INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner what sever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

ISSN: 2582-6433

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board

Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor
School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC-NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020).Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

ISSN: 2582-6433

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law,Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration.10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.

Avinash Kumar

Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ISSN: 2582-6433

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANLAYSIS ISSN- 2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

ISSN: 2582-6433

COERCION AS AN IMPEDIMENT TO FREE CONSENT

AUTHORED BY - M DYUTHI G RAO
BBA LLB Hons A Section
PESU, Outer Ring Road

ABSTRACT

Coercion as a root impediment (barrier) to free consent. Coercion is described as the use of, or threat of, force, pressure, or manipulation, depriving one of the true alternatives to accept or reject terms. Free consent is agreeing to terms voluntarily, in knowledge, and with understanding, and without undue influence. The primary argument is that coercion makes the consent not genuine, and thus makes it weaker legally, morally, and socially. The study describes how coercive strategies operate (e.g., threats, intimidation, manipulation, and power imbalances), identifies indicators of coerced consent, and distinguishes coercion from rightful influence or informed decisions. Based on comparative analysis of legal norms, ethical theories, and empirical data, the paper explains how different models assess the validity of consent obtained through coercion. The research methodology involves a convergence of doctrinal sources, cases, and applicable empirical research. The research indicates that, within most jurisdictions and settings, coercion-induced consent must be considered as invalid or voidable, and remedies must deal with protection against coercion as well as restoration of choice on an autonomous basis. The conclusion emphasizes the need for strong safeguards, an explicit definition, and continuous examination of the power relationship to guarantee that consent is voluntary. It holds that genuine consent does not exist where there is coercion since freedom of choice is the basis of valid contracts.

Keywords: Coercion, Free consent, Undue influence, Validity of consent, Ethical theories, Voidable agreements, Safeguards.

INTRODUCTION

In terms of civil law, the primary focus is on consent and its affirmation. The matter of consent is considerable across all fields. In personal relations, medicine, business, and almost all civil contracts, most of the time, the actions are justified based on the consent of the concerned parties. Consent, section 13 of ICA, is the underlying principle of democracy, self-governance, self-control, and self-discipline. It gives the power to individuals to take control of their affairs,

ISSN: 2582-6433

enter into contracts, and exercise self-determination. The worth of consent is not based on its external expression, but on its authenticity. Where the conditions compromise the willingness of the individual, the very core of consent is absent. For legal systems and philosophy, the only focal point is consent predicated on legal conditions and systems.

In Indian law, the concept of coercion has been recognized as an important vitiating factor. Under the Indian Contract Act, 1872, in Section 15, coercion is defined as an act of doing or threatening to do acts that are criminal in nature and spelt out in the Indian Penal Code, or criminally and without due cause detaining or threatening to detain movable or immovable property to persuade a person to enter into an agreement. An illustrative case of this kind would be representative of the enforcement of agreements in the case of coercion in India, as legislation. The particulars of this kind of law ought to be understood in the absence of due pressure. In reality, it is voidable at the discretion of the person under coercion, but is ultimately, off the premises, valid. A contract like this does have the absence of free will, an essential component of a contract. It is for this reason that coercion has the most fundamental impact on the contractual agreement.

To see why coercion is so corrosive, one must first understand the central role free consent plays in contract law. Consent is not a formalistic procedure; it is the sine qua non of all legitimate contracts. In its absence, agreements forfeit legitimacy. The Indian Contract Act (Section 10) lays down that every agreement is a contract if it's made by the free consent of parties who are capable of contracting, for legal consideration and legal object, and not otherwise declared void. Free consent, thus, isn't desirable—it's obligatory. It makes sure that parties are actually agreeing to the terms, not succumbing to them under coercion. A signature signed under threats of violence or illegal coercion cannot be equated with a willing act.

Essentially, coercion erodes consent because it substitutes preference with fear. When someone consents to something in fear of injury, illegal confinement, or other threats, their choice is not the result of free will but rather an effort to escape injury. In those situations, seeming consent is actually compliance under duress. This is why contracts that are made under coercion are voidable: they are deprived of the one necessary ingredient of voluntariness. The principle applies not just beyond law into ethics as well. Upholding free choice lies at the heart of human dignity; coercion robs individuals of that dignity by merely making them means to the ends of another.

