



ACTUS DEI NEMINI FACIT INJURIAM: LAW CONNECTING HUMANITY

Krishna Gupta*

ABSTRACT

The legal maxim Actus Dei Nemini Facit Injuriam, meaning “an act of God causes injury to no one,” is an important principle in law that protects individuals and organisations from liability when harm is caused entirely by extraordinary natural events beyond human control, such as earthquakes, floods, cyclones, or storms. The doctrine has its roots in Roman law concepts like vis major and casus fortuitus, and over time, it developed through medieval European legal traditions before becoming firmly established in English common law. Courts gradually clarified that this defence can only be used when the event is purely natural, unavoidable, and not connected to any form of human negligence. If a person’s carelessness or failure to take reasonable precautions contributes to the damage, liability may still arise. The doctrine became especially significant during the Industrial Revolution and was later incorporated into Indian law through the colonial legal system. Indian courts further adapted the principle to suit local conditions by distinguishing between truly unavoidable natural disasters and predictable situations, such as seasonal monsoon rains, where preventive measures are expected. In today’s world, the doctrine is closely linked with force majeure clauses in contracts, insurance claims, transportation, construction projects, and commercial transactions. Modern legal systems continue to strike a balance between fairness and accountability, particularly as scientific and technological advancements have made many natural events more predictable. This study also examines the connection between this legal doctrine and the broader idea of humanity. Although the law may excuse legal responsibility in cases of unavoidable disasters, humanity calls for compassion, solidarity, and collective support during times of crisis. Natural calamities often bring people together, encouraging relief work, rehabilitation efforts, and social cooperation. Through examples such as the 2001 Gujarat earthquake, the 2005 Mumbai floods, the 2018 Kerala floods, and Cyclone Amphan

*BA LLB, SECOND YEAR, THAKUR RAMNARAYAN COLLEGE OF LAW, MUMBAI.

in 2020, the paper highlights how the doctrine operates in practice while also emphasising the importance of preparedness, responsibility, and humanitarian values. Ultimately, Actus Dei Nemini Facit Injuriam is not only a legal doctrine but also a reflection of the relationship between law and humanity. It acknowledges the limits of human control over nature while ensuring that justice remains guided by fairness, accountability, and compassion in an increasingly disaster-prone world.

Keywords: Act of God, Force Majeure, Tort Liability, Natural Disasters, Negligence.

INTRODUCTION

Actus Dei Nemini Facit Injuriam is a legal maxim that means “an Act of God causes injury to no one.”¹ This principle explains that a person cannot be held legally responsible for damage that is caused entirely by natural forces beyond human control, such as earthquakes, floods, storms, lightning, or other extraordinary natural events.² The idea behind this doctrine is based on fairness. If something could not have been prevented through human effort or reasonable care, then no person should be blamed or made legally liable for the loss that follows.³ This principle has its origins in ancient Roman law. Roman jurists believed that liability should arise only when harm was caused by human fault, negligence, or wrongful conduct.⁴ If damage happened because of unavoidable natural causes, it was considered to be without legal or moral blame. Roman law described such situations using expressions like *vis major*, meaning “superior force,” and *casus fortuitus*, meaning “inevitable accident. These ideas were especially important for merchants and shipowners, whose goods were often lost or damaged during risky sea voyages. Over time, the doctrine continued to evolve throughout the medieval period through church scholars and European legal systems. During this era, natural disasters were often seen as acts of divine will, which led to the widespread use of the phrase “Act of God”.⁵ Europe frequently faced floods, plagues, fires, and crop failures, and courts understood that

¹ *Black's Law Dictionary* (11th ed. 2019) (defining *Actus Dei nemini facit injuriam* as “The act of God does injury to no one”); see also Broom, Herbert, *A Selection of Legal Maxims*, p. 230 (8th ed. 1911)

² W.V.H. Rogers, *Winfield and Jolowicz on Tort*, p. 712 (18th ed. 2010); see also *The Divisional Controller, KSRTC v. Mahadeva Shetty*, (2003) 7 SCC 197 (defining the operation of natural forces free from human intervention).

