AMOGHVARTA

ISSN : 2583-3189

Good Faith in Contract Law: A Comparative Analysis of Indian Contract Law and Emerging International Standards

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Author
Dr. Omendra Singh
Associate Professor
Department of Law
Brahmanand PG College
Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, INDIA

Abstract

The doctrine of good faith occupies a central position in modern contract law, shaping the conduct of contracting parties from the negotiation stage to the performance and enforcement of contractual obligations. While civil law jurisdictions generally recognise good faith as an overarching legal principle governing contractual relationships, common law systems have historically been reluctant to impose a general duty of good faith, preferring instead to rely on specific doctrines such as misrepresentation, undue influence, estoppel, and implied terms. India presents a distinctive legal landscape in this regard. Although the Indian Contract Act, 1872 does not expressly recognise a general doctrine of good faith, several statutory provisions and judicial decisions reflect an implicit expectation of honesty, fairness, and reasonableness in contractual dealings. The absence of an explicit statutory obligation, however, has generated uncertainty regarding the extent to which courts may impose duties of good faith beyond recognised categories of contracts.

Key Words

Good Faith, Indian Contract Act, Contractual Obligations, Comparative Contract Law, Cisg, Commercial Contracts.

Introduction

Contract law is founded upon the principle that agreements voluntarily entered into by competent parties should ordinarily be enforced according to their terms. This principle of contractual autonomy has long been regarded as the cornerstone of commercial certainty, enabling individuals and businesses to organise their legal and economic relationships with confidence. Nevertheless, absolute freedom of contract has increasingly been moderated by principles intended to prevent opportunistic conduct and ensure fairness in contractual dealings. Among these principles, the doctrine of good faith has emerged as one of the most debated concepts in modern private law. It seeks to regulate the behaviour of contracting parties by requiring honesty, fairness, loyalty, cooperation, and reasonableness throughout the contractual relationship. The precise content of good faith varies across jurisdictions, reflecting differences between civil law and common law traditions, yet its significance in contemporary commercial transactions is widely acknowledged.

The concept of good faith traces its origins to Roman law, where *bona fides* served as a standard of honest and fair dealing in contractual relationships. This tradition was subsequently incorporated into European civil law systems, particularly in Germany and France, where good faith developed into a comprehensive legal doctrine governing contract formation, interpretation, performance, and enforcement. German law, through Section 242 of the German Civil Code (*Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch*), recognises good faith as a fundamental principle requiring parties to perform obligations in accordance with fairness and established commercial practices. Similarly, the French Civil Code imposes duties of good faith during the negotiation, formation, and execution of contracts. International commercial instruments, including the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts and the Principles of European Contract Law, likewise identify good faith as an indispensable norm promoting fairness, cooperation, and predictability in cross-border transactions.

The common law tradition has historically adopted a more cautious approach. English courts have generally declined to recognise a universal obligation of good faith, preferring instead to regulate unfair conduct through established doctrines such as fraud, duress, undue influence, estoppel, fiduciary duties, and implied contractual terms. Nevertheless, modern judicial developments indicate a gradual willingness to acknowledge duties of good faith in specific relational or long-term commercial contracts. Similarly, the United States has incorporated an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing within contractual performance under the Uniform Commercial Code and the Restatement (Second) of Contracts. These developments illustrate a broader international movement towards recognising that contractual rights should be exercised honestly and reasonably without undermining legitimate commercial expectations.

The increasing complexity of domestic and international commerce has intensified the debate regarding the desirability of recognising a broader doctrine of good faith within Indian contract law. Contemporary commercial relationships frequently involve long-term cooperation, technological innovation, digital contracting, platform-based transactions, artificial intelligence-assisted negotiations, and cross-border commerce. These evolving commercial realities often create situations where literal enforcement of contractual terms may permit opportunistic behaviour inconsistent with reasonable commercial expectations. Consequently, courts are increasingly confronted with disputes requiring a balance between contractual certainty and equitable standards of conduct. The absence of an explicit statutory principle has resulted in inconsistent judicial reasoning and uncertainty regarding the legal basis upon which obligations of fairness may be imposed.

Evolution of the Doctrine of Good Faith

The doctrine of good faith has evolved over several centuries, reflecting changing conceptions of justice, commerce, and contractual responsibility. Its historical development demonstrates that contractual obligations extend beyond literal compliance with contractual terms to encompass standards of honest and fair conduct.

