Rule in Foakes v Beer should be Abolished

Consideration is a basic and deeply founded term at the core of English and Welsh legal system. Legally binding agreements (not embodied in a Domain) based on the exchange of valued compensation between the contracting entities.[1] What constitutes "consideration" is a constitutional principle that judges have attempted to explain. The long-standing dilemma of whether a commitment to settle a portion of an underlying obligation in exchange for a borrower's pledge to receive a reduced price in entire satisfaction of that obligation shows a legal snag. The legislation now says that such a contract is unlawful due to an absence of compensation.[2] The main point of this essay is that the Foakes v Beer ruling should be overturned. The distinction between agreements to accept less and agreements to accept more is not convincing.[3]. The basic notion of this essay is that the provision in Foakes v Beer should be repealed in conjunction with a restructuring that eliminates any necessity for deliberation in alteration agreements.

Arguments for Abolishing the Rule in Foakes v Beer

Williams v. Roffey Bros & Nicholls is seen to be the biggest recent change to the regulations laid forth in Foakes v Beer. The matter of Williams v. Roffey deviates from the standard norms of consideration in several respects.

Williams v Roffey Bros & Nicholls (Contractors) Ltd [1991] 1 QB 1

In the situation of Williams and Roffey Bros, Roffey Bros sub-engaged Williams to conduct woodwork job in a building of 27 apartments that they had been hired to restore for £20,000, but he was reluctant to accomplish the task on deadline since the amount he gave was insufficient to accomplish the task.[4] As a result, Roffey Bros promised a £10,300 salary rise provided the job was done on schedule; however, when Williams finished eight of the apartments, Roffey Bros neglected to fulfill the extra amount, prompting Williams to file a claim. Williams was not given due attention by Roffey Bros, according to the argument, and the case was settled in his benefit.[5]

---

[1]1 Adams, J. and Brownsword, R., 1990. Contract, consideration, and the critical path. *The Modern Review*, *53*(4), pp.536-542.

[2]2 Collins, Daniel M. "Part-payment of debt: a variation on a theme?" International Company and Commercial Law Review 28, no. 7 (2017): 253-258.

[3]3 Davies, P.S., 2016. Varying contracts. *The Cambridge Law Journal*, *75*(3), pp.455-458.

[4]5 O'Sullivan, J., 1996. In defense of Foakes v. Beer. *The Cambridge Law Journal*, *55*(2), pp.219-228.

[5]6 Gordon III, J.D., 1989. Dialogue about the doctrine of consideration. *Cornell L. Rev.*, *75*, p.986.

The judgement in Williams v. Roffey resulted in the emergence of the practical benefit test, which was earlier not thought to be a valid consideration. Because when Glidewell LJ managed to make his quote conclusion, he focused on whether the promisor obtained advantages "in exercise," rather than whether the promisee is at a vulnerable position because of his guarantee, or whether the promisor gets "judicial profit." Furthermore, according to the Declaration, this judgement would "disband the theory of consideration."[6]

The judgement in William's v. Roffey has had a modest impact across the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth; once the verdict was published, the concept was quickly adopted in England and Wales, and it was also confirmed by the Court of Appeal in New Zealand.

MWB Business Exchange Centers Ltd v Rock Advertising Ltd [2016] EWCA CIV 553

The ruling in Foakes v Beer goes against the judge's normal practice of upholding adjustment accords. Williams v Roffey's methodology has been praised for being "particularly elastic, least theoretical," and closest to current business practice where mobility is required. The previous obligation paradigm was very comprehensive and vague. If rigidly enforced, it would render many voluntarily bargained amendments, such as those in Williams v Roffey Bros., unenforceable. The justices are continuing to undermine the criteria of compassion, and there's no explanation why a similar technique can't be used in component cases.[7]

Second, MWB is a perfect illustration of what transpires when courts artificially modify regulations to get a correct achievement. The business rule says predictability, and MWB raises additional issues than it answers.[8] The concept of concern is being used by the judiciary to maintain legal variants. When it comes to reducing pacts, the theory of collateral contract is under jeopardy. If something additional' like fulfillment cannot be provided through a statutory modification, the surety can employ the argument to prevent the patentee from demanding due excess. If we adopt the tangible advantage criterion in declining accord scenarios, we may find that the theory of fundamental breach becomes outdated.[9] If substantial compensation plus actual advantage is sufficient to sustain a pledge to take less, the bar for discovering this value is as minimal as the one in Williams v Roffey.

