Jus Corpus Law Journal

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026 – ISSN 2582-7820

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

---

The Doctrine of Restitution: Restoring Justice by Preventing Unjust Enrichment

Debangshu Basu Roy[a]

[a]Symbiosis Law School, Nagpur, India

Received 23 May 2026; *Accepted* 23 June 2026; *Published* 27 June 2026

Restitution is a basic legal principle that seeks to avoid unjust enrichment and to put the parties back in the position they were in before the benefit was unjustly acquired. Restitution is based on the principles of equity, fairness and corrective justice and works by taking away the benefits gained rather than just the losses suffered. The article discusses the theoretical underpinnings of restitution, its close connection with the doctrine of unjust enrichment and its growth as an autonomous area of law. It examines the statutory provisions on restitution in India with a focus on the provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 and Section 144 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, both of which are concerned with the prevention of retention of benefit without just cause. The study also examines the wide scope of restitution through landmark judgments of the Supreme Court of India, which have considered restitution as an important tool to secure substantive justice and avoid abuse of judicial processes. Moreover, the article shows the relevance of restitution in the present day in fields like taxation, environmental protection, commercial transactions, public law and digital payments. It points to new issues, such as the lack of a comprehensive legal system and the need for a more conceptualised approach to restitution law. The article concludes that restitution is a dynamic and indispensable legal doctrine that is vital to the administration of justice because it provides justice, corrects the injustice of enrichment, and re-establishes the balance of justice between parties.

Keywords: *restitution, unjust enrichment, corrective justice, equity, fairness.*

INTRODUCTION

The principle of the administration of justice is that no man shall be able to take an unfair advantage of another. In all legal systems, it has been a longstanding principle of courts to avoid situations in which someone is unjustly enjoying an advantage without any legal justification. In this context, the doctrine of restitution becomes very important. In Law, restitution is a remedy to restore a person to his or her former state before a loss or an unjust benefit was taken from him or her by another party. The emphasis of restitution is not on the claimant's loss, but rather on the defendant's gain that was gained wrongfully.[1]

The purpose of restitution is not simply to make good for the damage, but to restore benefits to the person to whom they belong, and which have been received without right.[2] In this respect, restitution has a corrective and an equitable aspect in the legal system. It aims to remove unfair advantages and to bring about fairness between parties.

The idea of restitution has its origins in Roman law, where duties created by quasi-contracts have been acknowledged to eliminate the unjust advantage.[3] The principle grew in the English common law and in the equitable jurisdiction of courts, ultimately emerging as a separate strand of legal thinking. As time went on, restitution moved away from contractual disputes and into other fields of law, such as torts, property law, constitutional law, and public law remedies.

The principle of restitution is a significant part of the Indian legal system. The Indian Contract Act, 1872, contains several provisions which are in harmony with the principles of restitution, such as Sections 65, 68, 69, 70, 71 and 72. These provisions create obligations in situations where there is a benefit received by one person that, in justice and fairness, should be returned or compensated. Likewise, under Section 144 of the CPC, 1908, the courts have repeatedly laid emphasis that restitution is not merely a remedy but is a substantive principle which seeks to ensure complete justice.[4]

The Supreme Court of India has made a significant contribution to broadening the ambit of restitution. The Court, in a series of seminal decisions, has affirmed that restitution is a

[1] Andrew Burrows, *The Law of Restitution* (3rd edn, Oxford University Press 2011)
[2] Prof Robert Goff et al., *THE LAW OF UNJUST ENRICHMENT* (9th edn, Sweet & Maxwell 2016)
[3] Barry Nicholas, *An Introduction to Roman Law* (Clarendon Pr 1976)
[4] Code of Civil Procedure 1908, s 144

necessary remedy to prevent misuse of judicial processes and to ensure that litigants do not benefit from interim orders or acts of wrongdoing.[5] This judicial stance is in line with the overall principles of equity, fairness and good conscience of the legal system.

Restitutionary remedies have become more relevant following the increasing complexity of commercial transactions, technological advancements, and conflicts with public law. Issues of restitution for wrongful payments, unjust enrichment from fraud, restitution of taxes, and restitution in environmental and constitutional contexts have sparked much debate and controversy in the courts and among scholars. As a result, the doctrine has emerged as one of the most dynamic and evolving areas of modern jurisprudence.

In this context, the present article discusses the principle of restitution and its function in the prevention of unjust enrichment. It examines the theoretical underpinnings of restitution, the statutory provisions that define its scope in India and the role played by judicial rulings in developing the modern concept of restitution. The article also assesses the difficulties of restitutionary remedies and looks at potential reforms to enhance their ability to promote substantive justice. Finally, the study aims to show that restitution is still an essential tool for achieving fairness and justice and for preserving the integrity of the legal process.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE DOCTRINE OF RESTITUTION

Understanding the Concept of Restitution: The doctrine of restitution occupies a peculiar place in private law, in that it aims to correct the case in which one party has acquired a benefit in a way which the law considers to be unjust. Restitution differs from remedies, which are limited in their focus to the return of damages incurred by a claimant, in that restitution deals with the undoing of gains made by the claimant without a lawful basis. Restitution, then, is not punishment or simply compensation, but rather is aimed at making things fair, or, in other words, at preventing unjust enrichment.[6]

Restitution comes from the Latin word restitutio, which means restoration or reinstatement. Restitution is the restoration of a person to the state in which they were before a wrongful transfer of wealth, benefit or advantage took place; it is based on the principle that legal rights

[5] *South Eastern Coalfields Ltd v State of M P and Ors* AIR 2003 SC 4482; *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action Etc v Union of India & Ors Etc* (1996) 3 SCC 212
[6] Burrows (n 1)

and obligations must not allow one person to gain an unfair advantage over another.[7] Thus, the doctrine is designed to correct any imbalance of situations between parties that has occurred due to mistake, coercion, fraud, failure of consideration or other legally recognised situations. Restitutionary theory is now recognised as having a broader scope than it has with respect to contractual relationships. While many restitutionary claims are related to contracts, the principle also applies to other areas like tort law, property disputes, public law, taxation issues, and constitutional remedies. The wide scope of application indicates that restitution is not only an ancillary remedy but an autonomous principle of law that seeks to provide substantive justice.

