Legal Consequences of Implementing the Exoneration Clause in Franchise Contracts: Balancing Principles

Suhaila Zulkifli[1] , Teguh Prasetyo[2] ,
Elvira Fitriyani Pakpahan[3] , Willy Tan Jaya [4]

[123]Universitas Prima Indonesia, Indonesia
[4]Universitas Pelita Harapan,Indonesia
tidak ditemukan orcid
suhailazulkifli@unprimdn.ac.id

Abstract. The rise of the franchise business model opened the door for many new opportunities as well as challenges for franchisors and franchisees alike. Importantly, franchise contracts also included exoneration clauses that sought protection for franchisors in some cases. Abstract: This paper aimed at inspecting the legal implications of the insertion of exoneration clauses by franchise contracts, more specifically the balance doctrine. The principle of balance was then the basic legal meaning aiming to maintain equal weight between two contracting parties. This research examined whether the addition of exoneration clauses in franchise agreements influenced the equilibrium of franchisor rights versus franchisee obligations. The article attempted to discuss the legal problems of exoneration clauses through an extensive and critical review of case law, legislation and academic literature, claiming that certain types of exoneration clause are capable of shifting the risk and liability burden unfairly onto the franchisee, are able to do so in a way that is contrary to the good faith and fair dealing expectations under U.S. law with regard to franchises, raise vexing issues related to unconscionability and undue influence, and create unnecessary complications for enforcement and judicial interpretation. This study did not stop at examining the standard franchise agreements, which are already influenced by unequal bargaining positions, often leading to an intrinsic imbalance from which the exoneration clauses cannot be disentangled. Such clauses caused many franchisees to suffer large losses, while providing substantial profits to the franchisors. Based on these findings, it was reasoned that if a franchise agreement is void of the requisite terms and conditions because an exoneration clause was present, the franchise agreement is void and could be canceled. In conclusion, the paper said the enforcement of all the interests should be balanced with the values of franchisees' rights, and that the intrinsic inequality of bargaining power in franchise arrangements should be taken into account. Stakeholder-held recommendations were then made as to how exoneration clauses should be implemented to ensure that such implementation adheres to the balance principle, and continues to foster fairness within the franchise ecosystem..

Keywords: Exoneration clause, Balance Principle, Franchise contracts

1. Introduction

The franchise business model has experienced remarkable growth in recent decades, becoming a dominant force in various industries worldwide. Franchising offers franchisors the opportunity to rapidly expand their business reach, while providing

E. Yafie et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Humanities and Social Science (ICHSS 2024)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 901,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-352-8_28

franchisees with a proven business concept and brand recognition. However, this symbiotic relationship between franchisors and franchisees is often complicated by the inherent power imbalance and the complex legal frameworks governing franchise agreements. Franchise is a unique right owned by way of an individual or commercial enterprise entity to a commercial enterprise system with enterprise traits so that it will market goods and/or offerings which have tested successful and can be utilized and/or utilized by different parties based on a franchise agreement (Article 1 PP No 42, 2007). Franchising is often the first choice when starting a new business and the risk of failure in a franchise business is considered low. Franchising is a machine of relational exchanges wherein the hubfirm (franchisor) and the nearby marketers (franchisees) cooperate to jointly promote a emblem and co-createvalue (Kaufmann, 1988). marketers who select franchising count on to receive managerial guide, while maintaining some level of managerial autonomy. however, the franchisor's aim is to make bigger its commercial enterprise by retaining service-uniformity, even on the price of franchisee autonomy. As a result, tensions and disputes may arise among franchisees and franchisors. Contracts are vitally essential to the governance of inter-organizational relationships (Heide, 1998). Serving as an critical opportunity to possession or integration, they enable the allocation of decision control as formal authority between enterprise partners, because the terms of a franchise contracts are not contained in the Civil Code.

The franchise contract is a critical document that governs the relationship between franchisor and franchisee, emphasizing the principle of balance to safeguard the interests of both parties; as highlighted by Klein (2020), clear and transparent contracts are essential to avoid disputes, while Smith (2019) notes that one-sided clauses, particularly those related to damages, may be declared invalid, reinforcing the need for fairness. Additionally, Adams (2020) stresses the importance of protecting franchisees from overly restrictive provisions to foster equitable conditions and promote their success.

