Newsletter





The sudden onset of the Covid-19 emergency has caused significant disruption across swathes of the Japanese economy and raised novel and urgent questions for businesses as they seek to handle the challenges they face, whilst balancing the protection of their businesses and their obligations to their customers, suppliers, and banks, etc. This memorandum briefly addresses a number of key issues and questions relating to force majeure under Japanese law.¹

COVID-19 State of Emergency

On 7th April 2020 the Japanese government declared a state of emergency²; the declaration primarily relates to "stay-at-home" advice and employment practices and to date the Japanese government has not taken any mandatory measures regarding the performance or enforcement of private contracts, such as payment deferrals or waivers, or delaying debt enforcement³, though regulators, etc. have issued guidance regarding the conduct of certain financial transactions.⁴

Given the rapidly changing situation surrounding Covid-19 and the possibility of additional measures to contain the outbreak and mitigate its effects, businesses should ensure they have systems in place, such as arrangements with local counsel and other advisers, to monitor updates to relevant guidance, regulations, etc.

Q&A

Q1. Does Japanese law have a general concept of force majeure? Is it specified by statute?

"Force majeure" is used as a legal term in the Civil Code, etc., but it is not specifically defined by law. In general, the term is interpreted as meaning external events that cannot be avoided even with reasonable care.⁵ such as natural disasters, wars and riots.

Although not a typical force majeure, an order (but not a request, no matter how forceful) of a competent authority might constitute a force majeure depending on the circumstances (see Q3.).

Q2. If a contract does not contain a force majeure clause would one be implied?

Yes, though the concept of force majeure is not necessary in most cases. If a contract does not contain a force majeure clause, a contract party can make a claim (such as for compensation for delay in performance) against a non-performing obligor if the non-performance is attributable to the obligor. If the non-performance is due to force majeure in the general meaning of the term as described in Q1., it would not be attributable to the obligor, therefore the obligor is released from its liability.

¹ The information in this memorandum is based on data publicly available up to 24th April 2020.

² Originally covering Tokyo, Osaka and other urban areas, but extended nationwide on 16th April.

³ Article 58 of the New Type Influenza Special Measures Act stipulates that, in a state of emergency due to the new influenza, where there is no time to wait for the convocation of the Diet due to the emergency, the Cabinet may enact a Cabinet Order to take the necessary measures to postpone, etc. the payment of monetary debts.

⁴ The Financial Services Agency has issued guidelines encouraging banks to assist borrowers' cashflow by, e.g. making new loans, rescheduling existing loan repayments and changing guarantee terms. The Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry has requested companies to take special care including (i) refraining from actions delaying supplies to them, (ii) bearing appropriate costs derived from price increases in raw materials and/or extra work of subcontractors, (iii) making payments on their due date, and (iv) refraining from cancelling or changing purchase orders. The Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism has requested landlords to accept a deferral of rent payments by tenants who have difficulty paying rent due to the Covid-19 situation.
⁵ In the answers below it is assumed the party claiming force majeure has taken reasonable care to avoid its occurrence.

The general meaning of force majeure described in Q1, would apply where there is reference to force majeure in a contract but there is no description of the scope of the term.⁶

Q3. Might the Covid-19 situation give rise to a force majeure?

Each claim of force majeure would have to be examined based on its facts. Typical causes of a force majeure in the COVID 19 situation might include a government order (but not a request) to close a business or measures necessary (not just advisable) to prevent the infection spreading (e.g., closure of a factory). The threshold to prove force majeure is high, though given the nature of the Covid 19 situation we believe the scope for exemption from liability due to force majeure is likely to be interpreted more broadly than would otherwise be the case.

As an example, if a company voluntarily closed a factory to avoid the spread of Covid 19 the key question would be whether the closure was unavoidable even if the company exercised the level of care that would normally be required in operating the factory. Since business operators have an obligation to consider the safety of their employees, if the closure was unavoidable (not just desirable) due to safety concerns, it could be argued that the closure was due to a force majeure event. However, other factors may need to be considered such as whether there were other ways to continue the business while ensuring the safety of the employees, or whether the decision to suspend business operations was excessive.

There has been no legislative or judicial recognition of the Covid 19 pandemic as a force majeure event.

Q4. Would a governmental declaration, etc. that an event is force majeure influence how Japanese courts interpret how to apply force majeure to a contract? Is there any power for the government to issue such a declaration?