---

[6]7 MacNeil, I., 2009. Uncertainty in commercial law. *Edinburgh Law Review*, *13*(1), pp.68-99.

[7]16 Shaw-Mellors, A. and Poole, J., 2018. The recession changed circumstances, and renegotiations: the inadequacy of principle in English law. *Journal of Business Law*, *2018*(2), pp.101-121.

[8]17 Kha, H., 2020. *A History of Divorce Law: Reform in England from the Victorian to Interwar Years*. Routledge.

[9]18 Jan, H., 2020. The principle of good faith and fair dealing in English contract law. *Правоведение*, *64*(3), pp.312-325.

Third, when it comes to legal terms, the judiciary should take a hands-off posture. Entities may benefit commercially from portion settlement because they "each weekday realize and behave on the premise that rapid delivery of a portion of their claim may be financially profitable to them than insisting on their privileges and enforcing settlement of the entire claim."

Fourth, It's impossible to justify the contrast between promises to take less and commitments to provide extra. It is not possible to free a participant from the equilibrium since doing so would be pointless.[10] As a realistic approach that acknowledges the realities of commerce, O'Sullivan's case has nothing to promote it. According to O'Sullivan, commitments to take less may inspire the guarantor to urge the offeror to tolerate a lesser amount. O'Sullivan ignores the reality that the principle of damages, as well as other aggravating variables, can be utilised to nullify a fluctuation.

VANTAGE NAVIGATION CORPORATION v. SUHAIL AND SAUD BAHWAN BUILDING MATERIALS LLC (THE "ALEV") [1989] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 138

In the legal system, the notion of compulsory acquisition is an aggravating element that renders a compact unenforceable from the start.[11] When a side has not willingly and willingly engaged in a contract, the principle can be used. The surety might claim that the modification was invalid if this happens to take less where the commitment is the consequence of financial pressure. Suhail and Suad Bahwan Building Materials Ltd v Hobhouse The Alev[l] determined that there is a well-developed philosophy of contractual cancellation impact on macroeconomic hardship. As in Williams v Roffey, this also extends to promises to offer additional for the equivalent. Fifth, the rule's usefulness is jeopardized by the number of deviations to Foakes v Beer. If the actual advantage with a downpayment refund is sufficient, the necessity for these exclusions is jeopardized, which may not be what the Tribunal wanted.

Eliminating the concept of consideration, which allows authorities to evaluate whether a specific difficulty in a lawsuit should be addressed, is not only legal but also makes it simpler to implement accords.[12] The elimination of the norm, according to Atiyah, will improve judicial clarity for

[10]19 Vinokurov, S.N., 2021. Correlation of Assumptions About Good Faith in International Law and the Law of the United States. In *Modern Global Economic System: Evolutional Development vs. Revolutionary Leap 11* (pp. 1522-1531). Springer International Publishing.

[11]20 MacQueen, H. and O'Byrne, S., 2019. The Principle of Good Faith in Contractual Performance: A Scottish-Canadian Comparison. *Edinburgh Law Review*, *23*(3), pp.301-331.

[12]21 Devenney, J., 2018. The legacy of the Cameron-Clegg coalition program of reform of the law on the supply of goods, digital content, and services to consumers. *Journal of Business Law*, *6*, pp.485-511.

signatories to be needed to resolve. The actual value testing is used to assess is employed to determine whether a contract should be approved. When it concerns modification contracts, however, the judges are not required to create this border. The following section of this essay makes the argument for total eradication and explains why this is not the perfect idea.

Actual Benefits and Reducing Contracts

A bird in hand is better than two in the bush.