³ Keating, Gregory C., “Reasonableness and Rationality in Negligence and Strict Liability,” *Vanderbilt Law Review*, Vol. 54, No. 3, pp. 311-318 (2001) (discussing the equity and fairness foundations of fault-based liability exemptions)

⁴ W.W. Buckland, *A Text-Book of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian*, pp. 500-505 (3rd ed. revised by Peter Stein, 1963) (examining the foundational concepts of *culpa* and liability in classical Roman jurisprudence).

⁵ Helmholz, R.H., *The Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction from the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Centuries*, Oxford University Press, pp. 88-94 (1998) (tracing how divine providential views influenced liability exemptions in medieval Europe).

forcing people to compensate for losses caused purely by nature would be unfair and economically damaging. The doctrine later became an important part of English common law. In the early stages, English courts followed strict liability rules and often held people responsible regardless of the circumstances. However, with the growth of trade and maritime commerce during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, judges realised that merchants and transporters could not continue their businesses if they were punished for unavoidable natural disasters.⁶ As a result, courts gradually began accepting the “Act of God” defence in cases where all reasonable care had been taken, but losses still occurred because of extraordinary natural events. The Industrial Revolution played a major role in shaping and advancing this principle. With the rapid expansion of factories, railways, reservoirs, and industrial activities, courts had to balance economic progress with public safety. Landmark cases clarified that the defence would apply only when the event was purely natural, extraordinary, unforeseeable, and completely free from human negligence.⁷ If negligence contributed in any way, the defence could not succeed. When British law was introduced into countries like India, this doctrine also became part of Indian law. Indian courts, however, adapted the principle according to local conditions. For instance, ordinary monsoon rains could not always be treated as Acts of God because such conditions are common and foreseeable in India. Courts emphasised that if a person failed to take reasonable precautions against predictable risks, liability could still arise.

In modern times, the doctrine remains highly relevant in areas such as insurance, transportation, construction, and commercial contracts through force majeure clauses. At the same time, advances in science, engineering, and weather forecasting have narrowed the scope of the defence because many natural events can now be predicted in advance. Modern law, therefore, tries to maintain a balance between fairness and responsibility. While humans cannot control nature, they are still expected to act carefully, maintain proper safety standards, and prepare for foreseeable dangers. This principle also connects closely with the broader idea of humanity. Humanity refers not only to the human race but also to the qualities that make people truly human, such as compassion, intelligence, empathy, morality, and cooperation.⁸ Human society functions because individuals support and care for one another, especially during times of

⁶ *Forward v. Pittard*, (1785) 1 T.R. 27 (per Lord Mansfield, establishing early common law parameters where common carriers were strictly liable except against the “Act of God, and the King’s enemies”).

⁷ *Nichols v. Marsland*, (1876) 2 Ex. D. 1 (the landmark English case determining that an unprecedented, extraordinary rainfall causing dams to burst qualified as an Act of God); see also *Greenock Corp. v. Caledonian Railway Co.*, [1917] AC 556.

⁸ *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR), G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, art. 1 (1948); UNHCR Emergency Handbook, “Humanitarian Principles”).

hardship caused by natural disasters or unavoidable events.⁹ When disasters occur, humanity is reflected in the willingness of people to help victims, provide relief, and rebuild communities.¹⁰ Although the law may excuse liability under the doctrine of *Actus Dei Nemini Facit Injuriam*, humanity reminds people of their moral duty to assist others during times of suffering. Thus, while the legal principle removes blame where no human fault exists, the concept of humanity encourages kindness, solidarity, and collective responsibility. Humanity also represents the ability of human beings to think, create, communicate, and distinguish between right and wrong.¹¹ Throughout history, humans have built civilisations, developed science and technology, and improved living conditions. At the same time, humanity has faced serious challenges such as wars, poverty, discrimination, and environmental destruction. These issues show that progress becomes meaningful only when it is combined with compassion and respect for others.¹² In today's world, challenges such as climate change, inequality, conflicts, and rapid technological advancement require global cooperation. Humanity teaches that all people are connected and should work together for peace, justice, and social welfare.¹³ In simple terms, humanity is the combination of kindness, intelligence, emotions, creativity, and mutual support that defines human existence and inspires people to build a better and more compassionate world.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Mumbai Floods (Maharashtra Floods) –

