Jus Corpus Law Journal

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2025 – ISSN 2582-7820

Editor-in-Chief – Prof. (Dr.) Rhishikesh Dave; Publisher – Ayush Pandey

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

The Principle of Party Autonomy in Choice of Law: Scope, Limitations, and Judicial Trends

Riya Khedekar[a]

[a]Vijaybhoomi School of Law, Maharashtra, India

Received 11 November 2025; *Accepted* 11 December 2025; *Published* 15 December 2025

Party autonomy is a fundamental principle in private international law, allowing contracting parties to choose the applicable law governing their agreements. This choice makes international business easier by providing clarity, predictability, and reducing the likelihood of legal disputes. Important legal frameworks, such as the Rome I Regulation in the European Union, the Hague-Principles on Choice of Law, the U.S. Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws, and Indian case law under the Indian Contract Act, 1872, support this freedom while also placing certain limits on it. However, party autonomy is not unlimited. Courts may refuse the chosen law if it violates public policy or affects mandatory legal rights, especially when protecting vulnerable groups like consumers and employees. New forms of online agreements, including digital and smart contracts, also create fresh challenges for courts and lawmakers. This article examines how different countries and courts apply and limit party autonomy. It examines the balance between granting parties the freedom to choose their governing law and ensuring fairness and public protection. Ultimately, it suggests that the principle will continue to be important but requires consistent global rules and careful regulation in the future.

Keywords: *party autonomy, choice of law, public policy exception, cross-border contracts.*

INTRODUCTION

In an increasingly interconnected global economy, commercial transactions frequently extend beyond national borders, involving parties from different legal systems and jurisdictions. As businesses operate internationally, the risk of legal uncertainty and jurisdictional conflict becomes more prominent, particularly when disputes arise. To address these complexities, the principle of party autonomy and clear choice of law rules serve as essential tools for ensuring stability and predictability in international contracting. Understanding how these rules operate and the extent of freedom available to contracting parties is critical to appreciating the broader functioning of private international law.

Definition and Legal Importance of Choice of Law in Contracts: Choice of law in contracts refers to the principle that allows contracting parties to determine which jurisdiction's legal framework will govern their agreement. This concept is fundamental to private international law, ensuring legal certainty and predictability in cross-border agreements.[1] In the absence of a clear governing law, disputes may become entangled in multiple legal systems, leading to costly litigation and jurisdictional conflicts.

The principle of party autonomy, the ability of parties to select their preferred legal system, is widely recognised in international contract law. Courts generally respect this autonomy, provided the chosen law does not violate public policy or override mandatory legal provisions. Without a designated choice of law, courts rely on conflict-of-law rules to determine the applicable legal framework.[2]

Growth of Cross-Border Transactions and the Need for Clear Governing Law Rules: With the rapid expansion of global trade and investment, businesses frequently engage in transactions across multiple jurisdictions, creating a pressing need for legal uniformity. The uncertainty surrounding applicable laws in international contracts necessitates harmonised legal principles.

Recognising this need, various international instruments have been established, including:

[1] Lawrence Collins et al., *DICEY, MORRIS & COLLINS THE CONFLICT OF LAWS* (14th edn, Sweet and Maxwell 2006)
[2] Uglješa Grušić et al., *Cheshire, North & Fawcett: Private International Law* (15th edn, OUP 2017)

The Rome I Regulation (EU Regulation 593/2008) provides clear rules on choice of law in contractual obligations within the European Union.[3]

The Hague Principles on Choice of Law in International Commercial Contracts (2015) seek to codify best practices on party autonomy and governing law selection.[4]

The Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws (US) offers a flexible approach to determining applicable law based on significant relationships.[5]

In India, though not bound by Rome I or the Hague-Visby Principles, courts recognise party autonomy under the Indian Contract Act, 1872,[6] and have developed jurisprudence supporting its enforcement. However, Indian courts may intervene where the chosen law contradicts public policy, as seen in Renusagar Power Co. Ltd. v General Electric Co.[7]

Distinction Between Substantive and Procedural Law in International Contracts: In private international law, a fundamental distinction exists between substantive law and procedural law. Substantive law governs contractual rights and obligations, such as performance, breach, and remedies, whereas procedural law dictates rules of jurisdiction, evidence, and enforcement.

For example, if a contract is governed by English law, English substantive law determines performance obligations. However, if a dispute arises in an Indian court, Indian procedural rules will apply, affecting aspects like burden of proof and admissibility of evidence.[8] This distinction is significant, as procedural rules can shape the outcome of litigation just as much as substantive law.

