

MORALITY CLAUSES, CORPORATE IMAGE, AND THE PAYSTACK EXPERIENCE



Tolulope Raji
Head, Capital Markets



Precious Bassey
Associate Counsel

In an age when corporate reputation can be lost overnight through social media, celebrity conduct, or regulatory scandal, contracting parties increasingly deploy morality clauses to manage non-commercial risks that may threaten the value of business relationships. These provisions allow one or both parties to take action, such as termination or other remedies, when conduct outside the contract threatens to undermine the business, brand, or commercial purpose of the arrangement. The morality clause sits at the intersection of contract law, commercial risk management and ethics. This article explains what morality clauses do, why they matter, their legal and practical pitfalls, and how counsel should draft and negotiate them to balance reputational protection with fairness, enforceability and human rights considerations.

In November 2025, Ezra Olubi, the co-founder and Chief Technology Officer (CTO) of Paystack, was suspended following public allegations of sexual misconduct involving a subordinate, alongside the resurfacing of historic social media posts dating back to approximately 2009–2013. These posts contained explicit sexual content, references to minors, and other deeply troubling remarks.

Shortly thereafter, Paystack terminated Olubi's employment, citing the significant reputational harm arising from the circulation of these historical materials even though the independent investigation initiated by the company had not yet been concluded. Olubi, in response, asserted that he had been dismissed without being afforded a meeting, hearing, or any opportunity to present a defence. According to him, this contravened the terms of his suspension as well as Paystack's internal procedures. Paystack, however, maintains that it acted strictly within its contractual rights.

Although the precise contents of Olubi's employment contract remain confidential, the controversy has largely revolved around historical, off-duty conduct resurfacing online, and the consequent intense public scrutiny placed on Paystack's leadership culture and governance standards.

So, What is a Morality Clause?

A morality clause is a contractual provision that allows one party to terminate an agreement if the other party engages in behavior deemed unacceptable or potentially damaging to the contracting party's reputation. They appear across sectors such as entertainment, sport, brand licensing, finance, sponsorship and employment contracts. They typically capture conducts such as criminal convictions, public statements inimical to the brand, sexual misconduct, corruption, or other conduct deemed detrimental to the company's reputation, brand, or public image. Common prohibited conduct under morality clauses includes; criminal behaviour, drug abuse, sexual misconduct, harassment, discriminatory or offensive speech, illegal or unethical acts.

However, depending on how the clause is written, it could also cover broader "immoral" or "unethical" behaviour. The idea behind morality clauses is that thecontracting party effectively "purchases" not only the individual's performance, but also their public image and trustworthiness, and wants assurances that the individual will not engage in conduct that could bring "disrepute, contempt, scandal, ridicule," or otherwise "shock, insult or offend" a significant portion of the public.

A well-drafted morality clause typically addresses three core questions. First, it identifies the trigger, the specific conduct or circumstances that activate the clause. Second, it outlines the remedy, whether termination, suspension, clawback, withholding of payments, or other contractual relief. Third, it defines the process through which alleged misconduct is assessed, including the evidentiary threshold, who makes the determination, and what procedural safeguards are available to the affected party. Together, these elements determine whether the clause is precise, enforceable, and fair.

Morality clauses have grown in commercial significance as organizations place increasing weight on reputation, public perception, and ethical conduct.

Their purposes are multifaceted: they help safeguard brand value by allowing swift action when a key individual's behaviourthreatens consumer trust; they deter harmful conduct by signalling that certain actions, even outside the workplace, may carry contractual consequences; and they provide clearer behavioural expectations by articulating what the parties regard as unacceptable conduct. For companies in regulated or high-visibility sectors, they also serve as a practical tool for managing legal and financial exposure when public misconduct risks undermining business operations.

Despite their appeal, morality clauses present notable legal and practical challenges. Vague phrases such as "bringing the company into disrepute" may render a clause uncertain and vulnerable to narrow interpretation or judicial rejection. Overly broad clauses that authorize harsh remedies for minor indiscretions create proportionality concerns, while unilateral decision-making without due process invites disputes and reputational counterclaims. In employment contexts, these provisions can intersect uncomfortably with labourprotections, privacy laws, anti-discrimination rules, and even constitutional rights such as freedom of expression, especially where the alleged misconduct relates to political or religious speech. If drafted too aggressively, they may also create a chilling effect, discouraging talent and harming workplace morale.

Effective implementation therefore requires more than just contractual wording; it demands a robust operational framework. Organizations must establish clear escalation pathways involving legal, HR, and communications teams; define investigation protocols covering timelines, evidence standards, and investigator selection; and prepare communication strategies for both internal and external audiences. They should also review insurance arrangements, including reputational risk and directors' and officers' coverage, and maintain comprehensive documentation to support any enforcement decision. These governance measures not only mitigate legal exposure but also demonstrate procedural fairness, strengthening the clause's defensibility if challenged.