The principle of balance in the franchise contract has several important objectives, namely the principle of balance encourages harmonious cooperation between the franchisor and franchisee. A good relationship will improve brand performance and reputation (Brown, 2018). The principle of balance in the contract helps reduce potential disputes between the parties involved. Uncertainty in contract terms is often a major cause of conflict, and by promoting clarity, this risk can be minimized (Hoffman, 2018). If franchisees feel protected and equitably treated, they are more apt to invest in business evolution according to Dant and Grünhagen in 2018. The application of parity in franchising accords carries sizeable lawful and practical consequences. Courts often weigh the balance in contracts when settling disputes. Provisions seen as disproportionate may be invalidated as (Williams, 2022). Therefore, it's vital for franchisors and franchisees to comprehend and employ this concept in every facet of their legal contracts..

A debatable part of franchise agreements is the inclusion of exoneration clauses aiming to curb the accountability of franchisors in some scenarios. These provisions aim to shield franchisors from lawful responsibility, even in cases where their behaviors or omissions may have added to the franchisee's deficits or damages. While franchisors argue exoneration clauses are necessary to oversee risk and safeguard the total franchise system, franchisees regularly view them as unfair and unfavorable to their interests. The balance principle is a fundamental lawful notion that seeks to confirm equity and fairness between contracting parties. This precept is particularly pertinent inside the context of franchising pacts, in which the power dynamics and asymmetric info among franchisors and franchisees can generate large disparities. The execution of exoneration clauses within franchise contracts raises critical queries on the legal consequences and the degree to which they align with the balance principle. this newsletter presents a complete examination of the prison implications of imposing exoneration clauses in franchise contracts, with a selected recognition at the stability principle. via an in-intensity analysis of applicable case law, rules, and academic literature, the examine explores the numerous methods wherein exoneration clauses can effect the rights and duties of franchisors and franchisees, as well as the broader legal and ethical considerations surrounding this issue.

The application of the principles in the contracts particularly, freedom of settlement, consensualism, binding energy, and right religion is reflected in the growing prevalence of exoneration clauses in standard contracts. As previously mentioned, the principle of balancing the parties limits the binding force of these principles. The franchise contract contains a transfer or even a release of one party's responsibility. The concept of balance in the bargaining position between franchisors and Franchisees has a high likelihood of not being fulfilled. Franchise contracts, which are typical contracts with an exoneration clause, can undermine the stability of the existence of the principle of balance. The established order course of action is portrayed with the aid of a legally binding connection between a franchisor and a franchisee, wherein the franchisor awards the franchisee the option to make use of the franchisor's laid out commercial enterprise framework, emblem, and certified innovation in go back for an expense and progressing eminences. This intricate partnership is governed by a detailed franchise arrangement that outlines the privileges, duties, and commitments of both sides. The equilibrium standard is a fundamental lawful idea that seeks to ensure fairness and proportion between contracting gatherings. In the setting of franchise understandings, the balance standard is particularly huge because of the intrinsic force imbalance and data deficiencies that regularly exist between franchisors and franchisees. Franchisors, as the prevailing gathering in the relationship, typically have more extensive bargaining power, access to assets, and mastery in the business. Franchisees, then again, are regularly littler, less experienced enterprises that depend on the franchisor's direction and backing to set up and work their franchise units. This intensity imbalance can bring about the incorporation of contractual terms, for example, exoneration sections, that decidedly support the advantages of the franchisor. The balance principle requires that the terms of the franchise agreement, including the inclusion of exoneration clauses, do not unduly or unfairly burden the franchisee or undermine the fundamental fairness of the contractual arrangement. It appears to guarantee that the freedoms and commitments of the two players are adjusted and that neither one of the gatherings is uncovered to absurd or unjustifiable phrases. by looking at the legitimate outcomes of wearing out exemption situations in established order contracts from the perspective of the equilibrium trendy, this have a look at expects to provide reviews into the difficulties and contemplations that emerge while endeavoring to strike a fair and evenhanded concord among the hobbies of franchisors and franchisees.

Exemption provisos, in any other case known as restriction of responsibility statements, are legally binding preparations that try and limit or bar the obligation of 1 birthday party (for this case, the franchisor) for specific types of misfortunes or harms due to the opposite birthday party (the franchisee). These clauses are commonly found in franchise agreements and are often a source of contention between franchisors and franchisees. Franchisors contend that exoneration sections are important to oversee the dangers inherent in the franchise demonstrate and for ensure the general soundness and consistency of the foundation system. They contend that these sections permit them to zero in on framework broad activities and advances without dread of out of proportion obligation emerging from singular franchisee issues or disappointments.For instance, in a specific case, the court ruled that the franchisor’s delivery clause was excessively wide and unjust to the franchisee, and it was invalidated. This case shows the significance of cautiously drafting sections to meet pertinent lawful standards. The application of this exoneration section gives lawful insurance to the franchisor from cases that may emerge from the franchisee's activities, yet this exoneration section is not excluded from the danger of misuse. On the off chance that this section is excessively wide, it can be viewed as an endeavor to maintain a strategic distance from duty, which can welcome lawful difficulties. The courts regularly audit the fairness and proportionality of the section in the setting of relevant law (Bennett, 2015).

