ECONOMIC HARDSHIP VS. COMMERCIAL IMPOSSIBILITY: RETHINKING SECTION 56

Harish Navale, LLB, ILS Law College, Pune, Maharashtra, India

ABSTRACT

The Latin maxim pacta sunt servanda (agreements must be kept) forms the nucleus of classical contract law, demanding absolute adherence to contractual promises. The doctrine of frustration, codified under Section 56 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 (ICA), serves as the primary statutory exception to this rule, discharging parties when performance becomes unlawful or impossible. However, a glaring dichotomy plagues Indian commercial jurisprudence: the rigid distinction between absolute "commercial impossibility" and severe "economic hardship." While physical destruction or supervening illegality readily absolves a promisor, Indian courts have consistently maintained that unexpected, exponential escalations in costs rendering a contract commercially ruinous do not trigger Section 56.

Through a critical doctrinal analysis of landmark judgments, including Alopi Parshad & Sons and Energy Watchdog v. CERC, this paper argues that the binary, "all-or-nothing" nature of Section 56 is fundamentally archaic and ill-equipped to govern modern, long-term relational contracts (such as EPC, energy, and infrastructure projects). In a globalized economy susceptible to black-swan events (pandemics, geopolitical conflicts, and hyperinflation), denying relief for extreme economic dislocation creates systemic financial risks and promotes corporate insolvency. By undertaking a comparative analysis with the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts (PICC), the German BGB, and the reformed French Civil Code, this paper advocates for a paradigm shift. It proposes the statutory incorporation of a "Hardship" doctrine that mandates equitable renegotiation and judicial adaptation of contracts, thereby preserving commercial utility over destructive rigid enforcement.

Keywords: Section 56, Doctrine of Frustration, Economic Hardship, Commercial Impossibility, Force Majeure, UNIDROIT, Contract Adaptation, Relational Contracts.

I. Introduction

The sanctity of contracts is the bedrock of free-market economics. It provides commercial parties with the certainty required to allocate risks, secure financing, and project future revenues. At the heart of this certainty is the strict liability theory of contract law: a party who guarantees an outcome must deliver it or pay damages, regardless of intervening difficulties. Yet, the law has long recognized that enforcing this absolute liability can lead to profound injustice when an unforeseen, fundamental change in circumstances destroys the very foundation of the agreement.

In Indian jurisprudence, this mitigating principle is housed in Section 56 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, which deals with the doctrine of frustration. While the doctrine theoretically encompasses both literal physical impossibility and practical "impracticability," judicial interpretation has severely restricted its scope. A critical fault line has emerged in the treatment of commercial risk. The courts readily recognize "commercial impossibility" such as a change in law that bans the export of a required good as a frustrating event. In stark contrast, they systematically reject "economic hardship" where performance remains physically and legally possible but has become ruinously expensive due to unforeseen external shocks.

This distinction made sense in the 19th century, where contracts were primarily discrete, short-term transactions for the sale of goods. Today, however, the commercial landscape is dominated by complex, long-term "relational contracts." Infrastructure development, power purchase agreements (PPAs), and joint ventures span decades. These contracts are inherently incomplete; no legal draft can foresee every macroeconomic shock, geopolitical conflict, or global supply chain collapse over a twenty-year horizon.

When a black-swan event inflicts a 400% surge in raw material costs, forcing a contractor to perform under the threat of bankruptcy, the rigid application of Section 56 borders on the draconian. This research paper hypothesizes that the current binary framework of Indian contract law where a contract is either absolutely enforced or entirely voided is economically destructive. It traces the historical evolution of the doctrine, critically analyses the restrictive judicial trends in India, and draws upon modern international frameworks to propose the integration of an equitable "Hardship" doctrine into Indian law.

II. The Historical and Jurisprudential Bedrock of Section 56

To understand the inadequacy of Section 56 in addressing modern economic hardship, one must examine its historical and jurisprudential genesis.

A. The Common Law Origins: From Absolute Liability to Implied Terms

The English common law initially adopted an uncompromising stance of absolute liability. This was cemented in the infamous case of Paradine v. Jane (1647)[1], where a tenant was forced to pay rent even though he had been evicted from the land by an invading army. The court held that "when the party by his own contract creates a duty or charge upon himself, he is bound to make it good... notwithstanding any accident by inevitable necessity."

