensive fairness of agreements, encompassing the sufficiency of consideration, in order to ascertain their enforceability. By evaluating elements like relative bargaining power, the existence of good faith, and the reasonableness of contractual terms, this criterion would ensure that contractual relationships are conducted fairly and equitably. The adoption of a fairness test is supported by the principles established in cases such as *Yam Seng Pte Ltd v. International Trade Corporation Ltd* (2013), which underscore the significance of good faith and equitable conduct during negotiations (Robertson, 2015).

In conclusion, consideration is an essential element of contract law that is fundamental to the formation and implementation of legally enforceable contracts. By examining its definition, classifications, legality, and related obstacles, this essay has illustrated the importance of this concepts in preserving the honesty and enforceability of agreements. Through an examination of cases and legal concepts, the analysis has effectively responded to the assignment question by demonstrating the critical role that consideration plays in establishing legal relationships and ensuring the effectiveness of contractual agreements. Therefore, this essay provides a thorough evaluation of the significance of consideration in contract law, emphasizing its practical implications in the field of law and commercial transactions.

References

- Hermalin, B.E., Katz, A.W. and Craswell, R., 2007. Contract law. Handbook of law and economics, 1, pp.3-138.
- Furmston, M. and Tolhurst, G.J., 2010. Contract formation: Law and practice. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Eisenberg, M.A., 1981. Principles of Consideration. Cornell L. Rev., 67, p.640.
- Chloros, A.G. (1968) 'The Doctrine of Consideration and the Reform of the Law of Contract: A Comparative Analysis', International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 17(1), pp. 137–166. doi:10.1093/iclqaj/17.1.137.
- Hoffman, D.A. and Eigen, Z.J., 2017. Contract consideration and behavior. Geo. Wash. L. Rev., 85, p.351.
- Mason, M.S., 1941. The Utility of Consideration-A Comparative View. Colum. L. Rev., 41, p.825.
- Lisa, B., 2001. Consideration Considered: How English Law Identifies Valid Contracts. Common L. Rev., 1, p.14.
- Beale Jr, J.H., 1903. Notes on Consideration. Harv. L. Rev., 17, p.71.
- Faunce III, G., 1954. Nominal Consideration and Recitals Thereof. Intramural L. Rev. NYU, 10, p.23.
- Arya, A., 2022. Chapell & Co. v. Nestle Co. House of Lords, United Kingdom UKHL1, AC 87 (1959). Issue 1 Indian JL & Legal Rsch., 4, p.1.
- Stone, O.M., 1951. Assignment and Consideration in Action. The Modern Law Review, 14(3), pp.356-358.
- Patel, K., 2019. Reconsidering Consideration-An Evaluation of Williams v Roffey Brothers Thirty Years on. Manchester Rev. L. Crime & Ethics, 8, p.102.
- Cheshire, G.C. and Fifoot, C.H.S., 1947. Central London Property Trust Ltd v. High Trees House Ltd. *LQ Rev.*, 63, p.283.
- Stockdale, M., Mitchell, R., Wilson, S., Spurgeon, S., Hewitson, R. and Woodley, M., 2010. The law of contract. In *Galbraith's Building and Land Management Law for Students* (pp. 122-177). Routledge.
- Robertson, E., 2015. Yam Seng v International Trade Corporation-An Interim Report on the Implied Duty of Good Faith. *Manchester Rev. L. Crime & Ethics*, 4, p.141.