OVERHEADS, LOSS OF PROFIT, AND LOSS OF PROFITABILITY IN PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS: A TECHNO-LEGAL ANALYSIS OF EMPIRICAL QUANTIFICATION AND PROCEDURAL CHALLENGES IN INDIA

BY DR. RAM KISHAN RAO CHILAPPAGARI[1], ANANTA KOTI PADMANABHA RAO VADLADI[2], SRI VENKATA NARAYANA VUPPU[3], & SMT. MANASA PANGANAMALA[4]

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the legal and technical framework governing infrastructure development in India, with a focus on contractual obligations, arbitration, and engineering standards. It establishes a comprehensive framework for dispute resolution by integrating constitutional principles with the statutory provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872,[5] and the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.[6] The analysis emphasises adherence to technical manuals, including the Andhra Pradesh Detailed Standard Specifications[7] and the Standard Data Book for Analysis of Road Construction Rates,[8] to ensure fiscal accountability.

This study proposes a "Reverse Calculation Method" derived from MoRTH and CPWD models, replacing speculative formulas with project-specific data and sector-standard caps to quantify prolongation and terminal breach damages. Ancillary claims—including idling costs, design mix variances, and payment delays—are standardised under a "Doctrine of Continuity". Integrating statutory requirements with technical protocols, this approach mitigates litigation risk and enhances public works delivery in a legally sustainable manner.

[1] The author (I) is an Arbitrator and Engineer-in-Chief (R&B) (Retd.).
[2] The author (II) is a Chief Engineer (R&B) (Retd.)
[3] The author (III) is a Superintending Engineer (R&B) (Retd.)
[4] The author (IV) is an Advocate.
[5] The Indian Contract Act, No. 9 of 1872.
[6] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, No. 26 of 1996.
[7] PADALA RAMA REDDI & PADALA SRINIVASA REDDY, *A.P. Detailed Standard Specifications and General Principles of Engineering Contracts* (16th ed., Asia Law House 2022).
[8] INDIAN ROADS CONGRESS, *Standard Data Book for Analysis of Road Construction Rates,* Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (2d Rev. ed. 2019).

Keywords: Public Infrastructure; Contract Law; Arbitration; Delay Damages; Overheads; Loss of Profit; Loss of Profitability; Engineering Standards; Statutory Compliance; Reverse Calculation Method.

1 INTRODUCTION

India's ambition to emerge as the world's third-largest economy by 2028 is closely tied to the timely execution of infrastructure projects. However, persistent delays in public works continue to undermine this objective. While such delays are often attributed to administrative inefficiencies, funding constraints, and regulatory bottlenecks, their most immediate consequence is the proliferation of legal disputes concerning the quantification of "Overheads" and "Loss of Profit".

Historically, the governing framework for such works—notably the *Andhra Pradesh Detailed Standard Specifications* (APDSS)—[9] was rooted in colonial principles of sovereign immunity, which barred compensation for delays. As infrastructure projects grew in complexity, this "fixed-price" silence was replaced by a fragmented "G.O. Regime", characterised by ad-hoc executive interventions. This transition, while intended to offer relief, has resulted in a "dual-track" system comprising (i) formal contractual frameworks such as APDSS, and (ii) discretionary executive interventions through Government Orders (G.Os.). The absence of uniform standards governing such discretion often leads to inconsistent treatment of similarly situated contractors, raising concerns of unequal application of law under Article 14 of the Constitution of India.[10]

When these projects stall, contractors invariably seek damages under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872.[11] In the absence of a standardised domestic mechanism for quantification, the arbitral tribunals and courts have frequently turned to international formulas—namely *Hudson*, *Emden*, and *Eichleay*. However, recent judicial pronouncements have signalled a paradigm shift: formula-based estimation is no longer treated as a substitute for substantiated proof of actual loss. The judiciary now requires a clear distinction between "loss of profit," arising from unlawful

[9] APDSS, 2022.
[10] INDIA CONST. art. 14.
[11] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 73.

termination, and "loss of profitability," resulting from project prolongation, with claimants expected to provide detailed, project-specific evidence, including proof of lost business opportunities and measurable financial impact.

This article critiques the systemic reliance on these speculative international models. It proposes adopting the *Standard Data Book for Analysis of Road Construction Rates* issued by the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) as the primary evidentiary standard.[12] By leveraging the empirical data inherent in the original tender rates, this research demonstrates that a "Reverse Calculation Method" offers a more transparent, predictable, and constitutionally sound framework for quantifying damages in domestic arbitration.

2 RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

2.1 Scope of the Study

The research is delineated to ensure a focused analysis of the legal mechanisms governing claims relating to overheads, loss of profit, and loss of profitability in infrastructure projects. The prolongation of projects beyond the originally stipulated period constitutes a recurring concern in the Indian context and forms a critical basis for such claims. The study is strictly confined to domestic arbitration, where the substantive law of India applies.

The analysis scrutinises judicial pronouncements from the Supreme Court and various High Courts as benchmarks for principles, statutory interpretation, and evidentiary standards. Furthermore, it studies how the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) integrate Overheads and Profit during the derivation of final rates, which subsequently forms the empirical basis for contractor bidding.

2.2 Objectives of the Study

[12] IRC, *Standard Data Book for Analysis of Road Construction Rates*, supra note 4.

The primary objective of this research is to evaluate whether Indian courts have maintained consistency in applying principles related to overhead, loss of profit, and profitability claims. It seeks to determine whether judicial adjudication prioritises strict contractual interpretation or invokes equitable considerations to supplement or override contractual terms. Additionally, the study aims to examine the viability of domestic analysis of rate as a more suitable alternative to international formulas.

2.3 Significance of the Study

This study contributes to construction and arbitration law by addressing the lack of standardisation in damage quantification. It highlights the fiscal risks associated with speculative and non-evidentiary assessment models and proposes an empirically grounded alternative. By aligning damage quantification with actual tender conditions, the study aims to reduce arbitral inconsistency, prevent inflated claims, and ensure compliance with statutory requirements under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872.[13]

2.4 Period of Study

The period of study commences in 1984, the year in which the Supreme Court formally recognised the right of a contractor to claim damages due to the illegal rescission of a contract by the opposing party. The analysis extends through to the present, capturing the contemporary evolution of evidentiary benchmarks and the shifting reliance on mathematical formulas.

2.5 The Speculative Paradigm: Critique of International Formulas

The prevailing reliance on international formulas reflects a broader shift from evidence-based adjudication to approximation-based quantification. This section critiques that shift by examining the assumptions and limitations of these models. In the absence of a codified domestic standard, Indian arbitral tribunals have frequently imported three primary international models to quantify

[13] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 73.

"Overheads" and "Loss of Profit". These formulas represent the current speculative benchmark that this research seeks to replace with an empirical MoRTH-based framework.

2.5.1 *Mathematical Definitions*

2.5.1.1 *The Hudson formula (United Kingdom)*

The Hudson formula determines head office overheads and profit in claims arising from delays in construction contracts by applying the tender percentage to the original contract sum, allocating it across the contract period, and correlating it to the duration of the delay.

> Head Office Overheads and Profit = [(OVERHEADS%) / 100] × [(Contract Sum) / (Contract Period)] × (Period of Delay)

The variables utilised in this formula are defined as follows:

> OVERHEADS %: The percentage for head office overheads and profit used in the original tender.
>
> Contract Sum: Total tender value.
>
> Contract Period: Original time for completion in weeks or days.
>
> Period of Delay: The period for which the contractor is entitled to compensation.

This is the most commonly adopted approach in Indian arbitration; it relies on the overhead percentage in the original tender without verifying whether it corresponds to actual costs incurred during the period of delay.

2.5.1.2 *The Emden formula (UK)*

The Emden formula proceeds on a premise similar to the Hudson formula, relying on the contractor's actual head office overhead and profit percentage during the relevant period rather than the tender percentage.

Head Office Overheads and Profit = [(Actual OVERHEADS&P %) / 100] X [(Contract Sum) / (Contract Period)] x (Period of Delay)

Where;

Actual OVERHEADS&P % = The percentage for head office overheads and profit actually incurred during the original contract period.

Contract Sum = Total tender value.

Contract Period = Original time for completion in weeks or days.

Period of Delay = The period for which the contractor is entitled to compensation.

While this approach improves accuracy by relying on actual financial data, its application depends on the contractor's ability to produce audited, project-specific accounting records.