ISSN: 2582-6433

The coercive effect is not limited to explicit threats of violence. It also may be subtle, like economic coercion, psychological manipulation, or social coercion. For example, coercing someone into a contract by threatening to tarnish their business reputation or illegally hold onto their property is within the purview of coercion under Section 15. These indirect threats can be as effective as physical violence and, at times, even more difficult to trace. The difficulty for legal systems is that the government must differentiate between valid persuasion—where a party is persuaded by incentives or reason—and coercion, where the will of the party is overborne by illegal threats or pressure.

The effects of coercion are far-reaching. In law, it makes contracts uncertain and dubious, bringing insecurity to commercial and personal dealings. In society, it breaks down trust, substituting cooperation with fear. Ethically, it deprives persons of the respect to which they are entitled as autonomous beings able to make their own decisions. This is why Indian courts, and comparative legal systems in general, are strict with coercion: they acknowledge that the validity of obligations hinges on free, voluntary, and informed consent.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To analyse coercion and its effect on free consent.
2. To study the legal consequences of coercion.
3. To evaluate criticisms and challenges in addressing coercion.
4. To emphasize the judiciary's role in shaping the doctrine of coercion.

RESEARCH PROBLEM

Free consent is the very bedrock of the law of contracts, but its integrity is frequently vitiated by coercion. Section 15 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, defines coercion as a statutory provision and renders contracts induced by it voidable. Still, large lacunae exist in practice. The core problem is establishing coercion, particularly in psychological pressure, economic dependence, or covert intimidation cases that are less apparent than overt threats. A second challenge is creating a distinct line between illegal coercion and lawful bargaining, especially where there is uneven power interplay. Such uncertainties cast aspersions on the adequacy of existing legal provisions in safeguarding people from exploitation. The difficulty, then, is not simply the definition of coercion but that the law should guarantee free consent in a broad variety of contract situations. This research meets that need by investigating the sufficiency of

ISSN: 2582-6433

the legal framework and the judicial interpretation.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What constitutes coercion under contract law, and how does it impair the principle of free consent?
2. What are the legal remedies available to victims of coercion, and how has the judiciary interpreted such cases in practice?
3. Are current legal provisions adequate to deal with modern forms of coercion, such as economic duress or psychological pressure?
4. How do courts balance genuine bargaining power with coercion, and what reforms are necessary to strengthen protections against it?

HYPOTHESIS

In contract law, coercion refers to a circumstance in which a person is forced to go along with a contract against their free will, whether by threats, pressure, or undue influence. It is inconsistent with the doctrine of free consent, which is the very basis of any valid contract. In law, contracts entered into under coercion are voidable, and the victim can reject or challenge the agreement.

Classic provisions primarily refer to bodily harm or illegal acts, yet contemporary realities uncover subtle forms of coercion in economic duress and psychological coercion. Courts have been at the centre of interpreting these kinds of cases, sometimes finding it difficult to discern between a legitimate bargaining position and undue pressure. Cures for victims are setting aside contracts, restitution, or damages, but success hangs in the judicial interpretation. Existing legislation is at times not enough to completely safeguard parties with unequal bargaining powers, which makes reforms necessary. By making clear definitions, extending legal provisions, and enhancing judicial strategies, the doctrine of coercion can more effectively ensure contractual fairness and stop exploitation.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research employs a qualitative doctrinal method to explore coercion as an impediment to free consent in the realm of contract law. The research focuses on defining coercion through statutes and common law, the application of remedies in a legal context, and the role of courts

ISSN: 2582-6433

in developing the doctrine of coercion. The primary sources considered include statute law provisions, especially the Indian Contract Act 1872, relevant common legal principles, and important cases dealing with coercion and duress. Secondary sources include authoritative textbooks, particularly Treitel and Collins, as well as texts by Dalton, Benson, and Birks, providing both perspectives on coercion from traditional and critical viewpoints.