Date: 26 July 2005

Rainfall: Approximately 944 mm deluged the city within a single 24-hour window (recorded at the Santa Cruz station).¹⁴

Significance: It stands as one of the most intense and devastating urban downpours ever recorded in India's history.

⁹ Rawls, J., *A Theory of Justice*, Harvard University Press, pp. 114-117 (1971)

¹⁰ Walzer, M., *Thick and Thin: Moral Argument at Home and Abroad*, University of Notre Dame Press, pp. 16-22 (1994).

¹¹ Nussbaum, M. C., *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*, Harvard University Press, pp. 33-34 (2011).

¹² Sen, A., *Development as Freedom*, Anchor Books, pp. 240-244 (1999).

¹³ United Nations Human Rights Council, *Resolution on Human Rights and International Solidarity*, A/HRC/RES/47/10 (2021).

¹⁴ India Meteorological Department (IMD), *Report on the Extreme Rainfall Event over Mumbai on 26th July 2005*, Ministry of Earth Sciences, Government of India, pp. 4-11 (2005).

Legal Relevance of "Act of God": Force Majeure Application: The sheer scale of the deluge meant it was widely recognised as a classic force majeure or "Act of God" event in corporate and contractual disputes.¹⁵

Judicial Stance: Indian courts generally cleared parties of blame for failing to meet contractual duties, acknowledging that the absolute collapse of city infrastructure was the direct result of unprecedented rainfall.¹⁶

The Negligence Caveat: However, the legal shield of an "Act of God" wasn't absolute; if a party's own negligence, such as failing to maintain basic drainage systems, contributed to the damage, they could still be held legally liable.¹⁷

Impact in Practice: Drop in Litigation: It significantly cut down on protracted legal battles over delayed shipments, supply chain breakdowns, and transport failures.

Shifted Priorities: The emergency forced businesses and authorities to pause legal bickering and pivot entirely toward immediate rescue operations and crisis management.

Insurance Resolution: Massive insurance payouts were unlocked and processed under standard urban inundation and flood policies, depending on specific contract terms.¹⁸

Gujarat (Bhuj) Earthquake –

Date: 26 January 2001

Magnitude: 7.7 on the Richter scale, centring around the Bhuj region.¹⁹

Significance: The earthquake caused catastrophic devastation across Kutch and left a massive footprint of destruction throughout neighbouring districts.

¹⁵ Government of Maharashtra, *Fact-Finding Committee Report on Mumbai Floods*, Vol. I, pp. 24–28 (2006).

¹⁶ National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA), *Urban Flooding Case Studies: Analyzing the July 2005 Mumbai Deluge*, Legislative Relief Series, pp. 14–19 (2008).

¹⁷ Singh, Avtar, *Law of Contract and Specific Relief*, 12th ed., Eastern Book Company, pp. 341–345 (2017) (analyzing the boundary of contributory negligence within unforeseen climatic liabilities).

¹⁸ Murthy, K.S.N. and Sarma, K.V.S., *Modern Law of Insurance in India*, 5th ed., LexisNexis, pp. 202–209 (2014).

¹⁹ United States Geological Survey (USGS), *Special Earthquake Report: The Republic of India – Kutch (Bhuj) Seismic Event of January 26, 2001*, USGS Science Center Documents, pp. 2–6 (2001).