No; the Japanese government cannot declare that an event is force majeure in legal terms, as whether an event is a legal force majeure is highly dependent on each situation. The declaration of a state of emergency, and any future governmental statement referring to "force majeure" (in a non-legal meaning) might be a factor that a court would consider when determining whether an event gave rise to force majeure and justifies non-performance of an obligation.

Q5. What actions should a contract party take if it believes it cannot perform an obligation due to force majeure?

The affected party should take all reasonable steps to avoid and mitigate the effects of the force majeure. It should also give reasonable notice to the other party of its inability to meet its obligations.

Q6. How would force majeure be proved?

A contract party⁷ seeking to avoid an obligation due to force majeure would generally need to show:

(i) The nature of the alleged force majeure;

⁶ Where a contractual obligation is referred to below, and unless stated otherwise, it is assumed that the relevant contract does not set out specific rights and obligations which would apply should a party suffer a force majeure event.

This memorandum the party owing an obligation or in default is referred to as the obligor, and the party owed the obligation

is referred to as the obligee.

- (ii) that the party could not reasonably have foreseen the force majeure;
- (iii) that it has taken all reasonable steps to avoid the effect of the force majeure on the obligation in question; and
- (iv) the causal link between the force majeure and the failure to perform the obligation.

Q7. Is force majeure available for all types of business obligations?

No; unless provided in the relevant agreement, monetary obligations, e.g., payments for goods or services, loan repayments, rents and salaries (including related interest and penalties) are not excused by force majeure.8

Q8. We are unable to perform all our contractual obligations due to force majeure and propose to perform those most important to us; can we claim force majeure for nonperformance of the others?

No; the non-performance would be a matter of choice.

Q9. A force majeure in Japan has prevented us from performing an obligation under a foreign law contract but a foreign judgement has been entered against us; can we avoid enforcement in Japan due to the force majeure?

Very unlikely; in principle, the substance and remedy of force majeure is applied and interpreted in accordance with the governing law chosen by the parties. Therefore, it would not be possible to refute the enforceability of the foreign judgment solely on the grounds that the event would be considered to be force majeure under Japanese law even though it was not force majeure under the governing law of the contract. Although foreign judgements are not enforceable in Japan if contrary to Japanese law or public policy, this defence is very difficult to prove.

Q10. We cannot meet an obligation due to force majeure; will we be liable to pay compensation?

No; if an obligee fails to perform as required under a contract, and the non-performance is attributed to that party, the obligor may claim compensation from the obligee. If the nonperformance is due to force majeure and the obligation is not a monetary one⁹, there are no grounds for attributing the non-performance to the obligee, and so it is not liable to pay compensation.

Q11. We have failed to meet an obligation under a contract due to force majeure; can the other party cancel the contract?

It depends on when the contract was entered into; if the contract was concluded before 1st April 2020, it cannot be cancelled due to a breach caused by force majeure as the obligee may only cancel it for a reason attributable to the obligor and a force majeure by its nature is not attributable to the obligor. The requirement for an attributable reason was abolished for contracts entered into on or after 1st April 2020 so the obligee can cancel such a contract due a breach caused by force majeure, unless the non-performance is minor having regard to the contract and transactional common sense. 10

9 See Q7.

⁸ Article 419, paragraph 3 of the Civil Code; also see footnotes 3. and 4.

¹⁰ Reasonable notice of the termination must be given.

Q12. Are contracts with consumers subject to different rules?

Yes; the Consumer Contract Act regulates contracts between business operators and consumers (consumer contracts) and invalidates contract terms which would be disadvantageous to the consumer, such as those that would result in excessive claims for damages or exempt the business operator from certain liabilities for non-performance. Although there are no specific provisions in the Act regarding force majeure, a force majeure clause which unreasonably benefits the business operator, or unreasonably limits the rights of the consumer, could be invalid.

Q13. Can a contract be cancelled if adversely affected by outside events other than force majeure?

Yes, though not easily.

The remedy has rarely been used.

As a concept similar to frustration of contract under English and US law, the "principle of change in circumstances" is recognized under Japanese court precedents. This permits the termination or amendment of a contract where:

- (i) the circumstances on which the contract was based at the time of formation have changed;
- (ii) the parties to the contract could not foresee the change of circumstances at the time of formation of the contract;
- (iii) the change occurred due to reasons not attributable to the parties; and
- (iv) as a result of the change of circumstances, it is grossly inappropriate to bind the parties to the contractual obligations originally agreed based on the principle of good faith.