This harshness prevailed until the mid-19th century. In Taylor v. Caldwell (1863)[2], a music hall burned down just before a scheduled concert. Justice Blackburn mitigated the absolute rule by reading an "implied term" into the contract, holding that if the subject matter of the contract is destroyed without the fault of either party, the contract is frustrated. This was subsequently expanded beyond physical destruction to the "frustration of purpose" in the coronation cases, notably Krell v. Henry (1903)[3], where performance was possible, but the fundamental commercial purpose of the contract had vanished.

B. Codification in India: The Scope of Section 56

The drafters of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, sought to codify these common law developments. Section 56 comprises two critical limbs. The first paragraph deals with an agreement to do an act impossible in itself (which is void ab initio). The second paragraph, which forms the statutory basis of the doctrine of frustration, states:

"A contract to do an act which, after the contract is made, becomes impossible, or, by reason of some event which the promisor could not prevent, unlawful, becomes void when the act becomes impossible or unlawful."[4]

The Supreme Court of India fundamentally interpreted this provision in the landmark case of

[1] Paradine v. Jane, (1647) Aleyn 26, 82 ER 897 (KB).
[2] Taylor v. Caldwell, (1863) 3 B&S 826, 122 ER 309.
[3] Krell v. Henry, [1903] 2 KB 740.
[4] The Indian Contract Act, 1872, Act No. 9 of 1872, S. 56 (India) [hereinafter ICA].

Satyabrata Ghose v. Mugneeram Bangur & Co. (1954)[5]. Justice B.K. Mukherjea laid down a progressive interpretation, stating that the word "impossible" in Section 56 has not been used in the sense of mere physical or literal impossibility. The performance of an act may not be literally impossible, but it may be "impracticable and useless from the point of view of the object and purpose which the parties had in view."

If the Supreme Court in Satyabrata Ghose[5] acknowledged that "impossibility" encompasses "impracticability," one might logically deduce that severe economic hardship which makes performance practically ruinous would qualify as a frustrating event. However, the subsequent trajectory of Indian jurisprudence decisively closed the door on this interpretation, erecting a rigid wall between impossibility and onerousness.

III. The Judicial Dichotomy: Economic Hardship vs. Commercial Impossibility

The Indian judiciary has meticulously curated a firewall to protect the sanctity of contracts from the fluctuations of the market. The prevailing legal standard dictates that courts possess no general equity power to absolve a party from performance merely because it has become more burdensome, expensive, or less profitable than anticipated at the time of drafting.

A. The Genesis of the Strict Approach: Alopi Parshad

The foundation of this strict approach was firmly laid in Alopi Parshad & Sons Ltd. v. Union of India (1960)[6]. The appellants were acting as agents for the Government of India for the purchase of ghee for army personnel. Due to the outbreak of World War II, the market price of ghee skyrocketed, drastically altering the economic realities of the contract. The appellants demanded a higher rate than what was stipulated, arguing that the wartime inflation frustrated the original pricing mechanism.

The Supreme Court decisively rejected the claim. The Court noted that parties to an executory contract are often faced with turns of events which they did not at all anticipate, but this does not empower the courts to rewrite the contract for them. The Court established the enduring precedent that an unexpected rise in prices or a depreciation of currency does not render the contract "impossible" under Section 56.

[5] Satyabrata Ghose v. Mugneeram Bangur & Co., AIR 1954 SC 44.
[6] Alopi Parshad & Sons Ltd. v. Union of India, AIR 1960 SC 588.

B. The Modern Reaffirmation: Energy Watchdog v. CERC

The rigid distinction between commercial impossibility and economic hardship was tested in the context of modern infrastructure in Energy Watchdog v. Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (2017)[7].

Adani Power and Tata Power had entered into long-term Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs) to supply electricity to various state utilities in India at a fixed tariff. Their business model relied heavily on importing cheap coal from Indonesia. However, the Indonesian government enacted a sudden change in law that benchmarked the export price of coal to international market prices, causing the cost of imported coal to surge astronomically.

The power generators approached the CERC, arguing that the Indonesian law constituted a Force Majeure event and, alternatively, that the contract was frustrated under Section 56 because supplying power at the agreed tariff would lead to thousands of crores in losses, effectively wiping out their corporate net worth.

