GLOBAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY
PERSPECTIVES JOURNAL

The Role of Free Consent in the Validity of Contracts: A Critical Analysis Under the Indian Contract act, 1872

Dr. Santosh Kumar
B.Sc. (Mathematics), LL.M., UGC-NET, JRF, SRF, Ph.D. (Law), Independent Researcher, India

* Corresponding Author: **Dr. Santosh Kumar; Email Id: Kumarpandeysantosh934@gmail.com**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 3107-3972
Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.08
Volume: 03
Issue: 01
Received: 03-12-2025
Accepted: 05-01-2026
Published: 06-02-2026
Page No: 104-109

Abstract
The doctrine of consent is a foundational principle of contractual jurisprudence. Under the Indian Contract Act, 1872 (ICA), contractual enforceability depends not merely upon outward assent but upon consent that satisfies the statutory requirements of Sections 10, 13 and 14. This paper undertakes a doctrinal and jurisprudential analysis of the statutory architecture of free consent, examining coercion, undue influence, fraud, misrepresentation and mistake under Sections 15–22, together with the consequences and restitutionary principles contained in Sections 19, 19A, 64 and 65. It also evaluates the classical model of contractual autonomy against contemporary commercial and digital realities, including standard-form adhesion contracts, unequal bargaining power, click-wrap and browse-wrap agreements, and manipulative digital interface practices commonly described as dark patterns. The paper distinguishes the legal consequences of absence of consent from those arising where consent exists but is not free, and identifies areas where the nineteenth-century statutory framework requires clarification or supplementation. It argues that Indian contract law should preserve freedom of contract while developing clearer standards for informed digital assent, unfair terms and illegitimate economic pressure. The study concludes with targeted legislative and judicial recommendations designed to strengthen substantive contractual fairness without undermining legitimate commercial certainty.

Keywords: Free Consent, Indian Contract Act 1872, Consensus ad Idem, Coercion, Undue Influence, Fraud, Misrepresentation, Mistake, Unconscionable Contracts, Standard-Form Contracts, Digital Assent, Dark Patterns

1. Introduction

Freedom of contract rests upon the premise that parties should ordinarily be entitled to determine for themselves whether, with whom, and on what terms they will undertake legally enforceable obligations. The principle of pacta sunt servanda gives normative force to contractual promises, but that force presupposes a legally meaningful process of assent. Where apparent assent has been produced by coercion, domination, deception, material error or other legally recognised impairment, enforcement may cease to be justified.

The Indian Contract Act, 1872 codifies this premise principally through Section 10, which identifies free consent, competency, lawful consideration and lawful object as central requirements of a valid contract, subject to the statutory qualifications contained in the Act. Sections 13 and 14 then distinguish consent itself from free consent. This distinction is fundamental: where there is no consent at all, there may be no agreement in the legal sense; where consent exists but has been vitiated, the agreement may instead be voidable, depending upon the statutory provision involved.

The modern relevance of the doctrine is considerable. Commercial transactions increasingly occur through standard terms, online platforms and automated interfaces. Consumers and small enterprises may face substantial informational and bargaining disadvantages. The legal question is therefore no longer confined to whether a person physically signed a document. It increasingly concerns whether the legal system should treat formal assent as sufficient where the surrounding circumstances materially impair meaningful choice.

1.1. Research Objectives

To examine the statutory meaning and structure of consent and free consent under Sections 10, 13 and 14 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872.
To analyse the five principal vitiating factors and the legal consequences attached to each.
To evaluate leading judicial decisions shaping the doctrine of free consent in India.
To assess the adequacy of the existing framework in standard-form and digital contracting.
To propose legally workable reforms concerning unfair terms, economic pressure and informed digital assent.

1.2. Research Methodology

The paper adopts a primarily doctrinal methodology based on statutory interpretation, judicial precedent, Law Commission reports and comparative contractual principles. It also uses an analytical approach to evaluate the relationship between formal contractual autonomy and substantive fairness in contemporary transactions. The discussion of digital contracting is normative and legal in character; no unsupported empirical percentage is relied upon to establish consumer reading behaviour.