The latest appellate judge's ruling on Foakes v Beer was MWB v Rock Promotions. The major question in this dispute was about whether a verbal modification could be sustained notwithstanding the plan's stated requirement that all adjustments be written down. In other words, a compromise deal to take inferior.[13] The Court of Appeal decided that deliberation justified MWB's move to switch its engagement with Rock. Kitchin LJ acknowledged that MBW would be able to collect part of the monies owed by Rock v Advertising without having to find a replacement landlord. The advantage of MWB is that it prevented trying to displace Rock as a client. In Re Selectmove, Arden LJ highlighted that the Tax Authority received no extra advantage beyond obtaining substantial prompt settlement.[14]

The issue of MWB is complicated since the Trial judge tries to submit basic definitions effectively. The ruling, according to Shaw-Mellors, is "accepted for achieving an economically rational solution and the judge's desire to provide the implementation." Nevertheless, it confuses the legislation and brings us into a "logical cul-de-sac." The MWB has generated confusion about where to stand on the issue between commitments to tolerate little and others that demand more thought.[15] According to Roberts, the legislation should follow the course set down in Foakes v Beer and repeal the norm. The following section of this essay delves into the justifications made in support of this way to proceed.

A Relaxiation of the Doctrine Used in William v Roffey

A deal must be backed up by substance either when it is created or when it is modified. Once it comes to alteration pledges, the legislation simplifies the assessment standards. As noted in

[13]12 Shaw-Mellors, A. and Poole, J., 2018. The recession changed circumstances, and renegotiations: the inadequacy of principle in English law. *Journal of Business Law*, *2018*(2), pp.101-121.

[14]13 Rahmawati, N.D., 2021. THE IMPACT OF ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS ON CONTRACTING WITH COMPANIES UNDER THE ENGLISH LAW. *Fortiori Law Journal*, *1*(02), pp.86-108.

[15]14 Lee, Pey-Woan. "Varying Contracts–Consideration, Form and Reality." *The Modern Law Review* (2021).

Williams v Roffey, changes can be approved provided the surety derives a positive implication. Every genuine advantage qualifies as a clear value, and the bar to meet it is minimal.[16] The pragmatic utility test has been dubbed "fabricated concern" by some observers. Williams v Roffey is an illustration of tribunals distorting the interpretation of reimbursement guidelines. The law has developed a different approach to variation agreements where rights are being surrendered.[17] The key case in this area is Foakes v Beer, which involved a judgment debt. Julia Beer agreed not to sue Dr. Foakes for interest but the House of Lords ruled that the agreement was not supported by consideration.[18]

Because no compensation was supplied, the Tribunal determined that a promise to assume half compensation was not enforceable. The commitment to take £50,000 and vintage of champagne to settle a £100,000 obligation is legally enforceable.[19] The judge will look at whether the 'something additional' given is worth the money getting relinquished.

No Obligation for Compensation in Variant Contracts

According to John Coote, the obligation for compensation in modification contracts should be eliminated. Several countries, such as New Zealand and Canada, follow this method. In the United States, the Uniform Commercial Code acknowledges that if a contract is accepted by the other party, no compensation is necessary for change commitments. These methods "retain what is usually seen as the basic logic underpinning the norm in Pinnel's Particular instance firmly addressing the uncertainty of the legal system stance by eliminating the necessity of contemplation in such cases," according to the authors. was also proposed by the Constitutional Amendment Council, which determined that changes should be maintained "given that it is devoid of complaint in other aspects such as constitutionality and consistency with state opinion."

[16]8 Roberts, M., 2017. MWB Business Exchange Centres Ltd: The practical benefit doctrine marches on. *The Modern Law Review*, *80*(2), pp.339-351.

[17]9 Thampapillai, D., 2015. Practical benefits and promises to pay lesser sums: Reconsidering the relationship between the rule in flakes v Beer and the rule in Williams v Roffey. *U. Queensland LJ*, *34*, p.301.

[18]10 Thampapillai, D., 2015. Practical Benefits and Promises to Pay Lesser Sums. *University of Queensland Law Journal*.

[19]11 Shaw-Mellors, A., 2016. Contractual variations and promises to accept less: pragmatism in the Court of Appeal. *Journal of Business Law*, *8*, pp.696-706.