The Supreme Court of India, relying on conservative English precedents such as Tsakiroglou & Co. Ltd. v. Noblee Thorl GmbH[8], ruled against the power companies. The Court laid down several critical strictures:

1. **Alternative Modes of Performance:** The PPAs did not explicitly mandate that coal must only be sourced from Indonesia. Since coal could theoretically be sourced elsewhere (even at a massive loss), performance was not impossible.

2. **Profitability is Irrelevant:** An unexpected rise in the price of raw materials does not absolve a party from performing their obligations.

3. **No Equitable Power to Rewrite:** Section 56 cannot be invoked merely because the contract has become financially unviable. The doctrine of frustration is not a tool to bail out parties who have made a bad commercial bargain.

C. The Narrow Interpretation of Force Majeure

While Section 56 deals with the statutory doctrine of frustration (which renders a contract

[7] Energy Watchdog v. Central Electricity Regulatory Commission, (2017) 14 SCC 80.
[8] Tsakiroglou & Co. Ltd. v. Noblee Thorl GmbH, [1962] AC 93.

entirely void), commercial parties often rely on Force Majeure clauses to navigate unforeseen events without destroying the contract. However, Indian courts have applied the same restrictive lens to these contractual clauses. In cases like Southeast Asia Marine Engineering and Constructions Ltd. (SEAMEC) v. Oil India Ltd. (2020)[9], the Supreme Court maintained a highly restrictive interpretive standard. The Court held that even under a mutually agreed contractual mechanism, a change in circumstances (such as a sudden hike in diesel prices) will not trigger relief unless the contract's text explicitly provides for that specific economic adjustment.

IV. The Economic and Commercial Fallacy of the Binary Approach

The jurisprudence established by Alopi Parshad and reaffirmed by Energy Watchdog is intellectually consistent with classical contract theory. It provides legal certainty and prevents opportunistic parties from escaping obligations whenever markets fluctuate. However, the application of this absolute standard to modern, long-term commercial contracts yields profound economic inefficiencies and systemic risks.

A. The Nature of Relational Contracts vs. Discrete Transactions

Classical contract law envisions discrete, transactional exchanges for instance, the sale of 100 bales of cotton. If the price of cotton rises before delivery, the seller bears the risk. In contrast, modern infrastructure, energy, and joint venture contracts are "relational contracts." They span 20 to 30 years and involve massive capital outlay.

They are inherently incomplete because no legal team possesses the clairvoyance to draft clauses for every macroeconomic shift over a quarter-century.

When a black-swan event occurs such as a pandemic-induced global supply chain collapse or a sudden geopolitical conflict causing hyperinflation in essential materials like steel and cement the economic equilibrium of the contract is entirely destroyed.

B. The "Perform and Perish" Dilemma

Under the strict interpretation of Section 56, the disadvantaged party facing an unforeseen 300% escalation in costs has only two options:

[9] Southeast Asia Marine Engineering and Constructions Ltd. (SEAMEC) v. Oil India Ltd., (2020) 5 SCC 164.

- **Perform and Perish:** Continue performing the contract at a catastrophic loss, ultimately driving the corporation into insolvency and triggering the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC).

- **Breach and Litigate:** Abandon the project, face massive claims for liquidated damages, and trigger cross-defaults across their project financing loans.

C. Systemic Economic Harm and Deadweight Loss

The strictness of Section 56 harms not only the individual contractor but the broader national economy. If an EPC contractor building a critical national highway abandons the project because a geopolitical crisis has made steel unaffordable, the project stalls. The state is left with a half-built highway, the banks are burdened with non-performing assets (NPAs), and the public is deprived of infrastructure. The legal insistence on "contractual certainty" paradoxically creates commercial chaos.

D. The Destructive Remedy of Voiding

Even if a court were inclined to accept that severe economic hardship amounts to impossibility under Section 56, the statutory remedy provided is highly destructive. Section 56 mandates that the contract "becomes void." In a complex infrastructure project midway through construction, declaring the contract void leaves the parties in a legal vacuum, leading to complicated, multi-year restitution claims under Section 65 of the ICA. Commercial parties rarely want the contract destroyed; they want it adjusted so performance can continue under commercially viable terms. Section 56 lacks this surgical precision.

V. Comparative Jurisprudence: The Global Shift Towards Adaptation

While Indian law remains firmly anchored in 19th-century English common law principles of strict liability, international commercial law and modern civil codes have recognized the sheer necessity of addressing economic hardship distinct from absolute impossibility. The global trend has shifted from destroying the contract to adapting it.

