



The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026

Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

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.

REVISITING THE GROUP OF COMPANIES DOCTRINE IN ARBITRATION: A CASE COMMENTARY ON COX AND KINGS LTD. V. SAP INDIA PVT. LTD.

-Vaishnavi Rekha

ABSTRACT

The Group of Companies Doctrine plays a crucial role in arbitration, allowing, under certain conditions, a non-signatory company that's part of the same corporate family as a signatory to be held to an arbitration agreement. This principle has sparked quite a bit of discussion, as arbitration is all about consent, while companies in a corporate group are recognized as having distinct legal identities.

In the case of Cox & Kings Ltd. v. SAP India Pvt. Ltd., the Supreme Court of India took a close look at the validity and scope of this doctrine. A five-judge Constitution Bench deliberated on whether a non-signatory group company could be compelled to participate in arbitration. The Court ultimately supported the doctrine but made some important clarifications regarding its legal basis. It determined that the doctrine shouldn't rely on the phrase "claiming through or under" found in Sections 8 and 45 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. Instead, its application should hinge on the intentions and actions of the parties involved, as outlined in Section 7. This ruling shifted the emphasis from simply being part of a corporate group to focusing on consent and mutual intention.

CASE DETAILS

Case Name: Cox & Kings Ltd. v. SAP India Pvt. Ltd.

Citation: (2024) 4 SCC 1, 2023 INSC 1051

Court: Supreme Court of India

Bench: Five-Judge Constitution Bench comprising Chief Justice D.Y. Chandrachud, Justice Hrishikesh Roy, Justice P.S. Narasimha, Justice J.B. Pardiwala, and Justice Manoj Misra

Date of judgment: December 6, 2023

Petitioner: Cox & Kings Ltd.

Respondents: SAP India Pvt. Ltd.; SAP SE GmbH

Relevant Law: Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, Section: 2(1)(h), 7, 8, 11, 45

The case reached the Constitution Bench after a three-judge bench expressed doubts concerning the correctness of earlier decisions dealing with the Group of Companies Doctrine.

1

FACTS

Cox & Kings Ltd. entered into a Services General Terms and Conditions Agreement with SAP India on October 30, 2015, which included an arbitration clause. While SAP India signed the agreement, its parent company, SAP SE from Germany, did not. When disputes came up, Cox & Kings aimed to initiate arbitration not just against SAP India, but also against SAP SE.

The key question was whether SAP SE could be included in the arbitration process, despite not being a signatory, due to its connection with SAP India and its supposed involvement in the transaction. This issue was set against the backdrop of previous Indian rulings that recognized the Group of Companies Doctrine. In the case of *Chloro Controls India (P) Ltd. v. Severn Trent Water Purification Inc.*², the Supreme Court ruled that, under certain conditions, a non-signatory from the same corporate group could indeed be held to an arbitration agreement.

However, the evolution of this doctrine sparked debates about party autonomy, the principle of privity of contract, the distinct nature of corporate entities, and the legal foundation of the doctrine itself. As a result, the matter was escalated to a Constitution Bench for a definitive ruling.

¹ Cox & Kings Ltd. v SAP India Pvt. Ltd., (2022) 8 SCC 1

² (2013) 1 SCC 641

ISSUES

The principal issues were:

1. Is the Group of Companies Doctrine recognized under Indian arbitration law?
2. Can this doctrine be supported by the phrase “claiming through or under” found in Sections 8 and 45 of the Arbitration Act?
3. Is it possible for a non-signatory group company to be regarded as a party to an arbitration agreement?
4. Would applying this doctrine infringe upon the principle of separate legal personality of companies?
5. What factors should we take into account when figuring out if a non-signatory intended to be bound by an arbitration agreement?

JUDGMENT

The Constitution Bench has upheld the Group of Companies Doctrine, but it has also provided significant clarification regarding its legal foundation and how it should be applied.

i. Consent is the foundation

The Court made it clear that arbitration is fundamentally rooted in consent. Just because a company is part of the same corporate family as a signatory doesn't mean it can be forced into arbitration.

The crucial question is whether the situation indicates that the non-signatory intended to be bound by the arbitration agreement.