1.3. Central Research Questions

What constitutes consent and free consent under the Indian Contract Act, 1872?
How have Indian courts interpreted the statutory vitiating factors?
Do the existing doctrines adequately address unequal bargaining power and digital forms of assent?
What targeted reforms can improve contractual justice while preserving commercial certainty?

2. The Statutory Architecture of Consent

2.1. Consent under Section 13: Consensus ad Idem

Section 13 provides that two or more persons consent when they agree upon the same thing in the same sense. The provision expresses the classical idea of consensus ad idem, or a meeting of minds, although modern contract law generally assesses agreement through objective standards rather than attempting to reconstruct the private psychology of each party. A fundamental divergence concerning the identity or essential subject matter may prevent an agreement from arising at all.
The English decision in Raffles v. Wichelhaus, concerning two ships named Peerless, illustrates the problem of latent ambiguity and conflicting meanings. The case remains useful comparatively, although its application must be understood within the statutory and jurisprudential setting of Indian law.

2.2. Free Consent under Section 14

Section 14 adopts an exclusionary definition. Consent is free when it is not caused by coercion, undue influence, fraud, misrepresentation or mistake, subject to Sections 20–22. The causal requirement is important: the vitiating factor must have operated upon the consent. Section 14 therefore does not invalidate every instance of misconduct, pressure or false statement; the relevant conduct must have caused the party to enter the agreement.
The phrase "would not have been given but for" in Section 14 expresses this causal connection. Section 19 likewise clarifies that fraud or misrepresentation which did not cause the consent does not render the contract voidable.

3. Doctrinal Analysis of The Vitiating Factors

3.1. Coercion Under Section 15

Section 15 defines coercion through two principal forms of conduct: committing or threatening to commit an act forbidden by the penal law referred to in the statutory text, and unlawfully detaining or threatening to detain property, where the conduct is intended to cause a person to enter into an agreement. The definition is broader in some respects than the traditional English conception of duress because it expressly addresses property detention and does not require the coercive conduct to be directed against the contracting party himself.
A contemporary drafting issue concerns the continued textual reference in Section 15 to the Indian Penal Code, 1860, notwithstanding the repeal of the IPC and commencement of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. A 2024 private member's Bill specifically identified this drafting problem and proposed replacing the IPC-specific language with a broader reference to acts punishable under any law for the time being in force. The proposal should not be described as an enacted amendment. Accordingly, the present paper treats the IPC reference as a statutory-transition issue rather than asserting that Section 15 has already been amended.
In Chikkam Ammiraju v. Chikkam Seshamma (1917), the Madras High Court considered a threat of suicide used to procure execution of a document and treated the circumstances as coercion. The decision is historically significant for illustrating the broad protective purpose of Section 15. Its criminal-law reasoning, however, should now be read in light of the contemporary penal framework rather than mechanically applying repealed IPC provisions.

3.2. Economic Duress: A Statutory Gap

Economic pressure presents a more difficult problem. Commercial bargaining frequently involves strong negotiating leverage, and not every hard bargain is coercive in law. The central issue is whether pressure is illegitimate and sufficiently causative to undermine genuine consent. Indian law does not contain a separately codified doctrine of economic duress in the same form found in some other jurisdictions. Courts may therefore have to work through Sections 16, 23, unconscionability principles and other applicable doctrines. A carefully drafted statutory provision could provide greater certainty without converting ordinary commercial pressure into coercion.

3.3. Undue Influence under Section 16

Section 16 addresses situations in which the relationship between the parties places one person in a position to dominate the will of another and that position is used to obtain an unfair advantage. The doctrine differs conceptually from coercion: the central concern is domination of decision-making rather than the use of a prohibited act or unlawful property detention.
Section 16(2) identifies circumstances that may indicate a dominant position, including real or apparent authority, fiduciary relationships, and situations involving age, illness or mental or bodily distress. Section 16(3) provides an important evidentiary safeguard where a dominant party

enters into a transaction that appears unconscionable: the burden may shift to the dominant party to establish that the transaction was not induced by undue influence.

