



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

UNIVERSITY OF WALES TRINITY SAINT DAVID

MODULE CODE: BMLW5009

CONTRACT LAW

EVALUATE THE ROLE OF CONSIDERATION IN CONTRACT LAW

NAME: LAKSHANA KRISHNA KUMAR

STUDENT ID: 2226194

NAME OF LECTURER: ZITA DRAPER

A contract is an agreement with legal force that involves no less than two separate parties. Contracts back up all transactional actions, whether you are selling or purchasing services or goods, subscribing to a streaming platform, or leasing a house. Each legal agreement contains a particular set of conditions upon which both sides consent. These conditions define the parties' respective rights along with obligations, establishing the terms of the agreement that each party must follow.

The principle of consideration is central to these contractual engagements, serving as a foundation that not solely brings obligations to life yet additionally strengthens the ability to be enforced across the legal system. This essay conducts a thorough examination of the various function of consideration serves within the weave of Contract Law. Analysing the beginning of it till the complexities of its implementation, this study will be through the framework of consideration, revealing its importance in the formation of contracts and its validation.

This essay suggests that, although consideration is critical for the execution of contracts, the standard practices might block contract law's advancement. The analysis seeks to present an equal perspective by investigating its foundations, varieties, validity standards, along with associated issues such as the peppercorn issue and the past consideration issue with their reform solutions. It acknowledges consideration's previous worth; while seeking adaptability to solve issues in present day contracts.

Certain fundamental aspects should be established in order for a contract to be considered legitimate, indicating the beginning of an agreement that is enforceable. *Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Company* (1893) established that it a binding agreement is created while there exists a definite offer, acceptance of the respective offer, desire to establish legal relations, along with consideration. In this ruling, the court stressed the importance on consideration in forming a legal agreement, differentiating from an empty pledge versus a legal commitment. In this situation, consideration serves as the catalyst for transforming a promise into a legally binding contract.

As demonstrated in *Currie v Misa* (1875), the court determined that for consideration to be legitimate, either needs to an advantage to the promisor or a detriment to the promisee. Such bilateral transaction guarantees the mutual trust required for the enforcement of contractual agreements. This demonstrates the mutually beneficial connection involving the creation of contracts and consideration. The fundamental substance of a contract, as

demonstrated in these cases, is dependent upon the existence of consideration, highlighting its critical role in the formation of enforceable contracts.

Consideration within contract law defines the difference between a legally enforceable agreement and simply a promise. It entails each side providing anything worthwhile to compensate for the agreement of the other party. Consideration acts as a foundation for upholding obligations while emphasising fairness. This enables mutual understanding and sincerity in business commitments. As demonstrated in the outcome of *Eastwood v Kenyon* (1840), priority must shift from the promisee, emphasising the importance of reciprocal. Defining consideration is critical for differentiating from empty pledges and legally binding contracts, which aligns with a larger investigation of the topic's importance.

Consideration in contract law is classified into several forms, notably executed and executory consideration, with each one delineates specific temporal characteristics of contractual responsibilities. Executed consideration, as defined within *Lampleigh v Braithwait* (1615), refers to actions and activities that were done prior to the establishment of a contract. Whereas, executory consideration, as evidenced as *Stilk v Myrick* (1809), entails pledges of future acts or responsibilities. Recognizing this contradiction is critical because it determines when commitments are satisfied as well as how they make impact. Although executed consideration shows previous outcomes, executory consideration represents foreseeable obligations yet still to be fulfilled. Both of these classifications support binding relationships, assuring the legality and authenticity of agreements by defining when along with form of the parties' duties.