Then again, franchisees take a gander at exoneration sections as inequitable and excessively troublesome, as they successfully move the hazard and obligation weight onto the franchisee, even in circumstances where the franchisor's activities or oversights may have added to the franchisee's misfortunes. Franchisees contend that these sections undermine the harmony of privileges and commitments inside the franchise relationship and can bring about unconscionable results (Smith, 2018). The lawful legitimacy and translation of exoneration sections in franchise agreements can differ essentially over various legal systems. A few nations and states have presented explicit administration or directions to oversee the utilization of such segments, while others depend on the general standards of contract law and the idea of unconscionability to assess their legitimacy and application (Johnson, 2020). Exoneration sections may limit the franchisee's privilege to guarantee harms for misfortunes brought about by the franchisor's carelessness. In a few cases, this may cause disrespect to franchisees who may endure generous misfortunes (Williams, 2017). The execution of this section along these lines must think about the harmony between the insurance of the franchisor and the privileges of the franchisee. Courts regularly consider whether the section is adjusted and doesn't put the franchisee in an excessively powerless position (Adams, 2019).

As an example, the Franchise Rule of the Federal trade commission inside the united states of america mandates that franchisors include in their franchise disclosure files information about the terms and situations of any exoneration clauses. Additionally, several states have enacted laws that either limit the enforceability of these clauses or impose specific requirements for their inclusion in franchise agreements. Likewise, within the european association, the european Mandate primarily based on Out of line conditions in patron agreements has been deciphered to limit the usage of exemption provisos in status quo preparations, mainly wherein they may be taken into consideration to make a big unevenness within the privileges and commitments of the contracting parties. The legal consequences of implementing exoneration clauses in franchise contracts are, therefore, heavily dependent on the specific legal and regulatory frameworks within the relevant jurisdiction. The equilibrium guiding principle assumes a urgent part in assessing the decency and enforceability of those provisos, because it calls for a careful assessment of the general equilibrium of the legally binding connection between the franchisor and the franchisee.

2. Research Method

This research paper employs a normative juridical method, by collecting data in the form of laws, regulations, legal theories and concepts to find out the legal consequences of exoneration clauses in franchise agreements based on the principle of balance (Dworkin, 1986). The research illuminated the ways in which illegal exoneration clauses erode franchise deals. Such terms, if included means formal agreement has no effect, because insufficient guidelines (Hadfield, 1990). This analytical approach sought to help to establish a concrete understanding of the legal implications of stipulations of exoneration and the potential balancing of principles that may occur in practice.

3. Result and Discussion

The Impact of Exoneration Clauses on the Balance Principle

It spread commercially almost through franchise model. It presents opportunities and challenges for owners and operators (Rubin, 1978). However, these exoneration provisions can curb franchisor liability in some cases (Brickley et al., 1991). A New Franchise Contract That Focuses on Fair Treatment: A Look at Exoneration After the Fact Due to the rather central notion of balance providing fairness between the signatories (Macneil, 1980). When one has power over the other, as in franchising, it becomes particularly salient (Hadfield, 1990). On the other hand, balance requires that the allocation of rights and duties be equal in quantity to avoid preferences and also harm (Rubin, 1988). Most studies examined the legal effects of exoneration and balance aspects (Brickley et al., 1991; Rubin, 1988; Hadfield, 1990). To that end, these provisions may unduly transfer risk and liability to franchisees (Brickley et al., 1991), violate the principles of good faith and fair dealing essential to contracts (Macneil, 1980), raise concerns about unconscionability and as to contract standards of precariousness (Rubin, 1988), make contracts difficult to enforce and render interpretation (Hadfield, 1990. Terms such as these will often tip the balance away from residential tenants, a dynamic that is not disentanglable from these or any other exempt or limited liability provisions in standard contracts between asymmetric parties (Rubin, 1988). This type of provisions could penalize franchisees severely and enrich owners (Brickley et al., 1991).

Balancing Legitimate Interests and Protecting Franchisees

The paper concludes by discussing it is essential to find an equilibrium between the rightful interests of franchisors and the safeguarding of franchisees, particularly given the natural power imbalance. imbalance that often characterizes franchise arrangements (Rubin, 1988). Recommendations are provided for policymakers, legal practitioners, and franchise industry stakeholders to ensure that the implementation of exoneration clauses aligns with the balance principle and promotes fairness within the franchise ecosystem (Hadfield, 1990).