The Principle of Unjust Enrichment: The foundation of the concept of restitution is the doctrine of unjust enrichment. This principle has been understood in many legal systems and has become one of the most powerful concepts in modern law.[8] There are three key elements required for the theory of unjust enrichment to apply. First, the defendant must have been enriched or benefited. Second, the enrichment has to have been at the claimant's expense. The three elements together form the foundation for courts to decide whether restitutionary relief is to be provided.[9]

Not all enrichment is considered unjust enrichment. People regularly receive advantages via legal exchanges, gifts, contracts, and business exchanges. These enrichments are lawfully sanctioned and thus not subject to restitution. The doctrine only comes in when there is no valid juristic reason for the enrichment. Restitution claims may arise in situations where there is no legal basis for the enrichment, such as when money is paid under a mistake of fact, when benefits are obtained through fraud or when property is retained after a contractual arrangement fails.

The importance of the doctrine of unjust enrichment is that it can fill in the voids between the existing categories of law. Restitution can be an independent source of legal obligation in situations where there is no contract or tort to which it may be applied, to ensure that justice is not thwarted simply because there is no claim that fits into a doctrinal pigeonhole.

[7] Peter Birks, *An Introduction to the Law of Restitution* (Clarendon Press 1985)
[8] Goff (n 2)
[9] Peter Birks, *Unjust Enrichment* (2nd edn, OUP 2005)

Restitution as a Mechanism of Corrective Justice: Restitution, as one of the most significant theoretical justifications, is related to corrective justice. Corrective justice aims at restoring the wrongful imbalance that has occurred between people by returning them to their original state.[10] In the context of this, restitution is a way to rectify an unfair transfer of wealth. It is not a matter of a defendant's moral blameworthiness, but of an equitable balance between the parties. The law steps in when one party has a benefit which, based on the laws of fairness and justice, should be the other parties.

The corrective justice model separates restitution from criminal sanctions and punitive remedies. Restitution focuses on undoing the wrongs, while criminal law focuses on punishment and deterrence. The defendant must give up the benefits that should not have been kept, returning the balance of law and morality that had been disturbed by the transaction or event that is the subject of the action. This concept has received significant support from courts and legal commentators because it is very similar to the underlying principle of justice: that no one should benefit from situations that are considered to be unfair or inequitable.

Distinguishing Restitution from Compensation and Damages: Restitution is frequently mentioned in conjunction with compensation and damages, but these three concepts have different legal functions. If these differences are not fully understood, it often leads to conceptual confusion. Compensation and damages are usually claimant-centred remedies. They are meant to restore the hurt party's losses. The amount is typically based on the claimant's economic, physical or reputational damage.[11] The restitution, however, is more defendant-oriented. The court does not look at how much the claimant has lost, but how much benefit the defendant has received. The goal is to remove gains that have been obtained in an unfair manner, not to make amends for damages. Thus, a restitutionary award may be awarded to the claimant, and sometimes even be greater than the claimant's actual loss, or may be awarded even if an actual measurable loss cannot be proven.

For example, if a person accidentally sends money to another's bank account, the person who received the money might be expected to pay the money back even if the sender can prove that there was no other financial loss. The emphasis is on the unfair gain that the recipient

[10] Ernest J Weinrib, *The Idea of Private Law* (OUP 2012)
[11] Harvey McGregor QC, *McGregor on Damages* (17th edn, Sweet & Maxwell 2003)

keeps, instead of on the loss suffered by the payer. This distinction is important because it underscores the autonomous nature of restitution, and is why the modern legal literature increasingly recognises restitution as a distinct area of law, rather than simply as a 'companion' to contract or tort claims.

Equity, Good Conscience and the Moral Basis of Restitution: Restitution is rooted in equitable and good conscience principles. In the past, courts of equity fashioned remedies to situations where the common law rules created unfair outcomes. Restitution was one such just reaction, which allowed the courts to avoid injustice and to foster substantive justice.[12]

Restitution treats people fairly, as evidenced by the discretion that courts sometimes show when awarding relief. Whether restitution should be awarded is often subject to the judge's consideration of the conduct of the parties, the circumstances surrounding the acquisition of the benefit, and the overall justice of the case. The flexibility enables the doctrine to evolve with the social and economic changes without losing sight of its main goal, which is to prevent injustice. Moreover, the moral case for restitution is based on a popular idea of fairness: people shouldn't be allowed to keep what is someone else's. Although modern courts do not base their decisions solely on moral arguments, the ethical basis of restitution remains a factor in judicial decision-making and academic debate.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING RESTITUTION IN INDIA

Statutory Recognition of Restitution in Indian Law: While the concept of restitution is based on the principle of equity and justice, it is not just a concept created by the judiciary in India. It is explicitly acknowledged in several statutory provisions, which all aim to avoid unjust enrichment and restore a party to its rightful position. Indian law enshrines restitutionary principles under the Indian Contract Act, 1872, the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 and some judicial doctrines formulated by the constitutional courts. The statutes show that restitution is not restricted to a specific area of law. Instead, it functions in the contractual, procedural and public law arenas, and embodies the legislature's desire to ensure that legal rights and remedies are rendered fairly and justly. The general legislative

---

[12] Steven Elliott KC, *Snell's Equity* (Sweet & Maxwell 2024)

endorsement of restitution has allowed Indian courts to build up a substantial body of law that seeks to eliminate unjust gains and rectify legal inequities.