Roman law introduced the concept of bona fides, under which certain contracts required parties to perform obligations honestly and fairly. Roman judges were authorised to consider equitable factors while resolving contractual disputes, thereby preventing parties from exploiting strict legal rights in a manner inconsistent with fairness.

During the medieval period, canon law and mercantile customs further strengthened the moral dimensions of contractual obligations. Merchants engaged in long-distance trade relied heavily upon trust and commercial reputation, making good faith an indispensable element of commercial practice.

Civil law jurisdictions subsequently codified the doctrine. Section 242 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch) requires every obligor to perform obligations according to the requirements of good faith, taking customary commercial practices into account. German courts have interpreted this provision expansively, recognising duties of cooperation, disclosure, loyalty, mitigation of loss, and protection of legitimate expectations.

The French Civil Code likewise recognises good faith throughout the contractual relationship. Following the 2016 reforms, Articles 1104 and related provisions expressly require parties to negotiate, conclude, and perform contracts in good faith. This obligation is treated as a matter of public policy and cannot ordinarily be excluded by contractual agreement.

The common law developed differently. English contract law traditionally emphasised certainty, freedom of contract, and party autonomy. Rather than recognising a general obligation of good faith, courts addressed unfair conduct through doctrines such as fraud, duress, undue influence, unconscionability, estoppel, and implied terms. Consequently, English law historically resisted recognising good faith as an overarching contractual doctrine.

Nevertheless, modern English jurisprudence reflects a gradual shift. Decisions involving relational contracts have accepted that particular contractual relationships may require mutual cooperation, honesty, and fidelity to the contractual purpose. Although English law still rejects a universal doctrine of good faith, judicial reasoning increasingly acknowledges that commercial relationships cannot always be governed solely by literal contractual language.

The United States has adopted a more explicit position. Section 1-304 of the Uniform Commercial Code provides that every contract within its scope imposes an obligation of good faith in its performance and enforcement. Similarly, the Restatement (Second) of Contracts recognises an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing in contractual performance. American law therefore attempts to reconcile contractual certainty with equitable commercial conduct through statutory and judicial mechanisms.

International commercial law has also embraced the doctrine. Article 1.7 of the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts requires parties to act in accordance with good faith and fair dealing in international trade. Likewise, Article 7 of the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG) requires interpretation consistent with good faith in international commerce. These instruments significantly influence transnational commercial arbitration and comparative contract law.

The historical trajectory demonstrates a gradual international convergence towards recognising good faith as an essential component of commercial justice, although the extent and manner of its application continue to differ across jurisdictions.

Good Faith under the Indian Contract Act, 1872

Unlike several modern civil codes, the Indian Contract Act, 1872 contains no express provision imposing a general duty of good faith upon contracting parties. The omission reflects the Act's nineteenth-century English common law origins, where contractual certainty and freedom of contract predominated over broad equitable standards.

Nevertheless, the Act incorporates numerous provisions that implicitly promote honest and fair dealing.

- *Section 10* requires agreements to be made with the free consent of competent parties for lawful consideration and lawful object. Genuine consent cannot exist where dishonesty, coercion, fraud, or misrepresentation vitiates contractual formation.
- *Sections 13 and 14* define consent and free consent, establishing that contractual obligations arise only where parties voluntarily agree without improper influence.
- *Sections 15 to 18* regulate coercion, undue influence, fraud, misrepresentation, and mistake. These provisions collectively discourage dishonest bargaining practices and reinforce fairness during contract formation.
- *Section 17* defines fraud broadly to include active concealment, false representations, promises made without intention to perform, and acts specifically declared fraudulent by law. The provision demonstrates the legislature's concern with maintaining honesty during contractual negotiations.
- *Section 18* governs misrepresentation, recognising that even innocent false statements may affect contractual validity under appropriate circumstances.

Certain classes of contracts impose more stringent disclosure obligations. Insurance contracts have traditionally been regarded as contracts of uberrimae fidei (utmost good faith), requiring complete disclosure of all material facts by both parties. Failure to disclose material information may entitle the insurer to avoid the contract.

Agency relationships likewise embody fiduciary obligations requiring loyalty, honesty, and faithful performance. The provisions governing agency under the Indian Contract Act impose duties that substantially reflect principles of good faith.

Similarly, bailment, guarantee, indemnity, partnership, and trust relationships often require standards of fair dealing that exceed ordinary contractual obligations.

