INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN RIGHTS LAW REVIEW
An International Open Access Double Blind Peer Reviewed, Referred Journal

Volume 4 | Issue 3 | 2025 Art. 73

Contractual Risk and Responsibility in the Post-COVID Paradigm

Hithaishree D N
Law Student, BA.LLB (Hons.)
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Dr. Shobha Yadav
Assistant Professor,
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Recommended Citation
Hithaishree D N and Dr. Shobha Yadav, *Contractual Risk and Responsibility in the Post-COVID Paradigm*, 4 IJHRLR 1015-1033 (2025).
Available at www.humanrightlawreview.in/archives/.

Contractual Risk and Responsibility in the Post-COVID Paradigm

Hithaishree D N
Law Student, BA.LLB (Hons.)
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Dr. Shobha Yadav
Assistant Professor,
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Manuscript Received	Manuscript Accepted	Manuscript Published
26 May 2025	29 May 2025	08 June 2025

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic triggered unprecedented disruption across global markets, revealing significant weaknesses in traditional contract law frameworks and prompting widespread re-evaluation of doctrines such as force majeure, frustration, and hardship. This study explores how courts, legislators, and contractual parties responded to pandemic-induced uncertainties, with particular focus on judicial flexibility, legislative interventions, and proactive contract management. By analyzing industry-specific examples—from hospitality to manufacturing and event management—the research highlights the importance of detailed and anticipatory drafting, especially concerning force majeure and hardship clauses. The study also underscores the rise of pandemic-specific contractual provisions, the integration of digital contract management tools, and the increasing reliance on alternative dispute resolution mechanisms to preserve business relationships. Emerging trends include an emphasis on good faith, international harmonization of contract principles, and technological innovations such as smart contracts. The findings reflect a doctrinal shift toward flexibility, fairness, and resilience in contract enforcement. The paper concludes by recommending a reformation of contractual practices to build preparedness against future systemic disruptions, urging policymakers to foster adaptable legal frameworks that can ensure equitable outcomes in times of global crisis.

KEYWORDS

Contracts, Pandemic, Force majeure, Flexibility,

Technology

1. INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic, which began in late 2019 and swiftly escalated into a global crisis, has profoundly affected nearly every facet of society, including the legal framework governing contractual relationships. The sudden and far-reaching disruptions—ranging from government-imposed lockdowns to widespread supply chain failures—have tested the foundations of traditional contract law, particularly the doctrines of performance, force majeure, frustration, and hardship. As the world navigates the post-pandemic landscape, it is essential to examine how these contractual obligations have transformed, what legal complexities have emerged, and how courts, legislatures, and commercial actors have responded.

Contracts serve as the bedrock of both commercial and personal dealings, offering predictability and legal certainty. Central to this framework is the principle of *pacta sunt servanda*—that agreements must be kept. Yet, this principle is not inflexible. Most legal systems acknowledge that unforeseen events, such as natural disasters, armed conflicts, or global pandemics, can render performance impossible or unreasonably burdensome. COVID-19 has become a textbook example of such an event, triggering widespread legal disputes over non-performance, contract renegotiation, and termination.

The pandemic's impact on contractual obligations has been wide-ranging. Businesses faced forced closures, labor shortages, disrupted supply chains, and legislative restrictions that made contractual performance challenging or infeasible. These disruptions prompted urgent legal questions: Does the COVID-19 pandemic qualify as a force majeure event? Can contracting parties invoke the doctrines of frustration or hardship to excuse non-performance?

This paper aims to provide a thorough analysis of how contractual obligations have evolved in the wake of COVID-19. It will explore classical doctrines that address contractual performance under unforeseen circumstances, assess the pandemic's legal impact on these doctrines, and evaluate judicial and legislative responses across multiple jurisdictions. Furthermore, it will consider how businesses have adapted contract practices in response to these challenges.

Finally, the study will offer practical recommendations for drafting more resilient contracts, highlight best practices in risk allocation, and propose legal reforms to better equip contract law

to respond to future global disruptions. The findings are intended to guide legal professionals, policymakers, and commercial entities in building a more adaptive and forward-looking contractual framework.