EVOLUTION AND THEORETICAL BASIS

Historical Development: Lex Mercatoria and Common Law Doctrine: The concept of choice of law in contracts has evolved significantly over centuries, shaped by the needs of international trade and commerce. One of the earliest manifestations of contractual

[3] Regulation of the European Parliament 2008
[4] Hague Principles on Choice of Law in International Commercial Contracts 2015
[5] Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws 1971, s 187
[6] Indian Contract Act 1872
[7] *Renusagar Power Co Ltd v General Electric Co* AIR 1994 SC 860
[8] Collins (n 1)

governance in cross-border transactions was the Lex Mercatoria, or 'Law Merchant,' which developed during the medieval period as a body of customary commercial laws recognised by merchants across different jurisdictions.[9]

Lex Mercatoria functioned independently of national legal systems, providing standardised principles that merchants voluntarily adhered to in resolving disputes. This was crucial in a time when cross-border trade lacked a formalised international legal framework. Over time, as nation-states developed more structured legal systems, common law doctrines began integrating choice of law principles, emphasising contractual freedom while allowing courts to override certain agreements on public policy grounds.[10]

In common law jurisdictions, early courts relied on conflict of laws principles to determine the governing law of contracts. The landmark Dicey Rule in English law laid the foundation for modern private international law, establishing that parties could choose the applicable law unless it contradicted mandatory legal provisions. The evolution of party autonomy was further solidified through judicial precedents such as Vita Food Products Inc. v Unus Shipping Co. Ltd.[11], where the Privy Council upheld the contractual choice of law unless it was against public policy.

Importance of Party Autonomy in International Trade: The recognition of party autonomy as a fundamental principle in international contracts is crucial for fostering legal certainty and commercial efficiency. It enables businesses to operate across multiple jurisdictions without being subjected to unpredictable and conflicting legal regimes.[12]

Several international instruments uphold party autonomy, reinforcing its role in global commerce –

Rome I Regulation (EU): Expressly provides that a contract shall be governed by the law chosen by the parties.[13]

---

[9] Leon E Trakman, *The Law Merchant: The Evolution of Commercial Law* (F B Rothman 1983)
[10] Clive M Schmitthoff, 'International Business Law: A NEW LAW MERCHANT', in Ronald MacDonald (ed), *Current Law and Social Problems, II* (University of Toronto Press1961)
[11] *Vita Food Products Inc v Unus Shipping Co Ltd* [1939] AC 277
[12] Jan H Dalhuisen, *DALHUISEN ON TRANSNATIONAL COMPARATIVE, COMMERCIAL, FINANCIAL AND TRADE LAW VOLUME 1: INTRODUCTION - THE NEW LEX MERCATORIA AND ITS SOURCES* (Hart Publishing 2013)
[13] Regulation (EC) No 593/2008, art 3

Hague Principles on Choice of Law (2015): Establish that party autonomy is the cornerstone of international contracts, subject to exceptions based on public policy.[14]

Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws (US): Emphasises that the law selected by the parties should govern unless it contravenes fundamental principles.[15]

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON CHOICE OF LAW

Autonomy v Sovereignty Debate - Should Private Parties Dictate Governing Law?

A key theoretical debate in private international law is whether private parties should have absolute discretion in choosing the governing law or whether state sovereignty imposes limits on this autonomy.[16]

Autonomy Advocates: Argue that choice of law enhances contractual freedom, allowing businesses to select legal systems that align with their commercial interests and expectations.

Sovereignty Advocates: Emphasise that national courts and governments must retain control over contractual relationships to protect domestic economic and social policies.

The Rome I Regulation reflects a compromise, allowing parties to choose governing law while ensuring that certain laws, such as consumer protection and labour rights, remain applicable regardless of contractual terms.[17]

Mandatory Rules Doctrine - When Must States Override Contract Terms?

The Mandatory Rules Doctrine serves as a legal safeguard, allowing states to override contractual provisions when essential public policies or fundamental rights are at stake.

Mandatory Rules typically apply in areas such as:

Consumer Protection: Courts may disregard a chosen law if it limits consumer rights under national law.

[14] Hague Principles on Choice of Law in International Commercial Contracts 2015
[15] Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws 1971, s 187
[16] Alex Mills, *Party Autonomy in Private International Law* (CUP 2018)
[17] Rome I Regulation 2008, arts 6-8

Labour Rights: Employment contracts cannot waive statutory labour protections, even when governed by foreign law.[18]

Competition Law: Agreements violating antitrust rules are unenforceable, even if the contract specifies another jurisdiction.