Indian courts have generally preferred interpreting these statutory provisions rather than recognising an independent doctrine of good faith applicable to all contracts. Consequently, contractual fairness is protected through specific statutory mechanisms instead of a general overarching principle.

However, modern commercial transactions increasingly expose the limitations of this fragmented approach. Digital contracts, long-term infrastructure agreements, franchise arrangements, technology licensing, and cross-border commercial transactions frequently involve continuing duties of cooperation that are not easily addressed through traditional nineteenth-century contract doctrines. This evolving commercial environment has renewed academic and judicial interest in whether Indian law should formally recognise a broader doctrine of good faith comparable to developments in other jurisdictions.

Judicial Interpretation of Good Faith in Indian Contract Law

Although the Indian Contract Act, 1872 does not expressly impose a general obligation of good faith, Indian courts have progressively incorporated principles of fairness, honesty, and reasonableness while interpreting contractual rights and obligations. Judicial decisions indicate that the doctrine of good faith operates indirectly through equitable principles, constitutional values, public policy, and implied contractual obligations rather than as an independent legal rule.

The Supreme Court has consistently emphasised that parties exercising contractual rights must not act arbitrarily or dishonestly, particularly where contracts involve public authorities. In *Central Inland Water Transport Corporation Ltd. v. Brojo Nath Ganguly*, (1986) 3 SCC 156, the Court invalidated an unconscionable contractual clause permitting unilateral termination of employment. Although the judgment was primarily based on public policy under Section 23 of the Indian Contract Act, the Court stressed that contractual freedom cannot legitimise unfair or oppressive conduct. The decision illustrates that fairness may override strict contractual language where bargaining power is grossly unequal.

Similarly, in *LIC of India v. Consumer Education & Research Centre*, (1995) 5 SCC 482, the Supreme Court held that contractual terms framed by public corporations must satisfy constitutional standards of fairness and reasonableness. The Court rejected the notion that contractual autonomy is absolute and recognised that contractual discretion must be exercised consistently with equitable principles. While the case arose in a public law context, its reasoning reflects an underlying expectation of good faith in contractual performance.

The principle assumes even greater significance in insurance law. Insurance contracts have traditionally been regarded as contracts of *uberrimae fidei* (utmost good faith), requiring both insurer and insured to disclose every material fact affecting the assessment of risk. In *Satwant Kaur Sandhu v. New India Assurance Co. Ltd.*, (2009) 8 SCC 316, the Supreme Court reaffirmed that deliberate suppression of material facts entitles the insurer to repudiate the contract. The Court explained that mutual trust constitutes the foundation of insurance contracts and that nondisclosure undermines contractual validity itself.

Indian courts have also recognised duties analogous to good faith within fiduciary and agency relationships. Agents must act honestly, avoid conflicts of interest, and faithfully perform their principal's instructions. These obligations arise not from an express statutory doctrine of good faith but from the fiduciary nature of the relationship recognised under the Indian Contract Act.

Despite these developments, the judiciary has generally refrained from recognising a universal duty of good faith applicable to every contract. Instead, courts continue to resolve disputes through established statutory doctrines relating to fraud, misrepresentation, undue influence, unconscionability, estoppel, and public policy. Consequently, Indian jurisprudence remains fragmented, with good faith emerging only in particular contractual contexts rather than functioning as an overarching contractual principle.

Comparative Analysis

United Kingdom

English contract law has traditionally resisted recognising a general doctrine of good faith. The courts have consistently prioritised certainty, predictability, and contractual autonomy. Instead of imposing broad obligations of fairness, English law regulates dishonest conduct through specific doctrines such as fraud, duress, undue influence, estoppel, implied terms, and fiduciary duties.

However, recent judicial developments indicate a gradual evolution. In *Yam Seng Pte Ltd. v. International Trade Corporation Ltd.* [2013] EWHC 111 (QB), Leggatt J. observed that certain long-term commercial relationships may contain implied duties of honesty and fidelity to the contractual purpose. Although the judgment stopped short of recognising a universal doctrine, it acknowledged that good faith may be implied where necessary to give business efficacy to relational contracts.

Subsequent decisions have adopted a cautious approach, recognising implied duties of good faith only where justified by the nature of the contractual relationship. English law therefore continues to prefer incremental judicial development rather than comprehensive statutory reform.