2. LEGAL DOCTRINES: FORCE MAJEURE, FRUSTRATION, AND HARDSHIP

1. Force Majeure: Concept and Application

Force majeure is a contractual provision that relieves parties from the performance of their obligations when extraordinary events beyond their control render performance inadvisable, commercially impracticable, illegal, or impossible. Though the term originates from French law, it has found widespread acceptance in both civil law and common law jurisdictions.

Typical force majeure events include natural disasters, wars, strikes, government actions, and, more recently, pandemics. Prior to the outbreak of COVID-19, references to "pandemics" or "epidemics" in force majeure clauses were relatively rare, which led to significant interpretative challenges during the pandemic.

Courts and arbitral tribunals were compelled to evaluate the applicability of force majeure clauses in the face of unprecedented disruption. Key legal questions included:

- Whether COVID-19 constituted a force majeure event under the contract;
- Whether government-imposed lockdowns or restrictions could trigger the clause;
- Whether the affected party undertook reasonable efforts to mitigate the impact of the event.

Judicial interpretations generally hinged on the precise language of the contract. Where force majeure clauses explicitly referenced terms such as "pandemic," "epidemic," or "government action," courts were more inclined to excuse non-performance. In *Halliburton Offshore Services Inc. v. Vedanta Limited* (Delhi High Court, 2020), for example, the court acknowledged the impact of lockdowns as a force majeure event but emphasized the necessity of a case-by-case assessment.

Importantly, force majeure cannot be invoked for foreseeable events or when performance remains possible through reasonable means. Additionally, increased cost or economic hardship is typically insufficient to trigger the clause unless

specifically provided for in the contract.

2. Frustration of Contract in Common Law Jurisdictions

The doctrine of frustration arises where an unforeseen event occurs after the formation of the contract, fundamentally altering the nature of the obligations and rendering performance impossible or radically different from what was originally agreed. Unlike force majeure, frustration is a legal doctrine that operates independently of contractual terms.

In common law jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom and India, parties invoked frustration during the pandemic in light of lockdowns, supply chain disruptions, and workforce unavailability. However, courts have maintained a stringent standard, requiring that the event must render performance impossible—not merely more burdensome or economically unviable.

Seminal cases include *Taylor v. Caldwell* (1863), which laid the foundation of the frustration doctrine in English law. In India, Section 56 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 codifies the principle. In *Satyabrata Ghose v. Mugneeram Bangur & Co.* (1954), the Supreme Court clarified that frustration applies only when performance becomes impossible. In *Standard Retail Pvt. Ltd. v. G.S. Global Corp.* (Bombay High Court, 2020), the court ruled that mere delay due to lockdowns did not constitute frustration, as the performance was still possible once restrictions were eased.

3. Hardship in Civil Law Systems

The doctrine of hardship is prevalent in civil law jurisdictions and pertains to situations where performance, while not impossible, becomes excessively onerous due to unforeseen events. Unlike frustration or force majeure, hardship does not excuse performance but allows for adaptation or renegotiation of contract terms.

For instance, under Article 1195 of the French Civil Code, a party may request renegotiation if an unforeseeable event renders performance excessively burdensome. If renegotiation fails, courts may revise or terminate the contract. Similarly, the UNIDROIT Principles (Article 6.2.2) and the Principles of European Contract Law (Article 6:111) incorporate hardship provisions allowing for equitable adjustment.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, businesses in civil law countries increasingly relied on hardship doctrines to renegotiate

contract terms. Courts and arbitral bodies often encouraged such renegotiations and, in certain cases, permitted modifications or temporary suspensions of contractual obligations to preserve the contractual equilibrium.

4. Comparative Overview: Force Majeure, Frustration, and Hardship

Doctrine	Nature	Trigger Conditions	Relief Offered
Force Majeure	Contractual	Specified unforeseeable events (e.g., pandemics)	Excuses performance if explicitly included
Frustration	Legal doctrine (common law)	Fundamental change making performance impossible	Discharges the contract
Hardship	Legal doctrine (civil law)	Excessively burdensome performance due to unforeseen event	Allows renegotiation or contract adaptation

The COVID-19 pandemic has pushed the boundaries of these legal doctrines, revealing both their utility and limitations in responding to global crises. The experience underscores several critical lessons: the necessity of precise contract drafting, the value of proactive risk allocation, and the importance of evolving legal frameworks to accommodate unprecedented disruptions.

