

CLEVELAND & CO
External in-house counsel

CONTRACTS VIA EMAIL

18 January 2018



On 30 October 2017, the High Court (the “**Court**”) assessed and made a decision regarding contracts via email and the care that must be taken when entering pre-contract negotiations. *Goel and another v Grant and another* [2017] EWHC 2688 (Ch) (the “**Goel Case**”) identified the risk of inadvertently entering into a binding contract before terms are finalised. The key issues raised by the case are set out below.

BACKGROUND

Contracts are considered legally enforceable agreements if they satisfy the four key elements:

1. offer and acceptance;
2. consideration;
3. intention to create legal relations; and
4. certainty of essential terms.

Whilst there is no legislation directly dealing with email communications, case law has been developed stating that the general principles of contract law apply to emails. With that in mind, if these criteria are fulfilled through the exchange of emails, then a contract can be considered formed and legally enforceable.

CASE LAW

The Goel Case concerned Mr Goel and Mr Gupta (the “**Applicants**”) and Mr Sumner (the “**Second Respondent**”) who were both creditors and members of Meem SL Ltd (the “**Company**”). Stephen Grant and Anthony Cook (the “**Administrators**”) were appointed as joint administrators of the Company in April 2016.

The Applicants brought a derivative claim on behalf of the Company. E-mail correspondence took place between the Applicants and the Administrators regarding a potential assignment. The Applicants alleged that there was a concluded agreement that the Administrators would assign the Company’s claim to them for £5,740. However, the Administrators disagreed and sought to sell the Company’s claim by auction to achieve the best value.

To stop this auction, the Applicants brought a claim against the Administrators and Mr Sumner, alleged that:

- there had been an agreement concluded over a series of emails between the Applicants’ solicitors and Administrators; and
- failing this, the proposed auction of the Company’s claim would unfairly harm the Applicants’ interests as creditors/members of the Company.

On the facts, the Court held that no binding contract had been concluded. Notably, Mr David Halpern QC explained that there was no offer made nor was it capable of acceptance, as the language used in the emails suggested merely a tentative discussion of ideas. This was reinforced by the fact that the Applicants knew that further documents would need to be drafted and agreed before completion of the assignment.

CONTRACT VIA EMAIL CONSIDERATIONS

Given that each case will be assessed on its own facts, care should be taken when entering into pre-contract discussions. To prevent these discussions being construed as a binding contract, all correspondence should be marked ‘subject to contract’. Whether this statement is effective in preventing a party being unwittingly bound by contractual obligations depends on how consistent the parties’ words and conduct are in practice.

NEXT STEPS

For more information, and any guidance or advice on the enforceability of your contracts, Cleveland & Co, your External In-House Counsel are here to help.

DISCLAIMER

No individual who is a member, partner, shareholder, director, employee or consultant of, in or to any constituent part of Cleveland & Co Associates Limited accepts or assumes responsibility, or has any liability, to any person in respect of this document. Copyright in the materials is owned by Cleveland & Co Associates Limited and the materials should not be copied or disclosed to any other person without the express authorisation of Cleveland & Co Associates Limited. This document is not intended to give legal advice and, accordingly, it should not be relied upon. It should not be regarded as a comprehensive statement of the law and practice in this area. Readers must take specific legal advice on any particular matter which concerns them. If you require any advice or information, please speak to your usual contact at Cleveland & Co Associates Limited.

WHY WE'RE DIFFERENT

Cleveland & Co are specialists in financial services, investment management and commercial contracts and related courses. Our team's in-house experience means we understand client challenges and we work alongside you to create solutions. We can provide insight on real vs hypothetical risks and help your team evolve.

WE OFFER

Cleveland & Co offer you fixed fees and retainer structures that provide you with certainty of cost and we offer industry experience that cuts through common legal complexity.

CONTACT

EMMA CLEVELAND

Managing Director

+44.79.6387.8756
ecleveland@cleveland-co.com
www.cleveland-co.com



Cleveland & Co Associates Limited is incorporated in England and Wales, company No. 07871988 Unit B404, The Biscuit Factory, Drummond Road, London, SE16 4DG, VAT number 144 6988 70. Cleveland & Co Associates Limited is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) under no. 622069, as an alternative business structure, and as such all our solicitors are subject to the principles and code of conduct set out by the SRA. Please visit <http://www.sra.org.uk/handbook/> for more information.