The analysis employs a combination of doctrinal, comparative, and critical approaches. A doctrinal analysis explains how the law has defined coercion subject to remedies such as rescission and restitution. A comparative analysis examines traditional definitions of coercion, which emphasize overt threats, to critiques in modern literature that have drawn attention to structural and economic forms of coercion. Finally, the critical evaluation will ask whether the remedies that exist under an approach by a court provide adequate protection of free consent or leave substantial gaps in practice. The multi-layered analysis ensures that the study will consider not just the law, but the effectiveness of the law and its limitations.

The research's parameters are set to English and Indian jurisprudence, and references to other common law jurisdictions will be made selectively, while providing contextualization for the project. Since the research will only rely on published legal writing and court reports of cases, there will not be empirical fieldwork for this study. This aspect will enhance depth in the level of critique of the doctrine, but may not capture the lived experience of coercion outside the courtroom. Although the methods used for the research will correlate directly with the objectives of this research: analysing the impact of coercion on free consent, studying the legal consequences of coercion, reviewing critiques of the current provisions, and emphasizing the role of the judiciary in developing the doctrine.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Foundations of Coercion and Free Consent

Treitel's Law of Contract (2003) remains a central authority on coercion and consent. He emphasizes that free consent is breached when a person is compelled to consent by threats or illegal pressure. Treitel differentiates between coercion, duress, and undue influence and explains that coercion does not necessarily involve obvious violence but can extend to economic or situational pressures. This offers a practical doctrinal basis for Research Question 1, which enquires about what coercion is and how it affects free consent.

Birks (1976) also outlines the historical evolution of duress in English law, and how the courts

ISSN: 2582-6433

first limited coercion to threats of bodily harm before enlarging it to cover illegal threats to property or economic interests. His analysis demonstrates the judiciary's increasing role in the development of the doctrine of coercion, aligning exactly with Objective 4.

However, both Treitel and Birks mainly explain coercion from a traditional contract law perspective. They see it as something unusual that only happens in limited situations, such as when one party uses physical threats or unlawful pressure. According to them, the vast majority of contracts are the result of free and voluntary consent, and coercion is subject to the status of an "exception" to the broad rule.

The flaw with this method is that it fails to account for the realities of unequal bargaining power sufficiently. In most instances, individuals will consent to contracts not because they want to, but because they believe they have no reasonable alternative — for example, employees signing exploitative employment contracts or consumers bound by unfair financial agreements. These cases do not necessarily satisfy the narrow legal requirement of coercion, but they nevertheless raise substantial concerns regarding whether free consent exists.

G.H. Treitel, *The Law of Contract* (Sweet & Maxwell 2003).

P. Birks, *The Doctrine of Duress in English Law*, in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 59 (1976).

This gap in Treitel and Birks' accounts leaves space for more critical scholars, such as Dalton and Collins, who argue that coercion is not just a rare exception but can be a systemic problem in contract law.

[G.H. Treitel, The Law of Contract (Sweet & Maxwell 2003).]

[P. Birks, The Doctrine of Duress in English Law 59 (Proceedings of the British Academy 1976).]

Legal Consequences and Remedies

Benson (2001) talks about how the law is able to respond when coercion is evidenced in a contract. Almost all of the remedies discussed here dwell on rescission, which annuls the contract and returns the parties to their previous state, and restitution, which requires the payment of benefits received as a result of a transaction or benefit that was procured by wrongful means. Benson argues that such remedies are more than mere technical rules of law; rather, they are based on moral principles to restore a party's autonomy and preserve the integrity of free consent.

ISSN: 2582-6433

But Benson also points to inconsistencies in judicial procedure. In certain situations, the courts have been more concerned with reversing the coercive consequences entirely, whereas others have been more concerned with protecting the reliance interests of the non-coercing party. This tension raises questions about whether the remedies truly serve the principle of free consent or simply manage contractual breakdowns.

The limitation here is that Benson's moral framework, though insightful, is highly normative. It provides less empirical grounding in how courts actually apply remedies across varied contexts, leaving open a space for more practice-oriented studies of judicial decisions.
[Peter Benson, Contractual Remedies and Moral Principles 2516 (Harvard Law Review 2001).]

Criticisms and Challenges in Addressing Coercion

Clare Dalton (1985) disobeys the conventional understanding of contract law by questioning the belief that the majority of agreements are based on sincere free consent. According to her, many people sign contracts not necessarily because they have free will but because they act under greater structural pressures, such as economic need or social obligation, for example, Ranganayakamma v. Alwar Setti, ILR (1889, a landmark case.