The legal consequences of implementing exoneration clauses in franchise contracts are complex and multifaceted, with various legal principles and doctrines coming into play. Some of the main legal issues and aspects regarding this topic include unconscionability, undue influence, good faith and fair dealing, as well as statutory and regulatory frameworks.

The courts can refuse to enforce contract terms under the doctrine of unconscionability when they are so unfair, one-sided, or shocking as to be seen as gross injustice. In franchising, exoneration clauses may be invalidated on the basis of unconscionability, where they impose an onerous burden on the franchisee or similar (related to public policy) would render the contract the meeting of the minds unfair. Franchisees may contend that they were only persuaded to accept such provisions as a result of the inequitable bargaining power wielded by the franchisor (Korobkin, 1994; Kessler, 1943). Implied in all contractual relationships is a duty of good faith and fair dealing which requires the parties to act honest and fairly with one another. This duty may be challenged by the use of exoneration clauses to the contrary. In the past few years, certain jurisdictions have enacted laws and/or rules restricting the use of exoneration clauses in franchise agreements. This is because legal regimes influence the enforceability and interpretation of clauses in fundamental ways, with some jurisdictions entailing either purely mandatory or wholly discretionary rules as to whether they will be included (Craswell, 1993; Trebilcock, 1993).

And careful examination is often needed with regard to the public policy implications of liability waivers in franchise agreements. These KOA practices also warrant scrutiny for their equitable treatment of owners throughout the system, as well as consumer impact and broader economic effects (Macneil, 1980; Farber & Matheson, 1985). The difference between jurisdictions in respect of legislation, regulations and case law makes consistency difficult to achieve for operators acting across jurisdictions. The placement of the burden of proof and the level of evidence required affect results and litigation strategies in disputes between brand owners and franchisees. This makes it hard to balance the interests of the network with the interest of franchisees so partaking in these dynamics requires granular analysis. These substantial challenges can only be properly addressed through well-rounded comprehension of legal doctrines, statutes and relationship dynamics (Sternlight, 1996; Stempel, 1990).

The need to strike a balance between protecting the legitimate interests of franchisors while at the same time, ensuring that franchisees do not till 2023 endbear more than a control outspending in any event, should carefully appoint exoneration provision in the franchise contracts. Franchisors cite that clauses like these are essential in minimizing potential risks to their business model and ensuring a streamlined operation. However, franchisees see exoneration clauses as biased against them, effectively imposing liability with partners even where a franchisor's negligence contributed to damages. The preeminent principle that governs the legal consequences of exculpatory clauses, therefore, his the balance principle, whereby fairness between contracting parties is the prime consideration. In Morrison v. Jani-King, improper training by the franchisor caused the franchisee severe financial harm but an exoneration clause limited the franchisor's responsibility and placed all the blame on the franchisee. The Morrison case demonstrates proportionality of factors in the inter-relationship of franchisor/franchisee. It highlights the importance of franchisee protection and provides notice of restriction against the use of exoneration clauses. This also suggests that provisions that unilaterally place the onus of liability on one party perhaps will be deemed void regardless if the parties are negotiating from an even playing field.

And therefore, to reach a just equilibrium, the following recommendations are made:

That said, when considering general regulations regulating broad exoneration clauses, policymakers need to exercise caution, as these contractual terms are the product of a subtle negotiation between franchisor control and franchisee independence (Hadfield, 1990; Rubin, 1978). Instead of restricting rules, thoughtful guidelines that establish equitable principles would serve the relationship best (Sternlight, 1996; Stempel, 1990). They must give that clause equitable scrutiny, use its close family members (such as unconscionability) but not completely overgeneralize the analysis and disrupt the fragile equilibrium within the relation (Macaulay, 1963; Macneil, 1980).

Franchisors should consider providing meaningful upfront education identifying the rights and responsibilities of parties to their agreements. Promoting an understanding franchisee motivated to make decisions in their best interests and that of their personal risk tolerance Interactions/governance between industry stakeholders are defined by constructive dialogue that can bring forth collaborative solutions considering everyone involved,(Farber & Matheson, 1985; Macaulay, 1963). Franchisors want to mitigate risk to a reasonable point; franchisees have their own goals and plans; only an approach that recognizes those competing interests can ultimately aid sustainable growth of the system. A nuanced view of the franchisee-relationship along with caution in exoneration clauses and related implications can help address the need for balance between franchisor and franchisee so that its usage is consistent with the commitment to equity in franchise relationships. Equity, informed choice and collaborative solutions are the best way forward

4. Conclusion

The paper explored the legal implications of incorporating exoneration clauses into franchise contracts, especially in terms of the balance principle. The Exoneration Clauses Within Franchise Contracts and Reasons for Concern – This one is the best of the bunch as the author did an in-depth examination of exoneration clauses within franchise contracts. Such clauses can place an inordinate amount of risk and liability uniquely on the franchisees.

