

Case Study: Liskov Substitution Principle (LSP)

Domain: Banking → Account Types (Savings, FixedDeposit)

© Business Context:

Rajeev is building a banking application that handles Savings Accounts and Fixed Deposit **Accounts**. Both accounts allow querying balance, but **only Savings Accounts** allow **withdrawals**.

He uses inheritance — creates a FixedDepositAccount as a subclass of BankAccount, but this leads to a **violation of LSP**.



🗙 LSP Violation – Problematic Design

Superclass

```
public class BankAccount {
   protected double balance;
   public BankAccount(double balance) {
        this.balance = balance;
    public void withdraw(double amount) {
        balance -= amount;
        System.out.println("Withdrawn: " + amount);
   }
   public double getBalance() {
        return balance;
}
```

Subclass: FixedDepositAccount

```
public class FixedDepositAccount extends BankAccount {
    public FixedDepositAccount(double balance) {
        super(balance);
    // Override to prevent withdrawal
    @Override
    public void withdraw(double amount) {
        throw new UnsupportedOperationException("Withdrawals not allowed from
FD");
}
```

Test Code – Violates LSP

```
public class BankTest {
   public static void main(String[] args) {
        BankAccount account = new FixedDepositAccount(10000);
```

```
account.withdraw(1000); // \times Violates LSP — client expects it to work }
```

△ Why This Violates LSP?

"Objects of a superclass should be replaceable with objects of a subclass without breaking the application."

- We replaced BankAccount with a FixedDepositAccount, but it crashed.
- **Contract of withdraw() is broken** clients can't rely on the behavior anymore.
- This breaks polymorphism and makes the code fragile and unsafe.

☑ Refactored Code – LSP Compliant

Instead of forcing inheritance, use **interface segregation** to model account capabilities.

Step 1: Common Account Interface

```
public interface Account {
    double getBalance();
}
```

Step 2: Withdrawable Interface

```
public interface Withdrawable {
    void withdraw(double amount);
}
```

Step 3: SavingsAccount (supports withdrawal)

```
public class SavingsAccount implements Account, Withdrawable {
    private double balance;

public SavingsAccount(double balance) {
        this.balance = balance;
}

@Override
public void withdraw(double amount) {
        balance -= amount;
        System.out.println("Withdrawn: " + amount);
}

@Override
public double getBalance() {
        return balance;
```

```
}
```

Step 4: FixedDepositAccount (no withdrawal)

```
public class FixedDepositAccount implements Account {
    private double balance;

public FixedDepositAccount(double balance) {
        this.balance = balance;
    }

@Override
    public double getBalance() {
        return balance;
    }
}
```

✓ LSP-Safe Test Code

🧠 Real-World Analogy

You have two lockers:

- Savings locker: you can withdraw money any time.
- **FD locker**: once money is locked, you can't withdraw early.

If you treat all lockers the same and expect withdrawal from FD, it will **break your trust** in the locker system.

✓ Summary of LSP Benefits

Principle Benefit

Behavioral

You can use subclasses without worrying about different behavior

Principle	Benefit
Substitutability	
Code Safety	Prevents runtime surprises (e.g., UnsupportedOperationException)
Flexible Design	Models real capabilities, avoids misuse of inheritance

Teaching Tips

- Ask: "Can you substitute any subclass in the place of the superclass?"
- Use this case in discussions on **composition over inheritance**
- Add a twist: "Introduce another type of account (e.g., LoanAccount). Can it also fit cleanly?"