Restitution under the Indian Contract Act 1872: Restitutionary principles are reflected in a number of provisions of the Indian Contract Act 1872. These provisions mostly apply to cases in which one party is entitled to a benefit under unfair conditions.

Section 65: Liability of Person Benefited by Void Agreement: Section 65 states that if an agreement is found to be void, or a contract becomes void, then any person who has obtained an advantage under the agreement or contract shall restore that advantage or make good the loss to the person from whom it was obtained. This provision is in accord with a basic restitutionary principle. A void agreement cannot give rise to any rights and obligations that can be enforced, so anything gained under the agreement has no legal basis. Therefore, the law imposes a duty to restore the benefit to avoid unjust enrichment.[13] The Supreme Court has always held that Section 65 is founded on equitable considerations and that it aims to prevent one party from being unfairly prejudiced simply because the transaction is not legally effective.[14]

Section 68: Necessary Supplies to Persons who are Incapable of Contracting: Section 68 provides a right of reimbursement for the supply of necessaries to a person who cannot enter into a contract, e.g. a minor or an unsound mind.[15] The law requires that the supplier be reimbursed from the beneficiary's property, even though there is no valid contract between the parties. The reason for the provision is clearly restitutionary. The recipient shall not be allowed to make use of the goods or services without paying the supplier for them. This provision is an example of restitution without contractual consent and of the willingness of the law to impose obligations without consent, because of fairness.

Section 69: Reimbursement of Money Paid by an Interested Person: Section 69 is applicable when someone who is interested in paying a sum of money that is legally required to be paid by another person pays the sum and then seeks reimbursement.[16] If, for instance, one of the co-owners pays the government dues to stop the sale of the jointly owned property, he can

[13] Indian Contract Act 1872, s 65
[14] *State of West Bengal v M/S B K Mondal & Sons* AIR 1962 SC 779
[15] Indian Contract Act 1872, s 68
[16] Indian Contract Act 1872, s 69

claim back the share he paid from the other co-owner. The prevention of unjust enrichment is the reason for this provision, as it ensures that the person who receives the payment is not able to avoid their legal obligation. The heart of Section 69 is to ensure that one party does not receive the benefit of a discharged obligation without the burden.

Section 70: Duty of a person benefiting from a non-gratuitous act: Section 70 is one of the most important restitutionary provisions in Indian law. It says that if a man lawfully does something for another man or gives him something without intending it as a gift, and the other man benefits from it, he is obliged to pay the former.[17] This section is based on the concept that the person who knowingly accepts and enjoys a benefit is obliged to pay reasonable compensation for it, even without a contract. The section has been relied on in several situations where a technical defect meant that a contract was not formed, even though it was intended to confer substantial benefits on the party to the contract. Section 70 has been used many times in situations where a contract was never formed, because of a technical defect, but it was intended to provide substantial benefits to the party to the contract.

Section 71: Responsibility of Finder of Goods: Section 71 places on the finder the same duties as a bailee.[18] The provision mainly governs the obligations of the finder, and is based on restitutionary principles. The law aims at preventing unjust enrichment by requiring the finder to keep the property and return it to the owner, instead of keeping it for his own use. The provision is part of the general law's commitment to ensuring that possession of something by accident does not amount to unjust enrichment.[19]

Section 72: Money paid or goods delivered by mistake or under coercion: Section 72 states that if a person receives money or anything that is paid by mistake or under compulsion, he has to return or pay back the money. This is one of the most explicit statements of the doctrine of unjust enrichment in the statutes. The law acknowledges that benefits gained as a result of a mistake or coercion do not have a legal basis and thus should be returned.[20] The Supreme Court in the case of Sales Tax Officer v Kanhaiya Lal Mukund Lal Saraf[21] extended the ambit

[17] Indian Contract Act 1872, s 70
[18] *State of West Bengal v M/S B K Mondal & Sons* AIR 1962 SC 779
[19] Indian Contract Act 1872, s 71
[20] Indian Contract Act 1872, s 72
[21] *Sales Tax Officer, Banaras & Ors v Kanhaiya Lal Mukundlal Saraf* (1959) SCR 1350

of restitution and reiterated the principle that no one should be allowed to enjoy the fruits of the mistake.

Restitution under the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908: The Indian Contract Act speaks about substantive restitutionary obligations, and the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, has an important procedural provision under Section 144. Section 144 reflects that justice cannot be done simply by setting aside a wrong decree or order, but also by undoing the effects of the wrong decree or order.[22] The principle of Section 144 is based on the Latin maxim actus curiae neminem gravabit, which means that no one shall be prejudiced by an act of the court.[23] It is because of this principle that the court is obliged to ensure that no prejudice is done to the parties when the decree is reversed, varied or set aside. The restitutionary jurisdiction under section 144 is thus obligatory and not discretionary, but is a part of the judicial duty to do complete justice.

