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

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 2 | Issue 7 | July 2025
ISSN: 3048-9539 (Online)
Website: www.theinfinite.co.in

The Doctrine of Co-extensiveness under Section 128: Need for Reinterpretation?

Aakarshika Shree

Advocate

District & Session Court, Bokaro Steel City

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Keywords :

Surety, Co-extensive Liability, Indian Contract Act, Section 128, Legal Reinterpretation.

ABSTRACT

The doctrine of co-extensiveness, enshrined under Section 128 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, lays down a fundamental rule in contracts of guarantee: that the liability of the surety is co-extensive with that of the principal debtor, unless the contract explicitly states otherwise. This means that, in the event of default by the principal debtor, the creditor is legally entitled to recover the entire amount due from the surety, without first exhausting remedies against the principal debtor. This provision ensures strong protection for creditors, thereby facilitating credit expansion and enhancing confidence in commercial transactions.

However, this seemingly straightforward principle has become a subject of legal and academic scrutiny due to the evolution of complex financial transactions, corporate financing mechanisms, and personal guarantees in large-scale loans. The rigidity of the doctrine, especially its automatic and absolute nature, often leads to unfair consequences for sureties—particularly when individuals, such as family members or company directors, provide guarantees without fully understanding the extent of liability. The legal system currently offers limited recourse or flexibility for such guarantors, even in situations involving misrepresentation, unequal bargaining power, or changes in the terms of the principal contract without their knowledge or consent.

Moreover, recent judicial interpretations, particularly in the context of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), 2016, have further complicated the position of guarantors. Courts have ruled that a creditor may proceed against a guarantor even when insolvency proceedings are pending against the principal debtor. This has led to multiple and parallel litigations, raising questions about the fair treatment of sureties and the scope of their liability.

In light of these developments, this paper undertakes a comprehensive analysis of the doctrine of co-extensiveness, tracing its legal origins, examining judicial interpretations, assessing its practical implications in modern financial practice, and critically evaluating whether the doctrine, in its present form, serves the ends of justice and equity. The paper also explores possible reforms and reinterpretations needed to ensure a more balanced legal framework that continues to uphold creditor rights while also protecting sureties from disproportionate liability in an increasingly complex economic environment.

1.Introduction

A contract of guarantee is a tripartite agreement involving three distinct parties—the creditor, the principal debtor, and the surety. In this contractual arrangement, the surety agrees to fulfill the financial or legal obligation of the principal debtor in the event of the latter's default. This guarantee creates a secondary obligation, wherein the surety's liability arises only upon the non-performance or breach by the principal debtor. The legal foundation for this relationship is laid out in Section 128 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, which explicitly states that, unless the contract provides otherwise, the liability of the surety is co-extensive with that of the principal debtor. In other words, the surety is liable to the same extent as the principal debtor for the performance of the obligation and can be directly approached by the creditor without first exhausting remedies against the debtor.

This principle of co-extensiveness means that the surety's liability covers not only the principal amount owed but also includes any interest, damages, and legal costs associated with the default, unless there is an express limitation stipulated in the contract. Importantly, the liability of the surety becomes immediately enforceable upon default by the principal debtor, without any need for prior notice, demand, or legal action against the principal debtor. This provision is designed to enhance the creditworthiness and confidence of lenders, thereby encouraging the flow of credit and supporting the growth of commerce and trade.

However, while this provision serves an essential economic purpose by protecting the interests of creditors, it also raises significant legal and ethical concerns, especially in light of the changing economic landscape. In modern times, financial transactions have become increasingly complex, often involving high-risk ventures, layered corporate structures, and sophisticated loan instruments. Corporate guarantees, personal guarantees by directors, and cross-border financial arrangements have introduced new dimensions to the traditional concept of guarantee, creating situations where sureties—especially individual guarantors—may be unaware of or unable to comprehend the full scope of their liability.