2.5.1.3 *The Eichleay formula (United States)*

The Eichleay formula is a three-step method for calculating unabsorbed head office overheads, especially where a project is suspended. Unlike the Hudson and Emden models, it is based on the ratio of the specific contract's billings to the contractor's total billings during the contract period.

Step 1: Allocable Overhead = [(Contract Billings) / (Total Billings for Contract Period)] X Total Overhead for Contract Period

Step 2: Daily Overhead = Allocable Overhead / Days of Performance

Step 3: Amount of Claim = Daily Overhead X Days of Delay

While these three models—Hudson, Emden, and Eichleay—are the primary mechanisms utilised globally to estimate head office overheads and loss of profit, they are inherently retrospective. Their utility in Indian arbitration often depends on the quality of the financial records maintained and produced by the Contractor as evidence, and the tribunal's willingness to accept the underlying

assumption of linear overhead distribution. As the following comparative analysis illustrates, the choice of formula is rarely neutral and often dictates the quantum of the eventual award.

2.5.2 *Comparative Analysis of Quantification Models*

While each of the aforementioned formulas provides a mathematical basis for quantifying loss, their application varies significantly depending on the evidentiary standards required by arbitral tribunals. The table below delineates the core parameters, underlying logic, and the practical challenges associated with employing these international models within the Indian construction landscape.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Global Quantification Models for Delay Damages

No.	Parameter	Hudson	Emden	Eichleay
(1)	*(2)*	*(3)*	*(4)*	*(5)*
1	Origin	United Kingdom (1903)	United Kingdom (1975)	United States of America (1980)
2	Applicability	Used as a proxy for overheads when exact losses are difficult to quantify	Used when a Contractor can prove actual institutional overheads incurred	Calculates unabsorbed overheads for projects under total suspension.
3	Popularity in India	High; frequently adopted by tribunals as a standard “rule of thumb”.	Moderate; gaining traction as tribunals demand more forensic evidence.	Low; rarely applied due to the strict proof-of-standby requirement.

4	Indian Case Law	*M/s. Dwaraka Das Agarwal v. State of M.P.*; *Associated Engineering Co. v. Government of A.P.*	*National Highways Authority of India v. Som Datt Builders*; *K.N. Sathyapalan v. State of Kerala*.	*Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. v. L.K. Ahuja*; *Delhi Development Authority v. U.C. Construction*.
5	Merits	Simplicity in calculation reduces the evidentiary burden on the Contractor.	Higher forensic accuracy; it relies on verified accounting records.	Mathematically robust; effectively allocates fixed head office costs.
6	Demerits	Lacks empirical grounding; risks "double recovery" by ignoring actual cost fluctuations.	High evidentiary threshold; requires transparent disclosure of historical financial data.	Administratively intensive; requires the rigorous calculation of aggregate firm-wide billings and is restricted to instances of complete, indefinite project suspension.

2.5.3 *Discussion: Limitations within the Indian Public Works Context*

The application of these Western-origin formulas in Indian infrastructure projects faces significant legal and procedural hurdles, often rendering them incompatible with domestic regulatory requirements.

2.5.3.1 *Proof of loss*

Under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act,[14] compensation is contingent upon proof of actual loss, and formulas serve only as secondary aids rather than primary evidence. The Administrative Tribunals increasingly reject claims where these formulas are pleaded in isolation without supporting documentary evidence of actual expenditure. Judicial trends, including decisions such as *M/s. Dwaraka Das Agarwal v. State of Madhya Pradesh*[15] and *K.N. Sathyapalan v. State of Kerala*,[16] reflect an increasing reluctance to award damages based solely on theoretical calculations in the absence of demonstrable loss.

2.5.3.2 *MoRTH contradiction*

The Standard Data Book typically governs Indian highway contracts and is used to analyse Road Construction Rates issued by the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH). This manual explicitly allocates specific percentages for head office overheads and profit within the base item rates. Applying a "Hudson percentage" on top of these already enhanced rates risks unlawful "double-counting" of costs, thereby inflating claims and resulting in potential double recovery, which is inconsistent with the contractual pricing structure.

2.5.3.3 *Standby fallacy*

The Eichleay formula assumes that the Contractor is in "total standby", with resources frozen and unavailable for redeployment. In the context of Indian infrastructure projects, work frequently continues in fragmented patches despite delays. This operational reality renders the "all-or-nothing" assumption of the Eichleay model both factually unsustainable and economically inaccurate in the Indian public works context.

[14] *Id.*
[15] *M/s. Dwaraka Das Agarwal v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, (1999) 3 SCC 500.
[16] *K.N. Sathyapalan v. State of Kerala*, (2007) 13 SCC 43.

2.6 Proposed Empirical Framework: The MoRTH Standard Data Book

Given the inherent limitations of international formulas in the Indian public works sector, a more robust methodology necessitates an alignment with the MoRTH *Standard Data Book for Analysis of Road Construction Rates*. Unlike retrospective, formulaic estimations, the *Standard Data Book for Analysis of Road Construction Rates* provides an empirical, item-rate-based foundation that reflects the actual cost structure of Indian road construction. By leveraging the specific overhead and profit allocations already codified within the SDB, arbitrators can move toward a "cost-plus" actualisation rather than a "rule-of-thumb" speculation.

This framework shifts the burden from speculative, formula-based estimation to verifiable, project-specific data analysis grounded in the original tender structure. Under this approach, the quantification of damages due to delays is tethered to the actual mobilisation costs, time-related overheads, and site-specific operational data inherent in the project's original bill of quantities. This not only mitigates the risk of double-counting but also ensures that the resulting award is commensurate with the statutory requirement of proving actual loss under the Indian Contract Act.[17] In doing so, it represents a paradigmatic shift from approximation-based adjudication to evidence-based quantification, aligning arbitral outcomes with both contractual intent and constitutional principles of non-arbitrariness.

3 METHODOLOGY

This paper adopts a doctrinal legal research framework, focusing on the interpretation of statutory provisions and judicial precedents to critically examine the application of Overheads, Loss of Profit, and Loss of Profitability in Indian infrastructure projects. The methodology is designed to bridge the gap between established legal principles and empirical quantification.

3.1 Statutory and Case Law Analysis

[17] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1.

A detailed examination is undertaken of Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act,[18] which provides the statutory basis for compensation arising from contractual breaches. In parallel, the research analyses key decisions of the Supreme Court of India and various High Courts, tracing the judicial recognition of claims from landmark 1984 precedents to contemporary rulings. This evaluation identifies the evolving evidentiary standards that move beyond "global claims" toward substantiated proof of actual loss.

3.2 Technical Scrutiny of Mathematical Formulas

The study critically evaluates the three primary international formulas—Hudson, Emden, and Eichleay—which have gained judicial acceptance in India despite their foreign origins. The methodology assesses the underlying mathematical assumptions of each model and examines their suitability for application within the domestic infrastructure context.

3.3 Comparative Empirical Modelling (MoRTH Approach)

A core aspect of the research is a comparative analysis between these international formulas and the rate analysis methodology employed by the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH).[19] Using a "Reverse Calculation Method", a hypothetical item with a base rate of Rs. 1,000.00 illustrates how nominal percentages for overheads (variable based on magnitude) and profit (10.00%) convert into standardised coefficients relative to the final rate. This empirical modeling examines whether India's domestic frameworks provide a more accurate picture of contractors' financial exposure than conventional formula-based methods.

3.4 Synthesis and Reformative Proposals

Based on the preceding analyses, the paper integrates legal principles with technical analysis of rate practices. It proposes a more consistent judicial approach for quantifying damages and offers

[18] *Id.* § 73.
[19] IRC, *Standard Data Book for Analysis of Road Construction Rates*, supra note 4.

guidelines to align contractual recovery with the actual financial structure of Indian infrastructure projects. These recommendations aim to provide a transparent and equitable mechanism for resolving disputes in domestic arbitration.