Going forward, it is imperative for drafters, businesses, and policymakers to incorporate broader and more flexible contingency provisions, anticipate global risks, and ensure legal resilience in commercial contracts.

3. IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIPS: CASE STUDIES AND COMPARATIVE

The COVID-19 pandemic's impact on contractual relationships was immediate and far-reaching. With the enforcement of lockdowns, travel restrictions, and social distancing norms, economic activities across industries came to a standstill. This disruption was especially pronounced in sectors such as

construction, manufacturing, retail, hospitality, and international trade. Contracts governing the supply of goods and services, commercial leases, employment, and infrastructure development were severely affected, resulting in widespread disputes, renegotiations, and invocation of legal doctrines related to non-performance and impossibility.

In the construction and infrastructure domain, many ongoing projects were either delayed or entirely suspended due to government-mandated shutdowns, labor shortages, and supply chain interruptions. Across India and the Middle East, contractors frequently relied on force majeure clauses to justify deviations from original timelines. One significant case, *Halliburton Offshore Services Inc. v. Vedanta Limited* (Delhi High Court, 2020), recognized the national lockdown as a valid force majeure event, allowing the contractor relief from strict performance obligations. This judgment reflected an adaptive judicial approach to interpreting contractual clauses in light of an unforeseen global crisis.

Similarly, the retail and commercial leasing sector faced severe turmoil. The forced closure of retail establishments rendered many tenants unable to conduct business, prompting them to seek rent waivers or suspensions. In the United Kingdom, courts were called upon to address such issues. In *Commerz Real Investment Gesellschaft mbH v. TFS Stores Ltd* (2021), the tenant argued that the lockdown constituted frustration of the lease agreement. However, the court ruled that temporary inability to operate did not frustrate the lease, and rent obligations remained binding. This decision highlighted the judiciary's adherence to the principle that frustration must radically alter the nature of the contract, not merely render performance more difficult.

The international trade and supply chain sectors encountered similar disruption. Global closures, port delays, and logistical hurdles led to failure in fulfilling contractual obligations related to the delivery of goods. In *Standard Retail Pvt. Ltd. v. G.S. Global Corp.* (Bombay High Court, 2020), the court ruled that shipment delays caused by lockdowns did not constitute frustration since performance was still possible after restrictions were eased. Instead of protracted litigation, many parties opted for renegotiation or alternative dispute resolution mechanisms to resolve their differences amicably, preserving commercial relationships amid uncertainty.

Courts across jurisdictions responded to these disruptions in different ways, shaped by the underlying legal traditions and statutory frameworks. In India, courts adopted a pragmatic, case-

by-case approach. While the Ministry of Finance issued an Office Memorandum in February 2020 recognizing COVID-19 as a force majeure event in government contracts, judicial forums consistently emphasized the need for parties to prove a direct causal link between the pandemic and their inability to fulfill contractual duties. Courts closely scrutinized the wording of contracts and avoided blanket relief unless justified by the specific factual matrix.

In the United Kingdom, the legal threshold for invoking frustration remained high. The judiciary focused on the precise terms of the agreement and whether the pandemic fundamentally altered the contractual relationship. The decision in *Canary Wharf (BP4) T1 Ltd v. European Medicines Agency* (2019), where Brexit was held not to frustrate a lease, served as a reference point for courts dealing with COVID-19 claims. Temporary business interruptions or increased burdens were generally found insufficient to trigger frustration, reinforcing a conservative judicial stance.

In the United States, the interpretation of force majeure clauses depended on state-specific laws and the express language of the contracts. Courts generally required clear proof that the pandemic directly prevented contractual performance. Under the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), the doctrine of impracticability provides a possible defense to non-performance, but courts were cautious in applying it to pandemic-related cases, especially where alternative means of performance existed or where delays were not indefinite.