Furthermore, individual sureties, such as family members, friends, or employees, may not possess the same bargaining power, access to legal counsel, or understanding of the debtor’s financial health as institutional lenders or corporate debtors. As a result, they may find themselves unjustly burdened with liabilities that are disproportionate to their intent or capacity. Additionally, corporate guarantors are now often held accountable even when the principal debtor undergoes insolvency or restructuring, especially following judicial interpretations under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), 2016.

In this context, it becomes imperative to critically examine the continued relevance, fairness, and applicability of the doctrine of co-extensive liability. The present framework may need reconsideration to balance the legitimate interests of creditors with the need to protect sureties from undue hardship, particularly in cases where they lack informed consent, adequate legal safeguards, or the financial means to bear the burden of default. This paper, therefore, seeks to evaluate the strengths and shortcomings of Section 128 and propose legal, judicial, or policy reforms to ensure that the law on guarantees evolves in step with modern commercial realities and principles of equity.

2. Essentials of Surety's Liability

The primary features of a surety's liability under a contract of guarantee include:

- **Commencement on Default**: The liability of the surety arises immediately upon the default of the principal debtor, without the creditor being required to exhaust remedies against the principal debtor first.

- **Extent of Liability**: As per Section 128, the surety is liable to the same extent as the principal debtor, including interest, damages, and other incidental costs, unless the contract specifies otherwise.
- **Nature of Guarantee**: Guarantees can be specific (relating to a single transaction) or continuing (covering a series of transactions).

This absolute liability places the surety in a vulnerable position, often without adequate bargaining power or knowledge about the debtor's financial status.

3. Judicial Interpretation of Section 128

Indian courts have consistently upheld the principle of co-extensiveness. Key decisions include:

- **Bank of Bihar v. Damodar Prasad (1969)**: The Supreme Court held that the surety's liability is immediate and does not depend on the creditor first proceeding against the principal debtor. The Court rejected the notion that the creditor must exhaust remedies against the principal debtor before proceeding against the surety.
- **State Bank of India v. Indexport Registered (1992)**: The Court reinforced that the surety's obligation is co-extensive and independent. Even if the principal debtor is not sued, the surety can be held liable.
- **State Bank of India v. V. Ramakrishnan and Valliammal (2018)**: Under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), the Supreme Court clarified that the moratorium under Section 14 does not extend to the personal guarantor. The ruling emphasized that the creditor can proceed against the guarantor independently during the insolvency resolution process of the principal debtor.

These judgments highlight the strict interpretation of Section 128, with little room for judicial discretion in favor of the surety.

4. Challenges and Critique

Despite its intent to safeguard creditor interests, the doctrine poses several challenges:

- **Rigid Liability**: The automatic and full liability of the surety may be unjust, especially when the surety is unaware of the principal debtor's financial position or is induced into the contract without adequate disclosure.
- **Lack of Procedural Safeguards**: There is no legal obligation on the creditor to inform or involve the surety during renegotiations or restructuring of the debtor's obligations.

- **Disproportionate Burden**: In many cases, especially involving family members or employees acting as sureties, the liability becomes crushing and economically devastating.
- **Impact on MSMEs**: In the context of small businesses, personal guarantees are often mandatory for loans. A single default can lead to severe consequences for individual promoters.

5. Comparative Legal Perspective

The principle of co-extensiveness of surety liability is not unique to Indian law and finds recognition in other common law jurisdictions as well. However, both English law and U.S. law approach the concept with greater flexibility, providing more robust protections for sureties through statutory provisions and equitable principles. These jurisdictions have developed mechanisms that allow courts to take into account the conduct of the parties, the presence of coercion or misrepresentation, and the nature of the transaction itself, thereby ensuring that the liability of the surety is not unjust or excessive.

English Law

Under English contract law, the principle of co-extensive liability is acknowledged as a general rule, where the surety's obligation mirrors that of the principal debtor. However, English courts adopt a more nuanced approach in applying this rule. Several equitable defenses are available to a surety, which may result in a modification or discharge of liability in certain circumstances:

Misrepresentation or Non-disclosure: If the creditor obtains the guarantee by concealing material facts or misrepresenting the nature of the transaction, the surety may be discharged from liability. English law imposes a duty on the creditor to disclose facts that may affect the surety's decision to enter the guarantee, particularly in cases involving continuing guarantees or fidelity bonds.