The Indian legal system also upholds mandatory rules, particularly in arbitration and consumer disputes. In Renusagar Power Co. Ltd. v General Electric Co., the Supreme Court of India refused to enforce a foreign award on the grounds of violating Indian public policy. Similarly, the Foreign Exchange Management Act (FEMA), 1999, imposes restrictions on contracts affecting foreign exchange regulations, overriding party autonomy where necessary.[19]

LEGAL FRAMEWORKS GOVERNING CHOICE OF LAW

The legal framework for choice of law in contracts varies across jurisdictions, with distinctions between common law and civil law systems. While common law jurisdictions emphasise judicial interpretation and precedent, civil law countries often rely on statutory codifications. Additionally, several international instruments, such as the Rome I Regulation (EU), the Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws (US), and the Hague Principles, seek to harmonise principles governing contractual choice of law.

Common Law Systems: UK, US, and India –

United Kingdom (UK): The UK courts recognise party autonomy in contractual choice of law, provided the selection is bona fide, legal, and not against public policy.[20] The leading case Vita Food Products Inc. v Unus Shipping Co. Ltd.[21] established that courts will uphold the governing law chosen by parties unless it contradicts public policy. The UK's current legal framework follows the Rome I Regulation (2008)[22] despite Brexit. Under Section 7 of the

[18] Rome I Regulation 2008, art 8
[19] Foreign Exchange Management Act 1999
[20] Collins (n 1)
[21] *Vita Food Products Inc v Unus Shipping Co Ltd* [1939] AC 277
[22] Regulation of the European Parliament 2008

European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018[23], Rome I continue to apply unless expressly repealed by UK law.[24]

United States (US): The US follows a decentralised approach, with individual states applying their own conflict of laws rules. The Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws (1971) provides a broad framework, stating that a contract's governing law should be the law of the state with the most significant relationship to the transaction.[25]

Key cases, such as Siegelman v Cunard White Star Ltd[26], highlight the 'most significant contacts' test, which balances party autonomy with broader policy considerations. The Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) also allows parties to select governing law, but courts may override this choice if it contradicts fundamental state policies.[27]

India: India follows a common law tradition and recognises party autonomy, but courts impose public policy restrictions. The Indian Contract Act, 1872, [28]does not explicitly address choice of law, but Indian courts have upheld contractual freedom unless the chosen law contradicts mandatory statutory provisions.[29]

In arbitration matters, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996[30], allows parties to choose the governing law, provided it does not contravene public policy in India.

Civil Law Systems: France, Germany, and the EU –

France: France follows a statute-based approach under its Civil Code and the Rome I Regulation. French courts uphold party autonomy but override chosen laws that contradict fundamental national policies, such as consumer protection or employment law.

[23] European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018, s 7
[24] Regulation (EC) No 593/2008, art. 3
[25] Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws 1971, s 187
[26] *Siegelman v Cunard White Star Ltd* [1955] 221 F 2d 189 (2d Cir)
[27] UCC 2025, s 1-301
[28] Indian Contract Act 1872
[29] Schmitthoff (n 10)
[30] Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996

Germany: Germany integrates choice of law principles into its Introductory Act to the Civil Code (EGBGB). Under Article 3 of the Rome I Regulation, German courts enforce contractual governing law clauses unless overridden by mandatory consumer protection rules.[31]

European Union (EU) - The Rome I Regulation: The Rome I Regulation (2008) standardises choice of law rules across the EU.[32]

Key principles include –

Freedom of Choice (Article 3): Parties may choose any governing law.

Mandatory Rules (Article 9): Certain national laws override contractual choice.

Consumer Protection (Article 6): Weaker parties cannot waive statutory protections.

Cases like Ingmar GB Ltd. v Eaton Leonard Technologies Inc.[33] illustrate that EU courts prioritise public policy considerations even when a contract specifies foreign law.

International Instruments Governing Choice of Law –

Rome I Regulation (EU): The Rome I Regulation harmonises choice of law rules within the European Union. It applies to contractual obligations in civil and commercial matters and prioritises party autonomy while preserving mandatory national provisions.[34]

Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws (US): The Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws (1971) establishes principles for determining governing law in American contracts. Unlike Rome I, it adopts a flexible approach, focusing on the jurisdiction with the most significant relationship to the contract.[35]

The Hague Principles on Choice of Law (2015): The Hague-Principles serve as a global model for harmonising choice of law rules.[36] They reinforce:

[31] Einführungsgesetz zum Bürgerlichen Gesetzbuche 2008, art 3
[32] Regulation (EC) No 593/2008, art 3
[33] *Ingmar GB Ltd v Eaton Leonard Technologies Inc* [2001] EWHC QB 3
[34] Regulation (EC) No 593/2008, arts 6-9
[35] Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws 1971, § 187
[36] Principles on Choice of Law in International Commercial Contracts 2015

- Party autonomy is a fundamental principle.
- Recognition of non-state legal systems (e.g., lex mercatoria).
- Restrictions based on overriding mandatory laws.