By contrast, civil law jurisdictions such as France and China adopted a more flexible stance. French courts applied Article 1195 of the Civil Code, allowing for renegotiation of contracts when unforeseen circumstances made performance excessively burdensome. In China, the Supreme People's Court issued judicial guidance encouraging parties to renegotiate COVID-affected contracts and permitted judicial modification or termination where hardship was established. These approaches emphasized cooperation, equity, and the preservation of contractual relationships over strict enforcement. The COVID-19 pandemic exposed vulnerabilities in existing contractual frameworks and prompted a re-evaluation of doctrines such as force majeure, frustration, and hardship. While common law jurisdictions generally adhered to conservative interpretations and strict thresholds, civil law countries demonstrated greater openness to contract adaptation and renegotiation. The global legal response underscored the need for precise drafting of risk allocation clauses, proactive contingency planning, and greater

flexibility within legal systems to respond effectively to unprecedented global disruptions.

4. CASE STUDIES: PRACTICAL OUTCOMES

The hospitality industry was among the hardest hit during the COVID-19 pandemic. A notable example involved a hotel chain in Singapore that experienced mass cancellations due to international travel bans. Fortunately, its contracts included a well-drafted force majeure clause that explicitly covered "epidemics," enabling the hotel to refund customer deposits without incurring penalties. This proactive approach to drafting minimized disputes and helped preserve long-term business relationships during a time of uncertainty and financial stress.

In contrast, the manufacturing sector faced more complicated challenges. An Indian auto parts manufacturer found itself unable to fulfill delivery obligations due to factory closures prompted by lockdowns. Unfortunately, the force majeure clause in its contracts did not mention pandemics or similar public health crises. This omission led to a contractual dispute, which was ultimately resolved through judicial encouragement for mediation. The court examined both the intent of the parties and the extent of the disruption caused by the pandemic, opting for a settlement approach over adversarial litigation.

Event management companies were also severely impacted as large-scale gatherings were prohibited globally. A prominent international event management firm had to cancel conferences scheduled in multiple jurisdictions. Where the company had robust and detailed force majeure clauses, it successfully avoided liability. However, in locations lacking such protections, the firm faced lawsuits for breach of contract. These contrasting outcomes underscored the significance of careful and jurisdiction-sensitive contract drafting.

Several key lessons emerged from these experiences. The pandemic exposed the inadequacy of generic force majeure clauses, prompting businesses to reconsider the precision and scope of their contract language. There has been a marked shift towards including specific references to pandemics, epidemics, and government-imposed restrictions. Risk allocation has also come under renewed scrutiny, with businesses placing greater emphasis on flexibility and contingency planning in contract negotiations. Additionally, alternative dispute resolution mechanisms such as mediation and negotiation gained popularity for resolving COVID-19-related contractual disputes, offering a cost-effective and relationship-preserving alternative to litigation.

The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated the critical importance of clear contractual terms, strategic risk management, and adaptability in the face of global disruptions. Comparative legal analysis revealed significant variations in how jurisdictions responded to such crises, reinforcing the need for parties to account for local legal frameworks when drafting and enforcing contracts.

Government intervention became necessary as the magnitude of the pandemic's disruption overwhelmed private contractual remedies. Across the world, state actors stepped in to provide relief to parties unable to fulfill their contractual obligations. The rationale for such interventions was rooted in economic stability and fairness, aiming to avert cascading defaults, bankruptcies, and widespread financial distress. By mitigating the immediate economic impact, governments sought to maintain confidence in both markets and legal institutions.

In India, the Ministry of Finance took the lead by issuing an Office Memorandum on 19 February 2020. It classified the COVID-19 outbreak as a "natural calamity," thus enabling parties in government contracts to invoke force majeure provisions. This clarification provided much-needed relief to contractors, suppliers, and service providers involved in public projects. Indian courts responded in a generally sympathetic manner, though they remained firm on the requirement that affected parties must establish a direct causal connection between the pandemic and their inability to perform. In *M/s. Halliburton Offshore Services Inc. v. Vedanta Limited*, the Delhi High Court acknowledged the lockdown as a valid force majeure event and granted an extension for contract performance. Furthermore, some state governments issued notifications suspending select contractual obligations such as rent and loan repayments. Complementing this, the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) introduced moratoriums on term loan repayments, thereby providing indirect relief to borrowers in their contractual dealings with lenders.