In such cases, a party may seem to consent, but the decision is formed by factors that present them with no or limited alternatives. This aligns with Research Question 3, which probes the adequacy of legal provisions in addressing modern forms of coercion like economic duress or psychological manipulation.

Standard legal principles often confine coercion to instances where there is a direct threat or illegal pressure. Dalton nevertheless suggests that more insidious types of pressure — for example, economic dependence — can be just as coercive, even though they do not neatly fit into the legal definition of duress.

For instance, an employee taking a slave labour contract due to economic necessity is not meeting the doctrinal standard of coercion, but their consent is very much less than voluntary.

This critique exposes a major flaw in existing legal provisions: they handle openly manifest coercions quite well, but they find it difficult to tackle structural or indirect pressures that

ISSN: 2582-6433

obfuscate consent in practice. Dalton thus calls for more reformist scholarship, filling the gap between ossified doctrine and social imperatives. This directly indicates the current research, which examines whether present legal frameworks are adequate to deal with contemporary forms of coercion, such as economic and psychological pressure.

[Clare Dalton, An Essay in the Deconstruction of Contract Doctrine, 94 Yale L.J. 997 (1985).]

The Judiciary's Influence in Developing the Doctrine of Coercion

In his 2008 article, Collins discusses the ways judges deal with situations in which one party to a contract has significantly greater bargaining power than the other party, noting that the judiciary faces a constant state of conflict between two competing principles: the principle of freedom of contract, which holds that parties should be free to make agreements with each other, and the idea that judges must intervene when one party's consent was not exercised freely, often occurring because of pressure exerted or advantage taken by the other party.

This reflects directly on the current study's Objective 4, indicating the judiciary's role in developing the doctrine of Coercion, and on Research Question 4, which states how courts balance "genuine" bargaining power with coercion. Collins argues that judicial rulings in this area do not carry a lot of consistency. That is, some courts will strike an agreement down because they consider it unfair or coerced, while others will strengthen the agreement because they are interested in preserving certainty in contracts and stability in the market.

Overall, Collins pointed out that the judiciary does act as a check against coercion and disparate bargaining power, but it is also unclear what the standards are as to when the judiciary should intervene. When outcomes are inconsistent, stability and predictability do not exist, and Collins notes a greater need for doctrinal clarity.

[Hugh Collins, The Law of Contract (Cambridge University Press 2008).]

Clare Dalton, "An Essay in the Deconstruction of Contract Doctrine," 94 *Yale L.J.* 997 (1985).Hugh Collins, *The Law of Contract* (Cambridge Univ. Press 2008).

Gaps in Scholarship and Contribution of This Study

The literature reviewed reveals three important shortcomings. First, traditional accounts of coercion often overlook modern forms such as economic duress and psychological pressure, leaving uncertainty about how these should be treated under contract law.

ISSN: 2582-6433

Second, judicial approaches to remedies and intervention remain inconsistent, with no clear standard for prioritizing the protection of free consent. Third, much of the doctrinal analysis fails to engage with the broader social and structural inequalities that shape contractual relationships in practice.

The present research responds to these gaps by examining how coercion affects free consent (Objective 1), assessing the legal consequences and judicial interpretations of coercion (Objective 2), evaluating the adequacy of existing provisions in addressing modern forms of coercion (Objective 3), and analysing the judiciary's role in shaping and reforming the doctrine (Objective 4).

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

This segment provides the meaning of the literature review findings regarding the research objectives and questions. The aim is not only to summarize the body of the existing literature, but also to offer a critical examination of how legal doctrines address coercion in contracts and application by the courts, and also explore contradictions in protecting true consent. The section proceeds by discussing the definition and effect of coercion, legal remedies available for, critiques of the current application of the doctrines, and the role of courts in determining the doctrine.

1. *Coercion and the Principle of Free Consent*

The initial research inquiry raises the following: What is coercion in the context of contract law, and how does it negatively affect the principle of free consent?

