Research Journal of Social Sciences & Economics Review
Vol. 4, Issue 1, 2023 (January – March)
ISSN 2707-9023 (online), ISSN 2707-9015 (Print)
ISSN 2707-9015 (ISSN-L)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.36902/rjsser-vol4-iss1-2023(187-192)

RJSSER
Research Journal of Social Sciences & Economics Review

Non Est Factum: A Critical Analysis of the Doctrine's Evolution and Contemporary Application in Contract Law

* Abdus Samad Khan, Assistant Professor (Corresponding Author)

** Kalsoom Kishwar, LLM Scholar

*** Sobia Bashir, Assistant Professor

Abstract

This research article provides a critical analysis of the doctrine of "non est factum" in contract law, exploring its historical evolution and contemporary application. The doctrine, which allows a party to challenge the validity of a contract on the basis that it was signed under a mistaken belief as to its nature or character, is examined in light of its similarities and differences with other defenses in contract law, such as mistake and misrepresentation. The article also discusses the challenges and limitations associated with the use of the defense, including the need to demonstrate fundamental differences between the signed document and what the party believed it to be. Through a detailed analysis of case law and legal scholarship, the article offers insights into the doctrine's use and application in modern contract law, providing a valuable resource for legal practitioners and scholars alike.

Keywords: "non est factum", "non est factum" in contract law, historical evolution of "non est factum", contemporary application of "non est factum", defenses in "non est factum.

Introduction

The non est factum theory is important in the law of contract as a Latin phrase meaning "it is not my deed" or "it is not my document." It provides a legal defense for a person who signed a contract but claims not to fully understand the terms. The doctrine allows a party to escape contractual obligations if they can prove they were mistaken about the nature or effect of the contract.

The doctrine is based on the principle that a person cannot be bound by a contract if they did not understand what they signed. This defense is commonly raised when a person signs a contract without reading it or when the terms are not properly explained. Note that the doctrine is not always available and the burden of proof rests with the party relying on it. (Baker, J. H. 1970)

Understanding the legal principles underlying The non est factum theory is important in various situations. This introduction will explore the doctrine's elements, including its use and the requirements for proving non est factum.

History and Origin:

The non est factum theory, which translates to "it is not my deed," has a long history in contract law. Its evolution and development over time can be traced back to the Roman law concept of "error facti," which allowed parties to void a contract if they made an error in fact. This concept was later adopted into English law, where it became known as non est factum. (Bant, E. 2009) (Cote, J. E. 1972)

The non est factum theory originates from Common Law principles that view the execution of deeds as solemn and binding, except when cancelled. Initially, the defense was only available to illiterate individuals who could not read, but by the 19th century, the principle was extended to cover all documents, regardless of whether they were under seal or not (Baker, J. H.1970). This extension was due to the Thoroughgood v Cole case in 1582, where the doctrine was applied to a case where a bystander had misrepresented the contents of a deed to a landlord, who had signed it without understanding what it contained. The court ruled that non est factum could apply in cases where the signatory's mind did not accompany their signature, or when the document signed was significantly different from what the signatory intended to sign. The doctrine was further developed in the 17th and

* Department of Law, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan Email: abdus@awkum.edu.pk
** Department of Law, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan Email: Kalsoomk584@gmail.com
***Law College, University of Peshawar Email: sobiabashir@uop.edu.pk

18th centuries, where it was used to allow parties to escape liability in cases where they had signed a document under duress or where the document had been materially altered.

In the 19th century, the scope of non est factum was limited by the courts, which restricted its application to cases where the party had made an excusable mistake as to the nature of the document they were signing. This restriction was based on the principle that parties should take reasonable steps to understand the terms of a contract before signing it. In *Gallie vs Lee* 1969 it was held that A legal document with legal implications can't be denied by a person of full age, understanding, and able to read and write if they signed it without reading or verifying its contents. Even if the document differs from what they thought, they can't avoid its effects if they willingly signed it and were aware of its essential nature. Mere mistakes don't excuse them.

In contemporary contract law, The non est factum theory remains an important defense for parties who have signed a document under duress or who have been misled as to the nature of the contract. However, its application is limited to cases where the party's mistake is excusable and where they have taken reasonable steps to understand the terms of the contract. (Chew, C. 2011)

Legal Requirements for Non Est Factum Defense in Different Jurisdictions:

In order to successfully claim "non est factum" as a defense in contract law, certain legal requirements must be met. These requirements may vary depending on the jurisdiction in which the case is being heard.