United States

American contract law adopts a more explicit position. Section 1-304 of the Uniform Commercial Code provides that every contract governed by the Code imposes an obligation of good faith in its performance and enforcement. Similarly, the Restatement (Second) of Contracts recognises an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

Unlike civil law jurisdictions, the American doctrine generally governs contractual performance rather than negotiations preceding contract formation. Courts frequently invoke the doctrine where one party exercises contractual discretion dishonestly, frustrates the legitimate expectations of the other party, or exploits contractual powers for improper purposes.

The American approach demonstrates that recognition of good faith need not undermine contractual certainty provided judicial intervention remains confined to preventing opportunistic conduct.

Germany

Germany represents one of the strongest examples of statutory recognition of good faith. Section 242 of the German Civil Code (*Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch*) requires every obligor to perform contractual obligations according to the requirements of good faith while considering established commercial practice.

German courts have interpreted this provision expansively. Duties arising under Section 242 include cooperation, disclosure, loyalty, mitigation of loss, avoidance of contradictory conduct, and protection of legitimate expectations. The doctrine also supports judicial development of implied contractual obligations where necessary to preserve fairness.

The German experience demonstrates that a statutory principle of good faith can coexist with commercial certainty through consistent judicial interpretation.

France

French contract law has historically treated good faith as an essential feature of contractual relationships. Following the 2016 reform of the French Civil Code, Article 1104 expressly requires parties to negotiate, conclude, and perform contracts in good faith.

Unlike English law, French law regards good faith as mandatory and generally incapable of contractual exclusion. The doctrine extends beyond contractual performance to include pre-contractual negotiations, interpretation of contractual terms, and exercise of contractual rights.

This broad conception reflects the civil law tradition that contractual rights must always be exercised consistently with fairness and legitimate expectations.

International Commercial Instruments

International commercial law increasingly recognises good faith as an indispensable component of modern commerce.

Article 1.7 of the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts provides that each party must act in accordance with good faith and fair dealing in international trade and prohibits exclusion of this obligation by agreement.

Similarly, Article 7 of the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG) requires interpretation of the Convention with due regard to promoting uniformity and observance of good faith in international trade.

Although India is not a Contracting State to the CISG, both instruments significantly influence international arbitration, cross-border contracting, and comparative legal scholarship. Their widespread acceptance illustrates the growing international consensus favouring recognition of good faith as a fundamental commercial principle.

Critical Evaluation

The comparative analysis reveals that Indian contract law occupies an intermediate position between traditional English common law and modern civil law systems.

One strength of the Indian framework lies in its commitment to contractual certainty. By relying upon clearly defined statutory provisions concerning fraud, coercion, misrepresentation, undue influence, and public policy, Indian courts avoid the uncertainty that may accompany broadly formulated judicial standards.

However, this approach also presents significant limitations. Contemporary commercial relationships increasingly involve long-term cooperation, strategic partnerships, digital platforms, artificial intelligence-assisted contracting, franchise agreements, and complex infrastructure projects. Such transactions frequently require continuous cooperation and honest exercise of contractual discretion that cannot always be addressed through traditional doctrines alone.

The absence of an explicit doctrine of good faith has resulted in inconsistent judicial reasoning. Similar factual situations are often resolved through different legal doctrines, reducing predictability and doctrinal coherence. Moreover, reliance upon public policy or constitutional principles cannot substitute for a clearly articulated contractual obligation applicable to private commercial relationships.

Comparative experience demonstrates that recognising good faith does not necessarily weaken contractual autonomy. Germany, France, the United States, and international commercial instruments successfully balance commercial certainty with equitable standards of conduct through carefully developed judicial principles.

Nevertheless, wholesale transplantation of civil law concepts into Indian contract law would be inappropriate. India’s commercial environment, legislative history, and common law tradition require a calibrated approach. Rather than adopting an unrestricted general duty, India could gradually recognise obligations of honesty, cooperation, and fair dealing in relational contracts, long-term commercial arrangements, and situations involving discretionary contractual powers.

Such an approach would preserve contractual certainty while ensuring that contractual rights are exercised consistently with legitimate commercial expectations. It would also harmonise Indian contract law with evolving international standards without abandoning its common law foundations.

Recommendations

The analysis supports several reforms that could strengthen Indian contract law while preserving contractual autonomy.

