The Infinite
An International Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 3 | Issue 9 | September 2026
ISSN: 3048-9539 (Online)
Website: www.theinfinite.co.in

THE DOCTRINE OF QUANTUM MERUIT IN MODERN CONTRACT LAW: A COMPREHENSIVE JURISPRUDENTIAL AND RESTITUTIONARY ANALYSIS UNDER INDIAN AND ENGLISH LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

Dr. RangNath Singh: Ph.D. (Law), Legal Scholar (India)

Abubakar Muhammad Jibril, Faculty of Law, University of Indonesia

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Keywords :

Quantum Meruit, Restitution, Unjust Enrichment, Quasi-Contracts, Indian Contract Act 1872, Section 70, Breach of Contract.

ABSTRACT

The legal doctrine of Quantum Meruit—a Latin expression denoting 'as much as he has deserved' or 'as much as he has earned'—serves as one of the most vital judicial instruments for balancing contractual rigidity with equitable justice. Situated at the crossroads of contract law, quasi-contracts, and restitution, Quantum Meruit provides a legal avenue for a party to claim reasonable remuneration for goods delivered or services rendered when an express contract is missing, discharged by breach, rescinded, or discovered to be void ab initio. This comprehensive legal research paper investigates the historical evolution, jurisprudential foundations, and modern statutory codification of Quantum Meruit under the Indian Contract Act, 1872 (specifically Sections 65 and 70) and English Common Law. Through a rigorous examination of leading precedents—including Moses v. Macferlan, Planche v. Colburn, State of West Bengal v. B.K. Mondal & Sons, Alopi Parshad & Sons Ltd. v. Union of India, and MTNL v. Tata Communications Ltd.—this paper articulates the essential prerequisites for invoking the doctrine, distinguishes restitutionary claims from compensatory damages under Section 73, and analyzes its modern application in complex commercial, construction, and digital service contracts. The paper concludes with a proposed reform framework for

codifying clearer valuation standards to enhance predictability in commercial adjudication.

1. INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL GENESIS OF QUANTUM MERUIT

The doctrine of Quantum Meruit occupies a foundational position in the law of obligations, acting as an indispensable bridge between strict contractual doctrine and equitable justice. Translated literally from Latin as 'as much as he has deserved,' Quantum Meruit describes an action brought for the reasonable value of services rendered or work performed. In traditional common law pleading, it was accompanied by its sister doctrine, Quantum Valebat ('as much as they were worth'), which applied specifically to the reasonable value of goods sold and delivered. Over centuries of legal development, the distinction between the two has largely dissolved, with Quantum Meruit expanding into an overarching legal principle governing non-contractual and quasi-contractual remuneration.

The core problem that Quantum Meruit addresses arises when a party confers a measurable benefit upon another under circumstances where no enforceable express contract governs the payment rate, or where an existing contract has been rendered unenforceable, discharged, or declared void. In a pure regime of strict freedom of contract, a party who performs work without a perfected, binding agreement—or whose contract terminates prematurely due to the defendant's breach—would be left entirely without a remedy. Conversely, the recipient of the work would retain a substantial material advantage without providing any corresponding consideration. To prevent such manifest injustice, common law courts created a legal fiction: an implied promise or obligation imposed by law requiring the beneficiary to pay a fair and reasonable sum (meritum) for the value received.

Historically, the action of Quantum Meruit emerged in the English Courts of Common Law during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries through the writ of Indebitatus Assumpsit. Prior to this procedural evolution, the strict common law writ of debt required a plaintiff to prove a fixed, liquidated sum agreed upon by the parties. If a tradesman, artisan, or laborer performed work without agreeing beforehand on an exact price, an action in debt would fail. To overcome this procedural rigidity, courts allowed plaintiffs to bring an action in Assumpsit, pleading that the defendant had implicitly promised to pay as much as the plaintiff reasonably deserved for their labor. By the eighteenth century, under the influential stewardship of Lord Mansfield in cases such as Moses v. Macferlan (1760), Quantum Meruit was recognized not

merely as a procedural device, but as an expression of natural justice and equity designed to prevent unjust enrichment.

