


March 19, 2020

# Force Majeure and the Coronavirus

Lee Dresie, Kenneth Fields, Daniel Parino

Greenberg Glusker LLP

[+ Follow](#) [Contact](#)



Governor Gavin Newsom and Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti have recently ordered the limiting of public gatherings and the closing of all gyms, bars, wineries, breweries, and restaurants (other than take-out and delivery). The San Francisco Bay Area has issued “shelter-in-place” orders leaving many businesses to wonder if they are even allowed to remain open. As these precautions against the coronavirus continue, the threat of businesses being unable to meet the obligations of their leases, loans or other contractual obligations increases dramatically.

In this unprecedented and uncertain time for landlords and tenants, there are three words on the top of everyone’s mind: “Seriously, no tests?!”. Following closely behind those are most likely “Force Majeure Clauses.” This article addresses how California courts might approach “force majeure” clauses (or lack thereof) in commercial leases or loan documents during this period.

## “Acts of God”

“Force Majeure” is sometimes more commonly referred to as “Acts of God.” Literally, this label applies when, whether man-made or natural, there is an event that causes an interference with a party’s ability to meet its contractual obligations, without fault of the non-performing party and unpreventable even with reasonable care.<sup>[1]</sup>

## Agreements Without A Force Majeure Clause

Section 1511 of the California Civil Code excuses performance of a contract “when it is prevented or delayed by operation of law” or “by an act of God.” In other words, this section acts as a default “force majeure” clause for a contract without one.

This website uses cookies to improve user experience, track anonymous site usage, store authorization tokens and permit sharing on social media networks. By continuing to browse this website you accept the use of cookies. [Click here to read more about how we use cookies.](#)

[Continue](#)

Therefore, a party may still be able to take advantage of force majeure protections even if the agreement does not contain a “force majeure” clause.

To do so, however, the non-performing party must be able to prove that (1) the force majeure, in this case the coronavirus pandemic, is responsible for the inability to pay, and (2) it was unforeseeable. While this global catastrophe was almost certainly unforeseeable, a business that was already suffering might not be able to use the virus as an excuse without proving a direct connection to its failure to make rent. Additionally, any burden resulting from the coronavirus must be more than an increase in expense or financial difficulty. The breach must result from circumstances that are “extreme and unreasonable.”<sup>[2]</sup> This means the calculation may vary depending on the tenant: results may differ for Nike compared to a local mom and pop greeting card store.

### Agreements with a Force Majeure Clause

When an agreement of any kind does contain a “force majeure” clause, California courts have traditionally given the clause a strict interpretation, honoring the way the parties drafted the clause. “A *force majeure* clause is not intended to buffer a party against the normal risks of a contract.... A *force majeure* clause interpreted to excuse the buyer from the consequences of the risk he expressly assumed would nullify a central term of the contract.”<sup>[3]</sup> Courts have said that when parties exclude certain “acts of God” or fail to include certain events within a list of permissible excuses, the breaching party will remain liable.

California courts’ tendency to honor force majeure clauses may extend even to a lease or loan provision exempting obligations to pay from the clause’s protection. Though no California case has directly dealt with this sort of a provision specifically within a lease, it has been upheld in the context of a sales contract. A court held in an unpublished opinion that a term reading “Force majeure shall not, however, excuse the obligation of a party to make any payments required under this Agreement” precluded the application of a force majeure defense to the payments required.<sup>[4]</sup>

Enforcing such provisions would be consistent with California leases and loans—that the commercial leasing market should be able to freely contract in their own best interest. In 2020, a California court upheld a **50%** increase in rent after the expiration of its lease.

### These Are Uncertain Times

In either case, whether relying on Section 1511 or a force majeure clause, a party may be able to justify excusing or delaying lease obligations. Most of

This website uses cookies to improve user experience, track anonymous site usage, store authorization tokens and permit sharing on social media networks. By continuing to browse this website you accept the use of cookies. [Click here to read more about how we use cookies.](#)

Continue

the preventative health measures California has taken currently extend through the end of March or beginning of April. However, authorities do not know how long these mandates will remain in place. While a shutdown of two to three weeks may not qualify as extreme or unreasonable for some tenants, a lockdown of two to three months might.