4 LITERATURE SURVEY: THE EVOLUTION OF TECHNO-LEGAL RESEARCH

The scholarship on Indian infrastructure contracts reflects a clear transition from rigid contractual compliance toward an empirical, "actuals-based" model of adjudication. It has been observed that state action in infrastructure procurement must rest on objective departmental analysis rather than ad hoc executive directives. The legacy "G.O. Regime"—marked by iterative Government Orders that bypass structured inter-departmental scrutiny—exposes decision-making to challenge on grounds of manifest arbitrariness.[20] Prior work by the authors has emphasised that the State, as custodian of the public exchequer, cannot extend financial largesse or impose penalties without demonstrable empirical justification consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine.[21]

While Section 74 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 permits the imposition of Liquidated Damages (LD) without strict proof of loss,[22] recent scholarship indicates the emergence of a "rebuttable presumption of loss" that is frequently displaced in practice due to procedural deficiencies.[23] Studies by Ram Mohan et al[24] and Sanjana Reddy[25] demonstrate that tribunals increasingly require a well-documented factual matrix to sustain stipulated damages, particularly in public infrastructure projects characterised by institutional asymmetry. The absence of clearly defined time-related obligations, coupled with inadequate documentation of events causing delay, often

[20] *E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu*, (1974) 4 SCC 3.
[21] Dr. Ram Kishan Rao Chilappagari, Ananta Koti Padmanabha Rao Vadladi & Venkata Narayana Vuppu, *Evolution of Price Adjustment in Public Works: From Composite Andhra Pradesh to the State of Telangana*, Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research, Vol. VIII, Issue I, p. 6438, ISSN: 2582-8878.
[22] Indian Contract Act, 1872, § 74, supra note 1.
[23] *Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd. v. Saw Pipes Ltd.*, (2003) 5 SCC 705.
[24] M. P. Ram Mohan, Gaurav Ray, Promode Murugavelu & Jeeri Sanjana Reddy, *Liquidated Damages in India: Concepts, Enforceability, Drafting Considerations*, Indian Inst. Of Mgmt. Ahmedabad 4-9 (2024), https://www.iima.ac.in.
[25] Sanjana Reddy, *Judicial Approaches to Liquidated Damages in India: Concepts, Enforceability, Drafting Considerations*, Indian Inst. of Mgmt. Ahmedabad 4-9 (2024), https://www.iima.ac.in.

renders LD clauses vulnerable to challenge, thereby diluting the enforceability of "Time is of the essence" provisions through repeated time extensions.

Judicial development has gradually recognised price escalation as a routine incident of long-term contracts; however, a significant disconnect persists regarding evidentiary burdens.[26] While international formulas such as Hudson or Emden were discussed in *McDermott*, subsequent academic critique suggests that these often result in a "windfall" rather than restorative compensation.[27] Accordingly, arbitral tribunals now emphasise the need for robust and project-specific evidence to substantiate claims for loss of profit and unabsorbed overheads. This shift aligns with emerging trends toward a "proportionality" approach, ensuring that contractual remedies serve legitimate commercial objectives without becoming punitive.[28]

At the regional level, it is observed that the composite State of Andhra Pradesh and the subsequent State of Telangana have adopted the nomenclature of "Price Adjustment" in their regulatory frameworks. However, this remains a state-specific variant of "Price Escalation", which is the more widely accepted term in national arbitral awards and judicial pronouncements.[29]

The collective body of the authors' research reveals a "Dual-Risk" environment in which administrative volatility frequently conflicts with statutory mandates. This study argues that a transition toward a codified, empirical framework is essential to mitigate the institutional asymmetries currently affecting Indian infrastructure projects.[30] The reliance on iterative Government Orders has historically created a "Legal Maze" that complicates the enforcement of contractual claims.[31] To bridge this gap, a shift toward a unified regulatory framework is necessary to harmonise executive intent with financial standardisation, ensuring that the public sector remains protected while maintaining the commercial viability of infrastructure investments.[32]

---

[26] *FCI v. A.M. Ahmed & Co.*, (2006) 13 SCC 531.
[27] *McDermott International Inc. v. Burn Standard Co. Ltd.*, (2006) 11 SCC 181.
[28] *Denka Advantech Pte Ltd v. Steelcon Far East Pte Ltd*, [2018] SGCA 65 (Sing.).
[29] Dr. Ram Kishan Rao Chilappagari et al., *Evolution of Price Adjustment in Public Works Contracts*, 8(1) INDIAN J. L. & LEGAL RES. 6.2.
[30] *Id.* at 6.6.
[31] *Id.* at 6.8.
[32] *Id.* at 6.10.

5 ANALYSIS OF THE EVOLUTION OF JUDICIAL INTERVENTION IN INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRACTS

The adjudication of claims in Indian infrastructure contracts has historically been shaped by the tension between strict contractual enforcement and the compensatory principle of restitution under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act.[33] This monograph evaluates three distinct, yet interconnected, heads of damages: overhead expenses incurred during project prolongation, loss of profit arising from the illegal termination of a contract, and loss of profitability arising from project delays. By examining the transition from rigid adherence to contractual bars to the judicial development of an implied right to compensation, this analysis examines how courts have navigated the tension between contractual silence and the compensatory principles under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act.[34] This inquiry maps the evolution of evidentiary standards—from the era of "broad evaluation" to the current requirement of "strict substantiation"—which now governs these claims.

5.1 Regulatory Divergence and the Emergence of Implied Rights

While the legislative framework and judicial interpretation regarding construction contracts vary across jurisdictions, the principles applied in the state of Andhra Pradesh serve as an important reference point for understanding the limitations of employer-induced delays across India. Historically, when project execution was prolonged due to delays attributable solely to the employer, the remedy in this jurisdiction was governed by Preliminary Specification (PS) 59 to the *Andhra Pradesh Detailed Standard Specifications* (APDSS).[35] This provision established a framework for an extension of time but explicitly denied monetary relief. Such a clause effectively operated as a jurisdictional bar, precluding the contractor from claiming monetary compensation for prolongation, regardless of the cause or extent of the delay. Although this regulatory mechanism operates locally, it illustrates a consistent trend in Indian construction law: standard form contracts frequently restrict contractors' recovery for prolongation costs—an approach that

[33] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 73.
[34] *Id.*
[35] APDSS, supra note 3, PS 59.

courts, including various High Courts and the Supreme Court of India, have repeatedly scrutinised under national contract law principles.

Conversely, Clause 10(CC) of the Central Public Works Department *(*CPWD*)* Contract Conditions—the principal standard governing public works contracts at the national level—provides a structured mechanism for price escalation,[36] providing compensation for inflationary fluctuations in the cost of materials and labour during an extended period. When juxtaposed with PS 59 of the APDSS,[37] the contrast is stark. While Clause 10(CC) embodies a predictable,[38] formula-based system, the APDSS remained silent,[39] thereby leaving contractors to rely upon external instruments or judicial pronouncements for relief. This structural divergence between regional specifications and the central model has frequently catalysed litigation.

In *State of Andhra Pradesh v. M/s Associated Engineering Enterprises*,[40] the Andhra Pradesh High Court examined the restrictive effect of PS 59 of the APDSS,[41] holding that, since the contractor had accepted extensions, any claim for monetary compensation was barred by the contract. However, the legal landscape shifted with *Ch. Ramalinga Reddy v. State of Andhra Pradesh*,[42] where the Supreme Court addressed whether a contractor could recover escalation costs even without an explicit price-escalation clause. The Court affirmed the arbitral award, holding that compensation for escalation constitutes a valid head of claim under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act.[43] The Court reasoned that when delays are solely attributable to the employer, the contractor should not be forced to absorb losses from rising market costs merely due to contractual silence.

This judicial "gap-filling" approach, affirming a contractor's right to compensation for losses naturally flowing from an employer's breach, marked a pivotal shift in restitution jurisprudence.

---

[36] CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, *Works Manual* (incorporating General Conditions of Contract), Clause 10(CC) (revision as of 2024).
[37] APDSS, supra note 3.
[38] *Works Manual*, supra note 32 (Clause 10(CC)).
[39] APDSS, supra note 3.
[40] *State of Andhra Pradesh v. M/s Associated Engineering Enterprises*, AIR 1990 AP 10.
[41] APDSS, supra note 3.
[42] *Ch. Ramalinga Reddy v. Superintending Engineer*, (1994) 6 SCC 266.
[43] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 73.

It established the legal foundation for claims concerning anticipated profits. Within this framework, the judiciary began adjudicating more complex claims for "loss of profit" arising from illegal termination, culminating in the principles set out in *A.T. Brij Paul Singh v. State of Gujarat*.[44]

In *Brij Paul Singh*,[45] The Supreme Court considered whether a contractor could claim damages for loss of profit arising from the State's unjustified rescission of a works contract. The key legal issue was the standard of proof needed to establish such loss and the proper measure for quantifying damages under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act.[46] This landmark ruling remains authoritative for the principle that a contractor, whose contract is illegally terminated, is entitled to the "benefit of the bargain" via compensation for expected profits.

