Revisiting the Quincecare Doctrine in Light of Nigerian Law and Global Banking Practice

The Quincecare doctrine, once an obscure principle in English banking law, has in recent years become a recurring theme in high-profile litigation. Originating from the 1992 case of **Barclays Bank Plc v Quincecare Ltd**[1], the doctrine imposes a duty on banks not to execute a customer's payment instruction if they are "put on inquiry", that is, if they have reasonable grounds (though not necessarily proof) to suspect that the instruction may be an attempt to misappropriate funds.

For decades, the principle was rarely invoked, lying dormant in the shadows of banking law. However, in recent years, an increasing number of cases have thrust the doctrine back into the spotlight. This resurgence raises significant questions about the balance between a bank's duty of care, its obligation to honour customer instructions, and the broader implications for fraud prevention. More importantly, it forces us to ask whether, and how, Nigerian courts may adopt or adapt the doctrine in the context of our own legal and financial system.

The Origins of the Doctrine

In Barclays Bank Plc v Quincecare, Quincecare Ltd obtained a loan of £400,000 from Barclays. The company's chairman, acting dishonestly, misapplied most of the funds for personal purposes. The central issue before the court was whether the bank had breached its duty by failing to recognise and stop the fraudulent instructions.

Modern Applications: A Revival of Quincecare.

For many years after Quincecare, few cases tested its limits. That changed dramatically in the last decade, with courts revisiting the doctrine in cases involving increasingly complex frauds.

1. Singularis Holdings Ltd v Daiwa Capital Markets Europe Ltd[2]. The UK Supreme Court held that Daiwa breached its duty by executing payment instructions in the face of obvious warning signs of fraud by the company's director. The Court stressed that while the Quincecare duty applies in "exceptional circumstances," it remains a vital safeguard against misappropriation.

2. Philipp v Barclays Bank UK Plc[3]: In this case, the claimant herself was deceived by fraudsters into authorising transfers. The court rejected her claim, declining to extend Quincecare to protect customers from their own decisions. This highlighted the boundaries of the doctrine — it was never intended to protect customers from self-authorised fraud.

3. Federal Republic of Nigeria v JP Morgan Chase Bank[4]: Nigeria sought to recover over US$1.1 billion paid out under instructions allegedly tainted by corruption. While the High Court ultimately found no breach, the case reaffirmed the narrow scope of Quincecare and emphasised that vague suspicions are insufficient.

1 [1992] 4 All ER 363
2 [2019] UKSC 50
3 [2021] EWHC 10 (Comm)
4 [2019] EWCA Civ 1641

For liability to arise, the bank must have specific reasons to suspect the particular instruction.

Together, these cases underscore two things: first, that the doctrine is alive and relevant; and second, that courts remain reluctant to expand it beyond narrow boundaries.

The Key Questions

Recent litigation raises unresolved questions with significant implications for banks, creditors, and customers:

1. **To whom is the duty owed?** Is it limited to the bank's immediate customer, or can it extend to creditors and beneficial account owners in insolvency situations?

2. **Can the duty be excluded?** To what extent can contractual provisions, particularly clauses limiting liability to gross negligence, narrow or exclude the duty?

3. **What is the threshold for "inquiry"?** How should courts assess whether a bank had sufficient grounds to pause and investigate?

4. **How should the doctrine adapt to modern frauds?** In a world of Authorised Push Payment (APP) scams and sophisticated phishing schemes, the rigid boundaries of Quincecare may leave customers exposed.

Nigerian Law: The Road Ahead

While Nigerian courts have not yet directly embraced the Quincecare doctrine, its relevance is undeniable in a banking environment increasingly plagued by fraud, cybercrime, and misappropriation. The key challenge is whether our courts will:

1. Adopt the doctrine wholesale as part of persuasive English authority.

2. Adapt it to local realities, particularly given the prevalence of insider fraud and weak regulatory enforcement.

3. Resist it altogether, preferring to rely on contractual and regulatory mechanisms instead of judicially created duties.

There is precedent for Nigerian courts to follow English commercial case law where there is a gap in local jurisprudence. However, given the heavy reliance on contractual terms in banking relationships, one should expect vigorous litigation around exclusion clauses and the scope of bank liability.

Conclusion: Do We Care?

The Quincecare doctrine sits at the intersection of trust and suspicion in banking relationships. On one hand, banks are not expected to second-guess every instruction; on the other, blind execution in the face of red flags undermines public confidence and exposes customers to devastating losses.

For Nigerian banks, regulators, and courts, the doctrine offers both a warning and an opportunity. As fraud schemes become more sophisticated, there is a strong case for Nigerian jurisprudence to recognise — or at least grapple with — the principles underlying Quincecare. But whether the duty will expand or remain narrowly confined is an open question.

In the end, the Quincecare doctrine forces us to confront a simple but powerful issue: when fraud is suspected, does the law demand that banks care enough to stop and ask questions?

Tolu Osho
Associate

Disclaimer