SOCIAL SCIENCE REPORTS
AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

SOCIAL SCIENCE REPORTS

Original Research Article

Journal homepage: https://ssr.crcjournals.org/

p-ISSN: 3117-3497
e-ISSN: 3117-3489

Check for updates

The Application and Implications of the Group of Companies Doctrine in Arbitration under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996

Rajan Dargan*, Mohini Dwivedi, O. P. Gupta, and Sudhir Dahiya

Department of Law, Shridhar University, Chirawa, Rajasthan, India

Received 11 October 2025 | Revised 20 November 2025 | Accepted 26 November 2025 | Available Online 29 November 2025

*Corresponding Author: **Rajan Dargan** | Email Address: **amanpreet928818@gmail.com**

Citation: Rajan Dargan, Mohini Dwivedi, O. P. Gupta, and Sudhir Dahiya (2025). The Application and Implications of the Group of Companies Doctrine in Arbitration under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. ***Social Science Reports***.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.51470/SSR.2025.09.02.83

Abstract

The Indian arbitration framework, governed by the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, has reformed dispute resolution by reducing judicial interference and reinforcing arbitral autonomy. However, as international business transactions grow more complex, challenges have emerged regarding the inclusion of non-signatories in arbitration. This article explores the Group of Companies Doctrine, which enables affiliated entities, such as parent companies or subsidiaries, to be bound by arbitration agreements despite not being direct signatories. It examines the application of this doctrine and the landmark Chloro Controls case, where the Supreme Court broadened the interpretation of Section 45, allowing non-signatories to participate in arbitration. The study outlines key criteria for inclusion, such as direct involvement, relevance to the dispute, and the intent of the parties. Additionally, it analyzes India's evolving judicial stance, balancing party autonomy with the complexities of modern commercial transactions. As arbitration law advances, India's legal framework continues to adapt, addressing multi-party disputes while upholding fairness and consent-based resolution.

Keywords: *Arbitration, Non-Signatories, Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, Judicial Oversight, Party Autonomy.*

Introduction

The evolution of arbitration law in India has been significantly shaped by the implementation of the "Arbitration and Conciliation Act", 1996, a key legislative milestone in the country's efforts to modernize and strengthen its dispute resolution mechanisms. The Act aligns with international standards by reducing judicial interference, enhancing arbitral tribunal autonomy, and establishing an efficient, impartial framework for global dispute resolution. It underscores India's commitment to principles such as party autonomy, confidentiality, and minimal court intervention—critical to arbitration's effectiveness as the preferred method for commercial dispute settlement [1]. A key challenge in modern arbitration involves the inclusion of non-signatories, particularly in cases where affiliated corporate entities become entangled in disputes despite not having directly signed arbitration agreements. This issue is particularly complex in international transactions involving multiple interconnected agreements across corporate groups [2]. This article explores the Group of Companies Doctrine, which allows subsidiaries, parent companies, and affiliated entities to be bound by arbitration agreements even in the absence of direct consent. It examines the growing relevance of this doctrine in Indian jurisprudence and how courts are adapting arbitration principles to address the intricacies of multi-party international transactions and modern corporate structures.

The Group of Companies Doctrine: Overview and Applicability

The landmark Chloro Controls case, the Supreme Court of India affirmed the Group of Companies Doctrine, recognizing that an arbitration agreement signed by one entity within a corporate group may, under certain circumstances, bind non-signatory subsidiaries, parent companies, or affiliates. This principle rests on the premise that parties may implicitly or explicitly extend the obligations and benefits of an arbitration agreement to non-signatories. The doctrine applies when the conduct of the parties, the structure of related agreements, and the interconnected nature of the corporate group indicate a mutual intent to resolve disputes through arbitration, even in the absence of direct consent [3].

Courts assess multiple factors when determining the applicability of this doctrine, including the interconnection between agreements, the nature of the underlying transaction, the role of each entity within the corporate group, and whether a non-signatory stands to gain from or be affected by the execution of the primary contract. Additionally, courts examine whether non-signatories actively participated in the contract's negotiation or performance, or if they expressly intended to benefit from or assume liability under the agreement. Since its recognition as a legal tool, the Group of Companies Doctrine has been widely adopted and adapted across various jurisdictions, particularly in the context of complex international trade transactions [4].

Its application, however, remains inconsistent across jurisdictions, as local legal principles, the interpretation of arbitration clauses, and judicial views on party autonomy influence its practical implementation. While some jurisdictions adopt a more expansive approach, readily extending arbitration agreements to non-signatories, others apply the doctrine more cautiously, restricting its use to narrowly defined circumstances [5].

