Chapter V of the Indian Contract Act 1872 codifies certain quasi-contractual claims recognised by English law of the mid-nineteenth century. A particularly interesting provision in Chapter V is section 70, which states: “Where a person lawfully does anything for another person, or delivers anything to him, not intending to do so gratuitously, and such other person enjoys the benefit thereof, the latter is bound to make compensation to the former in respect of, or to restore, the thing so done or delivered”. Due to its broad wording, a wide variety of situations were alleged to fall within its ambit. Although the cases that interpret the section are numerous, they are not wholly consistent with regard to its requirements and underlying principle. As a result, the boundaries of the section could not be precisely ascertained. Given the historical origin of Chapter V, one suggestion is that section 70 is based on the principle of unjust enrichment. While this finds some support from the cases and academic literature, the existing attempts to explain the section on this basis are largely inadequate and superficial. This paper seeks to examine in more detail how the conventional unjust enrichment analysis could be used to rationalise the section. Particular emphasis will be placed on identifying the unjust factor(s) that underlies the right of recovery.