A. The UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts (PICC)

The UNIDROIT Principles[10] represent a progressive global consensus on best practices in

[10] UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts.

commercial law. Crucially, the PICC distinguishes between Force Majeure (Article 7.1.7) and Hardship (Article 6.2).

Under Article 6.2.1, the general rule is maintained: a party is bound to perform its obligations even if performance has become more onerous. However, Article 6.2.2 defines "Hardship" as an event that fundamentally alters the equilibrium of the contract, either because the cost of a party's performance has drastically increased or the value of the performance has drastically diminished, provided the events occurred after the conclusion of the contract, were unforeseeable, and were beyond the party's control.

The genius of the UNIDROIT framework lies in its remedies under Article 6.2.3:

1. **Mandatory Renegotiation:** The disadvantaged party is entitled to request renegotiations in good faith.

2. **Judicial Adaptation:** If the parties fail to reach an agreement within a reasonable time, either party may resort to the court or arbitral tribunal. The tribunal may either terminate the contract or, crucially, **adapt the contract** to restore its economic equilibrium (e.g., by adjusting the price or timelines).

B. The French Civil Code Reform (2016): The Acceptance of Imprévision

For over a century, French civil law (under the Canal de Craponne decision of 1876) strictly rejected the doctrine of imprévision (unforeseeability) in private contracts, mirroring India's current stance. However, recognizing the commercial harm caused by this rigidity during economic crises, the French Civil Code was heavily reformed in 2016[11].

The new Article 1195 explicitly recognizes imprévision. It stipulates that if a change of circumstances that was unforeseeable at the time of the conclusion of the contract renders performance excessively onerous for a party who had not accepted the risk, that party may request a renegotiation. If renegotiation fails, the parties can agree to terminate the contract or ask a judge to adapt it. If they cannot agree, a judge can revise the contract or terminate it. This represents a monumental shift from strict enforcement to equitable preservation.

[11] Code civil [C. civ.] [Civil Code] art. 1195 (Fr.) (as amended by Ordinance No. 2016-131 of Feb. 10, 2016).

C. The German Law Concept of Wegfall der Geschäftsgrundlage

Section 313 of the German Civil Code (BGB)[12] codifies the doctrine of "interference with the basis of the transaction." If the circumstances upon which a contract was based have materially changed after its conclusion, and the parties would not have entered into the contract (or would have done so on different terms) had they foreseen this change, adaptation of the contract can be demanded. The primary remedy under German law is contract adaptation; termination is viewed as a last resort.

D. The Gap in Indian Law

Comparatively, Indian law is suffering from a jurisprudential lag. It lacks both the statutory recognition of hardship and the judicial power of contract adaptation. Indian courts repeatedly assert that they "cannot rewrite the contract for the parties," leaving them at the mercy of explicitly negotiated price-escalation clauses, which often fail to capture unprecedented global shocks.

VI. Rethinking Section 56: Proposals for Statutory and Judicial Reform

To align Indian contract law with the realities of 21st-century global commerce, a paradigm shift is urgently required. The rigid distinction between commercial impossibility and economic hardship must be softened not to excuse bad business decisions or normal market fluctuations, but to protect the economic viability of relational contracts against systemic, unforeseeable shocks.

A. Legislative Amendment: Introducing Section 56A ('Commercial Hardship')

The most effective and permanent solution is a statutory amendment to the Indian Contract Act, 1872. A new section, provisionally titled "Section 56A," should be introduced to codify the doctrine of economic hardship, drawing inspiration from the UNIDROIT principles.

This provision should establish a clear threshold: it is triggered only when an unforeseeable external event fundamentally alters the economic equilibrium of the contract, making performance excessively and objectively onerous (e.g., an increase in costs exceeding a

[12] Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch [BGB] [Civil Code], § 313 (Ger.).

statutory or legally recognized threshold, such as 50% above the projected baseline).

Crucially, the remedy under this proposed Section 56A should not be the automatic voiding of the contract. Instead, it should mandate:

- A statutory duty on both parties to enter into good-faith renegotiations within a stipulated timeframe.
- The conferment of specific jurisdiction upon arbitral tribunals and specialized commercial courts to equitably adapt the contract (e.g., by adjusting the price, extending timelines, or altering technical specifications) to distribute the unforeseen loss equitably between the parties, thereby saving the contract from termination.