The Appellant was tasked with constructing a cement concrete surface on the Rajkot–Jamnagar Road. After partial execution, the respondent rescinded the contract, citing a breach of the stipulated timeline. The Appellant claimed Rs. 7,00,000/- as damages for loss of expected profits. The Trial Court dismissed the claim, but the High Court held the rescission unjustified. Referring to *Hudson's Building and Engineering Contracts*,[47] the High Court noted that profit is usually added to tenders at 3–7%, but the Appellant had not provided any documentary evidence beyond a partner's statement. Consequently, the High Court denied the claim. The matter then proceeded to the Supreme Court under Article 133(1)(a) of the Constitution of India.[48]

The Supreme Court held that once a breach by the State is established, the contractor is entitled to the position they would have held had the contract been performed. Drawing on its precedents, the Supreme Court emphasised that the judge is the sole arbiter of the quality and sufficiency of evidence. The bench further observed that a contractor reasonably expects to earn profit, and a broad evaluation based on established benchmarks—such as the 15% profit margin in comparable

[44] *A.T. Brij Paul Singh v. State of Gujarat*, (1984) 2 SCC 97.
[45] *Id.*
[46] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 73.
[47] ALFRED A. HUDSON, *HUDSON'S BUILDING AND ENGINEERING CONTRACTS* (I.N. Duncan Wallace ed., 10th ed. 1970).
[48] INDIA CONST. art. 133, cl. (1)(a).

contracts—is a permissible measure. Accordingly, the Court overturned the High Court's denial and awarded Rs. 2,00,000/- as reasonable compensation for anticipated profits.

Retrospectively, the "broad evaluation" principle shows that the 15% benchmark was an established judicial estimate even before *Brij Paul Singh*.[49]

In *Mohd. Salamatullah v. Government of Andhra Pradesh*,[50] the Supreme Court addressed the propriety of an appellate court's interference with a factual finding regarding the quantum of damages. This case represents an early judicial validation of the 15% profit margin as a standard measure in works contracts. The Court observed that once a Trial Court adopts a percentage-based estimate grounded in trade evidence, such a finding should not be disturbed by a High Court without substantial evidentiary justification for reduction.

The dispute arose from a contract for the supply of gunny bags, where the respondent-State committed an unjustified breach. The Trial Court awarded damages for loss of anticipated profit at 15% of the contract value. On appeal, the High Court sustained the finding of breach but reduced the compensation to 10%, deeming the original 15% award excessive. The Appellant challenged this reduction before the Supreme Court, asserting that the State had failed to provide evidence at trial to indicate that the profit would have been lower than the 15% as claimed by him.

The Supreme Court held that the High Court erred in arbitrarily reducing the compensation. The bench expressed the view that the 15% figure was a reasonable estimate of the contractor's loss. [. . .] The Court concluded that since the Government had not contested the quantum with its own evidence at the initial stage, the Trial Court's assessment was a reasonable "benefit of the bargain". Consequently, the Supreme Court set aside the High Court's reduction and restored the original 15% award.

While *Mohd. Salamatullah*[51] established a robust precedent for the 15% margin as early as 1977, it is noteworthy that the bench in *Brij Paul Singh*[52] did not explicitly engage with this earlier

[49] *A.T. Brij Paul Singh*, supra note 40.
[50] *Mohd. Salamatullah v. Govt. of A.P.*, AIR 1977 SC 1481.
[51] *Id.*
[52] *Brij Paul Singh*, supra note 40.

rationale. This judicial omission highlights the fragmented evolution of the "broad evaluation" principle, which lacked a unified evidentiary standard before its ultimate consolidation.

In *Dwarka Das*,[53] the Supreme Court examined the contractor's entitlement to claim damages for loss of profit arising from the wrongful termination of a works contract. Echoing the principles established in *Brij Paul Singh*,[54] the Court considered the necessity of awarding compensation under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872,[55] when the State is found to have committed a breach. This decision reinforces the doctrine that, upon an unwarranted rescission, the contractor is entitled to the "benefit of the bargain", including compensation for reasonably anticipated profits, distinct from mere restitution of incurred costs.

The Appellant was awarded a contract for constructing a hostel building for a Polytechnic Institute. The respondent-State rescinded the contract before completion, prompting the Appellant to claim damages, including loss of anticipated profit at 10% of the remaining contract value. While the Trial Court allowed this claim, the High Court reversed the decree, holding that the Appellant had failed to provide adequate evidence to substantiate the loss. Notably, this conclusion was reached despite the rescission being held unwarranted. The matter was subsequently carried to the Supreme Court, where the Appellant relied on Income Tax assessments to demonstrate consistent profit margins in similar works. The central issue was whether the contractor was required to produce exhaustive proof of specific loss, or whether a standard industry margin could operate as a rebuttable presumption of damage.

The Supreme Court held that the principles in *Brij Paul Singh*[56] and the evidentiary approach in *Mohd. Salamatullah*[57] squarely governed the case. The Court observed that, in works contracts, it is generally accepted that a contractor expects a reasonable profit, historically ranging between 10% —15%. [. . .] The bench remarked that where the State has committed a breach, the contractor need not establish the exact loss with mathematical precision if a reasonable expectation of profit

[53] *Dwarka Das*, supra note 11.
[54] *Brij Paul Singh*, supra note 40.
[55] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 73.
[56] *Brij Paul Singh*, supra note 40.
[57] *Mohd. Salamatullah*, supra note 46.

is evident from the nature of the trade and supporting Income Tax records. Applying this benchmark, the Court set aside the High Court's judgment and restored the Trial Court's award.

In *Government of Andhra Pradesh v. Sri Venkateswara Construction Co.*,[58] the Andhra Pradesh High Court deliberated upon the jurisdictional boundaries between contractual price adjustment and common law claims for overheads. The tribunal negated a claim for 7,59,700/- preferred under the head of overhead charges, which had been sought due to departmental delays. The learned arbitrator postulated that because the contractor was already a beneficiary of escalation for the period of prolongation, any further award for overheads would result in an inequitable double recovery. [. . .] This decision underscores a significant judicial impediment: the assumption that price adjustment clauses act as an exhaustive remedy, effectively eclipsing the "Loss of Profitability" that arises from the sterilisation of a contractor's fixed resources.

One of several issues stemming from this precedent is whether such an "either/or" judicial framework fails to recognise that market-driven material escalation and resource-based overhead costs are fundamentally distinct financial injuries.

In *Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. v. L.K. Ahuja*,[59] the principal issue before the Supreme Court was whether a contractor is entitled to compensation for loss of profit arising from a diminution in turnover resulting from project prolongation. The Court examined whether such a claim is maintainable without specific proof that the contractor was deprived of alternative profit-earning opportunities during the period of delay.

The dispute arose from an agreement to construct residential quarters, which was significantly delayed beyond the stipulated period due to the appellant's defaults in providing site access and necessary materials. Following the completion of the works, multiple claims were referred to arbitration, including a demand for damages for the diminution in turnover resulting from the prolonged project duration. The arbitrator, in his award, granted an amount of Rs. 6,00,000/- under this particular head. This award was subsequently made a rule of the court by the Subordinate Judge, Dhanbad, and upheld by the High Court of Patna (Ranchi Bench). Aggrieved by the High

[58] *Government of Andhra Pradesh v. Sri Venkateswara Construction Co*., 200 (5) ALD 142.
[59] *Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. v. L.K. Ahuja*, (2004) 5 SCC 109.

Court's dismissal of their appeal on various counts, the appellant approached the Supreme Court by way of a Special Leave Petition (SLP), which was subsequently granted and heard as a Civil Appeal. The Supreme Court examined the evidentiary requirements under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act for sustaining a claim for loss of profit.[60]

The Supreme Court found it difficult to accept the proposition that such a loss is an automatic consequence of every delay. The Court observed that it is not unusual for a contractor to claim loss of profit arising from a diminution in turnover due to delays in completing the work; however, the Court opined that the contractor must establish that, had he received the amount due under the contract, he could have utilised the same amount for some other business in which he could have earned profit. Since no such material was available on record to demonstrate that alternative profitable opportunities were frustrated, the Supreme Court deleted this sum from the amount awarded by the arbitrator to the respondent. This judgment thus crystallised the rule that a claim for loss of profit due to prolongation cannot be granted in a vacuum and requires the claimant to prove the existence of a missed opportunity as a prerequisite for the award of damages.