THIS	MEMOR/	ANDUM I	S PRO	OVIDED	FOR	INFORM	ATION	ONLY:	IT	DOES	NO
	STITUTE A										

We will from time-to-time update this memorandum on our website as material developments arise but please do contact one of our team named below or your usual contact at Atsumi & Sakai if you have any queries on the points covered above or on any legal issues relating to Covid19.

(Mr) Naoki Kanehisa Partner*

E: naoki.kanehisa@aplaw.jp

Daniel C. Hounslow
Consultant**
E: daniel.hounslow@aplaw.jp

(Mr) Akira Shimazaki Of Counsel*

* Attorney (Bengoshi), Japan

E: akira.shimazaki@aplaw.jp

Atsumi & Sakai is a multi-award-winning, independent Tokyo law firm with a dynamic and innovative approach to legal practice; it has been responsible for a number of ground-breaking financial deal structures and was the first Japanese law firm to create a foreign law joint venture and so admit foreign lawyers as full partners. Expanding from its highly regarded finance practice, the firm now acts for a wide range of international and domestic companies, banks, financial institutions and other businesses, offering a comprehensive range of legal expertise.

Atsumi & Sakai has an outward-looking approach to its international practice, and has several foreign lawyers with extensive experience from leading international law firms, so providing its clients with the benefit of both Japanese law expertise and real international experience.

We are the only independent Japanese law firm with offices in London and Frankfurt and can provide real-time advice on Japanese law to our clients in Europe, the Middle East and Africa, as well as a more convenient service to our clients in the Americas.

^{**} Mr. Hounslow is not registered in Japan as gaikokuho-jimu-bengoshi and neither practices law nor acts as an intermediary of legal matters on any laws in Japan; he does not practice law or advise on English or any other law in the UK or elsewhere. Neither Atsumi & Sakai LPC nor Atsumi & Sakai Europe Limited is regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority for England and Wales

Atsumi & Sakai

www.aplaw.jp/en/

Tokyo Office: Fukoku Seimei Bldg., 2-2-2 Uchisaiwaicho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-0011, Japan **London Office:** 4th Floor, 50 Mark Lane, London EC3R 7QR, United Kingdom

Frankfurt Office: OpernTurm (13F) Bockenheimer Landstraße 2-4, 60306 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

NOTICES

1. ABOUT ATSUMI & SAKAI

Atsumi & Sakai is a group of Atsumi & Sakai Legal Professional Corporation, a corporation organized under the Attorney Act of Japan, which forms foreign law joint ventures under the Act on Special Measures Concerning the Handling of Legal Services by Foreign Lawyers with certain registered foreign lawyers at our firm, and lawyers of a Japanese Civil Code partnership (represented by Yutaka Sakai, a lawyer admitted in Japan). We also form a foreign law joint venture with Markus Janssen, a foreign lawyer registered in Japan to advise on the law of the Federal Republic of Germany, heading Janssen Foreign Law Office. In addition to lawyers admitted in Japan (including Japanese lawyers also admitted in England and Wales and the Republic of the Marshall Islands), our firm includes foreign lawyers registered in Japan to advise on the laws of the US States of New York and California, the People's Republic of China, Taiwan, India, and the State of Queensland, Australia. Foreign lawyers registered in Japan to advise on state laws are also qualified to advise on federal laws of their respective countries.

Atsumi & Sakai Legal Professional Corporation also wholly-owns a subsidiary, Atsumi & Sakai Europe Limited (a company incorporated in England and Wales (No: 09389892); sole director Naoki Kanehisa, a lawyer admitted in Japan), as its London Office. It also has an affiliate office in Frankfurt, Atsumi Sakai Janssen Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH, a German legal professional corporation (local managing director: Frank Becker, a lawyer admitted in the Federal Republic of Germany).

2. LEGAL ADVICE

Unless stated otherwise by A&S, any legal advice given by A&S is given under the supervision and authority of (i) in respect of Japanese law or any laws other than foreign laws on which our foreign lawyers are registered in Japan to advise, a specified lawyer admitted in Japan at A&S, or (ii) in respect of any foreign law on which our foreign lawyer is registered in Japan to advise, such registered foreign lawyer.