In the Indian legal landscape, the principles underlying Quantum Meruit were institutionalized through the enactment of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 (ICA). Drafted by the Indian Law Commission under the influence of nineteenth-century English jurisprudence, the ICA codified the doctrine under Chapter V, titled 'Of Certain Relations Resembling Those Created by Contract' (commonly referred to as Quasi-Contracts). Rather than relying entirely on uncodified equitable principles, Indian contract jurisprudence anchors Quantum Meruit primarily within Section 70 (obligation of person enjoying benefit of non-gratuitous act) and Section 65 (obligation of person who has received advantage under void agreement), alongside general common law principles incorporated through Section 73.

> **JURISPRUDENTIAL CORE**
>
> ***Key Takeaway: Quantum Meruit is fundamentally an equitable and restitutionary remedy. It ensures that no party is allowed to enrich themselves unjustly at the expense of another who has performed valuable, non-gratuitous work in good faith.***

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS: UNJUST ENRICHMENT AND RESTITUTIONARY JURISPRUDENCE

To fully grasp the mechanics of Quantum Meruit, one must analyze its theoretical underpinnings. For over two centuries, legal scholars and jurists have debated whether Quantum Meruit is rooted in implied contract (the contractarian theory) or in unjust enrichment and restitution (the restitutionary theory). Resolving this conceptual debate is not merely an academic exercise; it determines the elements a plaintiff must prove, the defenses available to a defendant, and the method by which monetary relief is calculated.

2.1 The Implied Contract Theory (Factum Implied in Fact vs. Implied in Law)

Under the traditional nineteenth-century view, Quantum Meruit was framed as a contract implied in fact. Judges reasoned that when a person requests services from another, or knowingly accepts services under circumstances where payment is customarily expected, the law implies a real, albeit unexpressed,

agreement between the parties to pay a reasonable price. This approach preserved the fiction that all civil obligations outside of tort arose from consent.

However, the implied contract theory proved structurally inadequate when applied to cases where consent was completely absent or impossible—such as where a contract was void ab initio, or where a party performed work under a mistake, or where the defendant actively repudiated the agreement. If a contract is legally void, courts cannot logically imply a valid contract from the very same facts. Recognizing this fallacy, modern jurisprudence transitioned from 'contracts implied in fact' to 'contracts implied in law' (quasi-contracts), acknowledging that the obligation is imposed by law regardless of, and sometimes directly contrary to, the actual intention of the parties.

2.2 The Doctrine of Unjust Enrichment

The modern consensus, pioneered by legal scholars Lord Goff of Chieveley and Professor Gareth Jones in their seminal treatise 'The Law of Unjust Enrichment,' firmly establishes Quantum Meruit as a primary remedy within the law of unjust enrichment. The core principle of unjust enrichment comprises three essential elements:

1. **Enrichment:** The defendant must have received a measurable benefit or enrichment (whether in the form of money, property, services, or saved expenses).
2. **At the Plaintiff's Expense:** The enrichment must have been gained directly at the expense of the plaintiff.
3. **Unjust Factor:** The retention of the benefit by the defendant must be 'unjust' according to established legal principles (such as failure of consideration, mistake, coercion, or non-gratuitous provision of services).

When these three elements coincide, the law imposes an obligation upon the defendant to make restitution to the plaintiff. Quantum Meruit represents the monetary measure of that restitutionary obligation when the benefit conferred consists of work, labor, or professional services.

3. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK UNDER THE INDIAN CONTRACT ACT, 1872

Unlike the English legal system, which relied historically on judge-made common law to develop quasi-contractual remedies, the Indian legal system operates within a statutory framework. The Indian Contract

Act, 1872 provides explicit statutory provisions that embody the principles of Quantum Meruit. The two primary statutory anchors are Section 65 and Section 70.

3.1 Section 65: Obligation of Person Received Advantage under Void Agreement

Section 65 of the Indian Contract Act states:

'When an agreement is discovered to be void, or when a contract becomes void, any person who has received any advantage under such agreement or contract is bound to restore it, or to make compensation for it, to the person from whom he received it.'

Section 65 applies to two distinct operational scenarios:

a) **Agreements Discovered to be Void:** Agreements that were legally void from their inception (void ab initio), but the parties were unaware of the invalidity at the time of agreement (e.g., due to a mutual mistake of fact under Section 20, or technical statutory non-compliance).
b) **Contracts Becoming Void:** Contracts that were initially valid and enforceable but subsequently became void due to supervening impossibility, frustration (under Section 56), or statutory illegality.

