CASE ANALYSIS: WOOD V. CAPITA INSURANCE SERVICES LTD. [2017] UKSC 24

Aishah Afreen Misbah, BA LLB (Hons), Christ (Deemed to be University), Bengaluru

INTRODUCTION

The following case, Wood v. Capita Insurance Services Ltd[1], the United Kingdom Supreme Court examined the principles of contractual interpretation in relation to an indemnity clause made between the two parties of a commercial contract. An indemnity clause in a contract between two parties specifies a type of insurance pay-out for losses and damages. In an indemnity agreement, one party will agree to assume legal responsibility for any losses or damages suffered and to provide monetary compensation for any prospective losses or damages caused by the other party.[2] A provision known as an "indemnity clause" is used to include indemnity in contracts. This clause's scope is totally determined by the particulars of each agreement. Contract interpretation is when a court determines the meaning of a contract.

FACTS

The Respondent, Mr. Andrew Wood ("Mr. Wood") and others (collectively the "Sellers") entered into a Share Purchase Agreement dated 13 April 2010 with the Appellant, Capita Insurance Services Ltd ("Capita") for the purchase of Sureterm Direct Limited, a business that primarily provided insurance for classic cars.[3] The contract included an indemnification provision wherein the seller agreed to reimburse the buyer for any compensation brought on by consumer claims or complaints to the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA).

Employees of Sureterm voiced concerns about the Company's sales procedures soon after Capita bought the Company's share capital. A review that followed led to the discovery that several times the Sureterm's telephone operators had misled clients. The results were to be

[1] Wood v. Capita Insurance Services Ltd [2017] UKSC 24; [2017] 2 W.L.R. 1095.
[2] Paul Britton, *What is an Indemnity Clause?,* BRITTON & TIME (Jan. 23, 2023,10:09 PM), https://brittontime.com/2019/05/13/what-is-an-indemnity-clause/ .
[3] *Dispute Resolution Update,* ROSLING KING LLP, (Jan. 23, 2023, 10:45 PM), https://www.rkllp.com/2017/05/05/dispute-resolution-update-wood-v-capita-insurance-services-ltd-2017-uksc-24/

reported to the Financial Services Authority (FSA) by Capita and Sureterm. The FSA notified them that the clients had been harmed and had received unfair treatment. Capita and the FSA reached an agreement on a corrective plan. A customer compensation payment of about £1.35 million was agreed upon by Capita and Sureterm. Capita tried to collect its losses under the indemnity, but Mr. Wood refuted Capita's assertion. He claimed that the situation was not covered by the indemnity since Sureterm reported suspected mis-selling to the FSA on its own initiative rather than in response to a complaint from any Sureterm customers as stated in the indemnity clause.

Despite the fact that there had been no consumer complaints to the FSA, the High Court ruled that Mr. Wood was to indemnify Capita. The Court of Appeal heard Mr. Wood's appeal. The Court of Appeal overturned the High Court, concluding that according to the Indemnity's appropriate interpretation, no responsibility could exist until a claim for mis-selling against Sureterm or a complaint had been filed with the FSA. The Supreme Court heard an appeal from Capita.

ISSUE

1. Did the compensation plan come under the indemnification clause's purview?

LAW

1. 'Companies Act, 2006' Chapter 7 (sections 232 to 239)

2. Sale and Supply of Goods Act (HMSO 1994)

ANALYSIS

The point of contention is how to interpret an indemnification clause in an SPA for the sale of Capita shares of an online auto insurance company. Capita's appeal is dismissed by the Supreme Court in a unanimous decision. The indemnification was deemed vague and opaque by the Supreme Court. The loss, according to the Supreme Court, was not covered by the indemnification provision. The content of the phrase was important since it revealed the circumstances under which the indemnification kicked in and excluded losses covered by self-reporting mis-selling. The court did point out that it was still important to evaluate the larger factual matrix and situate the provision in its contractual context. The court put emphasis on

the contractual interpretation. It stated that not all interpretations should be taken literally. It should consider the entire deal or transaction. Depending on the type, calibre, and formality of the writing, the larger context around the agreement should be given more or less weight.