The United Kingdom adopted a multi-pronged strategy, combining emergency legislation with policy advisories. The Coronavirus Act 2020 introduced a temporary moratorium on commercial evictions, shielding tenants from eviction for non-payment of rent during lockdowns. This measure was extended multiple times, allowing businesses time to regain financial footing. The UK Cabinet Office supplemented these statutory protections with guidance encouraging contractual parties to act "responsibly and fairly" during the pandemic. Though not legally binding, this guidance promoted a cooperative spirit and

preferred negotiation over adversarial enforcement.

In the United States, the response focused more on financial relief than direct intervention in contractual obligations. The federal government enacted the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, which provided loans, grants, and enhanced unemployment benefits to individuals and businesses. This support enabled many to meet their contractual duties despite economic slowdown. Some states enacted their own temporary measures, such as halting evictions and utility shutoffs. While these policies indirectly impacted contractual rights, they were primarily designed to prevent homelessness and business failure.

Civil law jurisdictions, such as France and China, demonstrated greater legislative flexibility. France had already amended its Civil Code in 2016 to introduce Article 1195, which permits parties to request contract renegotiation when an unforeseen event makes performance excessively onerous. During the pandemic, French courts encouraged use of this provision, and the government issued ordinances suspending penalties for non-performance in selected sectors. China's Supreme People's Court issued detailed guidelines instructing lower courts to consider COVID-19 as a valid ground for invoking force majeure. The Chinese government also issued official force majeure certificates to affected businesses, enabling them to present credible evidence in contractual disputes.

International organizations contributed valuable model frameworks and guidance. The UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts, though non-binding, provided arbitrators and contractual parties with reference standards on force majeure and hardship. These principles promoted renegotiation and equitable contract adjustment in response to unforeseen global events like pandemics. Similarly, institutions like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund issued policy advisories encouraging governments to adopt fair, transparent, and flexible approaches to COVID-related contractual disruptions, recognizing the centrality of legal predictability to economic recovery.

While government interventions brought substantial relief, they also raised concerns regarding the sanctity of contracts. Critics contended that blanket moratoriums and legislative overrides risked undermining contractual certainty and could lead to moral hazard, discouraging prudent contractual behavior in the future. However, most measures were temporary and narrowly tailored, seeking to balance legal consistency with economic exigencies. Ultimately, these interventions revealed the necessity

for legal systems to be responsive, equitable, and resilient in the face of crises.

The COVID-19 pandemic marked a turning point in the global legal landscape, prompting a rethinking of how contracts are drafted, interpreted, and enforced during emergencies. It illuminated both the strengths and limitations of existing legal doctrines, contractual mechanisms, and governmental tools. As legal systems reflect on the lessons of the pandemic, future policies and legislative responses are likely to incorporate greater flexibility, nuanced risk allocation, and mechanisms that uphold both contractual sanctity and commercial fairness in times of widespread disruption.

5. CONTRACT MANAGEMENT LESSONS AND FUTURE PREPAREDNESS

The COVID-19 pandemic revealed significant weaknesses in contract management practices across industries, exposing organizations to uncertainty, disputes, and financial losses. Many businesses discovered that their contracts lacked provisions addressing extraordinary events such as pandemics or government-imposed restrictions. This unpreparedness led to a surge in legal conflicts and underscored the urgency for a more proactive and strategic approach to contract drafting and management. In response, legal professionals, corporate stakeholders, and policymakers have increasingly emphasized the importance of clarity, risk assessment, flexibility, and digital tools to ensure contracts are resilient in the face of global disruptions.

A key lesson from the pandemic is the critical importance of clear and comprehensive force majeure clauses. Contracts that explicitly referenced “pandemics,” “epidemics,” or “government actions” provided certainty and legal cover to the parties involved. In contrast, vague or generic clauses created ambiguity and fueled legal disputes. Moving forward, parties are expected to broaden the scope of force majeure provisions to include public health emergencies, define the consequences of such events—such as suspension, time extensions, or termination—and clearly lay out notification timelines and mitigation duties. This evolution in drafting aims to reduce ambiguity and align expectations when unforeseen disruptions arise.

In addition to force majeure, the pandemic highlighted the value of incorporating hardship and renegotiation provisions. Unlike force majeure, which deals with impossibility, hardship clauses address situations where performance becomes excessively

burdensome yet still possible. Common in civil law systems and increasingly adopted in international agreements, these clauses allow parties to renegotiate or adapt contractual terms through a structured and non-adversarial process. Their growing inclusion reflects a recognition that contracts must accommodate economic realities without defaulting to litigation.