Beyond their legal and operational complexities, morality clauses are equally shaped by negotiation dynamics and commercial realities. Their breadth often depends on the relative bargaining power of the parties: brand owners and licensors typically push for broad protections with low thresholds that allow swift action to preserve reputation, while talent, influencers, and other high-profile individuals tend to resist expansive discretion, preferring narrowly defined and objectively verifiable triggers, opportunities to remedy alleged breaches, and clear safeguards around compensation. Investors and lenders, on the other hand, favour unambiguous standards that protect asset value and enable timely intervention where misconduct threatens commercial stability. Against these competing interests, effective negotiation requires advisers to focus on crafting precise and objectively framed triggers, ensuring fair procedural protection, tailoring remedies to the proportionality of the conduct, and incorporating mechanisms that minimize unnecessary publicity or collateral reputational damage.

Navigating the Legal and Ethical Tightrope of Enforcement

A central difficulty with morality clauses lies in balancing an organization's legitimate need to protect its reputation with an individual's fundamental rights to privacy, autonomy, and freedom of expression. Striking this balance requires careful legal and ethical calibration to ensure that morality clauses do not overreach or become tools for arbitrary control. When drafted or applied too broadly, these clauses risk infringing personal liberties, creating ambiguity, and inviting legal disputes over fairness, due process, and proportionality.

This tension gives rise to deeper ethical and policy considerations. Morality clauses operate as forms of private regulation, prompting questions about the extent to which contractual relationships should police personal behaviour or set standards of public morality. While companies justifiably seek to safeguard brand value, the private enforcement of moral expectations can exert a chilling effect on personal autonomy if used without restraint. The most defensible approach therefore prioritizes measured, narrowly tailored provisions that protect commercial interests without imposing unwarranted moral judgments or undermining individual rights.

To mitigate these risks and ensure fairness, organizationsseeking to introduce or rely on morality clauses should adopt robust best-practice standards. Clarity is paramount: vague descriptors such as "immoral" should be replaced with precise, identifiable forms of misconduct that demonstrably harm reputation, client relationships, or fiduciary obligations. Likewise, the scope of the clause should be clearly defined with recognition that senior roles may warrant broader obligations than junior ones.

Fairness can also be strengthened through reciprocity, such as incorporating reverse-morality clauses that protect individuals when an employer engages in unlawful or unethical conduct. Equally important is embedding transparent processes before invoking the clause. Finally, tying enforcement to material harm ensures proportionality, preventing the clause from being triggered by trivial or inconsequential incidents. This holistic approach creates a system that is both commercially protective and ethically defensible.

Conclusion

Morality clauses are powerful risk-management tools in an era of reputational fragility. Properly drafted, they allow businesses to guard brand value and operational continuity. Poorly conceived, they are vague, unfair, and legally vulnerable. However, the experiences from Hollywood to the Paystack incident confirm that these clauses are potent weapons that must be handled with precision.

As the line between private and professional life continues to erode, the burden falls on corporations to move beyond boilerplate language and develop specific, context-sensitive morality provisions.

These provisions must strike a delicate balance: providing sufficient protection for the brand while respecting the individual employee's rights and ensuring the clauses are never weaponized to enforce personal, political, or discriminatory biases. The ultimate test of a morality clause is not its power to terminate a contract, but its ethical and legal defensibility when challenged.

References

Costanzo, J. S. (2025). Understanding Morality Clauses in Employment Contracts. Costanzo Law Firm. [General legal firm publication discussing modern use].

FindLaw. (2021). What is a morality clause? Is it legal? FindLaw. https://www.findlaw.com/legalblogs/law-and-life/what-is-a-morality-clause-is-it-legal

Kressler, Noah B. “Using the Morals Clause in Talent Agreements: A Historical, Legal, and practical Guide.” (2005).

Fung, B. (2021, December 4). CNN fires Chris Cuomo. CNN Business. [Specific news report detailing the firing and citing the morality clause breach].

Guardian Nigeria. (2025, November 14). Paystacksuspends Ezra Olubi over viral sexual-misconduct allegations. Guardian Nigeria.

https://guardian.ng/business-services/paystack-suspends-ezra-olubi-over-viral-sexual-misconduct-allegations/

Journal of Legal Studies in Business. (2008). Morality and money: Contractual morals clauses as fiscal and ethical safeguards.

https://journaloflegalstudiesinbusiness.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/mmcmcfrs_2008_1to29.pdf

TVC News. (2025). Paystack launches probe into allegations against co-founder Ezra Olubi. TVC News.

https://www.tvcnews.tv/paystack-launch-probe-in-pedophilia-allegations-against-co-founder-ezra/

Wikipedia. (2025). Morals clause. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morals_clause