In Subhas Chandra Das Mushib v. Ganga Prasad Das Mushib (1967), the Supreme Court emphasised the need to establish the relevant relationship of dominance, use of that position, and an unfair or unconscionable advantage in the circumstances contemplated by Section 16. Mannu Singh v. Umadat Pande (1890) is an early illustration of judicial scrutiny of transactions involving a spiritual or fiduciary relationship.

The doctrine also intersects with broader concerns about unequal bargaining power. In Central Inland Water Transport Corporation Ltd. v. Brojo Nath Ganguly (1986), the Supreme Court held that an unfair and unreasonable contractual term arising from grossly unequal bargaining power could be refused enforcement on public-policy grounds under Section 23 in the circumstances of that case. Importantly, the Court itself recognised that many economically pressured standard-form contracts may not technically fall within Section 16. The decision therefore should not be reduced to a simple proposition that all unequal bargaining power automatically constitutes undue influence.

3.4. Fraud under Section 17

Section 17 identifies several forms of fraudulent conduct, including knowingly false factual suggestions, active concealment, promises made without intention to perform, acts fitted to deceive, and conduct declared fraudulent by law. The central distinction from misrepresentation is the presence of fraudulent intent or equivalent culpability.

The common-law decision in Derry v. Peek remains a useful comparative reference for the mental element of fraudulent misrepresentation. Under Indian law, however, the statutory language of Section 17 must remain the primary source. The Explanation to Section 17 establishes that mere silence as to facts likely to affect willingness to contract is generally not fraud, subject to recognised circumstances in which a duty to speak exists or silence becomes equivalent to speech.

Shri Krishan v. Kurukshetra University (1976) demonstrates the importance of causation and context. The Supreme Court declined to treat the student's omission concerning attendance as fraud on the facts, particularly because the relevant information was available to the university from its own records.

The distinction between fraud and misrepresentation is also relevant to remedies. Fraud may support rescission under Section 19 and, depending on the facts and applicable principles, an independent claim for damages for deceit. Such damages should not be presented as an automatic remedy under Section 19 itself; their availability depends on the applicable cause of action and proof of loss.

3.5. Misrepresentation Under Section 18

Section 18 covers specified forms of misleading conduct without the fraudulent intent contemplated by Section 17. These include an unjustified positive assertion believed to be true, certain breaches of duty that mislead another to that person's prejudice, and innocent conduct causing a mistake concerning the substance of the subject matter.

Section 19 makes agreements induced by misrepresentation voidable at the option of the misled party, while also providing an important exception where the party had the means of discovering the truth with ordinary diligence in the circumstances specified by the section. The statutory scheme therefore balances protection against misleading conduct with a limited expectation of reasonable diligence.

3.6. Mistake Under Sections 20–22

Mistake differs from the first four vitiating factors because the problem may concern the parties' understanding of the facts rather than wrongful conduct by one contracting party. Under Section 20, an agreement is void where both parties are under a mistake as to a matter of fact essential to the agreement. Section 21 deals with mistakes of law, distinguishing Indian law from foreign law, while Section 22 provides that a contract is not merely because of unilateral mistake of fact voidable at the option of the mistaken party.

The classical cases Couturier v. Hastie and Raffles v. Wichelhaus are useful comparative authorities concerning fundamental factual error and ambiguity. The English decisions Cundy v. Lindsay and Foster v. Mackinnon may likewise illuminate narrow common-law exceptions concerning identity and non est factum. These cases should be used comparatively rather than treated as direct statutory authorities controlling Indian courts.

The critical distinction is therefore between absence of consensus and vitiated consent. A bilateral mistake falling within Section 20 may make an agreement void, whereas coercion, fraud or misrepresentation ordinarily makes a contract voidable at the option of the affected party under Section 19.

