BLOGS

Carlill v. Carbolic Smokeball Case: Landmark Case on Enforceability of Unilateral Contracts

Khushi Malviya · 22 May 2025

Carlill v. Carbolic Smokeball Case confirmed that a public advertisement can be a unilateral contract offer, accepted by performing the specified act. Read more here!

Edit Introduction Facts Issues Unilateral Contract Judgement Analysis Conclusion

Introduction

Carlill v. Carbolic Smokeball Case is a landmark English contract law case that established the important principles regarding the formation of contracts, especially in the context of unilateral contracts. This case is renowned for its unique subject matter and significant legal implications.



[Source: Taken from Wikipedia]

Facts of the Case

In 1891, the Carbolic Smokeball Company placed an advertisement in newspapers claiming that their product, the “Carbolic Smoke Ball”, would prevent colds and influenza if used as directed—three times daily for two weeks.

They also offered a £100 reward to anyone who contracted influenza despite using their product, backing this promise with a £1000 deposit in the bank. Lilli Carlill purchased the smoke ball, used it as instructed, and later caught the flu. She then sought to claim the £100 reward from the company as advertised.

Issues Identified

The main issue in Carlill v. Carbolic Smoke Ball Company was whether the company’s advertisement promising a £100 reward for anyone who used their product as directed and still contracted influenza constituted a legally binding promise or mere sales puffery. The issues raised included:

1) Whether there was a binding contract?

2) Whether formal acceptance notification was necessary?

3) Whether Mrs. Carlill needed to communicate her acceptance?

4) Whether she provided consideration for the reward?

Concept of Unilateral Contract

A unilateral contract, as exemplified in Carlill v. Carbolic, involves an offer made to the public at large where acceptance is demonstrated through performance rather than formal communication.

This type of contract poses challenges under traditional contract law principles, particularly concerning consideration. Typically, consideration, or something of value exchanged between parties, is essential for a contract’s validity. In unilateral contracts, however, only one party (the promisor) makes a promise, usually offering a reward or benefit upon fulfillment of specified conditions by the other party (the offeree).

The offeree’s performance, such as using a product or providing information, constitutes acceptance. Despite concerns that unilateral contracts lack mutual obligations and therefore

consideration, courts recognize them when the promisor's promise is clear, the conditions for acceptance are specified, and performance constitutes acceptance.

Carlill v. Carbolic Smokeball case underscores how courts interpret and enforce such contracts based on the clarity of the offer and the promisor's intent to be bound by specific terms advertised to the public.

Judgement of Carlill v. Carbolic Smokeball Case

The Court of Appeal ruled in favor of Mrs. Carlill. The judgment was delivered by Bowen LJ, with Lindley LJ and A.L. Smith LJ concurring.

The English Court of Appeals unanimously dismissed the defendant's appeal, affirming that Mrs. Carlill was entitled to recover £100. The court held that despite advertisements typically being viewed as mere puffery not intended to create legal obligations, the company's specific promise backed by a £1000 deposit in a bank demonstrated sincerity and transformed the advertisement into a binding unilateral contract.

Justice Lindley emphasized that the advertisement constituted an express promise to pay £100 to anyone who used the smoke ball as directed and still contracted influenza, without requiring prior notification of acceptance.

He reasoned that Mrs. Carlill's act of purchasing and using the smoke ball constituted sufficient consideration, benefiting the company through sales and involving inconvenience to the consumer, thus fulfilling the requirements for a valid contract. Justices Bowen and Smith concurred, highlighting the public nature of the offer and the company's deposited funds as indicators of their commitment to fulfilling the promise.

Breakdown of the Judgement

This case is pivotal in contract law for establishing the enforceability of unilateral contracts based on advertisements.

Offer: The court held that the advertisement was a clear offer to the public. It was specific enough to constitute an offer because it outlined the terms of the reward and the conditions under which it would be paid.

Acceptance: Mrs. Carlill's use of the smoke ball in the manner prescribed in the advertisement constituted acceptance of the offer. Acceptance was complete when she performed the conditions set out in the offer.

Intention to Create Legal Relations: The court found that the deposit of £1,000 in the bank was evidence of the company's intention to be bound by the contract. This showed that the offer was not merely a sales gimmick or a "mere puff."

Consideration: Mrs. Carlill provided consideration by going through the inconvenience and potential harm of using the smoke ball as directed.

Benefit to Promisor: Although the court noted that the consideration need not necessarily benefit the promisor, the increased sales and publicity gained from the advertisement could be seen as a benefit.

Notification of Acceptance: The court held that in unilateral contracts, notification of acceptance is not required. Acceptance is completed by performing the conditions of the offer.

Conclusion

Carlill v. Carbolic Smokeball case remains a foundational case in contract law, clarifying the enforceability of unilateral contracts arising from advertisements. It demonstrates that advertisements can constitute offers when they include specific promises and indications of sincerity, such as financial deposits. The case highlights the importance of clarity and intention in contractual communications, ensuring that even unconventional forms of offers can lead to binding agreements when the essential elements of offer, acceptance, and consideration are present.

Read More: Types of Contracts