Undue Influence and Duress: Where the surety can demonstrate that they were induced into the contract by undue influence, coercion, or abuse of trust (e.g., in cases involving spouses or close relations), the courts may set aside the guarantee. The landmark case of Royal Bank of Scotland v. Etridge (No. 2) (2001) clarified the duty of financial institutions to ensure that vulnerable parties receive independent legal advice before entering into guarantee agreements.

Variation of Contract without Consent: A material alteration in the terms of the principal contract without the surety's consent can discharge the surety. This principle ensures that the surety is not held accountable for obligations they did not agree to guarantee.

Overall, English courts exercise equitable jurisdiction to ensure that guarantees are not enforced in a manner that would result in injustice, especially where the surety is not a commercial actor or has been misled about the nature of their liability.

U.S. Law

In the United States, the law governing suretyship is largely codified under the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) and supplemented by Restatements and state-specific statutes. While the UCC supports the principle that a surety's liability may be co-extensive, it includes numerous procedural safeguards and rights in favor of the surety, reflecting a more balanced legal architecture.

Creditor Duties and Surety Rights: The UCC and related jurisprudence impose affirmative duties on creditors, such as notifying the surety of the debtor's default, refraining from modifying the contract terms without the surety's consent, and acting in good faith. If these duties are breached, the surety may be partially or fully discharged.

Right to Subrogation and Reimbursement: U.S. law ensures that sureties have clear post-payment remedies, such as stepping into the shoes of the creditor to recover amounts from the principal debtor (subrogation) and seeking reimbursement or indemnity.

Equitable Defenses: Sureties in the U.S. can invoke defenses like fraud, mistake, duress, or lack of consideration, and courts may grant equitable relief where enforcement would be unconscionable.

Commercial vs. Non-commercial Sureties: U.S. courts often differentiate between compensated sureties (such as insurance companies) and accommodation sureties (e.g., relatives or friends), applying stricter standards of fairness in the latter category.

This approach emphasizes procedural fairness and informed consent, ensuring that sureties are not exposed to excessive liabilities due to the creditor's unilateral actions or lack of transparency.The comparative analysis reveals that while the principle of co-extensiveness is accepted in both English and U.S. legal systems, significant safeguards exist to prevent abuse and ensure fairness. These include the availability of equitable defenses, procedural obligations on creditors, and judicial discretion to examine the overall fairness of the guarantee. Such protective mechanisms stand in stark contrast to the rigid and automatic enforcement of surety liability under Indian law, as currently interpreted. This underscores the need for Indian jurisprudence and legislation to evolve toward a more balanced and equitable model, taking cues from jurisdictions that prioritize both creditor security and surety protection.

6. Practical Implications in Modern Finance

In today's financial environment, guarantee contracts are widely used in banking, commercial, and corporate sectors. Key developments include:

- **Personal Guarantees by Promoters**: Financial institutions often require promoters to furnish personal guarantees. In the event of default, they face personal insolvency proceedings, even if corporate assets are available.
- **Corporate Guarantees**: Parent companies often provide guarantees for subsidiaries. This may impact shareholder value and corporate governance if the liability is triggered.
- **IBC and Guarantor Liability**: Post the Ramakrishnan judgment, creditors are filing parallel proceedings against personal guarantors, creating multiplicity and pressuring promoters.

The current legal position creates an imbalance in favor of creditors, with inadequate statutory or judicial safeguards for sureties.

7. Arguments for Reinterpretation or Reform

Given the above challenges, there is a growing need to reconsider the doctrine:

- **Judicial Discretion**: Courts should be empowered to examine the fairness and circumstances under which a guarantee was given and modify or reduce liability accordingly.
- **Statutory Amendment**: Section 128 can be amended to introduce proportional liability, procedural requirements, and information rights for sureties.
- **Regulatory Guidelines**: RBI and other regulators can mandate disclosure norms and risk assessment guidelines for lenders while accepting guarantees.
- **Protection Against Unfair Enforcement**: The law must provide remedies against arbitrary and disproportionate enforcement of guarantee obligations.