B. Judicial Evolution: The Implied Duty of Good Faith and Equitable Adjustment

In the absence of immediate legislative reform, the Indian judiciary must adopt a more progressive approach to contractual interpretation in commercial disputes. While the Supreme Court in Energy Watchdog correctly noted that Section 56 covers positive law, the courts can utilize Section 73 (damages) and the broader principles of equity to foster renegotiation.

Furthermore, Indian courts should begin to recognize an implied duty of good faith and fair dealing in long-term relational contracts. When a black-swan event inflicts severe economic hardship, the doctrine of good faith should mandate the advantaged party to reasonably consider proposals for equitable adjustment. Weaponizing the strict letter of the contract to drive a disadvantaged partner into insolvency should be viewed as a breach of this implied relational duty.

C. Drafting Resilient Contracts: The Role of the Practitioner

Until the statutory framework evolves, the burden rests heavily on commercial transactional lawyers. Legal practitioners must move beyond standard, boilerplate Force Majeure clauses that only deal with physical impossibility.

Contracts must feature comprehensive, bespoke "Hardship" or "Economic Dislocation" clauses that explicitly bypass the strictures of Section 56. These clauses must mathematically define what constitutes a fundamental alteration of economic equilibrium and outlines a mandatory, time-bound mechanism for expert determination or arbitral adaptation of the contract terms, ensuring the project survives the crisis.

VII. Conclusion

The Indian Contract Act of 1872 is a masterclass in legal codification, yet its rigid 19th-century underpinnings are showing signs of acute strain in the modern macroeconomic environment. Section 56, as currently interpreted by the Indian judiciary, operates on a binary logic that views absolute impossibility as the sole trigger for relief, while summarily dismissing severe economic hardship as a mere commercial risk to be absorbed by the promisor.

As demonstrated by the inflexible outcomes in cases from Alopi Parshad to Energy Watchdog, this classical approach fails to appreciate the complex, interdependent nature of modern, long-term relational contracts. By denying relief to parties facing unforeseeable, catastrophic escalations in cost, the law inadvertently promotes corporate insolvency, stalls vital national infrastructure projects, and generates massive economic deadweight loss.

The global legal landscape, spearheaded by the UNIDROIT Principles and the reformed civil codes of Germany and France, has already recognized that preserving the economic utility of a contract through equitable adaptation is vastly superior to mutual destruction. It is time for Indian jurisprudence to rethink Section 56. The law must evolve from being a rigid enforcer of nominal promises to a dynamic facilitator of commercial survival. Introducing a statutory or judicial framework for "Economic Hardship" focused on mandatory renegotiation and equitable adjustment is not a dilution of the sanctity of contracts. Rather, it is a necessary evolution to protect the true commercial intent of the parties in an increasingly unpredictable world.

Thus, The Indian Contract Act's rigid interpretation of Section 56 operates on a binary logic that fails to appreciate the interdependent nature of modern relational contracts. By denying relief to parties facing unforeseeable, catastrophic escalations in cost, the law inadvertently promotes corporate insolvency and economic deadweight loss. Evolving Indian law to include a framework for "Economic Hardship" focused on mandatory renegotiation and equitable adjustment is not a dilution of the sanctity of contracts, but a necessary evolution to protect commercial survival in an unpredictable world.

REFERENCES:

- Pollock, F., & Mulla, D. F., The Indian Contract and Specific Relief Acts (LexisNexis, 15th ed., 2017).
- Treitel, G. H., Frustration and Force Majeure (Sweet & Maxwell, 3rd ed., 2014).
- Schwenzer, I., "Force Majeure and Hardship in International Sales Contracts," Victoria University of Wellington Law Review, vol. 39, no. 4, 2008, pp. 709-725.
- Macneil, I. R., "Contracts: Adjustment of Long-Term Economic Relations under Classical, Neoclassical, and Relational Contract Law," Northwestern University Law Review, vol. 72, 1978.
- Rishabh Raheja*, Supreme Court on Hardship vis-à-vis Frustration and Force Majeure,* IndiaCorpLaw (July 13, 2017), https://indiacorplaw.in/2017/07/13/supreme-court-on-hardship-vis-vis/