In *McDermott International Inc.*,[61] the issue before the Supreme Court was whether an arbitrator is authorised to award compensation to a subcontractor for overheads and loss of profit by applying the Emden Formula once the primary entitlement to damages for delay has been established. The Court examined whether the quantification of such claims—premised on the subcontractor's inability to deploy resources elsewhere—constituted a valid exercise of arbitral discretion or an award that was perverse and liable to be set aside under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act.[62]

The dispute arose from a subcontract for the fabrication and installation of offshore platforms, where the project was significantly prolonged due to failures by the client, *Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd.,* or the respondent contractor. The subcontractor, *McDermott International Inc.*,

[60] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 73.
[61] *McDermott International Inc.*, supra note 23.
[62] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (as amended in 2015 and 2019), supra note 2, § 34.

claimed "Home Office Overheads" and "Loss of Profitability," asserting that the respondent's delays prevented them from earning profits on other available works.[63]

The Court analysed the Indian Contract Act, specifically Sections 55 and 73,[64] to determine the legal basis for the claim. The Court observed that Section 55 grants the right to claim compensation when time is of the essence of a contract, and the contract is delayed, while Section 73 sets out the principles for calculating such damages.[65] The Court emphasised that, while entitlement to compensation is the primary legal issue—requiring proof of breach and resultant loss—the specific formula for quantification is a secondary evidentiary concern.[66] The Court reviewed the arbitrator's reliance on the Emden Formula,[67] which utilises the subcontractor's actual overhead percentage from its accounts and is a widely recognised method for estimating loss in complex construction disputes where precise itemisation is difficult.

In *State of Rajasthan v. Ferro Concrete Construction (P) Ltd.*,[68] the Supreme Court adjudicated the evidentiary requirements for sustaining claims for overhead expenses and loss of profit arising from project prolongation. The pivotal legal issue was whether an arbitrator could award damages based on a percentage-based estimate without contemporaneous documentary evidence of the actual loss incurred.

The dispute arose from a contract for the construction of the Wagon Dam, which was subject to significant delays. The Appellant-State challenged an arbitral award that granted the respondent compensation under the heads of "Loss of Profit: and "Expenses towards Establishment and Machinery" (Overheads) during the extended period. While the lower courts upheld the award, the matter was escalated to the Supreme Court, primarily on whether the award was based on "no evidence" and thus patently illegal.

---

[63] *McDermott International Inc.*, supra note 23.
[64] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, §§ 55, 73.
[65] *Id.*
[66] *Id.*
[67] See Emden Formula, as discussed in *McDermott International Inc.*, supra note 23.
[68] *State of Rajasthan v. Ferro Concrete Construction (P) Ltd.*, (2009) 12 SCC 1.

The Supreme Court maintained that for claims relating to overheads, such as staff salaries or machinery maintenance during a stand-down period, the contractor must produce primary evidence. [. . .] The bench remarked that without muster rolls, logbooks, or wage records, an award for overheads based on mere claims is unsustainable. Regarding loss of profit, the Court articulated that while 10% is often viewed as a reasonable benchmark, it cannot be awarded as a matter of course. It suggested that the claimant must demonstrate that, but for the delay, the resources could have been utilised in another profit-earning project. Consequently, the Court set aside the portions of the award that lacked a foundational evidentiary basis, reinforcing the principle that "legal proof" cannot be entirely substituted by “arbitral guesswork”.

The significance of this ruling lies in its demarcation between the entitlement to a claim and its quantification. While earlier precedents focused on the fairness of the 10% or 15% figure, the Ferro Concrete bench emphasised that the threshold for establishing the “fact of loss” must be crossed before any mathematical formula is invoked. By requiring proof of idle machinery and unutilised establishment through contemporaneous records, the Court essentially precluded the automatic application of the Hudson or Emden formulas in cases where the underlying expenditure remains unproven. This judgment therefore stands as a precursor to the more stringent evidentiary standards later consolidated in *Unibros*,[69] shifting the judicial focus from “broad evaluation” to “strict substantiation”.

In *Associate Builders v. Delhi Development Authority*,[70] a primary contention before the Supreme Court concerned whether the Appellant was eligible to claim overhead expenses during the prolongation of work and, subsequently, whether the Hudson formula adopted by the arbitrator for the computation of such expenses was valid. The core legal question concerned the permissible extent of judicial interference under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act,[71] specifically regarding the tribunal's assessment of evidence and the application of standard formulas for quantifying damages in construction disputes.

[69] *Unibros v. All India Radio*, 2023 INSC 931.
[70] *Associate Builders v. Delhi Development Authority*, (2015) 3 SCC 49.
[71] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (as amended in 2015 and 2019), supra note 2, § 34.

The Appellant was awarded specific construction works by the respondent with a nine-month completion period; however, the project ultimately spanned 34 months. Following the emergence of disputes, the High Court of Delhi appointed an arbitrator to resolve 15 claims. The arbitrator sanctioned four claims, including Claim 15 for Rs. 6,25,679/- towards establishment charges, for which the Hudson formula was utilised for quantification. While a learned Single Judge of the High Court of Delhi dismissed the DDA's objections, a Division Bench, exercising jurisdiction under Section 37 of the Act,[72] subsequently set aside that judgment and negated the claims, leading the matter to the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court expressed the view that the Division Bench had improperly introduced facts that were neither pleaded nor proved. Reaffirming the principle established in *State of Rajasthan v. Puri Construction Co. Ltd.*,[73] the Apex Court further articulated that the arbitrator is the sole judge of the quality and quantity of the evidence produced before him. [. . .] The apex court articulated that a court does not sit in appeal over an arbitral award and, therefore, cannot substitute its own wisdom for that of the tribunal. It was underscored that as long as the arbitrator's view is a possible one, the merits of the award are not open to challenge. Consequently, the Court set aside the Division Bench's judgment, duly upholding the findings of the Single Judge and restoring the arbitral award.

In *Batliboy Environmental Engineers Ltd. v. Hindustan Petroleum Corpn. Ltd.*,[74] the Supreme Court examined whether the use of the Hudson formula to calculate loss of profit was sustainable in the absence of evidence showing that the contractor could have utilised his resources in alternative profitable works. A primary issue was whether an arbitral award granting damages for loss of profit solely on a mathematical formula, without proof of actual loss, is patently illegal. [. . .] The Court scrutinised the distinction between the "fact of loss" and the "measure of loss", stressing that the former must be proved independently before a formula can be applied.

The dispute originated from a contract for the construction of a sewage treatment plant, which was significantly delayed by several years. The arbitrator awarded loss of profit, duly adopting the

[72] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (as amended in 2015 and 2019), supra note 2, § 37.
[73] *State of Rajasthan v. Puri Construction Co. Ltd.*, (1994) 6 SCC 485.
[74] *Batliboy Environmental Engineers Ltd. v. Hindustan Petroleum Corpn. Ltd.*, (2024) 4 SCC 385.

Hudson formula at 10% of the contract value. The High Court, in a petition under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act,[75] set aside this portion of the award, a decision that was challenged before the Supreme Court. The judicial journey concluded with the apex court affirming the setting aside of the award, as the arbitrator had failed to demand evidence of missed opportunities.

The Supreme Court reaffirmed the principle that a formulaic approach to damages is not a substitute for evidence. Drawing from established precedents, the Supreme Court delineated that the arbitrator is the sole judge of the quality and quantity of the evidence produced before him. [. . .] However, the bench clarified that an award which ignores the requirement of Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act,[76] by assuming profit without proof is perverse. This judgment paved the way for the more stringent requirements later consolidated in *Unibros*.[77]

In *Unibros v. All India Radio*,[78] the Supreme Court considered a recurring issue: whether a claim for loss of profit may be sustained in cases involving delay *simpliciter* in the execution of a contract. The core legal question concerned the evidentiary threshold for establishing a claim for loss of profit under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act.[79] Specifically, the Court examined whether the mere delay is sufficient to justify an award of damages for loss of earning capacity, or whether the contractor must demonstrate that profit-yielding opportunities were actually foregone as a result of the prolongation.

The dispute arose from a contract for the construction of Delhi Doordarshan Bhawan, which was delayed by approximately 42½ months. The arbitrator, upon reconsideration following the initial and subsequent remittals of the award, sanctioned the contractor's claim for loss of profit by applying the Hudson formula. While the High Court of Delhi initially set aside the award under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996,[80] the contractor appealed the decision through successive tiers of the judiciary. The matter eventually reached the Supreme Court after

[75] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (as amended in 2015 and 2019), supra note 2, § 34.
[76] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 73.
[77] *Unibros*, supra note 65.
[78] *Id.*
[79] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 73.
[80] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (as amended in 2015 and 2019), supra note 2, § 34.

the Division Bench held that the award was patently illegal due to lack of evidence proving the actual loss of alternative profit-making opportunities.