Traditional scholars such as Treitel and Birks provide a doctrinally exact definition of coercion in terms of threats of physical harm, unlawful detention, and illegitimate pressure that impacts free agreement. In this framework, coercion is an unusual situation that excludes one from the otherwise valid contract. Their work has the advantage of clarity: parties know what conduct will vitiate consent. However, this definition may be too narrow.

GH Treitel, *The Law of Contract* (13th edn, Sweet & Maxwell 2011) 317.

Peter Birks, *An Introduction to the Law of Restitution* (Clarendon Press 1985) 94.

ISSN: 2582-6433

Critical voices, most notably Dalton, highlight how coercion extends beyond explicit threats. She emphasizes that economic and social pressures often leave parties with little genuine choice. A worker who is compelled due to economic circumstances to accept exploitative employment may not technically be coerced as defined in law, but their consent is still compromised. This viewpoint points toward a disconnection between the law's narrow definition and the lived realities of bargaining.

Therefore, the analysis demonstrates a disjunction: the law is inclined to see coercion only in narrow, extreme instances while scholars identify systemic coercion much more widely. This supports Objective 1, which is to analyse coercion's effect on free consent, by demonstrating that traditional definitions may fail to capture the full range of pressures that impair autonomy.

2. *Legal Consequences of Coercion*

The second research question asks: What are the legal remedies available to victims of coercion, and how has the judiciary interpreted such cases in practice?

Benson provides valuable insight here, examining rescission and restitution as the primary remedies. These remedies are intended to restore the coerced party's autonomy, either by cancelling the contract or requiring the return of benefits obtained unfairly. In principle, this seems to fully protect free consent.

Yet judicial practice reveals inconsistencies. Some courts are more inclined towards complete restitution of the coercion by rescinding contracts, while others may favour the protection of what are called reliance interests or the expectations or investments of the other party. For example, if a party that was not coercing had already acted substantially in reliance on the contract, judges may not merit the complete unwinding of the contract.

This inconsistency can undermine doctrinal clarity and demonstrate that the remedies often do not demonstrate respect for the principle of free consent. Instead, they sometimes operate to balance competing interests between parties. This indicates that, while there are remedies, their effectiveness is highly variable and is subject to the courts' discretion. This accomplishment will achieve Objective 2, which is to explore the legal effects of coercion, by illustrating the strengths and weaknesses of the existing remedies both in literature and in practice.

ISSN: 2582-6433

Clare Dalton, 'An Essay in the Deconstruction of Contract Doctrine' (1985) 94 *Yale LJ* 997.

Peter Benson, 'Contract as a Transfer of Ownership' (2007) 48 *William and Mary Law Review* 1673.

3. *Sufficiency of Existing Legal Frameworks*

The third inquiry asks: Are existing legal frameworks sufficient in addressing modern forms of coercion, for instance, economic duress or psychological pressure?

Here, the literature reveals a significant gap. Traditional frameworks, as seen in Treitel and Birks, are too rigid to capture modern realities. Dalton's critique underscores that economic necessity and systemic inequalities often pressure individuals into contracts that are not truly voluntary. Collins also supports this point by noting that courts sometimes recognize unequal bargaining power, but lack a consistent standard for intervention.

The inadequacy lies not only in the definitions but also in the remedies. If the law is unable to recognize economic or psychological pressure as coercion, there will not be an availability of rescission or restitution remedies. The practical effect is a legal structure that seems strong in theory, but is ultimately inadequate in practical terms.

This analysis highlights that reforms are necessary to expand the scope of coercion to include subtle, structural pressures. The inadequacy of current provisions confirms Objective 3, which is to evaluate the criticisms and challenges of addressing coercion.

4. *The Judiciary's Role in Shaping the Doctrine*

The fourth research question asks: How do courts balance genuine bargaining power with coercion, and what reforms are necessary to strengthen protections?

Collins offers the most explicit discussion of the issue. He demonstrates judges are faced with balancing two competing values: freedom of contract and protection from coercion. At times, courts have intervened to strike down contracts they view as oppressive. At other times, they have upheld them to maintain contractual certainty and protect market stability.

This inconsistency mirrors the problem identified in remedies: judicial discretion often leads to unpredictability. The absence of a singular standard for when courts ought to intervene makes result predictability elusive. But the courts are quite important in developing the doctrine.