These broad or unreasonably strict exoneration clauses could detract from the anti-derivative rights and obligations of the franchisor-franchisee relationship if franchisors are able to hold franchisees liable for losses necessarily arising from the actions, at least in part, of franchisors. A violation of the most basic expectation of good faith handling could put the fairness and validity of a contract in jeopardy." These provisions are often considered disadvantageous, especially when franchisees are under pressure or at a significant disadvantage to the franchisor. This would mean that some exoneration clauses might be rendered invalid or unenforceable only to some extent.

On the one hand, there is significant uncertainty as to whether exoneration clauses will ever be enforced since interpretation and enforcement of these clauses differ between jurisdictions, and it is difficult to maintain the principle of balance between the parties. Aligning exoneration clause usage with the balance principle is integral to creating a more equitable franchise landscape. Policymakers and legal experts need to thoughtfully weigh implications and take steps to protect franchisees from unfair practices. Taking into account the interests of franchisors as well as those of franchisees creates a more sustainable and fair structure for the franchise system.

References

Adams, R. (2019). The Importance of Transparency in Franchise Contracts. Journal of Franchise Law, 12(3), 45-58.

Burton, S. J. (1980). Breach of Contract and the Common Law Duty to Perform in Good Faith. Harvard Law Review, 94(2), 369-403.

Bennett, T. (2015). Exoneration Clauses in Franchise Agreements: A Legal Perspective. Franchise Law Review, 8(2), 30-40.

Brown, T. (2018). The Role of Transparency in Franchise Relationships. Franchise Insights, 11(3), 50-62

Craswell, R. (1993). Remedies When Contracts Fail: The Case of Fraud or Breach of Warranty. The Journal of Legal Studies, 22(1), 215-243.

Dant, R. P., & Grünhagen, M. (2018). Innovation in Franchising: Challenges and Opportunities. Journal of Business Venturing, 33(4), 345-359.

Farber, D. A., & Matheson, J. H. (1985). Beyond Promissory Estoppel: Contract Law and the "Invisible Handshake". The University of Chicago Law Review, 52(4), 903-947.

Hadfield, G. K. (1990). Problematic Relations: Franchising and the Law of Incomplete Contracts. Stanford Law Review, 42(4), 927-992.

Johnson, L. (2020). Balancing Interests in Franchise Contracts: The Role of Exoneration Clauses. International Franchise Journal, 15(1), 22-35.

Kessler, F. (1943). Contracts of Adhesion - Some Thoughts About Freedom of Contract. Columbia Law Review, 43(5), 629-642.

Korobkin, R. (1994). Bounded Rationality, Standard Form Contracts, and Unconscionability. The University of Chicago Law Review, 70(4), 1203-1295

Klein, S. (2020). Protecting Franchisee Rights in Contract Negotiations. Franchise Law Journal, 12(4), 37-50.

Kaufmann, P. J., & Stern, L. W. (1988). Relational exchange norms, perceptions of unfairness, andretained hostility in commercial litigation.Journal of Conflict Resolution,32(3), 534–552 https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002788032003007

Macaulay, S. (1963). Non-Contractual Relations in Business: A Preliminary Study. American Sociological Review, 28(1), 55-67.

Macneil, I. R. (1980). The New Social Contract: An Inquiry into Modern Contractual Relations. Yale University Press.

Rubin, P. H. (1978). The Theory of the Firm and the Structure of the Franchise Contract. The Journal of Law and Economics, 21(1), 223-233.

Stempel, J. W. (1990). Arbitration, Unconscionability, and the Problem of Preexisting Agreements. Nevada Law Journal, 12(2), 442-471.

Sternlight, J. R. (1996). Rethinking the Constitutionality of the Supreme Court's Preference for Binding Arbitration: A Fresh Assessment of Jury Trial, Separation of Powers, and Due Process Concerns. Nebraska Law Review, 72(3), 677-763.

Summers, R. S. (1968). "Good Faith" in General Contract Law and the Sales Provisions of the Uniform Commercial Code. Virginia Law Review, 54(2), 195-267.

Williams, K. (2017). Consumer Protection Laws and Franchise Agreements. Law and Business Review, 9(1), 15-25.