The pandemic also shifted the spotlight onto risk allocation and the role of insurance. Many businesses suffered avoidable losses due to poorly allocated risks or lack of adequate coverage. A re-evaluation of contractual risk-sharing is underway, with parties aiming to assign specific risks to the entities best equipped to manage them. Furthermore, insurance policies are being revisited to include coverage for business interruptions, pandemics, and other extraordinary events. Contractual terms must now be periodically reviewed and updated to reflect evolving risk landscapes and operational environments.

The rapid pivot to remote work further underscored the importance of digital contract management systems. Organizations that had already invested in digital infrastructure benefited from centralized storage, streamlined retrieval, automated alerts for key obligations, and enhanced collaboration and compliance tracking. These systems allowed for real-time access, efficient monitoring of contractual duties, and swift responses to shifting business conditions. In contrast, organizations reliant on outdated or fragmented systems struggled to maintain visibility and continuity.

In light of the pandemic, forward-looking businesses are adopting scenario planning and stress testing to evaluate how their contracts would perform under various adverse conditions, including natural disasters, supply chain disruptions, or geopolitical instability. These exercises help identify contractual weaknesses and provide a foundation for building robust contingency plans. Such planning ensures that organizations are not caught unprepared when the next crisis arises.

Flexibility and collaboration have emerged as defining features of resilient contractual relationships. The rigidity of traditional contract structures often proved counterproductive during the pandemic, escalating disputes and delaying resolutions. Modern contracts are increasingly incorporating flexible mechanisms, such as provisions for renegotiation, alternative performance, or temporary suspension. Moreover, there is a growing shift in mindset among contracting parties—favoring collaboration and shared problem-solving over confrontation and litigation.

Supply chain vulnerabilities became particularly pronounced during the pandemic. Companies are now diversifying their supplier base to avoid over-reliance on single sources. Supply agreements are being revised to include precise force majeure and hardship clauses, detailed crisis communication protocols, and escalation procedures. These reforms aim to enhance the resilience and agility of supply chains, ensuring better preparedness for future disruptions.

Training and awareness are crucial for effective contract management in crisis scenarios. Legal and business professionals must be well-versed in doctrines such as force majeure, frustration, and hardship to navigate complex contractual landscapes. Regular training initiatives ensure that key stakeholders understand their rights and obligations and can respond swiftly and effectively when faced with unforeseen challenges.

The pandemic also led to a surge in contractual disputes, overwhelming courts and highlighting the limitations of litigation. This has renewed interest in alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods such as mediation, arbitration, and negotiation. ADR offers quicker, more cost-effective resolutions while preserving commercial relationships. Contracts increasingly include mandatory ADR clauses to encourage early and amicable settlement of disputes, reflecting a systemic shift towards collaborative and interest-based dispute resolution.

Policymakers and legal professionals play a pivotal role in fostering a resilient contractual environment. There is a pressing need to develop model clauses tailored for pandemics and extraordinary events, promote the adoption of digital contract management tools, and offer comprehensive guidance on risk allocation and crisis response. Encouraging international cooperation is equally essential to harmonize legal standards and facilitate cross-border commercial stability in an interconnected world.

Ultimately, the COVID-19 crisis has transformed the landscape of contract law and practice. It has prompted a collective reassessment of how contracts are drafted, interpreted, and enforced. The emphasis now lies in clarity, adaptability, risk foresight, and mutual cooperation. By learning from the unprecedented challenges of the pandemic, contracting parties are better positioned to build durable, flexible, and fair contractual frameworks that can withstand the complexities of future global disruptions.

6. EMERGING TRENDS AND DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENTS

The COVID-19 pandemic has provoked a substantial re-examination of foundational principles in contract law. Traditional doctrines such as *pacta sunt servanda* (agreements must be kept) and party autonomy, while still central, have been tested against the realities of widespread, unforeseen global disruptions. As a result, courts, legislators, and legal scholars across jurisdictions have recognized that unwavering enforcement of contract terms may not always serve justice in extraordinary circumstances. This has led to a growing openness toward reinterpreting, and in some cases reforming, key doctrines like *force majeure*, *frustration*, and *hardship* to respond more equitably to systemic events such as pandemics.