Judicial Interpretation in India: The *Chloro Controls* Case

The Supreme Court of India made a significant ruling in the case of Chloro Controls India vs. Hindustan Construction. In this ruling, the court expanded and extended the original meaning of section 45 of the "Arbitration and Conciliation Act" of 1996, allowing for the inclusion of non-signatory parties in the arbitration process. The Supreme Court ruled that when there is a clear desire to extend the obligation among the non-signatories, particularly in a transaction involving numerous parties and significant work, a third party cannot be prohibited from arbitration. This ruling represents a major change in the direction of addressing the complexities of contemporary business transactions, in which multiple corporate entities are tied together by interwoven agreements [6].

Criteria for Inclusion of Non-Signatories in Arbitration

The incorporation of non-signatories into arbitration pursuant to the Group of Companies Doctrine is governed by specific essential criteria: Initially, a direct affiliation must exist between a non-signatory and the party executing the arbitration agreement, specifically when the non-signatory is a subsidiary, parent, or affiliate within the corporate group. The arbitration issue must directly pertain to the agreement's subject matter, necessitating the involvement of non-signatories for resolution. Moreover, it must be demonstrated that there exists at least an implied desire among the parties to render arbitration binding against non-signatories—an implication that reflects their common intent and comprehension regarding their respective responsibilities and obligations. The agreements being evaluated must be a component of a broader, composite transaction in which the non-signatory's involvement is essential to the fulfilment of the overall contract, so connecting their participation to the implementation of the larger commercial arrangement. Ultimately, the interests of justice must advocate for the participation of non-signatories to guarantee that fairness and equity govern the resolution of the dispute, preventing any unjust outcomes for any party involved. These elements collectively assist in ascertaining whether non-signatories may be obligated by an arbitration agreement pursuant to the Group of Companies Doctrine [4].

The Evolving Jurisprudence of the Group of Companies Doctrine in India

The application of the Group of Companies Doctrine in India remains an evolving area of law. The Chloro Controls decision, although a great step towards introducing modern business practices into arbitration law, leaves many questions about its scope of application.

The approach taken by the Supreme Court, however, by acknowledging the need for flexibility in arbitration agreements, may point to a change in the trend towards a more inclusive and adaptive framework for international commercial arbitration. But, according to P.R. Shah Shares, the Indian judiciary has rarely allowed addition of parties to arbitration, except when the arbitration agreement specifically so provides. This restraint hints at the imperative of ensuring that arbitration remains a consensual procedure and that parties opt for arbitration out of their free will [8].

CONCLUSION

With the passage of the "Arbitration and Conciliation Act" of 1996, India's arbitration laws were modernized, giving arbitral tribunals more independence and reducing the need for court intervention. The question of whether parties who are not signatories to an arbitration agreement should nonetheless be bound to its terms has taken on greater significance in light of the growing difficulty of cross-border business deals. As shown in cases like Chloro Controls, the Group of Companies Doctrine binds all companies in a corporate group to an arbitration agreement, and it may even apply to third-party parties who aren't signatories. Considerations such as the nature of the relationship between the non-signatory and the signatory, the significance of the disagreement, and the parties' desire to include non-signatories in the arbitration process are the foundation for the application of this theory. A step forward in expanding arbitration to include parties who did not sign the contract was demonstrated in the Chloro Controls case. The Indian judicial system has been extremely cautious in this area and has consistently upheld the principle of party autonomy. Indian procedures will adapt to the changing arbitration landscape, balancing modern business realities with fair enforcement of arbitration agreements.

REFERENCES

1. Mahawar, S. (2024, August 9). *Arbitration law in India*. iPleaders. https://blog.ipleaders.in/evolution-arbitration-india-lack-of-professionalism/
2. Mundi, J. (2017). *Rethinking consent in International Commercial Arbitration: A General theory for non-signatories*
3. Indulia, B. (2023, May 4). *The group of Companies doctrine in India – antithetical to free consent? | SCC Times*. SCC Times.
4. Garg, R. (2024, August 5). *Group of companies doctrine - iPleaders*. iPleaders. https://blog.ipleaders.in/group-of-companies-doctrine/
5. Singh, J. (2024, January 19). Doctrine of Group of Companies: An analysis across jurisdictions. *Arbitration & Dispute Resolution - Worldwide*.
6. Mistry, G. (2023, December 20). '*Supreme Court endorses the application of the group of companies doctrine in arbitration - Supreme Court Observer"*. Supreme Court Observer. https://www.scobserver.in/journal/supreme-court-endorses-the-application-of-the-group-of-companies-doctrine-in-arbitration/
7. Kabra, A. (2024, March 14). *Indian Supreme Court endorses the application of the 'Group of Companies' doctrine to join Non-Signatories - Kluwer Arbitration blog*. Kluwer Arbitration Blog.
8. Dubash, S. (2024, February 7). 'Group of companies' doctrine upheld in Indian arbitration law. *Pinsent Masons*.