4. Legal Consequences and Restitution

Table 1

Vitiating factor	Provision	Mental/causal requirement	Legal status	Principal consequence
Coercion	Ss. 15, 19	Coercive conduct causing consent	Voidable	Rescission; restitution where applicable
Undue influence	Ss. 16, 19A	Dominant position used to obtain unfair advantage	Voidable	Court may set aside, wholly or on terms
Fraud	Ss. 17, 19	Intentional/reckless deception causing consent	Voidable	Rescission; statutory and other applicable remedies
Misrepresentation	Ss. 18, 19	Misleading representation without fraud	Voidable	Rescission or statutory alternatives under s. 19
Bilateral mistake	S. 20	Mutual mistake as to essential fact	Void	Agreement unenforceable; restitution may arise under s. 65

The table should be read with the statutory text and facts of each case. In particular, not every mistake is bilateral and essential, and not every instance of unfairness constitutes undue influence or fraud.

4.1. Sections 64 and 65: Restitutionary Principles

Section 64 addresses restoration of benefits where a voidable contract is rescinded. The party rescinding must restore, so far as the section requires, any benefit received under the contract. Section 65 addresses restitution where an agreement is discovered to be void or a contract becomes void. These provisions reflect the broader principle that a party should not ordinarily retain an advantage received under a transaction that lacks enforceability, subject to the statutory conditions and applicable judicial interpretation.

Restitution is therefore a consequence distinct from the question whether consent was free. The first inquiry is whether the contract is valid, voidable or void; the second is what each party must restore if the transaction is avoided or found void.

5. Free Consent and Standard-Form Contracts

The classical model of contracting assumes meaningful choice and an ability to negotiate. Standard-form contracts challenge that assumption. Consumers routinely encounter pre-drafted terms in banking, insurance, telecommunications, employment, transport and digital services. The mere existence of a signature or acceptance mechanism does not necessarily answer every question of substantive fairness.

Central Inland Water Transport Corporation Ltd. v. Brojo Nath Ganguly remains particularly significant because the Supreme Court recognised that gross inequality of bargaining power may justify judicial refusal to enforce an unfair and unreasonable term in appropriate circumstances under public policy. The case should, however, be distinguished from the statutory test of undue influence: unequal bargaining power and undue influence overlap conceptually but are not identical legal categories.

LIC of India v. Consumer Education and Research Centre (1995) further demonstrates the constitutional and public-law dimensions that may arise where a public-sector or State-controlled entity imposes unreasonable contractual conditions upon individuals. Its relevance should be framed according to the status of the contracting party and the constitutional context rather than as a universal rule invalidating every private standard-form contract.

6. Digital Assent, Electronic Contracts and Dark Patterns

6.1. Click-Wrap, Browse-Wrap and Sign-In-Wrap

Electronic contracting has transformed the manner in which assent is communicated. Click-wrap agreements typically require an affirmative action such as clicking an “I agree” button. Browse-wrap arrangements attempt to infer assent from continued use of a website, often through a hyperlink to terms. Sign-in-wrap mechanisms connect account registration with acceptance of linked terms. The legal significance of each depends on notice, accessibility, presentation, the user's conduct and the applicable statutory framework.

Indian law recognises electronic records and electronic authentication through the Information Technology Act, 2000, while the Indian Contract Act continues to govern substantive questions of offer, acceptance, consent and enforceability. The key doctrinal challenge is therefore not whether electronic assent is conceptually possible, but whether the method of presentation supplies sufficient notice and meaningful opportunity to understand material terms.

6.2. Dark Patterns

Dark patterns are manipulative interface designs that can steer or deceive users into choices that may not reflect their genuine preferences. The Central Consumer Protection Authority issued the Guidelines for Prevention and Regulation of Dark Patterns, 2023 under the Consumer Protection Act framework and identified specified categories of manipulative practices. The official government materials describe dark patterns as practices capable of deceiving, coercing or influencing consumers into choices not in their best interests.

It would be legally overbroad to state that every dark pattern automatically constitutes fraud under Section 17 of the Contract Act. A stronger doctrinal proposition is that particular manipulative practices may, depending on their design, factual operation, materiality and causation, overlap with fraud, misrepresentation, coercion, unfair trade practices or other statutory protections. The appropriate legal analysis should therefore identify the precise conduct, the representation or omission involved, the user's reliance, and the causal connection to the transaction.