Valid consideration maintains the equality and authenticity of contractual relationships. Valid consideration requires an honest transfer of value, which the laws emphasise cannot be deceptive or ethically unacceptable. *Thomas v Thomas* (1842), the judge determined that an act committed prior to the promise being fulfilled constitutes legitimate consideration. This case demonstrates that a symbolic or nominal consideration is capable of being considered acceptable and adequate to sustain a contract, as long as it displays an actual intent of being obligated by its conditions. Qualities like shared advantage, legitimacy, and genuine concern are critical. Nevertheless, instances such as *Re McArdle* demonstrate situations in which consideration could prove non-valid. Furthermore, consideration could be deemed invalid when it violates the law. Contracts that involve illicit activity, like corruption, are invalid as

well as unenforceable. Acknowledging the validity of consideration highlights the importance of a fair and real exchange in contracts.

One significant issue with consideration in contract law is the Peppercorn Issue. Not every promise ought to be executed. Legal remedies for obligations to society or favours are not appropriate. Settlement requires a legal commitment. This requirement is frequently attributed to the consideration (Jr., 1968). The issue emerges if one side delivers something deemed so insignificant or minor which it has little to no economical or functional worth. Simply put, the proposed consideration is equivalent to a small value, for instance a peppercorn, that carries barely any intrinsic worth. Though the legislation normally does not address the sufficiency for consideration, it demands that compensation possess an obvious value. Court may analyse transactions with seemingly little consideration to determine ensure there has been an actual transfer of worth and to verify that the agreement is neither misleading nor immoral. One of the fundamental judgements on the peppercorn problem is the *Chappell & Co Ltd v. Nestle Co Ltd* (1960) case. Nestle gave a record on vinyl as a component to a campaign as a trade for three chocolate bar wrappers and cash. Chappell & Co Ltd, the owner of the rights of the record, claimed the packaging wrappers did not represent acceptable consideration because they were lawfully compelled to buy chocolate bars despite the advertising campaign. The House of Lords determined that the wrappers were genuine consideration, emphasising that the peppercorn principle remains as well as that even modest consideration can be enough for supporting a binding agreement. This judgement upheld the notion that courts are unlikely to look into the appropriateness of consideration when something of worth is transferred, regardless of whether it is very minor or has metaphorical importance. The biggest benefit associated with this issue is its versatility. The idea permits parties to construct binding contracts without much formalism by acknowledging any tiny consideration, for instance a peppercorn. This versatility encourages freedom within contracts and enables people to get into contracts without being bound by stringent consideration obligations. Although the peppercorn theory provides a certain degree of versatility, it additionally poses worries about being exploited, unpredictability, and the deterioration of established contractual rules. Addressing these issues is critical when determining the significance played by this theory in present-day contract law.

Another issue that can be found within consideration in contract law is past considerations. This issue is questioning if the consideration is valid if it is given before the contract formation. This can include any pre-contractual any perks or acts by one to another.

The main concern with this issue is that if it meets the criteria of being transferred for the other party's obligations and promises which must be met for the establishment of a legally enforceable agreement. The primary challenge derives from the customary rule that previous contemplation is insufficient to justify a contract. This stipulation states that consideration must be supplied in return for the other party's obligations or promises at the moment of contract development rather than before or after. This condition assures that both sides trade something of worth to acquire what they obtain, indicating their consent and desire to be legally committed by the agreement in question. This can be seen in the case of *Re Casey's Patents* (1892), where the party defending sought for trademarks on the basis of the plaintiff's ideas, promising of sharing earnings with her. The plaintiff claimed the guarantee constituted enforceable because of past consideration in the manner of his previous thoughts along with contributions. However, the court ruled that the pledge constituted unenforceable as the claimant's previous contributions had not been provided at the request of the defendant rather than in exchange for an incentive. Past consideration may occasionally justify unofficial contracts that revolve around shared obligations or conduct made without the legality of a legally binding agreement. This recognition enables participants to carry out agreements established in an honest manner and represents the objectives of those involved. It forbids one party from breaking their pledge after the other has fulfilled their portion of the agreement. Judging whether prior consideration has validity frequently necessitates a case-by examination of the facts underlying the stipulation for consideration including the intent of the parties concerned. This vagueness can cause confusion and problems in contract law, specifically if an absence of insufficient proof of previous demand or invitation for the consideration offered. As an outcome, the subject of previous consideration remains a sensitive point of contract law, necessitating careful investigation and implementation by judges to ensure justice and equality in contractual agreements.