Constitutional Dimensions of Restitution: The principle of restitution has gradually come to have constitutional status due to judicial interpretation. Restitution principles are now being used by constitutional courts to make the public law process fair and to stop people using it for bad purposes. In contemporary constitutional adjudication, courts are often faced with cases where a party can secure an interim order and thus benefit for a long time. To allow such persons to keep those benefits would be to frustrate the administration of justice.

Acknowledging this concern, the Supreme Court has time and again reiterated that restitution is a tool of the courts and an essential part of the administration of justice. The Court in South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. v State of M.P. noted that the delay in judicial proceedings should not be the cause of any successful litigant being put out of pocket and that courts have a duty to prevent any litigant from obtaining an unjust advantage from interim orders.[24] Likewise, in Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v Union of India, the Supreme Court stated that restitution is a basic rule of justice and that the court should make sure that the benefits are fully restored that have been wrongfully obtained.[25]

[22] Code of Civil Procedure 1908, s 144

[23] *Jai Berham v Kedar Nath Marwari* (1923) 25 BomLR 643

[24] *South Eastern Coalfields Ltd v State of M P and Ors* AIR 2003 SC 4482

[25] *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action Etc v Union of India & Ors Etc* (1996) 3 SCC 212

Restitution as an Instrument of Substantive Justice: The concept of restitution as an instrument of substantive justice is developed. The notion of restitution as an instrument of substantive justice is elaborated. As noted above, restitution plays a pivotal role in Indian jurisprudence, as the different statutory and judicial developments have shown. The doctrine is used in a variety of ways, both contractual and procedural, as well as through constitutional principles, and all have a common goal: to prevent unjust enrichment and restore fairness between the parties. Indian law says that justice is not just a matter of saying, 'yes, I have rights'. Indian law states that justice does not come from saying, 'Yes, I have rights'. Justice aims to take away illegal advantages and restore persons to their just due. The doctrine of restitution serves this vital purpose by attempting to compensate for losses as well as gains that are unjustly obtained.

JUDICIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF RESTITUTION IN INDIA

The doctrine of restitution in India has been developed to a great extent by judicial interpretation. Statutory provisions lay the ground rules for restitution, but the judiciary has made restitution a broad ground rule of justice. It has been a long time since the Indian courts have made it clear that it is not fair to let a person keep what he has acquired by mistake, fraud, procedural advantage or judicial error. The doctrine has been elaborated and adjusted by the Supreme Court and other constitutional courts in a series of major decisions in response to the changing legal and social context. Restitution was developed as a judicial remedy in response to a larger trend in Indian law towards substantive justice. It is now evident that the court should do more than just state the legal rights and entitlements. It also requires that any unfair advantages be removed, and the parties be restored to their status had the wrongful event not occurred. This has led to restitution developing as a viable alternative to the misuse of the legal system and to a fair resolution of civil and criminal cases.

Early Judicial Recognition of Restitutionary Principles: Judicial interpretations of quasi-contractual provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, suggest that the roots of the restitutionary jurisprudence in India can be found in the said Act. Early on, Courts recognised that these provisions were based on considerations of equity and fairness, rather than contractual obligations. State of West Bengal v B.K. Mondal & Sons[26] was one of the

[26] *State of West Bengal v M/S B K Mondal & Sons* AIR 1962 SC 779

earliest and most influential decisions in this regard, where the construction work was done without a formally executed contract with the Government. The contract was not of the sort required by the law, but the Government had accepted and profited from the work undertaken.

The Supreme Court ruled that the Government could not be allowed to keep the benefit without paying compensation to the contractor. The Court has applied the provision of Section 70 of the Indian Contract Act, which provides that a person must compensate another person who acted for him for any purpose other than for gratification. The importance of the decision is that obligations can exist without a contract where justice requires restitution. The judgment was far more than a formalistic one and a more just one of the obligations. It showed the Court's readiness to allow for an unjust enrichment even when the usual contractual remedies were not available.

Expansion of Restitution in Cases of Mistake: The interpretation of Section 72 of the Indian Contract Act was one of the important changes in Indian restitutionary jurisprudence. The provision is for the recovery of money paid and goods delivered under mistake or coercion. But the definition of the word 'mistake' was the subject of debate by the courts.

In Sales Tax Officer v Kanhaiya Lal Mukund Lal Saraf,[27] the Supreme Court has considered the question whether the sales tax could be recovered from a taxpayer who had paid the tax in the mistaken belief that he was not liable for it. The Court ruled that a mistake of fact and a mistake of law are included within the meaning of 'mistake' in Section 72. As a result, any payments made pursuant to a wrongful belief regarding legal responsibilities may also be sought. The Court did not accept the traditional common law rule, which barred recovery for errors of law.

Restitution and the Duty of Courts to Correct Their Own Errors: Another step forward in the evolution of restitution was through judicial construction of the Code of Civil Procedure, Section 144. Restitution was increasingly viewed as a remedy that courts have to provide, rather than just a remedy that litigants can seek from courts. The basic principle on which this is based is Jai Berham v Kedar Nath Marwari.[28] In this case, the Privy Council

[27] *Sales Tax Officer, Banaras & Ors v Kanhaiya Lal Mukundlal Saraf* (1959) SCR 1350
[28] *Jai Berham v Kedar Nath Marwari* (1923) 25 BomLR 643

emphasised that, on reversal of the decree, the court has the duty to place the parties into the position they would have been in if the decree had not been issued. The ruling set the precedent that judges should not be the source of unjust enrichment. Where one party gets an advantage solely by reason of a decree which is later rescinded, then justice must be done by removing the advantage.

Restitution as an Inherent Power of Courts: As time went on, it became apparent that restitution was not limited to the statutory provisions and was recognised as a court-ordered remedy. Some scenarios might not be covered by the words of Section 144 CPC, yet still require restitution relief.