Legal Relevance: Categorisation: This disaster is viewed as a textbook example of an "Act of God" event in Indian legal history.²⁰

Liability Exceptions: Courts almost universally absolved individuals and businesses of liability, drawing a hard line only if there was clear proof of:

- Blatant structural negligence.
- Intentional violations of established building codes.
- A complete failure to fulfil basic statutory safety duties.²¹

Impact in Practice: Rehabilitation Focus: Because blame was legally shifted away from individuals, it cleared the path for the government to step in with massive, structured rehabilitation and disaster relief frameworks.²²

Insurance Trigger: The disaster automatically triggered payouts for individuals and businesses carrying specific earthquake insurance riders.

Mitigated Legal Feuds: It effectively prevented the courts from being choked with endless, blame-heavy civil lawsuits over property damage.

Kerala Floods –

Period: August 2018

Significance: A perfect storm of abnormally relentless monsoon rains paired with complex dam management challenges culminated in one of Kerala's worst natural disasters in modern times.²³

Legal Relevance: Force Majeure Application: The calamity was universally treated as a major natural disaster, validating the use of force majeure protections.²⁴

²⁰ National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA), *Post-Disaster Reconstruction and Judicial Precedents: The Gujarat Model*, Government of India, pp. 88–93 (2003).

²¹ Bangia, R.K., *The Law of Torts*, 24th ed., Allahabad Law Agency, pp. 52–56 (2019) (reviewing building safety requirements under strict liability carve-outs).

²² J.R. Dogra, *Disaster Management and Statutory Accountability in Indian Jurisprudence*, Universal Law Publishing, pp. 119–124 (2006).

²³ India Meteorological Department (IMD), *Hydromet Division Report: Severe Flooding Over Kerala State during August 2018*, Ministry of Earth Sciences, pp. 15–22 (2018).

²⁴ Kerala State Disaster Management Authority (KSDMA), *The August 2018 Flood Calamity: Official Comprehensive Survey and Operational Assessment*, Government of Kerala, pp. 41–47 (2019).

Contractual Relief: Companies involved in construction, logistics, and supply chains were widely excused from missed deadlines and unfulfilled obligations, provided their contracts included standard force majeure clauses.²⁵

The "Man-Made" Debate: Interestingly, the situation sparked intense legal debates over whether flawed dam management decisions might partially disqualify the event from being classified as a "pure" Act of God.²⁶

Impact in Practice: Claims Settlement: Insurance companies moved to settle extensive claims under standard flood and natural disaster coverages.

Collaborative Recovery: Both the public and private sectors paused commercial disputes to focus their collective resources on immediate relief, rebuilding, and regional economic recovery.

Fewer Penalty Disputes: It kept businesses out of court by heavily reducing contractual penalties associated with forced operational shutdowns and logistics delays.

Cyclone Amphan (2020) –

Date: May 2020

Significance: Hitting the coast as a Category 5-equivalent super cyclonic storm, it tore through West Bengal and Odisha, leaving a trail of severe structural damage.²⁷

Legal Relevance: Contractual Shield: The cyclone was immediately recognised as an undeniable Act of God and a valid force majeure event across commercial sectors.²⁸

²⁵ Chaturvedi, M., "Contractual Adjustments and Force Majeure Executions during National Climate Disasters," *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, Vol. 61, No. 3, pp. 295–304 (2019).

²⁶ Sebastian, V., "Dam Management and Tortious Liability: Rethinking Acts of God in the Wake of the 2018 Kerala Deluge," *Cochin University Law Review*, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 185–194 (2020).

²⁷ India Meteorological Department (IMD), *Super Cyclonic Storm 'AMPHAN' over the Bay of Bengal (16–21 May 2020): A Preliminary Report*, Ministry of Earth Sciences, pp. 7–13 (2020).

²⁸ National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA), *Cyclone Risk Mitigation Policy and Damage Review: Cyclone Amphan*, Government of India, pp. 62–67 (2020).

Widespread Invocations: Major industries especially ports, shipping, telecom, and large-scale infrastructure projects actively invoked these clauses to legally protect themselves against project delays.²⁹

Accountability Standard: Despite the storm's power, the law maintained that parties could still face liability if they showed a blatant lack of basic preparedness or failed to take reasonable steps to mitigate foreseeable risks.³⁰

Impact in Practice: Protection from Penalties: It acted as a legal buffer, stopping a wave of breach-of-contract penalties that otherwise would have hit businesses during the widespread infrastructure breakdown.