So, simply being part of the same corporate group isn't enough.

ii. “Claiming through or under” isn't the basis

The Court dismissed the idea that the Group of Companies Doctrine is based on the phrase “claiming through or under” found in Sections 8 and 45 of the Arbitration Act³.

³ Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, No. 26, Acts of Parliament, 1996 (India)

This phrase is really about individuals who gain rights from a party involved in the arbitration agreement. Just being in the same corporate group doesn't automatically qualify a company for this category.

The Court clarified that the previous reasoning in *Chloro Controls* was flawed to the extent that it treated this phrase as the legal basis for the doctrine.

iii. Section 7 provides the right framework

The Court situated the doctrine within the context of Section 7, which outlines what constitutes an arbitration agreement.

The lack of a signature doesn't automatically mean there's no agreement, as consent can sometimes be inferred from actions and the context. However, there still needs to be enough evidence to show an intention to be bound.

In this way, the doctrine doesn't remove the need for consent; rather, it offers a way to determine if consent can be inferred from a non-signatory's behavior.

iv. Protection of separate corporate personality

The Court made it clear that the doctrine doesn't lump together companies within the same corporate group as a single legal entity.

Each company retains its own distinct legal personality. This means that the Group of Companies Doctrine is separate from concepts like piercing the corporate veil or the alter ego principle.

The doctrine doesn't overlook the separate identity of the non-signatory. Instead, it looks at whether that company showed a clear intention to engage with and be bound by the arbitration agreement.

v. Factors to consider when applying the doctrine

The Court stated that the decision is based on specific facts. Some relevant factors might include:

- a. Relationship between the signatory and the non-signatory;
- b. Commonality of the subject matter;
- c. Composite nature of the transaction;
- d. How the contract was performed;
- e. Involvement of the non-signatory in negotiations or performance; and
- f. Mutual intentions of the parties.

No single factor is definitive. It's important to look at the circumstances as a whole to figure out if the non-signatory intended to be bound by the arbitration agreement.

The Court also highlighted the principle of kompetenz-kompetenz, suggesting that detailed jurisdictional questions regarding the non-signatory can, when appropriate, be addressed by the arbitral tribunal rather than being fully resolved at the referral stage.

SIGNIFICANCE

This decision marks a pivotal moment for Indian arbitration law for a number of reasons.

To start with, it sheds light on the legal basis of the Group of Companies Doctrine, clarifying its distinction from the phrase "claiming through or under."

Moreover, the ruling emphasizes the importance of consent and mutual intention within the doctrine, reinforcing the principle of party autonomy that lies at the heart of arbitration.

Additionally, the judgment upholds the principle of separate corporate personality, making it clear that a parent company or subsidiary isn't automatically liable for the arbitration obligations of another company in the group.

It also acknowledges the complexities of modern commercial transactions, where large deals often involve multiple related entities. If a non-signatory has played a significant role in negotiating or executing a transaction, overlooking its involvement just because it didn't sign the agreement could undermine the true commercial intentions of the parties involved.

Lastly, this decision aims to avoid unnecessary fragmentation of disputes while ensuring that the convenience of commerce doesn't overshadow the essential need for consent.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS

This judgment represents a significant advancement by striking a balance between the realities of business and the necessity of contractual agreements.

What stands out the most is the Court's emphasis on consent, which ensures that a company isn't dragged into arbitration just because it's part of a corporate group. This approach

safeguards the autonomy of the parties involved. The dismissal of the “single economic entity” theory makes sense, as corporate groups can operate as cohesive units while their individual companies maintain distinct legal identities.

The Court’s clarification between the Group of Companies Doctrine and piercing the corporate veil adds further insight. This doctrine isn’t a loophole to ignore corporate identity; rather, it’s an arbitration principle that helps determine if a non-signatory intended to be bound by the agreement.

That said, some ambiguity still lingers. Elements like shared subject matter, composite transactions, and participation in performance require thorough factual examination, which might lead tribunals to different conclusions. There’s also the risk that mere commercial involvement could be misinterpreted as consent. A parent company might oversee or support its subsidiary without actually wanting to be a party to all its contracts. Thus, commercial participation should be viewed as just one piece of the puzzle, not definitive proof of consent.

In the end, the mutual intention should be the primary focus, with other factors serving only to help clarify that intention.