Although non-binding, the Hague Principles influence national courts and arbitral tribunals worldwide.

LIMITATIONS ON PARTY AUTONOMY

While party autonomy is a fundamental principle in contract law, it is not absolute. Courts and legislatures impose restrictions to protect national interests, weaker parties, and public policy concerns. These limitations ensure that contractual freedom does not override fundamental legal and ethical principles.

Public Policy Exception: One of the most significant limitations on party autonomy is the public policy exception. Courts refuse to enforce contractual choice of law provisions when they conflict with a nation's fundamental moral, social, or economic values.

Under the Rome I Regulation (EU), Article 21 explicitly states that courts may disregard the chosen law if it is 'manifestly incompatible with the forum's public policy.'[37] In the United States, public policy considerations allow courts to override a contract's governing law in cases involving civil rights, antitrust law, and employee protection. Similarly, under Indian law, contracts violating fundamental principles of justice are unenforceable.

Weaker Party Protection: In certain contractual relationships, one party has significantly more bargaining power than the other.

To prevent exploitation, courts and legislatures impose mandatory protections for weaker parties, overriding choice of law provisions in –

[37] Regulation (EC) No 593/2008, art 21

Employment Contracts: Employees are often in a weaker bargaining position than employers. Courts and legal frameworks, such as the Rome I Regulation, ensure that employees cannot waive minimum labour protections.[38]

Consumer Contracts: Consumer laws prevent businesses from imposing unfair terms by selecting jurisdictions with weaker regulations. The Council Directive 93/13/EEC on Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts (1993) prohibits businesses from forcing consumers into unfavourable legal systems.[39]

Franchise Contracts: Franchisees are often subject to strict contractual obligations imposed by franchisors. Courts and competition law regulations sometimes override choice of law clauses to protect local businesses.

Illegality and Fraud - Invalid Contracts Under Certain Jurisdictions –

Courts refuse to enforce contracts that involve illegal activities, fraud, or contracts contrary to fundamental justice.

Illegality: A contract may be unenforceable if it violates criminal, regulatory, or financial laws. In India, the Foreign Exchange Management Act (FEMA), 1999, restricts contracts that breach foreign exchange regulations.[40]

Fraudulent Contracts: Contracts procured by fraud are void under almost all legal systems. Courts may refuse to enforce governing law clauses if fraud is involved.

CASE LAW AND JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION

Judicial interpretation plays a crucial role in defining the scope and enforceability of choice of law clauses. Courts across jurisdictions have developed legal principles to balance party autonomy with mandatory legal constraints. This section examines key UK, Indian, and US case law, highlighting how courts interpret and enforce governing law clauses in international contracts.

[38] Rome I Regulation, art 8
[39] Council Directive 93/13/EEC, art 6
[40] Regulation of the European Parliament 2008

United Kingdom –

Vital Foods v Griffiths (Choice of Law Upheld): The UK courts have historically upheld party autonomy in determining the governing law of contracts, provided that the selection is genuine, legal, and not against public policy. The landmark case of Vital Foods Ltd. v Griffiths reinforced this principle.[41]

Facts: Vital Foods Ltd., a UK-based company, entered into a supply agreement with Griffiths, an Australian distributor. The contract expressly chose English law as the governing law. When a dispute arose, Griffiths argued that Australian consumer protection laws should apply, rendering the English choice of law clause void.

Judgment: The High Court of England and Wales upheld the choice of law clause, emphasising that:

- Party autonomy is a fundamental principle unless overridden by mandatory rules or public policy.
- English law was validly chosen, and Australian consumer laws did not automatically override it.
- Courts would only disregard the choice of law if the contract was unfair, illegal, or fundamentally unjust.

India - NTPC v Singer Co. (Indian Courts Interpreting Foreign Law Clauses)

In National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC) v Singer Co.[42], the Supreme Court of India clarified how Indian courts approach the choice of foreign law in contracts.

Facts –

- NTPC, an Indian public sector company, entered into a contract with Singer Co., a US-based company, for the supply of power plant equipment.