Under Section 65, if a plaintiff has rendered services or executed partial construction work under an agreement that is later discovered to be void, the plaintiff cannot enforce the agreement itself. However, the plaintiff is entitled to claim compensation on a Quantum Meruit basis for the benefit or 'advantage' received by the defendant. The Supreme Court of India in Fibrosa Spolka Akcyjna v. Fairbairn Lawson Combe Barbour Ltd. (adopted in Indian jurisprudence) and State of Rajasthan v. Associated Stone Industries (1985) confirmed that Section 65 is founded on the doctrine of restitution to prevent a party from retaining an unearned advantage.

3.2 Section 70: Obligation of Person Enjoying Benefit of Non-Gratuitous Act

Section 70 of the Indian Contract Act constitutes the most significant statutory expression of Quantum Meruit in Indian law. It provides:

'Where a person lawfully does anything for another person, or delivers anything to him, not intending to do so gratuitously, and such other person enjoys the benefit thereof, the latter is bound to make compensation to the former in respect of, or to restore, the thing so done or delivered.'

Section 70 creates a statutory liability completely independent of any express or implied contract. To successfully invoke Section 70 and secure compensation on a Quantum Meruit basis, a plaintiff must satisfy three mandatory statutory conditions precedent, as established by the landmark Supreme Court decision in State of West Bengal v. B.K. Mondal & Sons (AIR 1962 SC 779):

1. **Lawfulness of the Act:** The plaintiff must have done the act or delivered the thing lawfully. An illegal act or an act performed in direct violation of statutory prohibitions cannot form the basis of a Section 70 claim.
2. **Non-Gratuitous Intention:** The plaintiff must not have intended to perform the act or deliver the goods gratuitously. The burden of proof lies on the plaintiff to demonstrate that the services were rendered with an expectation of remuneration or compensation.
3. **Enjoyment of Benefit:** The defendant must have voluntarily accepted and enjoyed the benefit of the act done or thing delivered. If the defendant had no opportunity to reject the benefit, or if no tangible benefit accrued, Section 70 cannot be invoked.

> **STATUTORY FORMULA**
>
> ***Section 70 ICA Threshold Test:***
>
> ***1. Lawful Performance -> 2. Non-Gratuitous Intent -> 3. Voluntary Acceptance and Enjoyment of Benefit by Defendant = Statutory Right to Reasonable Remuneration (Quantum Meruit).***

4. CONDITIONS PRECEDENT AND PREREQUISITES FOR INVOKING QUANTUM MERUIT

While Quantum Meruit is an equitable and flexible doctrine, it is not an unrestricted licence for judicial intervention. Courts have established strict procedural and substantive boundaries governing when the doctrine may be invoked.

4.1 Absence of a Subsisting Express Contract

The most fundamental restriction on Quantum Meruit is expressed in the legal maxim: expressum facit cessare tacitum (when an express agreement exists, an implied agreement is excluded). A party cannot

maintain a claim on a Quantum Meruit basis while an express, valid, and subsisting contract governing the exact same subject matter and remuneration remains in force.

In the definitive decision of Alopi Parshad & Sons Ltd. v. Union of India (AIR 1960 SC 588), the Supreme Court of India held that where a contract explicitly stipulates the rates of remuneration, a party cannot ignore those contractual terms and seek higher compensation on Quantum Meruit merely because performance became unexpectedly onerous or financially burdensome. Quantum Meruit applies only when the contract has been discharged, rescinded, held void, or where the extra work performed falls completely outside the scope of the original agreement.

4.2 Voluntary Acceptance of Benefit

Restitution cannot be forced upon an unwilling recipient. A plaintiff who officiously confers an unsolicited benefit upon another without their request or acquiescence is regarded in law as a 'gratuitous intermeddler.' To ground a Quantum Meruit claim, the defendant must have had the option to accept or reject the benefit, and must have voluntarily chosen to retain or enjoy it.

4.3 Absence of Fraud, Illegality, or Officiousness

Equity requires that a party seeking equitable relief must come with clean hands. If work is executed in furtherance of an illegal object, or in direct contravention of public policy (Section 23 of ICA), no claim for Quantum Meruit can be entertained by the courts. Similarly, performance driven by officious meddling confers no right to restitution.