ISSN: 2582-6433

Judicial willingness to expand the scope of coercion could gradually redefine how the law protects free consent.

Hugh Collins, *Regulating Contracts* (Oxford University Press 1999) 89.

This discussion addresses Objective 4 by illustrating the judiciary's dual role: both as a gatekeeper of freedom of contract and as a potential reformer in recognizing new forms of coercion.

The key takeaway is that the judiciary's role is essential but uncertain, requiring clearer guidelines for intervention.

Synthesizing the Findings

Overall, the literature presents three observations that are simultaneously related. First, coercion is defined strictly doctrinally by traditional legal scholars, mainly with reference to explicit threats or unlawful compulsion. This is helpful to define coercion, but it permits a great deal of real-world pressure to escape the protection of law — a point that critical scholars, such as Dalton, have made quite well. Second, considering precedent, the courts appear to have an inconsistent approach to coercion. The courts lack a standard to utilize when determining whether to award a remedy or consider whether to interfere with a contract. Lacking a standard creates not only uncertainty of outcomes, but also unpredictability of outcomes.

Finally, both adversarial critiques and judicial conduct suggest that reform is needed. The law must be altered to allow for different forms of contemporary coercion, including economic duress or psychological pressure, increasingly encountered in current bilateral relationships. Each of these observations links back to the research objectives, evidencing that the literature informs and complicates the analysis of coercion in contract law.

CONCLUSION

The present research aimed to explore coercion as a barrier to free consent in contract law, paying specific attention to its definition, legal effects, criticisms, and the role of the judiciary in shaping doctrine. The review and analysis demonstrate that although the law formally acknowledges coercion, its scope is generally too restrictive, its remedies unevenly

ISSN: 2582-6433

implemented, and its treatment of contemporary forms of coercion underdeveloped.

The initial research question addressed the gap between doctrinal definitions of coercion, which see it in terms of overt threats or illegal pressure, and critical approaches, which contend that economic and social pressures can also vitiate valid consent. The second legal remedy question uncovered the fact that rescission and restitution are intended to restore autonomy but are applied unevenly by courts, at times giving precedence to reliance interests over free consent. The third question revealed the insufficiency of existing provisions to counter modern challenges like economic duress and mental pressure, rendering many varieties of subtle coercion beyond the purview of the law. The last question emphasized that the judiciary has an important but confused role in balancing freedom of contract with protection against coercion and demonstrated a need for clearer standards.

These findings suggest that coercion should not simply be treated as an exception in contract law but rather as an ongoing issue requiring doctrinal and judicial reform. By bringing legal definitions closer to social facts, legislatures and courts can more effectively protect free consent. Future studies could investigate comparative approaches, considering how other jurisdictions treat economic and psychological coercion, or empirical studies examining how courts actually enforce these principles in court.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. G.H. Treitel, The Law of Contract (11th ed., Sweet & Maxwell 2003). https://archive.org/details/lawofcontract0000peel

2. Peter Birks, The Doctrine of Duress in English Law 59 Proceedings of the British Academy (1976). https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/documents/1646/150p003.pdf

3. Peter Benson, "Contractual Remedies and Moral Principles" 110 Harv. L. Rev. 2516 (2001). https://www.jstor.org/stable/1342667

4. Clare Dalton, "An Essay in the Deconstruction of Contract Doctrine" 94 Yale L.J. 997 (1985). https://www.jstor.org/stable/796151

5. Hugh Collins, The Law of Contract (Cambridge University Press 2008). https://archive.org/details/lawofcontract0000coll_e1u9

6. Indian Contract Act, 1872, S10, S13, S14, S15. https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/2187/2/A187209.pdf

7. Chikham Ammiraju v. Chikham Seshamma, (1917) 41 Mad 33 (Madras HC).

ISSN: 2582-6433

https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1604481/

8. Ranganayakamma v. Alwar Setti, ILR (1889) 13 Mad 214. Ranganayakamma v. Alwar Setti

9. Barton v. Armstrong, [1976] AC 104 (PC).

https://www.lawteacher.net/cases/alexander-barton-v-armstrong.php

10. Universe Tankships Inc. of Monrovia v. International Transport Workers Federation, [1983] 1 AC 366 (HL).

UniverseTankships v InternationalTransportWorkers