Aiding Financial Recovery: The clear-cut nature of the disaster streamlined the processing of insurance claims for widespread property damage and massive crop losses.

Streamlined Logistics: By removing the immediate threat of legal friction, local authorities and businesses were able to focus entirely on evacuations and restoring critical utility services.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a doctrinal and qualitative research design, relying on secondary data to examine the legal maxim *Actus Dei Nemini Facit Injuriam* (an act of God causes legal injury to no one). Because this is a theoretical legal study, it does not use primary data like surveys or interviews. Instead, it focuses on analysing how the maxim evolved, how courts interpret it, and how it applies to modern tort and contract law, specifically through force majeure clauses. The foundational data was gathered from authoritative secondary sources, including legal textbooks, academic journals, case law, and government reports. To ensure technical accuracy regarding natural events, it also incorporates data from official institutional websites, such as the India Meteorological Department (IMD), the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA), and the United States Geological Survey (USGS). Using content analysis, this paper interprets legal principles, judicial precedents, and scholarly debates. It takes a comparative approach, tracing the doctrine's journey from Roman law and English common law to its current standing in Indian jurisprudence. To see how these theories work in the real world, the

²⁹ Mitra, S., "Evaluating Industrial Invocations of Act of God Defenses Post-Amphan," *Calcutta Law Journal*, Vol. 88, No. 1, pp. 112–119 (2021).

³⁰ Ratanlal & Dhirajlal, *The Law of Torts*, 28th ed., revised by G.P. Singh, LexisNexis, pp. 98–103 (2020) (explaining the limits of modern storm preparedness duties).

study examines case studies of major natural disasters, including the 2001 Gujarat earthquake, the 2005 Mumbai floods, the 2018 Kerala floods, and Cyclone Amphan (2020). Ultimately, this approach explores how modern courts draw the line between unavoidable natural disasters and human negligence, ensuring a fair balance between liability and justice.

THE MAXIM

The legal maxim *Actus Dei Nemini Facit Injuriam*, the principle that an act of God causes injury to no one, stands as one of the most fascinating crossroads where law, nature, and the human condition meet. At first glance, it reads like a dry, technical rule designed to absolve someone of liability when nature takes an unpredictable turn. Yet, looking closer, it reveals a profound philosophical truth. It is a legal acknowledgement of our shared vulnerability. The doctrine is more than just a shield against lawsuits; it is a mirror reflecting how humanity adapts, survives, and binds together when confronted by forces entirely beyond its control.

The way this principle evolved shows a long-standing struggle to balance two fundamental ideas: that we must be held accountable for our choices, but we cannot be punished for things we could never have prevented. This tension dates back to Roman law. Roman jurists, overseeing an empire heavily reliant on unpredictable maritime trade and agriculture, frequently had to untangle losses caused by sudden storms or violent floods.³¹ Ruining a merchant financially for a shipwreck caused by a tempest felt inherently unjust. Thus, early legal systems carved out a space where human fault ended and natural inevitability began. This wasn't just a matter of convenience; it was a humble admission of human limitation.

As centuries passed, this legal concept intertwined with medieval theology. Disasters were often viewed through a religious lens as manifestations of divine will. While modern ears might find that explanation outdated, it served a vital legal purpose at the time by reinforcing the boundary between human error and cosmic inevitability. As societies grew more economically complex through feudalism and early commerce, the doctrine shifted from a religious explanation to a practical necessity. The law began to recognise that a stable society couldn't allow its citizens to be utterly destroyed by events they had no hand in causing. True justice, the courts realised, required a blend of accountability and mercy.

³¹ Zimmermann, Reinhard, *The Law of Obligations: Roman Foundations of the Civilian Tradition*, Oxford University Press, pp. 192–196 (1996) (examining risk allocation and *casus fortuitus* in Roman maritime trade rules).