In Kavita Trehan v Balsara Hygiene Products Ltd,[29] the Supreme Court stated that the concept of restitution is based on principles of justice, equity and fair play. The Court noted that the powers of restitution were not confined to the statute, and that they are to be exercised under the inherent powers of the courts whenever deemed necessary to prevent injustice. What is important in the judgment is that it acknowledges that restitution is not just a remedy, but a substantive legal rule. The Court recognised that technical restrictions should not be an obstacle to the restoration of fairness between the parties. Thus, restitution was seen more and more as an intrinsic power of the court that could be applied to a wide range of injustices.

South Eastern Coalfields: A Turning Point in Restitutionary Jurisprudence: The modern law of restitution in India was profoundly influenced by the Supreme Court's decision in South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. v State of Madhya Pradesh.[30] The case involved interim judicial orders that enabled a party to avoid certain financial liabilities during the pendency of litigation.

The Supreme Court held that no litigant should be permitted to derive an advantage from an interim order once the final decision goes against him. The Court observed that litigation cannot be allowed to become a source of profit and that courts possess a duty to neutralise any unfair advantage gained through judicial proceedings. Importantly, the Court emphasised that restitution is based upon the principle that successful parties should not

[29] *Mrs Kavita Trehan & Anr v Balsara Hygiene Products* (1994) 5 SCC 380
[30] *South Eastern Coalfields Ltd v State of M P & Ors* (2004) 3 MAD LW 286

suffer because of delays inherent in the legal process. Where a party has enjoyed benefits solely because of an interim order, those benefits must ordinarily be restored once the litigation concludes.

Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action and the Concept of Complete Restitution: The doctrine reached a new level of maturity in Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v Union of India.[31] The case arose from prolonged environmental litigation involving industrial pollution and non-compliance with judicial directions.

The Supreme Court strongly criticised attempts to delay compliance through repetitive litigation and procedural manoeuvres. The Court declared that restitution is a fundamental principle of justice and that courts must ensure complete restoration of benefits wrongfully obtained. A particularly significant aspect of the judgment was its recognition that restitution may include not only the principal amount wrongfully retained but also interest, costs, and other consequential benefits derived from the wrongful conduct. The Court stressed that partial restoration may fail to achieve genuine justice where the wrongdoer has enjoyed substantial advantages over time.

Restitution in Contemporary Public Law Jurisprudence: Recent judicial developments demonstrate that restitution has moved beyond traditional private law disputes and now occupies an important position within public law. Constitutional courts frequently invoke restitutionary principles in cases involving taxation, government action, regulatory disputes, and abuse of public power. Courts have repeatedly emphasised that public authorities are equally bound by restitutionary obligations. The State cannot retain money collected without legal authority, nor can public bodies benefit from unlawful administrative actions. This approach is consistent with constitutional principles such as the rule of law and Article 265 of the Constitution, which prohibits the collection of taxes except by authority of law.

RESTITUTION AND UNJUST ENRICHMENT: CONCEPTUAL RELATIONSHIP AND PRACTICAL APPLICATION

Restitution and the principle of unjust enrichment are so intertwined that they are sometimes mentioned side by side. However, they are not the same. Unjust enrichment provides the

[31] *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action Etc v Union of India & Ors Etc* (1996) 3 SCC 212

basis or reason for imposing liability, while restitution is the remedy by which the law eliminates the unjust enrichment and makes the parties fair. That is, the concept of unjust enrichment is one of why the defendant should be held liable, and the concept of restitution is one of how that liability is to be addressed. In the past few decades, Indian courts have come to increasingly understand that many conflicts can only be resolved through a combination of other contractual or tortious remedies. In many cases, a person can enjoy a benefit without doing a tort or without entering into an enforceable contract. When this is the case, the doctrine of unjust enrichment will step in to prevent a party from taking the benefit for which it is not entitled. The law of restitution is thus a useful tool for making the principle of unjust enrichment actionable.

Essential Elements of Unjust Enrichment: While no doctrine of unjust enrichment has been codified into Indian law, decisions and statutes do indicate some key elements that typically inform restitutionary claims.

Enrichment of the Defendant: The first is that there must have been a benefit received by the defendant. Enrichment is a wide and general term and can be more than just a monetary gift. It can be property, services, improvements to property, discharge of liabilities, use of another's resources, or an economic advantage that is capable of objective valuation.[32]

Enrichment at the Expense of Another: The second is that the enrichment must have been at the claimant's cost. This element is used to create the required link between the benefit received by the defendant and the deprivation of the claimant. The relationship does not necessarily involve the transfer of any property or money. The important thing is that there is a causal link between the claimant's loss and the defendant's gain.[33] If there is no such connection, a restitutionary claim will not likely prevail.

Absence of Legal Justification: The third and most significant one is that the enrichment has to be unfair. Restitution is not required for all enrichments. People enter into contracts, receive gifts, inherit or receive benefits from business obligations every day. Such enrichments are entirely proper and will not give rise to judicial intervention. When the enrichment is lacking an authentic legal justification, the enrichment is considered to be

[32] Burrows (n 1)
[33] Birks (n 9)

unjust. This can happen where the benefit was gained in any of the following ways: by mistake, by coercion, by fraud, by undue influence, where the underlying transaction is void or unenforceable.[34]

Restitution in Cases of Mistake, Fraud and Coercion: A typical example of restitutionary claims is mistaken payments. This has become more common in modern commercial transactions, electronic banking systems and digital payment systems. Indian law provides that funds paid under a mistake should be recoverable, because the recipient has no right to keep the money. The recovery of money paid by mistake or by coercion is expressly provided in Section 72, Indian Contract Act.[35]

The Supreme Court in the case of Sales Tax Officer v Kanhaiya Lal Mukund Lal Saraf, has given a wide berth to this principle and has held that recovery is not limited to only mistakes of fact but also to mistakes of law.[36] The judgment is in keeping with the overall goal of restitution, namely, the avoidance of the retention of benefits not lawfully accrued. Restitution is an even stronger basis for fraud. If someone gains money, property or other benefits by fraudulent means, he cannot claim any legal right to keep them. Restitution is thus an important tool for removing benefits stemming from deception and placing them back where they belong.