The Supreme Court settled the matter on the key constitutional matter of the agreement's modification provision and verbal amendment. In Rock Advertising Limited v MWB Business Exchanges Centre Ltd, Rock Marketing took their case to the High Council. Columnists anticipated that the Tribunal would take the matter of attention into account. The Supreme Court identified that the statute in this region required review by a board of further than five Appointees in a lawsuit alleging a serious problem. While the Supreme Court undoubtedly exceeded its bounds in the Northern Irish contraception particular instance only a few months after this one, it lacked the same desire to eat for a remark in the MWB scenario. This is regrettable.[20]

In basic words, an agreement modification happens when the principal's consent to do everything substantially than they initially intended, while the rest of the agreement remains in effect. If legitimate, such an compensation would be considered a change to the current deal. A legitimate modification typically consists of four main components: the sides must generally consent to amend or amend the agreement. The fundamental agreement may grant one side the sole permission to enact specifically restricted modifications in particular situations, although consent is usually required. The entities must aim for the change/modification to have a long-term impact on their interests. If no clear purpose exists, the modification is more apt to be a momentary tolerance or indulgence than a lasting treaty amendment. Any criteria for the manner of the modification must be followed by the sides. These might be mandated by law or spelled forth in the existing deal that is being modified.

When sides alter a relationship in the essay, it is usually simple for a side exercising its interests to demonstrate the approved modification by referring to a modification document or an electronic discussion. In this scenario, the side asserting that the agreement has been changed must establish that there has been a distinct habit that is incompatible with the initial deal's provisions and only compatible with the partners' agreement to change those provisions. It might be difficult to prove that a contract has been changed due to behavior. As a result, partners need to document differences in paper to prevent litigation.

Budget Proposal by Law Commission for Restructurig Foakes v Beer Ruling

[20]22 Chng, K. and Goh, Y., 2016. A renewed consideration of consideration: MWB Business Exchange Centres Ltd v Rock Advertising Ltd [2016] EWCA CIV 553. *Oxford University Commonwealth Law Journal*, *16*(2), pp.323-332.

The Law Commission has released its five-year Budget Proposal, which does not refer to the Foakes v Beer ruling. If there is no change, there will be another tumultuous time for businesses in this sector. The reality that the Law Commission has not selected change as a major plan does not negate the necessity for change. The existing legal issues have arisen because of legal precedent construction rather than principled grounds, and only policy action, such as that found in the US Commercial Code, may address them. Irrespective of the Law Committee's reformation agenda, entrepreneurs and other involved parties should advocate for this amendment.

Considering that whatever gain is better than no gain at all, and since this is a low bar to clear, the legislation as it exists might be considered to have eliminated the compensation need for contracts to spend extra. A revision that eliminates the necessity for all versions thereby sends a clear signal to what the judges are already attempting to achieve. Elimination of the need, on the other hand, would result in greater transparency in the legislation since litigants would no longer be required to use the pragmatic advantage assessment. As a result, the least beneficial remedy approach is to repeal the regulation entirely.[21]

Conclusion

The purpose of this essay was to see if the Foakes v Beer ruling should be changed. The law was established back, and it has always been susceptible to constraints (which may be traced back to the 'steed, falcon, and cloak' before Foakes v Beer). The contemplation criteria for contracts to spend extra the equivalent have been lessened by the arbitral tribunals. In the case of accords to tolerate lesser, the judges should use a similar stance. Scholarly grounds are used to oppose such a transformation. It is appropriate to refer to the pragmatic and economical considerations. Promissory estoppel is designed to facilitate money activities, and the legislation should represent this. The Trial judge has the chance to review the matter in MWB v Rock Media. The judgment of the lawsuit makes it uncertain to what degree the Foakes v Beer rule will be upheld. Considering that the Trial judge was unable to overturn Foakes v Beer, it must have considerable staying power. The High Justices dismissed to hear the case this fall as well. Change is not a goal for reformist organizations. The core point of this essay, though, is that change is urgently required since the arguments for needing compensation in commitments to take lesser (or any adjustments) are unpersuasive and ignore the specific implications of commercial contracts. Furthermore, total repeal of the norm is urged since it avoids the need to distort current statutory concepts, and alternative pieces of legislation.