The Supreme Court maintained that for a claim for loss of profit to succeed, the claimant must establish three essential conditions: the delay was not attributable to the contractor, the contractor was a profit-making entity, and there was a "proven anticipation of profit" based on actual missed opportunities. Citing principles articulated in *Associate Builders*,[81] the Court emphasised that the arbitrator is the sole judge of the quality and sufficiency of the evidence before him. [. . .] However, the bench clarified that applying a mathematical formula such as Hudson's without evidence of a lost alternative contract constitutes a patent illegality. Consequently, the Court upheld the judgment of the Division Bench of the High Court of Delhi, which set aside the arbitral award, clarifying that while the arbitrator remains the master of evidence, an award remains vulnerable when it is based on no evidence.

In *State of West Bengal v. M/s S.K. Maji*,[82] the central issue raised before the High Court of West Bengal was whether a claim for loss of profit at 15% could be awarded by the sole arbitrator in the absence of both oral and documentary proof.

The Government of West Bengal awarded the contract for the construction of the District Health Administrative Building at Bankura. Disputes arose between the parties, prompting the Executive Engineer to rescind the work. The respondent invoked the arbitration clause, leading to the appointment of a sole arbitrator. The respondent-claimant submitted nine claims, and the sole arbitrator rendered an arbitral award on these. Claim 3 pertained to loss of profit.

Dissatisfied with the outcome, the State of West Bengal challenged the award by filing a petition under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act,[83] before the Calcutta High Court. The Court's final decision, which did not reach the Supreme Court, established an important precedent.

[81] *Associate Builders*, supra note 66.
[82] *State of West Bengal v. M/s. S.K. Maji*, 2025 SCC OnLine Cal 3945.
[83] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (as amended in 2015 and 2019), supra note 2, § 34.

This judgment is a seminal pronouncement that explicitly recognises and rules on the distinction between “loss of profit” and “loss of profitability”.

Regarding “loss of profit”, the Court affirmed that a reasonable expectation of profit is inherent in works contracts. Therefore, where a contract is illegally terminated, the contractor is entitled to damages for the unexecuted portion without needing granular evidentiary proof.

Conversely, for "loss of profitability," which arises from delays or the inability to redeploy resources elsewhere, the Court imposed a more stringent standard. The Court ruled that such claims are not inherent and must be substantiated by contemporaneous evidence of missed opportunities or financial injury, thus exempting "loss of profit" from the stricter evidentiary standards usually applied to prolongation claims.

The statutory basis for awarding compensation under both heads of damage is Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act,[84] which mandates restitution for loss or damage arising naturally from a breach. However, as clarified in *M/s S.K. Maji*,[85] the judicial application of this section varies depending on the nature of the claim. While a claim for "loss of profit" is typically treated as presumptive following the illegal termination of a works contract, a claim for “loss of profitability” is considered inherently speculative and requires a more stringent evidentiary standard. The distinguishing features between these two categories are presented in the table below:

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of Loss of Profit vs. Loss of Profitability

No.	Parameter	Loss of profit	Loss of Profitability
(*1*)	(*2*)	(*3*)	(*4*)
1	Triggering Event	Illegal or premature termination of the contract.	Prolongation or delay in performance while the contract remains active.

[84] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 73.
[85] *S.K. Maji*, supra note 78.

2	Nature of Loss	Loss of anticipated earnings from the unexecuted portion of the work.	Diminished margins or lost opportunities to deploy resources elsewhere during the delay.
3	Applicability	Generally considered inherent in most works contracts upon illegal termination.	Contingent upon proving actual opportunity cost and financial injury.
4	Evidentiary Standard	Lower threshold: a broad, estimation-based evaluation often suffices.	High threshold; requires strict, contemporaneous proof of financial injury.
5	Quantification	Percentage-based calculation on the value of the unexecuted work.	Requires a formulaic nexus (e.g., actual overhead costs incurred during the delay period).
6	Formula Used	Hudson or Emden formulas.	Eichleay formula or actual cost-benefit analysis.

As illustrated in the synthesis above, while both claims are sub-species of compensatory damages under the same enabling provision, they reside on separate evidentiary planes. The *Maji*[86] ratio maintains that "loss of profit" [Column (*3*)] is a primary, presumptive consequence of termination, whereas "loss of profitability" [Column (*4*)] remains a secondary, speculative loss. Accordingly, the former permits a degree of judicial estimation based on established norms. At the same time, the latter remains strictly tied to the claimant's ability to prove that resources were demonstrably prevented from being deployed more profitably.

5.2 The Analytical Composition of Rate Analysis (MoRTH and CPWD)

The Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) approach provides a standardised Rate Analysis methodology.[87] Initially, a base rate is established by aggregating costs for materials, labour, and machinery. Thereafter, overheads are applied according to project magnitude, followed by a 10 per cent margin for profit on the cumulative figure to arrive at the final rate. Since this

[86] *Id.*
[87] IRC, *Standard Data Book for Analysis of Road Construction Rates*, supra note 4.

final rate serves as the primary reference for subsequent project valuations, it is preferable to compute overheads and profit based on the final rate rather than the base rate.

The CPWD framework similarly incorporates comparable provisions. The CPWD *Works Manual*, in conjunction with the *Delhi Analysis of Rates* (DAR) 2023, as updated by subsequent correction slips, provides for a consolidated addition of 15 per cent to the prime cost towards contractor's profit and overheads.[88]

Juxtaposing these two methodologies reveals a shared regulatory philosophy but divergent mathematical applications. While CPWD adopts a flat, consolidated percentage, the MoRTH Rate Analysis model is preferable due to its sequential transparency, which distinguishes between the recovery of overhead expenses and the generation of profit. Accordingly, the present analysis adopts the MoRTH methodology as the primary benchmark for quantifying prolongation claims. To exemplify clearly, an illustrative item with a base rate of Rs. 1,000.00 for different categories of works with corresponding overheads results in the following breakdown:

Table 3: Sequential Rate Analysis (MoRTH Model)

No.	Component	Civil Works Cost up to Rs. 200 Cr (Overheads @ 12%)		Civil Works Cost above Rs. 200 Cr and up to Rs. 500 Cr (Overheads @ 10%)		Civil Works Cost above Rs. 500 Cr (Overheads @ 8%)	
		Amount (Rs.)	Percentage of Final Rate (%)	Amount (Rs.)	Percentage of Final Rate (%)	Amount (Rs.)	Percentage of Final Rate (%)
(*1*)	(*2*)	(*3*)	(*4*)	(*5*)	(*6*)	(*7*)	(*8*)
1	Base Rate	1000.00	81.50	1,000.00	82.50	1,000.00	84.50

[88] *Works Manual*, supra note 32 (Clause 10(CC)); *Delhi Analysis of Rates* (DAR) 2023 (with subsequent correction slips).

2	Overheads	120.00	9.50	100.00	8.50	80.00	6.50
3	Profit (10.00% on Sub-total)	112.00	9.00	110.00	9.00	108.00	9.00
4	**Total / Final Rate**	**1,232.00**	**100.00**	**1,210.00**	**100.00**	**1,188.00**	**100.00**

Note: The percentages derived through reverse calculation for overheads and profits have been rounded off to the nearest 0.50 for administrative convenience and numerical standardisation across project categories.

Given that conventional reliance on internationally derived formulas—such as those of Hudson, Emden, or Eichleay—often misaligns with the economic realities of domestic infrastructure projects, it is proposed that arbitrators adopt the methodology endorsed by the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH). The MoRTH approach,[89] which constructs a final rate through a deliberate layering of material, labour, and machinery hire charges, followed by proportional additions for overheads and profit, provides a framework inherently suited to the specificities of Indian contracts. Rather than invoking foreign precedents that may distort the recovery of costs, adopting the MoRTH structure—and specifically, calculating overheads and profit as a percentage of the final rate—offers a more transparent and balanced mechanism. This alignment ensures that the financial provisions stipulated within the tender reflect the actual total valuation, thereby reducing the discrepancies frequently encountered in litigation.

In fine, the transition from rigid formula-based quantification to an integrated, MoRTH-inspired model represents a critical evolution in contract administration. By grounding these calculations in the empirical logic of the tender itself, stakeholders can achieve greater certainty and consistency in loss evaluation. This shift not only acknowledges the distinct cost drivers in the Indian market but also fosters a more robust, project-specific approach to resolving disputes concerning overheads and profitability. Having established this preferred methodology, we now

[89] IRC, *Standard Data Book for Analysis of Road Construction Rates*, supra note 4.

transition to a broader synthesis of these financial impacts to determine their cumulative influence on project viability.