The Court of Appeal's interpretation in this instance was accurate. The contractual background had a major role. It would be clear that the clause did not specify who could bring the actions, proceedings, and claims referred to in the indemnity clause in order to bring about the indemnity if only penalties, compensation, remedial action, or payments imposed on the company had to result from complaints made to the FSA against the company.[4] The arrangement may have turned out to be a terrible deal for the buyer, but it is not the role of the court to apply commercial acumen to make their deal better.[5]

Looking at it at first glance, the judgment given by the Supreme Court may seem unremarkable. It is false that there is a conflict between the two methods of contractual interpretation. The court has access to both textualism and contextualism to help it determine the objective meaning of the contract in light of its surrounding circumstances. However, it is clear that the focus is shifting toward a more textual approach and away from dependence on corporate common sense, which is to be commended. Judges are not the ideal people to determine business common sense, as Lord Sumption observes extrajudicially.[6] Few judges have such real-world experience, to start. Second, judges decide on the issue when a disagreement has developed. Thirdly, as Lord Sumption points out, courts frequently incorporate fairness in their considerations, although fairness has no place in the formation or drafting of business contracts.[7]

By contrasting the verdicts in Arnold v. Britton[8] and the current case to Rainy Sky[9] and ICS v. West Bromwich[10] , it was noted that the courts started to attach greater weight to the language of the contract over the circumstances. On the surface, the ruling seems to offer much-needed

[4] Andrew Twigger, *Wood v. Capita Insurance Services Ltd,* MAITLAND CHAMBERS (Jan. 23, 2023, 10:23 PM), https://www.maitlandchambers.com/resources/cases/andrew-wood-v-(1)-sureterm-direct-ltd-(2)-capita-i
[5] Wood v. Capita Insurance Services Ltd [2017] UKSC 24; [2017] 2 W.L.R. 1095.
[6] Lord Sumption JSC, "A question of Taste: The Supreme Court and the Interpretation of Contracts" Harris Society Annual Lecture, 8 May 2017, p.10.
[7] Lord Sumption JSC, "A question of Taste: The Supreme Court and the Interpretation of Contracts" Harris Society Annual Lecture, 8 May 2017, p.10.
[8] Arnold v Britton [2015] UKSC 36; [2015] A.C. 1619.
[9] Rainy Sky v Kookmin Bank [2011] UKSC 50; [2011] 1 W.L.R. 2900.
[10] Investors Compensation Scheme Ltd v West Bromwich Building Society (No.1) [1998] 1 W.L.R. 896.

clarity regarding the course of action the court should pursue, but upon closer examination, it could also raise more concerns than it resolves. The conclusion given by the court is obvious: the terms chosen will have precedence in cases when there is only one rational or sane interpretation imaginable, regardless of the commercial absurdity of the result. The exact words said by the parties will be given more weight.

CONCLUSION

This situation demonstrates how crucial proper wording and drafting of clauses of the contract is. A clause that is imprecise and poorly written might subject an agreement to the interpretation of the courts, who might not always rule in the party's favour. When there are conflicting interpretations, the court can determine which construction is most reasonable. Using the recital and acknowledgment provisions to describe the business and factual context of the agreement must be ensured. This is crucial if the contract has any burdensome or unique provisions such as an indemnity clause.

REFERENCES

1. Wood v. Capita Insurance Services Ltd [2017] UKSC 24; [2017] 2 W.L.R. 1095.
2. Paul Britton, *What is an Indemnity Clause?,* BRITTON & TIME (Jan. 23, 2023,10:09 PM), https://brittontime.com/2019/05/13/what-is-an-indemnity-clause/ .
3. *Dispute Resolution Update,* ROSLING KING LLP, (Jan. 23, 2023, 10:45 PM), https://www.rkllp.com/2017/05/05/dispute-resolution-update-wood-v-capita-insurance-services-ltd-2017-uksc-24/
4. Andrew Twigger, *Wood v. Capita Insurance Services Ltd,* MAITLAND CHAMBERS (Jan. 23, 2023, 10:23 PM), https://www.maitlandchambers.com/resources/cases/andrew-wood-v-(1)-sureterm-direct-ltd-(2)-capita-i
5. Lord Sumption JSC, "A question of Taste: The Supreme Court and the Interpretation of Contracts" Harris Society Annual Lecture, 8 May 2017, p.10.
6. Arnold v Britton [2015] UKSC 36; [2015] A.C. 1619.
7. Rainy Sky v Kookmin Bank [2011] UKSC 50; [2011] 1 W.L.R. 2900.
8. Investors Compensation Scheme Ltd v West Bromwich Building Society (No.1) [1998] 1 W.L.R. 896.