[21]23 Daly, P., 2021. *Understanding Administrative Law in the Common Law World*. Oxford University Press.

Reference

OSCOLA for Oxford Standard for the Citation Of Legal Authorities

1 Adams, J. and Brownsword, R., 1990. Contract, consideration, and the critical path. *The Modern Review*, *53*(4), pp.536-542.

2 Collins, Daniel M. "Part-payment of debt: a variation on a theme?" International Company and Commercial Law Review 28, no. 7 (2017): 253-258.

3 Davies, P.S., 2016. Varying contracts. *The Cambridge Law Journal*, *75*(3), pp.455-458.

4 Halson, R., Sailors, Sub-Contractors and Consideration' (1990). *LQ*, *106*, p.183.

5 O'Sullivan, J., 1996. In defense of Foakes v. Beer. *The Cambridge Law Journal*, *55*(2), pp.219-228.

6 Gordon III, J.D., 1989. Dialogue about the doctrine of consideration. *Cornell L. Rev.*, *75*, p.986.

7 MacNeil, I., 2009. Uncertainty in commercial law. *Edinburgh Law Review*, *13*(1), pp.68-99.

8 Roberts, M., 2017. MWB Business Exchange Centres Ltd: The practical benefit doctrine marches on. *The Modern Law Review*, *80*(2), pp.339-351.

9 Thampapillai, D., 2015. Practical benefits and promises to pay lesser sums: Reconsidering the relationship between the rule in flakes v Beer and the rule in Williams v Roffey. *U. Queensland LJ*, *34*, p.301.

10 Thampapillai, D., 2015. Practical Benefits and Promises to Pay Lesser Sums. *University of Queensland Law Journal*.

11 Shaw-Mellors, A., 2016. Contractual variations and promises to accept less: pragmatism in the Court of Appeal. *Journal of Business Law*, *8*, pp.696-706.

12 Shaw-Mellors, A. and Poole, J., 2018. The recession changed circumstances, and renegotiations: the inadequacy of principle in English law. *Journal of Business Law*, *2018*(2), pp.101-121.

13 Rahmawati, N.D., 2021. THE IMPACT OF ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS ON CONTRACTING WITH COMPANIES UNDER THE ENGLISH LAW. *Fortiori Law Journal*, *1*(02), pp.86-108.

14 Lee, Pey-Woan. "Varying Contracts–Consideration, Form and Reality." *The Modern Law Review* (2021).

15 Chrysanthou, A., 2019. Reliance and representations/promise in frozen embryo disputes: UK and Israeli approaches to estoppel. *Medical Law International*, *19*(1), pp.32-61.

16 Shaw-Mellors, A. and Poole, J., 2018. The recession changed circumstances, and renegotiations: the inadequacy of principle in English law. *Journal of Business Law*, *2018*(2), pp.101-121.

17 Kha, H., 2020. *A History of Divorce Law: Reform in England from the Victorian to Interwar Years*. Routledge.

18 Jan, H., 2020. The principle of good faith and fair dealing in English contract law. *Правоведение*, *64*(3), pp.312-325.

19 Vinokurov, S.N., 2021. Correlation of Assumptions About Good Faith in International Law and the Law of the United States. In *Modern Global Economic System: Evolutional Development vs. Revolutionary Leap 11* (pp. 1522-1531). Springer International Publishing.

20 MacQueen, H. and O'Byrne, S., 2019. The Principle of Good Faith in Contractual Performance: A Scottish-Canadian Comparison. *Edinburgh Law Review*, *23*(3), pp.301-331.

21 Devenney, J., 2018. The legacy of the Cameron-Clegg coalition program of reform of the law on the supply of goods, digital content, and services to consumers. *Journal of Business Law*, *6*, pp.485-511.

22 Chng, K. and Goh, Y., 2016. A renewed consideration of consideration: MWB Business Exchange Centres Ltd v Rock Advertising Ltd [2016] EWCA CIV 553. *Oxford University Commonwealth Law Journal*, *16*(2), pp.323-332.

23 Daly, P., 2021. *Understanding Administrative Law in the Common Law World*. Oxford University Press.