Quantum Meruit and Restitutionary Recovery: An important practical manifestation of restitution is the doctrine of quantum meruit, which literally means as much as he has earned or as much as he deserves. The doctrine allows for damages to be awarded for reasonable services performed or benefits provided when no enforceable contract exists, or one is performable.[37] This principle is especially applicable in circumstances where one party has partially fulfilled its contractual duties before the time the contract is void, frustrated or terminated. Where such a situation occurs, contractual remedies may not be available. But if you were to refuse any recovery, then the other party would reap the benefit and have no cost. The doctrine of quantum meruit thus represents the underlying purpose of restitution -

[34] Goff (n 2)
[35] Indian Contract Act 1872, s 72
[36] *Sales Tax Officer, Banaras & Ors v Kanhaiya Lal Mukundlal Saraf* (1959) SCR 1350
[37] Pollock & Mulla, *INDIAN CONTRACT & SPECIFIC RELIEF ACTS* (17th edn, LexisNexis 2024)

that of avoiding unjust enrichment. The court does not require the contract to be enforceable, but it is fair to grant compensation for benefits actually received and enjoyed.

Constructive Trusts and Equitable Restitution: Restitution also includes 'other' remedies, such as constructive trusts. While Indian law does not extensively use the doctrine of constructive trusts, as do some common law jurisdictions, the principle has been a factor in numerous decisions where a fiduciary relationship exists, and property is acquired through an improper method. Constructive trust occurs when someone acquires or takes possession of property under such circumstances that it is unfair for him to claim the property. If so, equity assumes that the individual is holding the property for someone else. Constructive trusts are important because they provide a remedy for unjust enrichment when monetary damages are not a sufficient remedy. Courts can issue damages or order the transfer of the property or the surrender of profits from the property.

Restitutionary Remedies in Contemporary Commercial Transactions: In the modern business world, restitutionary remedies have become more important due to the complexity of business transactions. In business deals, the advance payment, deposit, performance guarantee, electronic transfer or cross-border financial arrangements are common. Unjust enrichment issues often arise in disputes arising from transactions. For example, if a contract is lost after advance payments have been paid, then restitution might include the return of advance payments. Similarly, if services are performed for a contract that is never executed, then courts have the power to award restitutionary damages for the value of the services provided.

The rapid development of electronic payment systems has also presented new challenges. In the modern-day age of technology, erroneous bank transfers, duplicate payments, and unauthorised digital transactions are becoming more and more frequent, forcing courts to apply traditional restitutionary principles to contemporary technological settings. While the facts of each case might vary from those envisioned by the laws of the nineteenth century, the principle is the same: no person should have a benefit for which there is no legal basis.

CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES AND EMERGING DIMENSIONS OF RESTITUTION IN INDIA

The concept of restitution has seen tremendous development in Indian law. Once considered more as a remedy for contractual or quasi-contractual obligations, it has slowly turned into a wider principle that can be used in a variety of other fields of law. The doctrine has come under new challenges, however, due to the complexity of the economic and legal relations of the modern world. In modern controversies, the issues can range from digital transactions to massive commercial transactions, environmental concerns, regulatory decisions, and extended litigation, all of which are issues not envisioned by the traditional principles of restitution.

Restitution in the Era of Digital Transactions: Digital banking and electronic payment systems have revolutionised how financial transactions are conducted. Physical cash has taken over a significant part of daily transactions thanks to online banking platforms, mobile payment apps, digital wallets and real-time payment systems. These innovations have not only made life easier and more efficient, but they have also created new types of restitutionary conflict. The number of mistaken transfers has increased more than ever before. Money can go to the wrong account due to system failure, technical glitches and typing mistakes. In many cases, the recipient will withdraw or use the funds before the error is noticed. These scenarios give rise to some interesting questions about the amount of restitutionary liability and the duties of the recipients who are receiving the money without a legal right to it.

Restitution in Taxation and Fiscal Administration: The issue of restitution and taxation has grown to be a significant issue in modern India. Restitution often comes into play in cases of disputes over illegal tax takings, unconstitutional levies, and late refunds. Such claims are based on Article 265 of the Constitution, which states that no tax shall be levied or collected without the authority of law.[38] If the State is collecting money from someone without legal authority, it is a concern if the money is not being returned. As a result, courts have frequently held that taxpayers can obtain a refund of over-collected taxes.

[38] Constitution of India 1950, art 265

Meanwhile, tax controversies have illustrated one of the abiding dilemmas of restitution law. Courts are required to consider the rights of the claimant to recovery and the possibility that the burden of the tax has already been shifted to consumers. This concern has led to the development of the law of unjust enrichment in indirect tax cases, especially in the field of customs and goods and services tax. The difficulty is to make sure that restitution is effective, that it does what it claims to do, restores justice without generating windfall profits. Judicial rulings in this regard show the fine line that judges are required to walk between fairness toward taxpayers and the economic interests of the general public.