8. Conclusion

The doctrine of co-extensiveness under Section 128 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, while historically grounded in sound commercial logic, must be reassessed in light of modern financial realities and emerging socio-economic complexities. The rule, which equates the surety's liability with that of the principal debtor and makes it immediate and unconditional, was originally intended to provide creditors with a reliable secondary source of repayment, thereby encouraging credit expansion and economic activity. However, its rigid application in today's financial ecosystem—marked by complex credit arrangements, increased corporate defaults, and escalating personal bankruptcies—raises serious concerns of fairness, proportionality, and justice.

In the current era, financial transactions frequently involve multilayered obligations, cross-border guarantees, and complicated restructuring processes. Sureties are often individuals—such as family members, friends, or company directors—who may have limited understanding of their legal liabilities or may act under emotional pressure rather than informed consent. Unlike institutional creditors, these sureties lack negotiating power, legal sophistication, and sometimes even access to independent legal advice. When the law enforces co-extensive liability without offering room for contextual evaluation, it disproportionately burdens such individuals and risks creating economic ruin for those who never intended or anticipated such outcomes.

Moreover, developments in insolvency jurisprudence, particularly under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), 2016, have further magnified the doctrine's implications. Courts have clarified that proceedings against corporate debtors do not preclude simultaneous proceedings against personal guarantors, which has resulted in parallel litigation, asset seizure, and in many cases, double jeopardy for the surety. This trend, while legally consistent with Section 128, calls into question the ethical dimensions of enforcement and underscores the need for greater judicial discretion.

To strike a more equitable balance, it is imperative to pursue multi-pronged reforms. First, statutory amendments to Section 128 could clarify that co-extensiveness is not absolute and that certain categories of sureties—such as non-commercial or accommodation sureties—deserve differential treatment. Legislators could introduce safe harbor provisions to protect those who act as sureties in good faith but without commercial gain. Second, the judiciary should be encouraged to apply equitable principles when assessing the enforceability of guarantees, particularly in cases involving misrepresentation, undue influence, or lack of informed consent. Indian courts have historically demonstrated creativity in interpreting contract law, and this tradition can be extended to inject fairness into the doctrine's application.

Third, regulatory authorities like the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) and financial institutions should issue guidelines mandating transparency and informed consent in the execution of guarantee agreements. Lenders should be obligated to explain the nature, risks, and scope of guarantee contracts, especially when individuals or non-professional guarantors are involved. This would reduce information asymmetry and enhance accountability in credit markets.

Finally, legal education, legal aid, and judicial training must emphasize the importance of balancing contractual sanctity with societal justice, particularly in the context of suretyship. Guarantee law should not become a tool for uncritically transferring risk from powerful financial entities to vulnerable individuals.

In conclusion, while the doctrine of co-extensiveness continues to serve an important role in maintaining creditor confidence, its unchecked and inflexible application threatens to undermine principles of equity and justice. By embracing progressive legislative reforms, context-sensitive judicial interpretation, and robust regulatory practices, Indian contract law can evolve to better reflect the realities of the 21st-century economy, ensuring that it remains both commercially sound and morally just.

References:

1. Indian Contract Act, 1872
2. Bank of Bihar v. Damodar Prasad, AIR 1969 SC 297
3. State Bank of India v. Indexport Registered, AIR 1992 SC 1740
4. State Bank of India v. V. Ramakrishnan & Anr., (2018) 17 SCC 394
5. Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016
6. English Law Commission Reports on Guarantees
7. Uniform Commercial Code (USA)
8. R.K. Bangia, Law of Contract-II
9. Avtar Singh, Law of Contract and Specific Relief
10. Mulla on the Indian Contract Act and Specific Relief