

No signature, no sale: The emoji that couldn't seal the deal

15 mai 2025

In *Ross v. Garvey*, 2025 BCSC 705, the British Columbia Supreme Court was asked to determine whether a thumbs-up emoji was a valid electronic signature to a contract. **This case follows closely on the heels of the “emoji case”** *South West Terminal Ltd. v. Achter Land*, 2023 SKKB 116, in which in Saskatchewan courts found that a contract was “signed” using a thumbs-up emoji via text message ([read our article discussing Achter Land here](#)).

Background

The plaintiff, Daniel Ross, is a real estate developer and licensed realtor. He alleged that he had entered into a binding agreement to purchase a residential property from the defendants, brothers Kyle and Matthew Garvey. The Garveys had listed the property privately and were communicating with Ross via text and email.

Ross emailed the Garveys a signed formal offer using a standard real estate contract, which the Garveys initially rejected. Days later, Kyle Garvey emailed Ross a modified version of Ross's offer detailing changes to the price, deposit, and brokerage fees. **Although Kyle Garvey referred to this as a “counteroffer” in the email and attached a marked-up version of the standard contract sent by Ross, the Garveys did not sign it.**

Ross promptly replied by email accepting the counteroffer. Ross followed up with a text message stating he had sent an “accepted offer.”

Kyle Garvey texted back a thumbs-up emoji.

The Garveys later accepted an offer to sell the property to third party buyers.

Ross sued the Garveys, arguing that they had a binding contract which the Garveys breached by not completing the sale. The Garveys, however, claimed that there was no binding contract since they never signed the contract.

The dispute turned on whether the digital exchange between the parties, particularly the thumbs-up emoji, amounted to a binding and enforceable agreement

The decision

The Court found that a contract was formed in the email and text exchanges by the parties. The language used by Kyle Garvey in the counteroffer email, the document **attached, and the subsequent thumbs-up emoji after Ross's acceptance all objectively** signaled mutual assent to the deal.

Despite the finding that a contract was formed, the Court ultimately refused to enforce **the agreement since the contract failed to meet the requirements of BC's Law and Equity Act, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 253**. Specifically, section 59(3)(a) of the Act requires contracts respecting land to be in writing and signed.

Though the Garveys did not sign the counteroffer with an electronic signature, Ross argued that the thumbs-up emoji sent by Kyle after Ross accepted the counteroffer should be treated as a valid signature.

The Court disagreed. The Court adopted the analysis of Justice Barrington-Foote of the **Saskatchewan Court of Appeal writing in dissent in Achter Land**. In line with Justice Barrington-Foote's analysis, **the Court concluded that, for the contract to be enforceable**, the seller must have inserted a signature in the writing of the contract for the purpose of authenticating the document.

The signature does not need to be a traditional handwritten signature but must bear at least some sort of a formal inscription, made manually or electronically, that reflects the identity of the party who made it. The thumbs-up emoji did not meet this standard.

Key takeaways

1. **Digital communications can form contracts** : To determine if a contract has been formed, courts will look at the objective conduct and communications of the parties, including emails and texts. Here, the thumbs-up emoji was sufficient to form the contract, but because contracts for land have the unique requirement that they be signed, the contract was not enforceable. The consequence of this decision means that there is now precedent in British Columbia in which contracts can be formed through the use of emojis and, if not contracts for land, may be enforced.
2. **Seek professional advice** : The Garveys represented themselves without a realtor, leading to confusion and procedural missteps, such as making a counter offer when the Garveys intended to simply negotiate certain terms. Seeking advice from professionals can stop litigation before it happens.

Conclusion

Ross v. Garvey is a modern reminder that while technology has transformed how deals are made, certain legal formalities remain critical, particularly in real estate transactions.

We will continue to monitor future developments in the use of emojis on the law of **contract, including any appeal of the decision in Ross v. Garvey**.

If you have further questions about this topic, please reach out to any of the key contacts below.

Par

[Jake Cabott, Dalal Tubeishat, Matthew G. Swanson](#)

Services

BLG | Vos avocats au Canada

Borden Ladner Gervais S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L. (BLG) est le plus grand cabinet d'avocats canadien véritablement multiservices. À ce titre, il offre des conseils juridiques pratiques à des clients d'ici et d'ailleurs dans plus de domaines et de secteurs que tout autre cabinet canadien. Comptant plus de 725 avocats, agents de propriété intellectuelle et autres professionnels, BLG répond aux besoins juridiques d'entreprises et d'institutions au pays comme à l'étranger pour ce qui touche les fusions et acquisitions, les marchés financiers, les différends et le financement ou encore l'enregistrement de brevets et de marques de commerce.

blg.com

Bureaux BLG

Calgary

Centennial Place, East Tower
520 3rd Avenue S.W.
Calgary, AB, Canada
T2P 0R3

T 403.232.9500
F 403.266.1395

Ottawa

World Exchange Plaza
100 Queen Street
Ottawa, ON, Canada
K1P 1J9

T 613.237.5160
F 613.230.8842

Vancouver

1200 Waterfront Centre
200 Burrard Street
Vancouver, BC, Canada
V7X 1T2

T 604.687.5744
F 604.687.1415

Montréal

1000, rue De La Gauchetière Ouest
Suite 900
Montréal, QC, Canada
H3B 5H4

T 514.954.2555
F 514.879.9015

Toronto

Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower
22 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, ON, Canada
M5H 4E3

T 416.367.6000
F 416.367.6749

Les présents renseignements sont de nature générale et ne sauraient constituer un avis juridique, ni un énoncé complet de la législation pertinente, ni un avis sur un quelconque sujet. Personne ne devrait agir ou s'abstenir d'agir sur la foi de ceux-ci sans procéder à un examen approfondi du droit après avoir soupesé les faits d'une situation précise. Nous vous recommandons de consulter votre conseiller juridique si vous avez des questions ou des préoccupations particulières. BLG ne garantit aucunement que la teneur de cette publication est exacte, à jour ou complète. Aucune partie de cette publication ne peut être reproduite sans l'autorisation écrite de Borden Ladner Gervais S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L. Si BLG vous a envoyé cette publication et que vous ne souhaitez plus la recevoir, vous pouvez demander à faire supprimer vos coordonnées de nos listes d'envoi en communiquant avec nous par courriel à desabonnement@blg.com ou en modifiant vos préférences d'abonnement dans blg.com/fr/about-us/subscribe. Si vous pensez avoir reçu le présent message par erreur, veuillez nous écrire à communications@blg.com. Pour consulter la politique de confidentialité de BLG relativement aux publications, rendez-vous sur blg.com/fr/ProtectionDesRenseignementsPersonnels.