5. CATEGORIZATION OF CLAIMS UNDER QUANTUM MERUIT

In judicial practice, claims for Quantum Meruit arise under four distinct factual and legal circumstances:

5.1 Claim Following Breach or Prevention of Performance by Defendant

When a contract is partially performed by the plaintiff, and further performance is prevented or rendered impossible by the defendant's wrongful repudiation or breach, the innocent party has a legal election. The innocent party may either treat the contract as subsisting and sue for damages for breach of contract, or treat the contract as rescinded and sue on a Quantum Meruit basis for work actually executed.

The classical English authority illustrating this principle is Planche v. Colburn (1831) 8 Bing 14. The plaintiff was engaged by the defendants to write a book on ancient armor for a publication series titled 'The Juvenile Library' for a lump sum of £100. After the plaintiff had completed substantial research and written several chapters, the defendants abandoned the publication series. The Court held that the plaintiff was entitled to recover reasonable remuneration on Quantum Meruit for the work performed, irrespective of the fact that the full book was never published.

5.2 Work Performed Under a Void or Unenforceable Agreement

Where work is executed pursuant to an agreement that both parties believed to be valid, but which is subsequently discovered to be void due to technical, statutory, or constitutional defects, the performing party is entitled to Quantum Meruit under Section 65 of ICA or common law quasi-contract.

In Craven-Ellis v. Canons Ltd. [1936] 2 KB 403, the plaintiff was appointed managing director of a company under an agreement executed by directors who lacked the necessary qualification shares. Consequently, the appointment contract was legally void. However, the plaintiff rendered valuable managerial services to the company. The Court of Appeal held that since the services were rendered at the request of the company and accepted by it, the plaintiff was entitled to reasonable remuneration on Quantum Meruit. The obligation to pay was imposed by law independently of the invalid contract.

5.3 Performance of Divisible Contracts

In the law of contracts, obligations are categorized as either 'entire' or 'divisible' (severable). An entire contract is one where full performance by one party is a strict condition precedent to any liability of the other party (e.g., a lump-sum building contract or a voyage charterparty).

Historically, under the harsh common law rule established in Cutter v. Powell (1795) 6 TR 320, a second mate who agreed to serve on a ship from Jamaica to Liverpool for a lump sum, but died six weeks into the eight-week voyage, was awarded nothing because the contract was entire. Modern contract law mitigates this severity through the doctrines of 'substantial performance' (Hoenig v. Isaacs [1952] 1 All ER 176) and 'severable obligations.' Where a contract is divisible into distinct stages or units, a party who completes one or more divisible units can recover the contract price for those completed units, and claim Quantum Meruit for extra or altered work.

5.4 Extra, Altered, or Additional Work Outside Contractual Scope

In commercial construction and engineering contracts, contractors frequently perform extra or altered work at the verbal request of the employer or architect, which falls entirely outside the scope of the original written contract. Where the original contract contains no mechanism or agreed schedule of rates for such extra work, the contractor is entitled to be paid for the additional work on a Quantum Meruit basis based on prevailing market rates.

6. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: QUANTUM MERUIT VS. COMPENSATORY DAMAGES UNDER SECTION 73

A fundamental conceptual error in contract litigation is confusing a claim for Quantum Meruit with a claim for damages under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act. Although both remedies result in a monetary award, their legal nature, objectives, computation methodologies, and evidentiary burdens are entirely distinct.

Legal Dimension	Claim for Damages (Section 73 ICA)	Claim on Quantum Meruit (Sec. 65/70)
Jurisprudential Basis	Contractual obligation arising from breach of a valid contract.	Quasi-contractual or restitutionary obligation imposed by law.
Primary Objective	Compensatory: Put plaintiff in the financial position if contract was performed.	Restitutionary: Restore value of benefit conferred; prevent unjust enrichment.
Measure of Award	Loss suffered by plaintiff (expectation loss, lost profit, reliance loss).	Value of work done or benefit received by defendant (reasonable market price).
Impact of Contract Price	Contract price forms the strict upper boundary and framework for calculation.	Not bound by contract price if contract is rescinded, void, or work is extra.

Duty to Mitigate Loss	Plaintiff is under a strict legal duty to mitigate damages (Explanation to Sec. 73).	Concept of mitigation does not apply to restitution for work already completed.

7. LANDMARK JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS AND INDIAN JURISPRUDENCE

The evolution of Quantum Meruit in India has been shaped by landmark rulings of the Supreme Court of India and High Courts, which have adapted common law principles to Indian statutory realities.