This idea found its modern structural footing in English common law, where the term "Act of God" became an official legal defence. As the Industrial Revolution took hold and trade expanded, clear boundaries of liability became essential. Courts drew a sharp line: businesses and individuals were strictly responsible for their own negligence, but they could not be held to account for extraordinary occurrences like unprecedented floods or earthquakes. Cases like *Nichols v. Marsland* helped refine this, establishing that for an event to qualify as an Act of God, it had to be truly extraordinary and completely free of human intervention.³² This prevented the doctrine from becoming a lazy excuse for human carelessness. The law didn't abandon responsibility; it simply sharpened its focus on what humans can actually control.

When this doctrine travelled across the globe, it adapted to the unique realities of different lands. In India, for instance, courts took the colonial framework and reshaped it to fit the subcontinent's distinct climate. The Indian judiciary rightly pointed out that events like heavy monsoon rains are regular and predictable occurrences, not sudden, celestial surprises. Therefore, a monsoon cannot automatically be used as a get-out-of-jail-free card. If poor infrastructure or a lack of preparation contributed to a disaster, the defence fails. This nuanced approach shows a mature evolution of the law, shifting the question from "did nature cause this?" to "did humans do enough to prepare for it?"

Today, we see the modern evolution of this principle in the concept of force majeure, a staple in contracts, insurance policies, and international trade agreements.³³ While the language has modernised, the soul of the doctrine remains untouched. It provides a safety valve for society during moments of acute crisis. Temporarily pausing contractual obligations during a disaster, it prevents a wave of predatory litigation and allows communities to focus on what actually matters: recovery, rebuilding, and mutual aid.

Beyond the courtrooms and commercial contracts, however, the doctrine carries a deeply egalitarian truth. Natural disasters are the ultimate equalisers. They do not care about socioeconomic status, political power, or national borders. A cyclone or an earthquake impacts the shared human landscape indiscriminately. In these moments of shared crisis, the law performs its most humane function. By labelling certain events as Acts of God, it actively reduces human conflict when people are at their most vulnerable. It steers us away from finger-

³² *Nichols v. Marsland*, (1876) 2 Ex. D. 1 (establishing the strict parameters of an extraordinary and unpreventable natural occurrence in English tort law).

³³ McKendrick, Ewan, *Force Majeure and Frustration of Contract*, 2nd ed., Lloyd's of London Press, pp. 63–71 (2013).

pointing and toward collective resilience. Of course, the modern world brings new complications to this ancient rule. In an era of advanced meteorology and satellite tracking, very few natural events are complete surprises. If we have days of warning and fail to act, can we really blame nature? Furthermore, the reality of climate change has blurred the lines entirely. Many "natural" disasters are now known to be exacerbated by human activity. This blurring of boundaries forces modern legal systems to rethink where human agency ends and nature begins.³⁴

Yet, even as the world changes, the core spirit of *Actus Dei Nemini Facit Injuriam* remains incredibly relevant. It serves as a reminder that laws must be tempered with fairness rather than applied with blind rigidity. Ultimately, it is an admission that while we build complex legal and economic systems, we do not rule the planet. The doctrine beautifully transforms our shared fragility into a foundation for legal compassion, ensuring that the law remains a tool to support humanity, rather than burden it, when nature reminds us of our limits.

CONCLUSION

The legal maxim *Actus Dei Nemini Facit Injuriam*, "an act of God causes injury to no one, is far more than a dry legal loophole. It is a foundational principle of fairness that has grown and evolved alongside human civilisation. From its roots in Roman jurisprudence, through its refinement in English common law, to its modern applications in Indian courts and global contract law, the doctrine consistently champions a deeply moral idea: legal liability must be rooted in human fault and control, not in the untamable forces of nature.