The judicial evolution from the seminal principles in *Brij Paul Singh*,[90] which championed the "benefit of the bargain" through broad, percentage-based estimates, to the rigorous evidentiary standards established in *Unibros*[91] and *M/s S.K. Maji*[92] reflects a fundamental shift in the landscape of Indian construction law. Initially, the judiciary sought to provide equitable relief in the face of rigid contractual bars, such as the APDSS's Preliminary Specification 59,[93] often utilising international formulas as pragmatic proxies for loss. However, this reliance on approximation has increasingly faced judicial scrutiny, as contemporary commercial realities necessitate a higher degree of fiscal accountability. The contemporary legal demand is no longer for speculative "best guesses" but for a demonstrable nexus between the breach and the substantiated financial injury.

Consequently, the transition toward the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) approach represents the logical maturation of the doctrine. By shifting from the "vacuum-based" application of foreign models to a "Reverse Calculation Method" derived from the internal logic underlying the tender, the MoRTH methodology replaces arbitrary percentages with project-specific reality. This transition bridges the gap between the outdated "broad evaluation" of the 1980s and the constitutional requirement for non-arbitrary administrative action under Article 14,[94] thereby providing a uniform, empirical framework that aligns contractual recovery with the project's actual financial structure.

6 SYNTHESIS: TOWARD A UNIFIED EMPIRICAL FRAMEWORK

[90] *Brij Paul Singh*, supra note 40.
[91] *Unibros*, supra note 65.
[92] *M/s. S.K. Maji*, supra note 78.
[93] APDSS, supra note 3.
[94] INDIA CONST. art. 14.

The judicial evolution, from the *Brij Paul Singh*[95] era to the recent *Unibros*[96] and *S.K. Maji*[97] precedents, constitutes a decisive move away from arbitrary quantification of damages. The persistent reliance on international formulas—*Hudson, Emden, and Eichleay*—has proven to be a sub-optimal substitute for the actual financial data embedded within the tender process. As identified through our analysis of the "G.O. Regime" and the fragmented APDSS framework, the lack of a unified, empirical standard has necessitated a "Dual-Track" system that is both fiscally risky and constitutionally vulnerable under Article 14.[98] The precariousness of this regime is exemplified by the judicial tendency to treat price adjustment and overheads as mutually exclusive remedies. As evidenced in *Sri Venkateswara Construction Co.*,[99] the absence of a distinct statutory definition for "Loss of Profitability" allows tribunals to erroneously assume that inflationary escalation clauses act as an exhaustive discharge of all prolongation costs.

The fundamental dissonance in current arbitral practice arises from treating "Loss of profitability" as an abstract mathematical variable rather than a substantiated financial reality. The MoRTH methodology, by contrast, relies on the "final tender rate" as a transparent and accepted baseline. By adopting the "Reverse Calculation Method", arbitrators can bypass the speculative nature of international formulas and instead anchor their awards in the very figures that defined the contract's economic equilibrium at its inception.

This synthesis confirms that the path forward for domestic infrastructure arbitration lies in codifying these empirical standards. By aligning the quantification of overheads and profit with the MoRTH analysis of rates, we move beyond the "vacuum" of unproven claims and toward a regime of fiscal predictability and contractual equity.

7 REFORMATIVE PROPOSALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Statutory Incorporation of Techno-Legal Definitions

[95] *Brij Paul Singh*, supra note 40.
[96] *Unibros*, supra note 65.
[97] *M/s. S.K. Maji*, supra note 78.
[98] INDIA CONST. art. 14.
[99] *Sri Venkateswara Construction Co.*, supra note 54.

To eliminate the "profit-profitability divide" that complicates domestic arbitration, it is necessary to provide statutory clarity within the interpretation clause of the Indian Contract Act. By codifying the distinction established through judicial precedents—specifically the shift toward empirical evidence over speculative formulas—the following definitions are proposed for insertion as new clauses under Section 2 after clause (j):[100]

*[(k) When a contractor is deprived of the anticipated financial gain that represents the reward for the deployment of capital and expertise toward the completion of a defined scope of work, such deprivation arising from a breach of contract by the employer is called loss of profit.

(l) When a contractor sustains actual indirect costs, comprising site overheads and head office overheads, which are essential for project management and the organisation and are limited to expenses actually sustained during prolongation as a direct consequence of delay, such costs are called overhead expenses.

(m) When the resources of a contractor are prevented from being redeployed to other viable projects due to a delay solely attributable to the employer, thereby causing a loss of opportunity to earn a profit on alternative projects, such consequential loss is called loss of profitability.]

7.2 Consolidation of Evidentiary Standards

To prevent a windfall for the contractor and ensure redressal remains restorative, it is suggested that evidentiary standards for terminal breach and prolongation claims be consolidated. A substantive Proviso is proposed for Section 31(7) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act to regulate the quantification of damages:[101]

† [Provided that in any arbitral award involving claims for "Overhead Expenses", "Loss of Profit", or "Loss of Profitability", the Tribunal shall adhere to the following mandates:

[100] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 2.
* Proposed Amendment to § 2 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 (authors' suggestion).
[101] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (as amended in 2015 and 2019) supra note 2, § 31(7).

(a) Evidentiary Standard: No award for "Overhead Expenses" or "Loss of Profitability" during a period of prolongation shall be granted unless substantiated through primary empirical evidence, including audited financial statements and assessed Income Tax returns for the specific period of the claim;

(b) Exclusion of Overlap: The Tribunal shall exclude from "Overhead Expenses" any costs already indemnified through "Price Escalation" clause. This principle codifies the mandate against double-recovery; where primary cost inputs—commencing with material procurement and followed by labour deployment—are subject to indexation in the rate analysis of executed items, such recovery shall be deemed exhaustive of all inflationary relief and separate overhead claims shall not be maintainable;

(c) Terminal *vs.* Prolongation: "Loss of Profit" shall be restricted solely to cases of unlawful termination, representing the unabsorbed margin for the remaining scope of work. "Loss of Profitability" shall be restricted to prolongation and shall not result in a double benefit where head-office overheads have already been compensated; and

(d) Methodology: The "Reverse Calculation Method", derived from the financial architecture of the original tender, shall be the primary mode of assessment to ensure the claim remains proportionate to the actual investment made by the contractor.]

7.3 Quantification Framework and Benchmarks

It is pertinent to mention that "Loss of Profit" lacks a statutory definition within the Indian legal corpus; it remains a nomenclature adopted by Courts to quantify damages under Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act. While not a statutory prescription, the "Reverse Calculation Method" satisfies the "reasonable certainty" test established in *McDermott*.[102] In instances involving premature termination, the recommended approach is to restrict the profit element to a maximum permissible ceiling of 9.00%.[103] This ceiling is derived from an empirical deconstruction of the MoRTH

† Proposed Amendment to § 31(7) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (authors' suggestion).
[102] *McDermott International Inc.*, supra note 23.
[103] IRC, *Standard Data Book for Analysis of Road Construction Rates*, supra note 4.

analytical framework, wherein the profit component—when calculated as a reciprocal of the Final Rate—aligns with this threshold.[104]

To ensure consistency across varying project scales, the Tribunal shall adopt the specific coefficients derived from the MoRTH Sequential Rate Analysis.[105] The following table identifies the applicable benchmarks for separate assessment:

Table 4: Benchmarks for Reverse Calculation (Project Magnitude Basis)

No.	**Project Magnitude (Civil Works)**	**Overhead coefficient (k_{oh})**	**Profit/Profitability coefficient (kp or k_l)**
(*1*)	(*2*)	(*3*)	(*4*)
1	Up to Rs. 200 Cr	0.095	0.090
2	Rs. 200 Cr to Rs. 500 Cr	0.085	0.090
3	Above Rs. 500 Cr	0.065	0.090

Note: The percentages above represent the standardised values derived through reverse calculation. The Tribunal must select the value corresponding to the project magnitude at the time of the contract's inception.

The proposed methodology is:

7.3.1 *Compensation for Loss of Profit (Lp)*

In cases of unlawful termination, it is recommended that the profit component be limited to a maximum permissible limit of 9.00%. This cap is derived from the deconstruction of the MoRTH analytical model, where the profit component constitutes 9.00% of the Final Rate. The proposed formula is:

$$L_p = k_p \text{ X } (V_c - V_e)$$

Where:

[104] *Id.* Clause 5.2 (Calculating Profit & Overheads).
[105] *Id.*

L_p = Loss of profit,

k_p = Loss of profit co-efficient subject to a maximum of 0.090.