7.1 State of West Bengal v. B.K. Mondal & Sons (AIR 1962 SC 779)

This Constitution Bench decision of the Supreme Court remains the definitive authority on Section 70 of the Indian Contract Act. The respondent contractor constructed certain temporary office structures for the State Government upon verbal requests from government officials. After accepting and occupying the buildings, the State refused to pay, arguing that no valid written contract had been executed in compliance with Article 299(1) of the Constitution of India (which mandates formal execution of government contracts).

Gajendragadkar, J., speaking for the majority, rejected the State's defense. The Supreme Court held that even if the contract was unenforceable against the State for non-compliance with Article 299(1), the State was bound under Section 70 of the Contract Act to pay compensation on a Quantum Meruit basis. The Court ruled that Section 70 was enacted specifically to prevent the state or private individuals from enjoying non-gratuitous benefits without paying fair compensation.

7.2 Alopi Parshad & Sons Ltd. v. Union of India (AIR 1960 SC 588)

In this pivotal decision, the Supreme Court demarcated the strict boundaries of Quantum Meruit. The appellants were appointed agents for buying ghee for the Government of India under a formal contract specifying fixed commission rates. Due to World War II, circumstances changed dramatically, leading to a massive increase in procurement volume and operational expenses. The agents claimed compensation on Quantum Meruit above the agreed contract rates, citing changed conditions.

Shah, J., firmly rejected the claim, holding that:

'Compensation Quantum Meruit is awarded for work done or services rendered when there is no specific contract providing for remuneration for the work done... Courts have no power to ignore the express terms of a contract and award what they consider reasonable remuneration, on grounds of equity.'

7.3 Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd. v. Tata Communications Ltd. (2019 5 SCC 341)

In modern telecommunications litigation, the Supreme Court evaluated the application of Quantum Meruit in regulatory and contractual disputes. The Court clarified that where a contract exists but fails to prescribe an explicit tariff rate for an extended period of service, or where performance extends beyond the contractual term with the consent of both parties, Quantum Meruit applies to determine reasonable compensation based on prevailing market rates.

7.4 Puran Lal Sah v. State of U.P. (1971 1 SCC 424)

The Supreme Court re-emphasized that a claim under Section 70 is not based on a contract, but on a quasi-contractual obligation. The Court noted that for Section 70 to apply, the plaintiff must prove that the work was done lawfully, non-gratuitously, and that the defendant derived direct material benefit from it. If the work was discarded or conferred no benefit, Quantum Meruit cannot be sustained.

8. QUANTUM MERUIT IN SPECIAL COMMERCIAL DOMAINS

The modern application of Quantum Meruit has expanded beyond traditional trade disputes into complex commercial sectors:

8.1 Infrastructure and Engineering Construction Contracts

Construction contracts are prone to delays, variations, scope changes, and unexpected site conditions. When an employer orders variations that substantially alter the character of the work beyond what was contemplated in the original bill of quantities, courts and arbitral tribunals frequently award variation claims on a Quantum Meruit basis. Standard international contract forms, such as FIDIC (International Federation of Consulting Engineers), incorporate Quantum Meruit valuation standards for extra-contractual variations.

8.2 Public Procurement and Government Contracts

In India, public contracts frequently suffer from formal non-compliance with statutory or constitutional requirements (e.g., Article 299 of the Constitution or municipal tender rules). Indian courts consistently apply Section 70 to ensure that private contractors who carry out legitimate public works in good faith receive Quantum Meruit recovery, preventing public authorities from enriching state coffers through procedural defaults.

8.3 Digital Economy, Software Development, and E-Commerce

In the contemporary technology ecosystem, software developers and IT consultants often execute iterative software updates, custom code modifications, or cloud infrastructure setup without formal executed change orders. When digital service agreements fail or terminate mid-development, courts assess the value of deployed code, database architecture, and functional software modules using Quantum Meruit, relying on expert technical valuation of developer hours and software functionality.

9. MEASUREMENT AND COMPUTATION OF QUANTUM MERUIT

Calculating the precise monetary value of a Quantum Meruit award is one of the most contentious aspects of commercial litigation. Unlike contractual damages, which refer to contract price and profit margins, Quantum Meruit focuses on the objective value of the benefit conferred.