Modifying the course of action of each the issues with consideration in contract law mentioned above, demands an appropriate strategy that satisfies questions regarding equitable treatment, fairness, and clarity while protecting engaging parties' autonomy and freedom. Addressing the peppercorn issue, another option is to create a minimum threshold criterion for consideration to guarantee that it has real-world significance and represents each side's devotion to executing the agreement. Contracts featuring significant expenditures, such as property transfers, can demand consideration in excess of a particular amount of cash. This method would avoid circumstances in which fictitious consideration has no actual worth, such

as in the case of *Thomas v Thomas* (1842), wherein an insignificant rent of one shilling was regarded as valid consideration. More straightforward criteria might be provided as well for establishing the appropriate level of consideration, while taking consideration variables that include economic worth and both parties' intents. Reform initiatives ought to emphasise on defining the conditions enabling past consideration to qualify as valid and enforceable. This could include recognising circumstances in which the promisee legitimately trusted the guarantee for potential compensation and advantage, regardless of whether the consideration had been offered prior to the promise being made. An extension of what are exemptions from the rule prohibiting past consideration, as demonstrated in *Pao On v Lau Yiu Long* (1979), to include cases when implementing the agreement made would be considered reasonable and equitable which is additionally useful. By following such reform ideas, lawmakers as well as legal experts can improve contract law's integrity, lucidity, and authenticity while simultaneously fostering impartial as well as effective settlement of disputes.

In the end, consideration is the foundation of contract law, defining the entitlements and responsibilities of parties to legal agreements. An examination of classic instances such as *Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Company* (1893) and *Currie v Misa* (1875) reveals that consideration performs a critical role in converting promises into enforceable contracts. Nevertheless, two major concerns emerge: the Peppercorn Issue and past consideration. Addressing the Peppercorn Issue, as defined by *Chappell & Co Ltd v. Nestle Co Ltd* (1960), must guarantee that consideration has genuine worth. In a comparable manner the difficulty of past consideration, as demonstrated in *Re Casey's Patents* (1892), requires clarity and criteria to assess its validity. Establishing minimal requirements for consideration and explaining past consideration demands are two reform recommendations aimed at improving equal treatment in legal partnerships. By enacting these modifications, law on contracts will more effectively address society's changing demands while respecting values of fairness and honesty.

References:

Benson, P., 2011. The Idea of Consideration. *University of Toronto Law Journal*, Volume 61, pp. 241 - 276.

Currie v. Misa (1875-76) LR 1 App Cas 554.

Edwin Peel, G. H. T., 2015. *The Law of Contract*. 14th ed. s.l.:Sweet & Maxwell.

Eastwood v Kenyon (1840) 113 ER 482.

John Adams, R. B., 1990. Contract, Consideration and the Critical Path. *The Modern Law Review*, 53(4), pp. 536 - 542.

Jr., E. P., 1968. , The Peppercorn Theory and the Restatement of Contracts. *William & Mary Law Review*, 10(1), pp. 201 - 211.

Lampleigh v Brathwait (1615) 80 ER 255.

Laste, C. I., 2020. The Origins of the Concept of Consideration. In: *Law, Language and Change*. s.l.:s.n., pp. 59 - 111.

Lorenzen, E. G., 1919. Causa and Consideration in the Law of Contracts. *The Yale Law Journal*, 28(7), pp. 621-646.

Louisa Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Company [1892] 1 QB 256.

Pao On v Lau Yiu Long [1980] AC 614.

Re McArdle (1951) Ch 669.

Re Casey's Patents (1892) 36 RPC 551.

Stilk v Myrick (1809) 170 ER 1168.

Thomas v. Thomas (1842) 2 QBR 851

Twyford, J. W., 2002. *The Doctrine of Consideration: The Role of Consideration in Contract Modifications*, Sydney: University of Technology .