V_c = The original Contract Value.

V_e = The Value of Work Executed before the illegal termination.

7.3.2 *Reimbursement of Overhead Expenses (E_{oh})*

For overhead expenses resulting from prolongation, reimbursement should be restricted to a maximum limit as specified in Table 4, Column (*3*). The framework adopts a Modified Emden Formula:

$$E_{oh} = k_{oh} \text{X } (V_c/C_p) \text{ X } D_p$$

Where:

E_{oh} = The total claimable Overhead Expenses (Emden-derived).

k_{oh} = overhead component, subject to a maximum of relevant magnitude of work as in Table 4, Column (3) .

V_c = The original Contract Value (in Rs.),

C_p = The Original Contract Period (in months).

D_p = The Delay Period (in months) solely attributable to the Employer.

7.3.3 *Evidentiary Thresholds for Loss of Profitability (P_l)*

Section 73 stipulates that compensation is recoverable only for losses that "arose naturally" or were in the contemplation of the parties.[106] Because Loss of Profitability is an indirect consequence, a heightened level of evidentiary proof is mandatory. The Contractor must demonstrate a genuine "deployment constraint" through contemporary Notice Inviting Tenders (NITs), internal records discussing resource "freezing" or bid rejection orders where capacity

[106] Indian Contract Act, 1872, supra note 1, § 73.

criteria were not met due to the delayed project.[107] The recovery for this opportunity cost is similarly restricted to a 9.00% cap:

$$P_l = [k_l \text{ X } (V_r / C_p)] \text{ X } D_p$$

Where:

P_l = The claimable Loss of Profitability (Opportunity Cost).

k_l = Loss of profitability co-efficient subject to a maximum of 0.090.

V_r = The Value of Remaining Work (the balance of the contract yet to be executed at the start of the delay).

C_p = The Original Contract Period (in months).

D_p = The Delay Period (in months) solely attributable to the Employer.

7.4 The Doctrine of Commercial Interdependence

It is imperative to acknowledge that while overhead expenses and profit margins appear as distinct silos in analytical frameworks, they are functionally interdependent within the crucible of a competitive tender. A contractor, bound by the exigencies of market-driven procurement, must strategically calibrate these components; an aggressive inflation of one necessitates a corrective reduction in the other to maintain a viable bid.

Adjudicators must, therefore, apprehend the “Final Rate” not merely as a sum of parts, but as an integrated financial architecture. In awarding damages for prolongation or termination, Tribunals must ensure that the cumulative recovery of overheads and profitability does not transcend this original commercial trade-off. This principle serves as a safeguard against the awarding of a windfall that would be inconsistent with the contractor’s own competitive pricing strategy, ensuring the award remains a true reflection of the contract's “financial architecture”.

[107] *See Bharat Coking Coal*, supra note 55 (discussing the necessity of proving that the contractor was actually deprived of other work).

7.5 Demarcation and Mutual Exclusivity

It is imperative to clearly distinguish Loss of Profit (L_p) from Loss of Profitability (P_l). While both may co-exist with a claim for Overhead Expenses (E_{oh}), they are fundamentally mutually exclusive in their application:

(1) Loss of Profit (L_p): This is a "Terminal Claim". It applies exclusively when the contract is terminated unlawfully by the Employer, causing breach of contract. It compensates for the profit the Contractor would have earned from work they were never permitted to perform (V_c - V_e).

(2) Loss of Profitability (P_l): This is a "Prolongation Claim". It applies when the contract continues but is delayed due to reasons solely attributable to the employer. It compensates for the profit the Contractor could have earned elsewhere had their resources not been "frozen" on the delayed project (V_r).

Consequently, an award cannot grant both L_p and P_l for the same portion of the contract. If the contract is prolonged and then terminated, P_l applies to the period of delay, and L_p applies to the unexecuted portion after termination.

Finally, an arbitrator or judicial forum must exercise heightened caution when applying these coefficients if a project was successfully bid with a tender discount. If a contractor has quoted below the estimated rate—whether due to intense competition, a strategic desire to qualify for a higher class of registration, or the necessity of maintaining a permanent establishment despite foregoing a portion or the entirety of their projected margin —the awarded percentage must be adjusted downward from the benchmarks specified in Table 4.

In such instances, the "Actual Proven Profit" and "Actual Proven Overheads" must reflect the commercial reality of the specific tender to ensure that the award remains strictly compensatory and does not result in a windfall to the Contractor. It is a technical necessity to recognise that in a discount tender, the Contractor typically prunes overhead expenses to the greatest extent possible by exercising tight, efficient control over the resources and personnel deployed for that specific project. Therefore, any quantification that ignores the original bid's discount would fail the test of

reasonableness. The tribunal must ensure that the awarded relief is proportionate to the Contractor's actual financial structure as evidenced by the bid analysis and contemporary project records.

8 SCOPE FOR FURTHER STUDY

While this monograph establishes a robust techno-legal framework for price adjustments and core damages, the complexities of modern engineering procurement give rise to ancillary disputes requiring further empirical standardisation. The authors are currently engaged in a detailed analysis of both monetary and non-monetary claims to provide a structured quantification methodology. Future research will specifically address claims arising from extra quantities and variations, idled resources, and design-mix variances, as well as the financial implications of statutory tax revisions and delayed payments. Furthermore, the legal determination of critical procedural milestones—such as the actual date of handing over the site and the cessation of overhead liabilities (a principle maintained in the authors' previous discourse)—remains a vital frontier for standardising arbitral awards. This ongoing investigation aims to ensure that future redressal remains consistent with the techno-legal benchmarks established herein, evolving as the complexities of infrastructure litigation continue to unfold

9 CONCLUSIONS

The analysis within this monograph demonstrates that the transition from a "formula-based" approach to an "empirical, rate-based" methodology is essential for the maturation of Indian infrastructure law. By aligning contractual recovery with the financial structure of the tendering—specifically by adopting the MoRTH Sequential Rate Analysis—we move toward a regime of fiscal predictability and constitutional compliance. As established in Clause 5.2, the deconstruction of the final rate reveals that the standardised 10.00% profit actually constitutes 9.09% of the Final Rate. Consequently, the adoption of the 9.00% profit cap and the magnitude-specific overhead coefficients of the Final Rate ensures that the "Doctrine of Commercial Interdependence" remains mathematically grounded and non-arbitrary.

This transition from the “vacuum-based” application of international formulas to a “Reverse Calculation Method” bridges the gap between the outdated “broad evaluation” of the 1980s and the modern requirement for substantiated financial injury. By anchoring awards in the very figures that defined the contract's economic equilibrium at its inception, the proposed framework satisfies the "reasonable certainty" test while preventing the “windfall” effect often encountered in prolongation disputes.

As detailed in Section 8, this study represents the foundation of the authors' current research agenda. The lead author, in conjunction with the co-authors, is vigorously working on the detailed analysis and standardisation of ancillary claims—including Idling of Labour and Machinery, Design Mix Variances, and the financial implications of delayed payments to the Contractors. This ongoing investigation continues to refine the empirical roadmap for Arbitrators and judicial forums, ensuring that the resolution of infrastructure disputes remains robust, transparent, and equitable.

Xxx

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CONSTITUTIONAL DOCUMENTS

(1) INDIA CONST. [CONSTITUTION OF INDIA].

LEGISLATION

(1) The Indian Contract Act, No. 9 of 1872, India Code (1872).

(2) The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, No. 26 of 1996, India Code (1996).

BOOKS

(1) PADALA RAMA REDDI & PADALA SRINIVASA REDDY, *A.P. Detailed Standard Specifications and General Principles of Engineering Contracts* (16th ed., Asia Law House 2022).

(2) INDIAN ROADS CONGRESS (IRC), *Standard Data Book for Analysis of Road Construction Rates* (2d Rev. ed. 2019).

Technical Manuals and Administrative Reports

(1) CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, *Works Manual* (incorporating General Conditions of Contract) (2024).

(2) CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, *Delhi Analysis of Rates* (2023).

Correspondence

For further information, data requests, or clarifications regarding the methodologies used in this study, please address correspondence to: crkr1955@gmail.com, vakprao@gmail.com, vvn.randb@gmail.com, and manasa.manu1987@gmail.com.