Courts worldwide have demonstrated increased flexibility in adjudicating disputes arising from the pandemic. For instance, Indian courts have adopted a context-based approach, taking into account the intent of the parties and the commercial background of contracts, rather than relying strictly on literal wording. Similarly, courts in civil law jurisdictions such as France and China have shown a greater willingness to support renegotiation and contract adaptation, aiming to restore balance rather than enforce potentially unjust outcomes. This judicial pragmatism signals an evolving jurisprudence that favours fairness and commercial reasonableness in times of crisis.

In tandem with judicial shifts, legislative reforms have also gained momentum. In India, the Law Commission has proposed revisiting contract laws to address the shortcomings exposed during the pandemic. These proposals include introducing standardized *force majeure* provisions and providing statutory recognition of the hardship doctrine. Such reforms aim to offer predictability, consistency, and legal certainty in handling unforeseen disruptions in commercial relationships.

One of the most visible drafting trends following the pandemic is the widespread incorporation of pandemic-specific clauses in contracts. Parties now routinely include express references to pandemics, epidemics, and government-imposed restrictions within *force majeure* provisions. These clauses not only identify relevant triggering events but also specify procedures for invocation, such as notice requirements and evidentiary standards, and set out the legal consequences, which may include suspension, extension, or termination of obligations. This new wave of contract clauses often includes detailed provisions on risk sharing, alternative performance, and the duty to mitigate losses.

Another emerging doctrinal trend is the reinforced emphasis on good faith and fair dealing in contractual performance. The pandemic has exposed the limitations of rigid enforcement and encouraged courts and arbitral tribunals to expect greater cooperation between parties. There is an increasing expectation that parties will negotiate in good faith and pursue equitable resolutions where circumstances have drastically changed. Although this principle is codified in many civil law systems, it is now gaining acceptance in common law jurisdictions as a guiding standard for contractual conduct.

In several notable cases, courts have encouraged parties to renegotiate terms or engage in mediation prior to pursuing litigation. For example, in China, the Supreme People's Court issued guidelines promoting mediation in COVID-19-related disputes, reflecting a broader global preference for collaborative and efficient dispute resolution methods. These developments underscore the growing relevance of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) as a means to preserve commercial relationships while addressing unexpected contractual challenges.

The pandemic has also accelerated the integration of technology in contract law. The use of electronic signatures, virtual negotiation platforms, and online dispute resolution (ODR) systems has become increasingly mainstream. Legal institutions have adapted to remote hearings, digital submissions, and virtual proceedings, resulting in improved access, cost-efficiency, and procedural adaptability. These technological advancements are now considered essential features of modern contract management and enforcement.

In this context, there is also a rising interest in smart contracts — self-executing agreements that operate on blockchain technology. Although still evolving, these digital contracts can automatically enforce obligations when predefined conditions are met, including the activation of *force majeure* clauses, provided the triggering events can be verified through objective data inputs. The potential for automation and transparency has sparked discussions around the broader applicability of smart contracts in commercial transactions.

The global scope of the pandemic has emphasized the need for greater harmonization of contract law across jurisdictions. International organizations such as UNIDROIT and the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) have responded by updating their model clauses and guidelines to better address pandemics and other systemic risks. The adoption of the UNIDROIT Principles and the ICC's 2020 *Force Majeure* and

Hardship Clauses has increased in international commercial contracts, promoting consistency and coherence in cross-border legal practices. Arbitration institutions have similarly revised their rules to facilitate remote proceedings, making international arbitration more accessible and effective for resolving complex, multi-jurisdictional disputes.

Legal scholars and policymakers are actively debating whether the pandemic necessitates the creation of a new "extraordinary law of contracts" to deal with future systemic crises. While some advocate for statutory frameworks that offer automatic relief or adaptation mechanisms during officially declared emergencies, others warn that such frameworks may undermine contractual certainty and disincentivize proactive risk management by parties. This academic and policy debate reflects a deeper tension between preserving the sanctity of contracts and ensuring justice and resilience in the face of overwhelming external shocks.