Courts employ two primary valuation methodologies:

1. Cost-Plus Method (Objective Market Rate of Inputs): Calculating the actual cost of labor, materials, equipment, and overheads reasonably incurred by the plaintiff, plus a fair commercial profit margin (typically 10% to 15% in construction and service industries).

2. Subjective Benefit to Defendant (Quantum of Benefit): Measuring the actual economic value derived by the defendant. If the work rendered was partially defective or delivered reduced value, the award is discounted accordingly.

> **COMPUTATION FORMULA** ***Valuation Standard:***
>
> ***Quantum Meruit Award = Reasonable Market Value of Labor & Materials + Fair Commercial Overhead/Profit - Deductions for Defective Work.***

10. CRITICAL EVALUATION, RECENT TRENDS, AND LEGISLATIVE REFORM RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite its utility, the doctrine of Quantum Meruit faces criticism for judicial subjectivity and uncertainty in valuation. In arbitration proceedings, tribunals sometimes misapply Quantum Meruit as a discretionary tool to rewrite bad bargains or rescue negligent contractors from fixed-price loss-making contracts.

To enhance certainty and predictability in Indian contract jurisprudence, the following reforms are recommended:

1. **Statutory Amendment to Section 70 ICA:** Explicitly define the parameters for calculating 'compensation' under Section 70, incorporating objective market-rate standards.
2. **Guidance for Arbitral Tribunals:** Establish clear guidelines requiring tribunals to make specific factual findings on non-gratuitous intent and voluntary acceptance before invoking Quantum Meruit.
3. **Integration with Contractual Variation Clauses:** Encourage standardized commercial drafting that pre-defines Quantum Meruit valuation formulas for extra-contractual scope changes.

11. CONCLUSION

The doctrine of Quantum Meruit remains one of the most elegant and essential mechanisms in modern contract jurisprudence. By providing a legal basis for recovering reasonable remuneration in the absence of an enforceable contract, the doctrine enforces the foundational moral and legal command that no party shall be unjustly enriched at the expense of another. From its sixteenth-century English common law origins under Indebitatus Assumpsit to its statutory codification in Sections 65 and 70 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, Quantum Meruit has demonstrated remarkable durability and adaptability.

As commercial transactions become increasingly complex in the modern digital and infrastructure landscapes, courts and arbitral tribunals must continue to apply Quantum Meruit with jurisprudential rigor—maintaining a strict distinction between compensatory damages and restitutionary recovery, respecting valid contractual boundaries, and applying objective valuation metrics. When applied within its proper legal limits, Quantum Meruit ensures that fairness, equity, and good conscience remain at the heart of the law of obligations.

12. REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY (APA 7th EDITION)

Anson, W. R., & Beatson, J. (2010). Anson's Law of Contract (29th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Avtar Singh. (2017). Law of Contract and Specific Relief (12th ed.). Eastern Book Company.

Birks, P. (2005). Unjust Enrichment (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Beatson, J. (1991). The Use and Abuse of Unjust Enrichment: Essays on the Law of Restitution. Clarendon Press.

Burrows, A. (2011). The Law of Restitution (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Goff, R., & Jones, G. (2016). The Law of Unjust Enrichment (9th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.

Pollock, F., & Mulla, D. F. (2014). The Indian Contract and Specific Relief Acts (14th ed.). LexisNexis.

Treitel, G. H. (2015). The Law of Contract (14th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.

Alopi Parshad & Sons Ltd. v. Union of India, AIR 1960 SC 588.

Craven-Ellis v. Canons Ltd., [1936] 2 KB 403 (CA).

Cutter v. Powell, (1795) 6 TR 320.

Fibrosa Spolka Akcyjna v. Fairbairn Lawson Combe Barbour Ltd., [1943] AC 32.

Hoenig v. Isaacs, [1952] 1 All ER 176 (CA).

Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd. v. Tata Communications Ltd., (2019) 5 SCC 341.

Moses v. Macferlan, (1760) 2 Burr 1005.

Planche v. Colburn, (1831) 8 Bing 14.

Puran Lal Sah v. State of U.P., (1971) 1 SCC 424.

State of Rajasthan v. Associated Stone Industries, (1985) 1 SCC 575.

State of West Bengal v. B.K. Mondal & Sons, AIR 1962 SC 779.