6.3. The Problem of Formal versus Substantive Assent

Digital transactions expose a recurring distinction between formal assent and informed assent. A user may technically click “accept” while lacking reasonable notice of an onerous arbitration clause, unilateral price variation provision, automatic renewal mechanism or extensive data-use term. This does not mean that courts should disregard every standard term; rather, it supports a graduated approach in which conspicuous notice and specific assent are required for especially onerous provisions where legislation or precedent supports such scrutiny.

7. Comparative and Jurisprudential Perspective

The Indian framework draws historically from English common-law principles but has developed a distinct statutory structure. The Indian Contract Act expressly codifies coercion, undue influence, fraud, misrepresentation and mistake, whereas English law has developed several of these doctrines through judicial precedent and subsequent legislation. Comparative authorities such as Derry v. Peek, Raffles v. Wichelhaus, Cundy v. Lindsay and Foster v. Mackinnon are therefore best used to illuminate concepts rather than to displace Indian statutory rules.

The jurisprudential tension is between autonomy and fairness. A strongly autonomy-based model gives high priority to party choice and certainty. A fairness-oriented model recognises that meaningful choice can be impaired by informational asymmetry, dependency, economic distress and manipulative presentation. Indian jurisprudence has increasingly acknowledged this tension, particularly through Section 23 public-policy reasoning and the judicial scrutiny of unconscionable standard-form terms.

8. Law Commission Reports and The Unfair-Terms Problem

The Law Commission of India has repeatedly identified limitations in the existing law concerning unfair standard-form terms. The 103rd Report (1984) proposed insertion of

Section 67A to empower courts to refuse enforcement of unconscionable contractual provisions in specified circumstances. The 199th Report (2006), titled "Unfair (Procedural and Substantive) Terms in Contracts," revisited the subject and proposed a more developed framework distinguishing procedural and substantive unfairness.

These reports are particularly relevant to the free-consent debate because they recognise that unfairness may arise even where conventional proof of coercion, fraud or undue influence is difficult. They therefore support the case for a more explicit statutory framework rather than forcing every unfair standard-form transaction into an existing vitiating-consent category.

9. Critical Reforms and Legislative Recommendations

9.1. Clarify Coercion and Economic Pressure

Section 15 could be modernised to use technology-neutral and law-neutral terminology covering illegitimate pressure prohibited by law, while carefully distinguishing it from legitimate commercial negotiation. Any reform should specify factors such as illegitimacy of the threat, causation, absence of reasonable alternatives and disproportionate exploitation.

9.2. Enact a Clear Unfair-Terms Framework

The proposals developed in the Law Commission's 103rd and 199th Reports provide a substantial foundation for legislation addressing procedural and substantive unfairness. A modern framework should distinguish negotiated commercial bargains from non-negotiated standard terms and should provide courts with structured criteria for assessing transparency, bargaining power, necessity, proportionality and legitimate business interests.

9.3. Develop Standards for Informed Digital Assent

For particularly onerous or unexpected digital terms, legislation or judicial standards could require clear presentation, accessible language and affirmative assent. The aim should not be to make electronic contracting impracticable, but to ensure that a user's assent to material burdens is not manufactured through concealment or manipulative design.

9.4. Harmonise Contract and Consumer Protection

Consumer law already addresses misleading conduct and unfair trade practices in important contexts. Contract-law analysis should therefore operate alongside, rather than in isolation from, the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and the CCPA's dark-pattern framework. Harmonisation would reduce doctrinal fragmentation and allow courts to identify the most appropriate remedy for the particular wrong.

10. Conclusion

The doctrine of free consent remains one of the principal safeguards of contractual legitimacy under Indian law. Sections 13 and 14 establish the conceptual distinction between consent and free consent, while Sections 15–22 provide a structured statutory response to coercion, undue influence, fraud, misrepresentation and mistake. Sections 19, 19A, 64 and 65 then determine the principal consequences and restitutionary implications.