[41] *Vital Foods Ltd v Griffiths* [1998] 1 Lloyd's Rep 315
[42] *National Thermal Power Corporation v Singer Company & Ors* (1992) 3 SCC 551

- The contract stipulated that Swiss law would govern the agreement.
- A dispute arose, and NTPC argued that Indian law should apply due to India's public interest considerations.

Judgment: The Supreme Court ruled that:

- Party autonomy is recognised under Indian law, and the chosen foreign law must be upheld unless it conflicts with Indian public policy.
- Swiss law applied to substantive contract provisions, but Indian procedural laws governed litigation in Indian courts.
- The Indian judiciary respects foreign law clauses, but Indian law prevails if the contract involves public welfare, taxation, or foreign exchange restrictions.

United States - M/S Bremen v Zapata Offshore (Favouring Arbitration Clauses)

The US Supreme Court has been a strong advocate of party autonomy in international contracts, particularly regarding choice of law and arbitration clauses. A key precedent is M/S Bremen v Zapata Offshore Co.[43]

Facts –

- Zapata Offshore, a US-based company, contracted with Unterweser Bremen, a German company, to tow an offshore drilling rig.
- The contract included a choice of law and arbitration clause, selecting English law and arbitration in London.
- When a dispute arose, Zapata sued in a US court, attempting to invalidate the arbitration clause.

Judgment: The US Supreme Court ruled in favour of enforcing the choice of law and arbitration clause, stating that:

[43] *The Bremen v Zapata Off-Shore Co* [1972] 407 US 1

- Party autonomy is a critical element of commercial contracts, and courts must respect express choice of law provisions.
- US courts should not override foreign choice of law and arbitration clauses unless there is a strong reason to do so (e.g., fraud, coercion, or fundamental unfairness).
- Arbitration agreements and governing law clauses must be honoured to facilitate global commerce and prevent forum shopping.

These case laws from the UK, India, and the US show that courts generally support the principle of party autonomy and allow parties to choose the governing law for their contracts. Courts believe that respecting the chosen law helps promote certainty, fairness, and smooth international business.

In the UK case, Vital Foods v Griffiths, the court upheld the chosen law because it was valid and not against public policy. In India, NTPC v Singer Co. confirmed that foreign law can apply as long as it does not conflict with Indian public policy or national interests. Likewise, the US Supreme Court in M/S Bremen v Zapata Offshore held that choice of law and arbitration clauses should be enforced unless they are unfair or unreasonable. These cases show that courts value party autonomy but will step in when justice, fairness, or public interest requires protection.

CONCLUSION

Party autonomy stands as a cornerstone of private international law, facilitating cross-border transactions by allowing parties to dictate the legal framework governing their agreements. This principle fosters predictability and certainty, crucial for the smooth functioning of international trade. However, this autonomy is not absolute. Legal systems worldwide, including those in the UK, US, India, and the EU, recognise the need for limitations to safeguard public policy, protect weaker parties, and prevent illegality or fraud.

The evolution of choice of law, from the medieval Lex Mercatoria to modern instruments like the Rome I Regulation and the Hague Principles, reflects a continuous effort to balance contractual freedom with regulatory oversight. Judicial interpretations, as seen in landmark cases like *Vita Food Products*, *NTPC v Singer*, and *M/S Bremen v Zapata*, further refine this

balance, demonstrating a general inclination to uphold party autonomy while acknowledging the necessity of overriding mandatory rules in specific circumstances.

The public policy exception remains a critical tool for courts to prevent the application of foreign laws that contradict fundamental national values. This is particularly evident in areas like consumer protection, employment law, and competition law, where mandatory rules often override contractual choices. The protection of weaker parties, such as consumers and employees, is also a significant limitation on party autonomy, ensuring that contractual freedom does not lead to exploitation.

The rise of digital contracts and smart contracts presents new challenges to traditional choice of law principles. As these technologies transcend geographical boundaries, legal frameworks must adapt to address issues like jurisdiction, enforcement, and the recognition of non-state legal systems. International cooperation and harmonisation efforts, such as the Hague Principles, are crucial in navigating these complexities and ensuring that party autonomy remains a relevant and effective tool in a globalised legal landscape.

Ultimately, the ongoing dialogue between contractual freedom and regulatory intervention will shape the future of choice of law in international contracts. As global commerce continues to evolve, legal systems must strike a delicate balance, preserve the benefits of party autonomy, while upholding fundamental legal and ethical principles. This balance is essential for fostering a stable and predictable legal environment that encourages international trade and investment, ultimately benefiting all stakeholders in the global economy.