According to Atiyah and Smith (2017), in most common law jurisdictions, the signer of the document must demonstrate that they were mistaken as to the nature of the document they signed. Specifically, they must show that the document was fundamentally different from what they thought it was, and that they were not negligent in signing it without reading or understanding its contents.

The legal requirements for successfully claiming "non est factum" as a defense in the USA, Australia, and the UK may vary slightly. In general, however, the signer of the document must demonstrate that they were mistaken as to the nature of the document they signed.

In the USA, the signer must show that they signed the document under duress, coercion, or mistake of fact, and that the mistake was material to the agreement (Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 164) (American Law Institute, 1981).

In Australia, the signer must demonstrate that the mistake was induced by the other party to the contract, and that the signer was not negligent in signing the document without reading it (Rennick, 2015).

In the UK, the signer must show that they were unaware of the nature of the document, and that they did not have reasonable opportunity to read it (Woods v. Martins Bank Ltd [1959] 1 QB 55) (LexisNexis UK, 2022).

Other jurisdictions may have additional requirements, such as demonstrating that the mistake was induced by the other party to the contract or that the signer was under duress or undue influence. In some cases, the signer may need to show that they were unable to read or understand the document due to a disability or language barrier (Rosenberg, 2018).

Non Est Factum Defense: Common Situations and Court Responses:

Non Est Factum is a legal defense that can be invoked in various situations where a person signs a contract or legal document under a mistaken belief. Some common situations where this defense is used include situations involving illiteracy, blindness, mental incapacity, or fraud. (Chew, C. 2011)

If a person is illiterate, blind or otherwise unable to read a contract or legal document, and is not fully aware of its contents, they may invoke Non Est Factum as a defense. In such cases, courts may examine the circumstances surrounding the signing of the document to determine whether the signer was induced by the other party to the contract or whether they acted negligently in signing without understanding its contents.

Similarly, if a person suffers from a mental incapacity that prevents them from understanding the nature and consequences of the document they are signing, Non Est Factum can be invoked as a defense (Connell, S. 2016). In such cases, courts may require evidence of the signer's mental incapacity and may examine whether the other party to the contract had knowledge of the signer's incapacity and took advantage of it.

Finally, *Non est factum* can also be invoked in cases of fraud or misrepresentation. For example, if a person signs a document that they believe to be something else, such as a waiver of rights, but which is actually a contract with serious legal consequences, they may claim *Non est*

factum. In such cases, courts may examine whether the signer was induced by the other party to sign the document under false pretences (Chew, C. 2011).

The response of courts to the invocation of *Non est factum* varies depending on the specific circumstances of each case. In general, courts will examine the evidence presented by the parties to determine whether the signer was mistaken as to the nature of the document they signed, and whether they acted negligently or were induced by the other party to the contract. If the court finds in favor of the signer, the contract may be set aside or reformed to reflect the true intentions of the parties. (Rosenberg, 2018)

Alternative legal defenses or remedies:

There are alternative legal defenses or remedies that could be used instead of "non est factum" in cases where a person has signed a document under duress or undue influence (Cote, J. E. 1972).

The defense of "non est factum" is a common law doctrine that allows a person who has signed a contract to argue that they did not fully understand the nature and effect of the contract they signed. It is typically used when the person signed the contract under a mistaken belief as to its content or character (Duru, O. 2012). However, when a person has signed a document under duress or undue influence, there are other legal defenses or remedies that may be available to them.

One such alternative defense or remedy is rescission. Rescission is a legal remedy that allows a party to a contract to have the contract cancelled or set aside due to some defect in its formation. In the case of duress or undue influence, the party may argue that their consent to the contract was not freely given, and therefore the contract should be rescinded (Gunson, H., & Watts, T. 2021).

Another alternative defense or remedy is the doctrine of unconscionability. This defense asserts that the contract is unconscionable, or so one-sided that it shocks the conscience of the court. Under this doctrine, a court may refuse to enforce a contract that is so unfair or oppressive that it would be contrary to public policy to enforce it. (Gunson, H., & Watts, T. 2021)

In conclusion, while the defense of "non est factum" may be available in certain situations, when a person has signed a document under duress or undue influence, there are other legal defenses or remedies that may be used instead, including rescission and the doctrine of unconscionability (HUSS, J. 2022).