Ultimately, the challenge for lawmakers and courts is to strike a careful balance between certainty and flexibility. Legal systems must evolve to safeguard the predictability of contractual obligations while allowing mechanisms that respond to genuinely unforeseeable and disruptive events. As jurisdictions continue to assimilate the lessons of the COVID-19 pandemic, the evolution of contract law is expected to reflect a blend of doctrinal reform, technological innovation, and international convergence — collectively aimed at building a more adaptive and resilient framework for future global disruptions.

7. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION

The COVID-19 pandemic has served as a watershed moment for contract law, compelling a fundamental reassessment of long-standing doctrines, drafting practices, and enforcement mechanisms. Traditional principles such as *pacta sunt servanda* and party autonomy, while still vital, proved insufficient in addressing the complexities and uncertainties that arose during a global crisis. The experience demonstrated the necessity of embedding flexibility, fairness, and technological readiness into the legal fabric of contractual relationships. Emerging trends such as the incorporation of pandemic-specific clauses, the growing acceptance of hardship and renegotiation provisions, and the emphasis on good faith reflect a broader movement towards more resilient and adaptive contract frameworks. Technological integration, especially in the form of digital contract management systems and smart contracts, has further revolutionized how agreements are executed and disputes resolved. These developments collectively signal a shift in contract law from a

rigid, static model to a more dynamic, responsive paradigm better equipped to handle future systemic shocks.

In light of these insights, several recommendations are imperative. First, legislative bodies should consider codifying standardised *force majeure* and hardship provisions to ensure clarity and consistency. Second, judicial systems must continue promoting flexibility and equity in contract interpretation, especially in times of crisis. Third, policymakers should support the development and adoption of digital infrastructure and ODR platforms to enhance access and efficiency. Fourth, contract drafters and legal professionals must routinely incorporate risk-sharing mechanisms and scenario-based contingency planning into commercial agreements. Fifth, international cooperation and harmonisation of contract principles, guided by instruments like the UNIDROIT Principles and ICC model clauses, should be strengthened to support cross-border trade and dispute resolution. Finally, legal education and professional training should evolve to prepare practitioners for the complexities of future crises. Together, these steps will ensure that contract law remains a reliable yet adaptable tool in an increasingly uncertain world.

REFERENCES

- Beatty, J. F., Samuelson, S. S., & Abril, P. S. (2021). *Introduction to business law* (6th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Brownsword, R. (2020). Contract law, transactional uncertainty, and COVID-19. *Journal of Contract Law*, 37(2), 103–121.
- Chitty, J., Beale, H., & Furmston, M. (2019). *Chitty on Contracts* (33rd ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.
- Eidenmüller, H. (2020). Contracting for COVID-19: Lessons from the pandemic. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 40(3), 609–630. https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqaa015
- Gillespie, C., & Weitz, M. (2021). Force majeure and frustration of contract in the age of COVID-19. *International Business Law Journal*, 2021(1), 1–15.
- Halliburton Offshore Services Inc. v. Vedanta Limited & Anr., (2020). Delhi High Court. MANU/DE/0856/2020.
- International Chamber of Commerce. (2020). *ICC Force Majeure and Hardship Clauses 2020*. https://iccwbo.org

- Law Commission of India. (2021). *Report on the need for reform in force majeure and hardship clauses in Indian contract law* (Report No. 278).
- McKendrick, E. (2021). *Contract law: Text, cases, and materials* (9th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Ministry of Finance, Government of India. (2020). Office Memorandum No. F.18/4/2020-PPD regarding COVID-19 and force majeure.
- Schwenzer, I., & Hachem, P. (2020). Force majeure and hardship in international sales contracts. *Uniform Law Review*, 25(3), 243–270. https://doi.org/10.1093/ulr/unaa019
- Supreme People's Court of China. (2020). Guidelines on force majeure and contract renegotiation during the COVID-19 outbreak.
- UNIDROIT. (2016). *UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts 2016*. Rome: International Institute for the Unification of Private Law.
- Vogenauer, S. (2021). Pandemic and private law: A comparative study. *Cambridge Law Journal*, 80(2), 312–338. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197321000275
- World Bank. (2021). *Legal and regulatory responses to COVID-19: Lessons from global practice*. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/lawjusticeanddevelopment