The framework has demonstrated considerable durability, but contemporary contracting exposes limits that could not have been anticipated in 1872. Standard-form agreements, unequal bargaining power, digital interfaces and manipulative choice architecture complicate the assumption that outward assent necessarily reflects meaningful contractual autonomy. Indian courts have responded through doctrines including public policy and unconscionability, while the Law Commission has proposed more systematic legislative solutions.

The appropriate future direction is not to replace freedom of contract with judicial paternalism. It is to preserve genuine autonomy by ensuring that consent is not reduced to a purely formal event. Clearer rules on unfair terms, illegitimate economic pressure and informed digital assent would strengthen both contractual justice and commercial certainty. The continuing task of Indian contract jurisprudence is therefore to reconcile the value of voluntary exchange with the equally important requirement that legal enforcement should not reward deception, domination or materially impaired choice.

11. References and Table of Authorities

11.1. Statutes and Regulatory Materials

The Indian Contract Act, 1872. Act No. 9 of 1872.
The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. Act No. 45 of 2023.
The Information Technology Act, 2000. Act No. 21 of 2000.
The Consumer Protection Act, 2019. Act No. 35 of 2019.
The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023. Act No. 22 of 2023.
Central Consumer Protection Authority. Guidelines for prevention and regulation of dark patterns, 2023. New Delhi: Central Consumer Protection Authority; 2023.

11.2. Law Commission Reports

Law Commission of India. 13th report on the Indian Contract Act, 1872. New Delhi: Law Commission of India; 1958.
Law Commission of India. 103rd report on unfair terms in contract. New Delhi: Law Commission of India; 1984.
Law Commission of India. 199th report on unfair (procedural and substantive) terms in contracts. New Delhi: Law Commission of India; 2006.

11.3. Judicial Authorities

Astley v Reynolds. (1731) 2 Str 915.
Central Inland Water Transport Corporation Ltd v Brojo Nath Ganguly. (1986) 3 SCC 156; AIR 1986 SC 1571.
Chikkam Ammiraju v Chikkam Seshamma. (1917) ILR 41 Mad 33.
Couturier v Hastie. (1856) 5 HLC 673.
Cundy v Lindsay. (1878) 3 App Cas 459.
Dai-ichi Karkaria Pvt Ltd v Oil and Natural Gas Commission. AIR 1992 Bom 309.
Derry v Peek. (1889) 14 App Cas 337.
Foster v Mackinnon. (1869) LR 4 CP 704.
LIC of India v Consumer Education and Research Centre. (1995) 5 SCC 482; AIR 1995 SC 1811.
Mannu Singh v Umadat Pande. (1890) ILR 12 All 523.
Phillips v Brooks Ltd. [1919] 2 KB 243.
Raffles v Wichelhaus. (1864) 2 H & C 906.
Shri Krishan v Kurukshetra University. (1976) 1 SCC 311; AIR 1976 SC 376.
Subhas Chandra Das Mushib v Ganga Prasad Das Mushib. (1967) 1 SCR 331; AIR 1967 SC 878.

11.4. Books and Secondary Literature

Anson WR, Beatson J, Burrows AS, Cartwright J. Anson's law of contract. 31st ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2020.

Cheshire GC, Fifoot CHS, Furmston MP. Law of contract. 17th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2017.

Fried C. Contract as promise: a theory of contractual obligation. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015.

Pollock F, Mulla DF. The Indian Contract Act and specific relief acts. 16th ed. New Delhi: LexisNexis; 2021.

Singh A. Contract and specific relief. 13th ed. Lucknow: Eastern Book Company; 2022.

Treitel GH, Peel E. The law of contract. 15th ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell; 2020.

11.5. Selected Official Online Materials Consulted

Department of Consumer Affairs, Government of India — Consumer Protection and Dark Patterns materials.

Supreme Court of India — judgments concerning unequal bargaining power and unconscionable contractual terms.

Law Commission of India — Reports on unfair terms in contracts.

How to Cite This Article

Kumar S. The role of free consent in the validity of contracts: a critical analysis under the Indian Contract Act, 1872. Glob Multidiscip Perspect J. 2026;3(1):104-109.

Creative Commons (CC) License