Technological Advances and Non Est Factum Defense:

"Non est factum" is a Latin term that translates to "it is not my deed." It is a common law defense that allows a party to escape liability under a written contract if they can prove that they did not understand the nature and consequences of the agreement they signed (DAVIDSON, A. 2002).

The applicability of "non est factum" has been affected by technological advances such as electronic signatures and digital contracts. Electronic signatures are defined as electronic symbols, sounds, or processes that are attached to or logically associated with a record and executed or adopted by a person with the intent to sign the record (Khan, A. S. 2014). Digital contracts are agreements that are created, signed, and stored electronically.

The use of electronic signatures and digital contracts has made it easier for parties to enter into contracts without ever meeting face to face (DAVIDSON, A. 2002). This has increased the risk that a party may sign a contract without fully understanding its terms and conditions. However, the use of electronic signatures and digital contracts has also made it easier for parties to demonstrate that they did, in fact, understand the terms of the contract they signed (Hunter, A. J., Yiga, H. N. 2020).

Electronic signatures and digital contracts have created a digital trail of evidence that can be used to prove that a party understood the nature and consequences of the agreement they signed. For example, when a party signs a digital contract, they may be required to complete a series of steps, such as entering a password or answering security questions, before they can sign the contract (DAVIDSON, A. 2002). These steps can help to ensure that the party fully understands the terms of the agreement they are signing.

In addition, electronic signatures and digital contracts can include a clause that specifically acknowledges that the signer has read and understood the terms of the agreement. This clause can be used as evidence that the signer was fully aware of the terms of the agreement they signed (Korie, S. 2018).

Overall, the use of electronic signatures and digital contracts has made it easier for parties to enter into contracts, but it has also increased the risk that a party may sign a contract without fully understanding its terms and conditions (Khan, A. S. 2014). However, the digital trail of evidence

created by electronic signatures and digital contracts can also be used to prove that a party understood the terms of the agreement they signed, making it more difficult to successfully use "non est factum" as a defense.

Cultural and Linguistic Differences in the Application of Non Est Factum:

The defense of "non est factum" can vary in its interpretation and application across different legal systems around the world due to cultural and linguistic differences. These differences can affect the way in which courts interpret and apply the defense, as well as the types of evidence that are considered relevant (Schwartz, S. 1985).

One example of how cultural and linguistic differences can affect the interpretation and application of "non est factum" is in the context of the Chinese legal system. In China, contracts are often viewed as more than just a legal agreement between two parties, but also as a reflection of the relationship between those parties. As a result, when a party raises the defense of "non est factum" in China, the court will often consider the cultural context of the agreement and the relationship between the parties in deciding whether the defense should be accepted. For example, in a 2017 case involving a disputed loan agreement, the court ultimately rejected the defense of "non est factum" after considering the fact that the parties had a long-standing relationship and that the loan agreement was consistent with the parties' past dealings (Schwartz, S. 1985).

Similarly, in the United Kingdom, the defense of "non est factum" has been subject to linguistic interpretation. Specifically, the defense requires the signer to show that they did not know the nature of the document they were signing (Spencer, J. R. (973). This has led to controversy over whether the defense can apply in situations where the signer understood the contents of the document, but was mistaken about its legal effect. In a 2002 case, Royal Bank of Scotland v. Etridge (No. 2), the court considered the linguistic interpretation of "non est factum" and ultimately ruled that the defense could not be used in situations where the signer knew what the document said but was mistaken about its legal effect.

Another example of cultural and linguistic differences affecting the interpretation and application of "non est factum" can be seen in the Canadian legal system. In Canada, the defense is known as "contractual incapacity" and is typically used in situations where the signer has a physical or mental disability that prevented them from understanding the nature of the document they signed. However, in a 2001 case, Blackwater v. Plint, the Supreme Court of Canada expanded the defense to include situations where the signer was under extreme emotional duress at the time of signing.

Overall, cultural and linguistic differences can have a significant impact on the interpretation and application of the defense of "non est factum" in different legal systems around the world. These differences can affect the types of evidence that are considered relevant, the way in which courts interpret the defense, and the circumstances in which the defense can be used. As a result, it is important for parties to understand the cultural and linguistic context of the legal system in which they are operating in order to make informed decisions about the use of the defense.