Environmental Restitution and Ecological Restoration: Restitution is one of the most dynamic areas where it is used in environmental law. The traditional concept of restitution was concerned with the restitution of benefits which had been wrongfully acquired by one person at the expense of another. The conflicts surrounding nature, however, tend to be more community and nature-oriented and future generation-oriented. In light of these facts, Indian courts have taken a more restorative stance in environmental cases. Courts have not only given awards for damages but also tried to make the environment as a whole as possible.

The emergence of the 'Polluter Pays Principle' is a big step towards that. According to this principle, the industries and individuals that cause environmental damage could have to pay not only compensation to the victims but also for the restoration of the damaged environment.[39] This type of restitution is not like the normal private law remedies, as the purpose is not just to make right individual losses. It aims to restore ecological balance and to prevent those responsible for environmental degradation from enjoying financial gains by carrying out such activities. It does so and demonstrates an expanded understanding of restitution that is sensitive to current social issues.

Restitution and Abuse of Judicial Process: Restitution is one of the most important developments by the modern Indian judiciary, which has been adopted for abating the misuse of the court process. Litigation has become such a source of injustice in a way that it is now acknowledged by courts. A party can seek an interim order, stay or injunction that gives it significant benefits pending the outcome of the proceedings. In a few instances, the litigation will last for several years, allowing the party to obtain economic benefits that would

---

[39] *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v Union of India & Ors* (1996) 5 SCC 647; *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action Etc v Union of India & Ors Etc* (1996) 3 SCC 212

not have been available if the law had been properly applied from the beginning. The Supreme Court has consistently underscored that litigation is not a means for litigants to claim unfair profits. In recent years, courts have ordered restitution in addition to costs and interests to compensate for any advantage gained by delay where a party ultimately fails in the litigation.[40]

Restitution in Commercial and Corporate Disputes: As India's economy has grown and developed, so have the nature and sophistication of its commercial disputes involving restitutionary issues. When companies engage in business deals, they may require significant prepayments, intricate agreements, investments and commitments for future performance. If these transactions fail, there are often questions about the return of benefits that have been exchanged. In many situations, traditional contractual remedies will not suffice, especially when contracts are cancelled, frustrated or become invalid before completion. Restitution is therefore an important means of resolving commercial conflicts. Restitution principles are increasingly used by courts and arbitral tribunals to prevent a party from benefiting from an act of which it no longer has a legitimate basis.

Emerging Issues and Future Challenges: Though increasingly significant, the doctrine of restitution is beset by a number of difficulties. The first problem is that there is no exhaustive legislation on the subject of unjust enrichment in India. Indian jurisprudence is very much reliant on judicial interpretation and the few and scattered statutes on restitution, as compared to other jurisdictions that have a more systematic body of restitution law. The other issue is the conceptual limits of restitution. It can sometimes be difficult for courts to differentiate between restitution and compensation, damages, and disgorgement of profits. The uncertainty over the nature and extent of remedies can be confusing.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The concept of restitution has undergone a significant transformation in Indian law and has now emerged as a crucial tool to counter unjust enrichment and to promote justice in legal transactions. Its application has gone far beyond the realm of contract disputes, and it has been used in constitutional, environmental, tax, commercial, and procedural law. Despite these advances, there are still challenges that impact its consistent and effective use. The

[40] *South Eastern Coalfields Ltd v State of M P and Ors* AIR 2003 SC 4482

challenges that these raises make it essential to continue the process of doctrinal development, law reform and institutional change. In an era of accelerating economic growth, technological progress and complex litigation in India, the principle of restitution needs to be developed in a way that it upholds its basic tenets of fairness, but also offers greater certainty and efficiency. The following recommendations can help to further develop restitutionary jurisprudence and its implementation.

Enactment of a Comprehensive Restitution Framework: The need of the hour in Indian law is to have a more consistent framework in relation to restitution and unjust enrichment. Restitution principles are today fragmented in various statutes and judicial pronouncements. This piecemeal approach has given courts a lot of flexibility, but it also has led to some confusion about the scope and application of restitutionary remedies.[41] A comprehensive legislative framework could assist in clarifying essential elements of unjust enrichment, provide parameters for determining when restitution may be awarded and offer general guidelines for determining restitutionary relief. This would not mean that judges' decisions couldn't be based on their individual discretion, but would offer a more solid basis for them. Restitution has been slowly evolving into a more coherent system of law in several common law countries. Such a system could be beneficial for India, especially with the growing complexity of modern-day legal and commercial transactions.[42]

Greater Conceptual Clarity in Judicial Reasoning: While Indian courts have contributed to the evolution of restitution, there is some confusion in the jurisprudence in using similar terms interchangeably without clarifying the differences between restitution, compensation, reimbursement, disgorgement and damages. More conceptual precision would further enhance the legal certainty and doctrinal consistency. There should be a clear statement in a court decision of the legal basis for the relief and of whether the relief is to compensate for a loss, to remove an unjust enrichment, to restore the status quo ante, or to prevent further enrichment.

Strengthening Restitution in Public Law: Restitution has become an integral part of constitutional and administrative law in India, and it is one of the most significant advancements in the court's jurisprudence in recent years. Public officials should not be

[41] Burrows (n 1)
[42] Birks (n 9)

allowed to keep the fruits of illegal acts, unconstitutional actions, or administrative mistakes. Courts have increasingly acknowledged that the fruits of illegal acts, unconstitutional acts or administrative mistakes may not be kept by public officials.[43] But it can be hard to implement restitutionary claims against public authorities. Reducing the effectiveness of available remedies can be a problem due to delays in refund processing, procedural complexity or extended litigation.