Also of note, while California Civil Code 1511 allows parties to contract around the excuse of “irresistible, superhuman causes,” delay or failure to honor an obligation resulting from operation of law will be excused “**even though** there may have been a stipulation that this shall not be an excuse.” This might force a court to have to evaluate how much responsibility falls on the pandemic itself and how much rests with the government’s reaction. How courts might weigh these factors is difficult to foresee.

Parties to leases should also be aware that many courts are closed at the moment and many jurisdictions have already issued moratoriums against both residential and commercial evictions. This may give landlords more incentive to reach reasonable accommodations with tenants, perhaps through partial rent deferrals.

Given the uncertainty in all of this, parties on either side of a lease and/or loan documents would be best served by being proactive and communicating how the coronavirus and its accompanying restrictions are affecting their businesses and their properties. Likewise, parties entering into an agreement should address possible COVID-19 protections from the outset. By attempting to work out (reasonably and fairly) how this world-changing event will affect an agreement before a dispute lands in front of a judge, parties can attempt to avoid much of the unpredictability that will surely accompany pandemic-related litigation. As we have seen from the recent news, pretending it isn’t happening leads to the worst of all worlds.

---

[1] *Pac. Vegetable Oil Corp. v. C. S. T., Ltd.*, 29 Cal. 2d 228, 238 (1946).

[2] *Butler v. Nepple*, 54 Cal. 2d 589, 599 (1960).

[3] *Horsemen's Benevolent & Protective Assn. v. Vallejo*, 13 Cal. 2d 551, 555 (1943), *modified* (Apr. 6, 1992).

[4] *Citizens of Humanity, LLC v. Caitac Int'l, Inc.*, 201 Cal. App. 4th 1000 (2010).

This website uses cookies to improve user experience, track anonymous site usage, store authorization tokens and permit sharing on social media networks. By continuing to browse this website you accept the use of cookies. [Click here to read more about how we use cookies.](#)

 Send

 Print

 Report

Continue

## RELATED POSTS

- [Business Interruption Coverage for COVID-19 Losses](#)
- [We Will Get By, We Will Survive: Critical Issues for Businesses During the COVID-19 Crisis](#)
- [Status and Summary of the Federal Government’s Pending Families First Coronavirus Response Act](#)
- [9 Things for Businesses to Consider During a COVID-19 Cash Crunch](#)

## LATEST POSTS

- [Commercial Eviction Moratoriums in California in Response to COVID-19 \(Update\)](#)

[See more »](#)

DISCLAIMER: Because of the generality of this update, the information provided herein may not be applicable in all situations and should not be acted upon without specific legal advice based on particular situations.

© Greenberg Glusker LLP 2020 | Attorney Advertising

### WRITTEN BY:



Greenberg Glusker LLP

Contact

[+ Follow](#)



Lee Dresie

[+ Follow](#)



Kenneth Fields



Daniel Parino



This website uses cookies to improve user experience, track anonymous site usage, store authorization tokens and permit sharing on social media networks. By continuing to browse this website you accept the use of cookies. [Click here to read more about how we use cookies.](#)

### PUBLISHED IN:

[Breach of Contract](#)

[Business Closures](#)

[Continue](#)

[+ Follow](#)

- [City of Los Angeles](#) [+ Follow](#)
- [Commercial Tenants](#) [+ Follow](#)
- [Force Majeure Clause](#) [+ Follow](#)
- [Governor Newsom](#) [+ Follow](#)
- [Landlords](#) [+ Follow](#)
- [San Francisco](#) [+ Follow](#)
- [Shelter-In-Place](#) [+ Follow](#)
- [General Business](#) [+ Follow](#)
- [Commercial Real Estate](#) [+ Follow](#)

**GREENBERG GLUSKER LLP ON:**



This website uses cookies to improve user experience, track anonymous site usage, store authorization tokens and permit sharing on social media networks. By continuing to browse this website you accept the use of cookies. [Click here to read more about how we use cookies.](#)

[Continue](#)