Similarities and Differences between Non Est Factum and other Defenses in Contract Law:

The defenses of non est factum, mistake, and misrepresentation are often used in contract law to challenge the validity of a contract. While these defenses may appear similar at first glance, there are important differences in the way they operate and the circumstances in which they can be used (Swain, W. 2020).

Non Est Factum: The defense of non est factum, also known as "it is not my deed," is used when a party claims that they did not know the nature or effect of the document they were signing. In order to be successful, the party must show that the document was fundamentally different from what they thought it was and that they had no reason to suspect that it was anything other than what they believed it to be (Schwartz, S. 1985).

One example of the application of the non est factum defense is the 2002 UK case, Royal Bank of Scotland v. Etridge (No. 2). In this case, the court considered the linguistic interpretation of "non est factum" and ruled that the defense could not be used in situations where the signer knew what the document said but was mistaken about its legal effect.

Mistake: The defense of mistake is used when a party claims that there was an error in the formation of the contract that renders it void or voidable. There are two types of mistakes: mutual mistake and unilateral mistake. Mutual mistake occurs when both parties to the contract are mistaken

about a material fact, while unilateral mistake occurs when only one party is mistaken (Swain, W. 2020).

In the 1998 case, Great Peace Shipping Ltd. v. Tsavliris Salvage (International) Ltd., the UK House of Lords considered the issue of unilateral mistake. The court held that a contract could be set aside on the basis of unilateral mistake if the mistaken party could show that the other party knew or ought to have known about the mistake.

Misrepresentation: The defense of misrepresentation is used when a party claims that the other party made a false statement that induced them to enter into the contract. The misrepresentation may be innocent, negligent, or fraudulent (Swain, W. 2020).

One example of the application of the misrepresentation defense is the 2013 UK case, AXA Sun Life Services plc v. Campbell Martin Ltd. In this case, the court considered whether a statement made by the insurer about the value of an investment product constituted a misrepresentation. The court ultimately held that the statement was not a misrepresentation because it was an honest opinion and not a statement of fact.

In comparing these defenses, it is clear that there are some similarities between them. For example, all three defenses can be used to challenge the validity of a contract. However, there are also important differences between the defenses, such as the types of mistakes or misrepresentations that are covered, and the circumstances in which they can be used. As a result, it is important for parties to understand the specific requirements of each defense in order to make an informed decision about whether to challenge the validity of a contract.

Challenges and limitations of "non est factum" as a defense:

While the "non est factum" defense can be a powerful tool in challenging the validity of a contract, there are also several challenges and limitations associated with its use.

Firstly, in order to be successful, the party using the defense must be able to demonstrate that the document they signed was fundamentally different from what they believed it to be. This can be difficult to prove, as the court will generally assume that the party signing the document was aware of its contents (BUTT, P. (993).

Secondly, the defense is typically only available in cases where the document is of a type that the party would not reasonably be expected to understand. For example, it might be available in cases where a person is asked to sign a legal document in a foreign language without understanding it, but it might not be available in cases where a person signs a simple contract in their native language (Graham, T., Russel, D., & NPJ, L. H. 2021).

Thirdly, the defense may be limited by the principle of "caveat emptor" (buyer beware). In situations where the party signing the document had the opportunity to read it or seek legal advice but failed to do so, the defense may not be available (Gunson, H., & Watts, T. 2021).

Fourthly, the defense may be subject to limitations based on the conduct of the party using it. For example, if the party waits a long time before raising the defense, or if they have previously acknowledged the validity of the document, the defense may be precluded (Graham, T., Russel, D., & NPJ, L. H. 2021).

Finally, the defense may be subject to limitations based on the specific circumstances of the case. For example, in some jurisdictions, the defense may not be available in cases involving commercial contracts, or in cases where the party using the defense is a sophisticated businessperson.

In analyzing the challenges and limitations of the "non est factum" defense, it is clear that its use is subject to a number of factors, including the specific circumstances of the case, the type of document being signed, and the conduct of the parties involved. As a result, it is important for parties to carefully consider whether the defense is likely to be successful before deciding to challenge the validity of a contract using this approach.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the doctrine of "non est factum" is a vital defense mechanism in modern contract law. The legal requirements for the application of this defense vary across different jurisdictions, and parties must be aware of the specific criteria that must be met to successfully invoke this doctrine. Common situations where this defense may arise include cases involving fraud, duress, undue influence, or misrepresentation. Courts have generally been receptive to non est factum defenses, provided that the party invoking the doctrine can demonstrate that the signed document fundamentally differed from their understanding of its nature or character.