In order to address these concerns, more efficient mechanisms should be introduced by administrative authorities in the implementation of judicial instructions related to restitution. Clearer deadlines for compliance, increased public administration accountability and streamlined procedures for restitution of illegally collected amounts would improve the effective implementation of restitutionary justice.

Adapting Restitution to Technological Developments: Technological innovation is changing the economic nature of transactions and is giving rise to new types of legal conflict. New digital payment systems, online banking services, automated financial services, blockchain-based technology, and cryptocurrency transactions have brought new challenges that were not specifically considered in the restitutionary doctrines.

The legal system, therefore, has to meet these changes while still providing for the principle of restitution. Courts must establish guidelines for the recovery of benefits gained by electronic transactions that are unauthorised and mistaken transfers. Legislative and regulatory bodies can also consider creating dedicated mechanisms to deal with restitution claims from digital transactions. These changes would enhance legal predictability and prevent the case of an unreasonable enrichment in the name of technological progress.

Enhancing the Role of Restitution in Environmental Protection: Restitution has shown itself to be useful for a variety of purposes beyond the personal level in environmental jurisprudence. Ecological restoration as a type of restitution is gaining recognition because of a growing awareness of justice that considers the interests of both collective and intergenerational interests.[44]

---

[43] *South Eastern Coalfields Ltd v State of M P and Ors* AIR 2003 SC 4482
[44] *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action Etc v Union of India & Ors Etc* (1996) 3 SCC 212

Restorative approaches to environmental conflicts should be further developed in the future through legal changes. Polluters must not only pay for damages to individuals but also for damages to the ecosystems, which can be fixed. A greater focus on environmental restitution would be consistent with the constitutional obligation to protect the environment and sustainable development, as well as with the fact that it would help prevent economic actors from profiting from practices that impose high, uncompromising environmental costs on society.

Promoting Judicial Efficiency in Restitutionary Claims: Restitution cannot be effective if it is not compatible with the legal principles, but also if the institutions tasked with enforcing the principles are not effective. Restitutionary remedies are often of little use if there is a delay in judicial proceedings, especially if the benefits have been received for a long period of time. The courts should, therefore, continue to implement measures to speed up restitution-related litigations. The provision of specialised commercial courts, better case management and increased adoption of alternative dispute resolution processes can help deliver more expedient results.

Encouraging Academic and Judicial Engagement: Restitution, although of increasing significance, is still a relatively underdeveloped topic in Indian legal scholarship. Much of the current debate remains centred on the traditional areas of law, including contracts, torts, and constitutional law, and restitution is rarely the subject of much discussion. More use of the restitutionary theory in the academic classroom would be a major step forward in the development of doctrine. It should be suggested that there be increased, more specific research into the doctrine of unjust enrichment, restitutionary remedies and comparative developments in this area at universities, research institutions and in the legal field.

CONCLUSION

One of the longest-standing principles of justice in the judicial system is restitution. The principle is a legal one and a moral one: nobody can keep a benefit which they have gained on the backs of others without legal justification. The concept might seem straightforward, but its implementation has been a game-changer for promoting fairness in various legal relationships. This research has demonstrated that restitution is not a technical solution that is limited to contract disputes or procedural changes. Instead, it's a general principle of law that aims to balance the scales whenever there has been an inequitable transfer of wealth, property, or benefit. Restitution has been developed as a potent tool for the prevention of unjust enrichment and the advancement of substantive justice through the provisions of the Indian Contract Act 1872, the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and the progressive interpretation given by the Indian Courts.[45]

The evolution of the law of restitution in India is an ongoing attempt by the judiciary to prevent the law from being a tool of unfair advantage. It is a cardinal rule of law that a litigant may not benefit from a judicial mistake, a payment that was never made, an invalid payment or an abuse of legal processes. In this way, they have strengthened the notion that justice is not realised based on rights and obligations; justice is realised when parties are restored to the place they should have been in the first place as much as possible.[46]

Meanwhile, restitution's use in constitutional law, taxation, environmental protection, commercial disputes, and digital transactions, among other fields, shows its amazing versatility. The doctrine has been able to meet the changing social and economic realities without straying from its core purpose. The issue is the same, whether it's an incorrect electronic payment, an illegal tax collection, environmental destruction, or a benefit accrued from long litigation; the question is whether the law should allow a person to keep a gain that is not fair and just? Restitutionary principles consistently answer with a 'NO'.

However, the research has also shown that there are still significant issues with the doctrine. When looking at the lack of a single comprehensive legislative framework, the sometimes-conflicting decisions of judges, the uncertain nature of the procedures, and the new types of technologically sophisticated transactions, restitutionary law is far from being fully developed. The problems, however, are not to be considered shortcomings of the doctrine. Instead, they illustrate the need for ongoing doctrinal refinement and legislative focus to make sure restitution continues to be able to serve the needs of today's victims of injustice.

Finally, it is important to remember that the doctrine of restitution is not just about rules, but about fairness. Its lasting importance has to do with how it connects with the fundamental rights and just treatment. Restitution upholds the rule of law and instils trust in its

[45] Indian Contract Act, 1872, ss 65–72; Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, s 144
[46] *South Eastern Coalfields Ltd v State of M P and Ors* AIR 2003 SC 4482; *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action Etc v Union of India & Ors Etc* (1996) 3 SCC 212

procedures and processes, while also restoring the parties to their proper place and averting any unjust enrichment.