- **Legislative Reform:** Parliament should consider introducing a carefully drafted provision recognising a limited duty of good faith in contractual performance and enforcement. Such a provision should define the doctrine with sufficient precision to minimise uncertainty and avoid excessive judicial discretion.
- **Judicial Development:** Courts should progressively recognise implied duties of honesty, cooperation, and fair dealing in long-term relational contracts, joint ventures, franchise agreements, technology licensing, and other contracts requiring continuing collaboration.
- **Commercial Contract Drafting:** Commercial parties should be encouraged to include express good faith clauses, cooperation obligations, dispute-resolution mechanisms, and disclosure requirements to reduce litigation arising from ambiguous contractual expectations.
- **Digital Commerce:** Given the increasing use of electronic contracts and artificial intelligence in commercial negotiations, legislative policy should clarify standards of transparency, disclosure, algorithmic fairness, and responsible contractual conduct in digital environments.
- **Judicial Training:** Continuous judicial education on comparative contract law and international commercial principles would promote greater consistency in interpreting complex contractual disputes involving foreign parties and cross-border transactions.

- **International Harmonisation:** Although India is not presently a Contracting State to the CISG, courts and policymakers may draw persuasive guidance from the UNIDROIT Principles and other international instruments while developing domestic contract law.

Conclusion

The doctrine of good faith represents one of the most significant developments in contemporary contract law. Although its precise meaning differs across jurisdictions, the underlying objective remains constant: ensuring that contractual rights are exercised honestly, fairly, and consistently with the legitimate expectations of the contracting parties.

The Indian Contract Act, 1872 was enacted during a period when English common law strongly emphasised freedom of contract and commercial certainty. Consequently, it does not recognise an overarching duty of good faith. Instead, fairness is achieved through specific statutory provisions addressing fraud, coercion, misrepresentation, undue influence, public policy, fiduciary obligations, and other specialised contractual doctrines. While this framework has functioned effectively for many decades, modern commercial relationships increasingly expose its limitations.

Comparative analysis demonstrates that jurisdictions such as Germany, France, and the United States have successfully integrated good faith into their contractual systems without sacrificing legal certainty. Even English law, traditionally resistant to the doctrine, has gradually acknowledged implied duties of honesty and cooperation in appropriate contractual relationships. International commercial instruments similarly recognise good faith as a foundational principle promoting uniformity, commercial fairness, and sustainable contractual relationships.

The central hypothesis of this study that Indian contract law implicitly incorporates elements of good faith but lacks a coherent general doctrine is substantially supported by the doctrinal and comparative analysis. Judicial decisions reveal growing recognition of fairness and reasonableness, yet the absence of an explicit legal framework continues to produce fragmented jurisprudence and inconsistent outcomes.

Rather than adopting an unrestricted civil law model, India would benefit from a calibrated and incremental approach. Legislative clarification, supported by principled judicial interpretation, could recognise limited duties of honesty, cooperation, and fair dealing in appropriate contractual contexts while preserving contractual autonomy and commercial predictability. Such an approach would modernise Indian contract law, strengthen confidence in commercial transactions, and align domestic jurisprudence with evolving international standards without departing from the fundamental structure of the Indian Contract Act, 1872.

Bibliography

1. Burton, S. J. (1980) Breach of contract and the common law duty to perform in good faith. *Harvard Law Review,* 94(2), 369–404.
2. Central Inland Water Transport Corporation Ltd. v. Brojo Nath Ganguly, (1986) 3 SCC 156.
3. Farnsworth, E. A. (1968) Good faith performance and commercial reasonableness under the Uniform Commercial Code. *The University of Chicago Law Review,* 30(4), 666–679.
4. German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch), 242.
5. Indian Contract Act, 1872 (Act No. 9 of 1872)
6. Leggatt, J. (2013) Yam Seng Pte Ltd v. International Trade Corporation Ltd [2013] EWHC 111 (QB)
7. Life Insurance Corporation of India v. Consumer Education & Research Centre, (1995) 5 SCC 482.
8. Pollock, F. & Mulla, D. F. (2019) Pollock & Mulla: Indian Contract and Specific Relief Acts (16th ed.) LexisNexis.
9. Satwant Kaur Sandhu v. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., (2009) 8 SCC 316.

10. Summers, R. S. (1968) Good faith in general contract law and the sales provisions of the Uniform Commercial Code. *Virginia Law Review,* 54(2), 195–267.
11. UNIDROIT. (2016) UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts (2016 ed.) International Institute for the Unification of Private Law.
12. Uniform Commercial Code, 1-304 (Am. Law Inst. & Unif. Law Comm'n 2022)
13. United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, Apr. 11, 1980, 1489 U.N.T.S. 3.

——==00==——