However, in certain situations, other legal defenses or remedies, such as mistake or misrepresentation, may be more appropriate. Technological advances, such as electronic signatures and digital contracts, have also raised unique challenges and limitations for the application of the non est factum defense.

Moreover, cultural and linguistic differences across various legal systems may affect the interpretation and application of this defense. There are also similarities and differences between the non est factum defense and other defenses in contract law, such as mistake or misrepresentation, and parties should be aware of the nuances of each defense to ensure the most effective legal strategy.

Despite its importance, the non est factum defense is not without its challenges and limitations. Parties must meet strict legal requirements and provide compelling evidence to support their claim. Moreover, courts may be reluctant to accept non est factum defenses in cases where the party invoking the defense has failed to exercise due diligence or where the signed document was not sufficiently ambiguous. As such, legal practitioners must carefully weigh the benefits and risks of invoking this defense and ensure that they have a solid legal foundation to support their claim.

Reference:

Baker, J. H. (1970). Non Est Factum. *Current Legal Problems*, *23*(1), 53-70.

Bant, E. Incapacity, Non Est Factum and Unjust Enrichment'(2009). *Melbourne University Law Review*, *33*, 368.

BUTT, P. (1993). Registration of transfer of mortgage overcomes defence of non est factum. *AUSTRALIAN LAW JOURNAL*, *67*(4), 295-296.

Chew, C. (2011). The defence of Non Est Factum: a paradox in banking law.

Connell, S. (2016). Not my doctrine?: Finding a contract law explanation for non est factum. *Victoria University of Wellington Law Review*, *47*(2), 245-265.

Cote, J. E. (1972). Contracts-Mistake-Non Est Factum-Error as to Identity of Parties. *Alta. L. Rev.*, *10*, 374.

Cote, J. E. (1972). Contracts-Mistake-Non Est Factum-Error as to Identity of Parties. *Alta. L. Rev.*, *10*, 374.

DAVIDSON, A. (2002). Electronic signatures. *PROCTOR*, *22*(8), 32.

Duru, O. (2012). The Plea of'Non Est Factum'is No Longer Valid in Present Day Nigeria-Do You Agree?. *Available at SSRN 2147372*.

Gee, S. (2020). Jurisdiction and arbitration clauses. In *The Evolving Law and Practice of Voyage Charterparties* (pp. 35-52). Informa Law from Routledge.

Graham, T., Russel, D., & NPJ, L. H. (2021). g Gotterdämmerung II. *Trusts & Trustees*, *27*(5), 357-358.

Gunson, H., & Watts, T. (2021). Mackay v Wesley: mistaken trusteeships and sufficiently distinct mistakes. *Trusts & Trustees*, *27*(5), 424-430.

Hunter, A. J., Yiga, H. N., & Law, H. L. THE SIX-MINUTE EMPLOYMENT LAWYER 2020.

HUSS, J. (2022). JOHANNES HUSS.

Khan, A. S., Ali, A., Saleem, M., Naznin, S., & Shah, M. (2014). Understanding and Analysis of Consumer Protection Laws in Pakistan. *J. Appl. Environ. Biol. Sci*, *4*(12), 92-98.

Korie, S. (2018). The Principle of Non EST Factum and its Application to Contractual Obligations in Both English and Nigerian Law. *Available at SSRN 3159277*.

L'Estrange v E. Graucob Ltd [1934] 2 KB 394

Nadler, E. (1984). Is Non Est Factum Dead-Bank of Montreal v. Hansen. *Advoc. Q.*, *5*, 248.

Schwartz, S. (1985). Non est Factum in Canada after Marvco Color Research Ltd. v. Harris. *UNBLJ*, *34*, 92.

Spencer, J. R. (1973). Signature, Consent, and the Rule in L'Estrange v. Graucob. *The Cambridge Law Journal*, *32*(1), 104-122.

Swain, W. (2020). Without the Power to Drink or Contract. *Edinburgh Law Review*, *24*(1), 26-48.

Thoroughgood v Cole (1584) 2 Co Rep 9 (b)