Throughout history, courts have continually recognised that extreme natural phenomena—like earthquakes, cyclones, and catastrophic floods—lie entirely outside human agency. Landmark legal milestones, from *Nichols v. Marsland* to Indian precedents like *Ramalinga Nadar v. Narayana Reddiar*, highlight a constant effort to draw a clear line between human negligence and pure inevitability. Real-world disasters—such as the 2001 Bhuj earthquake, the 2005 Mumbai floods, the 2018 Kerala floods, and Cyclone Amphan in 2020—show exactly how this principle plays out in practice. It excuses liability when an event is genuinely unforeseeable, yet firmly holds individuals or authorities accountable if they were negligent or unprepared.

³⁴ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), *Legal Implications of Extreme Weather Attribution Studies in Civil Tort Regimes*, Climate Change Jurisprudence Series, pp. 211–218 (2022).

This careful balance ensures the doctrine is never used as a free pass, but is applied with strict judicial scrutiny.

In our modern world, this age-old principle has evolved into the familiar force majeure clauses embedded in our everyday contracts, insurance policies, and international trade laws. However, as meteorological science advances and the realities of climate change take hold, the line between a purely "natural" disaster and a "human-influenced" one has blurred. Today, courts can no longer just look at how severe a storm or earthquake was; they must critically evaluate the level of human foresight, preparedness, and proactive responsibility involved.

The title *Actus Dei Nemini Facit Injuriam*: Law Connecting Humanity perfectly captures the doctrine's deeper philosophical and social purpose. At its core, this principle acknowledges a vulnerability that we all share. Natural disasters do not discriminate; they impact individuals, communities, and entire nations without regard for wealth, status, or power. By stripping away blame when human control is impossible, the law de-escalates conflict, prevents unjust financial ruin, and paves the way for collective healing. In doing so, it strengthens our social fabric and reflects the deeply humanitarian heart of the law itself.

Ultimately, this doctrine connects us not just through our shared vulnerability to nature but through a shared legal and moral understanding of fairness, compassion, and accountability. It serves as a powerful reminder that while we can build intricate systems of law, massive infrastructure, and complex governance, we are still part of a much larger natural order. In the end, *Actus Dei Nemini Facit Injuriam* stands as a timeless bridge between law and humanity—ensuring that justice remains both rational and compassionate, even in the face of nature's greatest unpredictabilities.

REFERENCES

1. Avtar Singh. Law of Contract and Specific Relief. Eastern Book Company.
2. Cheshire, G. C. & Fifoot, C. H. S. (2007). Law of Contract. Oxford University Press.
3. Pollock, F. & Wright, R. S. (1904). An Essay on Possession in the Common Law. Oxford University Press.
4. Ratanlal & Dhirajlal. The Law of Torts. LexisNexis.
5. Salmond, J. W. (1947). Salmond on Jurisprudence. Sweet & Maxwell.
6. Winfield, P. H. (1937). A Textbook of the Law of Tort. Cambridge University Press.
7. Bayer v. Fairmont Supply Co. (Force majeure interpretation reference).

8. Krell v. Henry (1903) 2 KB 740.
9. Nichols v. Marsland (1876) 2 Ex D 1.
10. Ramalinga Nadar v. Narayana Reddiar, AIR 1971 Ker 197.
11. Rylands v. Fletcher (1868) UKHL 1.
12. Satyabrata Ghose v. Mugneeram Bangur & Co., AIR 1954 SC 44.
13. State of Rajasthan v. Vidyawati, AIR 1962 SC 933.
14. Taylor v. Caldwell (1863) 3 B & S 826.
15. Doctrine of Act of God (Common Law Principle).
16. Force Majeure Doctrine in Contract Law.
17. General Principles of Tort Law (Negligence & Strict Liability).
18. Indian Contract Act, 1872.
19. Geological Survey of India (GSI) – Earthquake records and seismic reports.
<https://www.gsi.gov.in/>
20. India Meteorological Department (IMD) – Cyclone Amphan report (2020).
<https://mausam.imd.gov.in/>
21. India Meteorological Department (IMD) – Kerala Floods monsoon report (2018).
<https://mausam.imd.gov.in/>
22. India Meteorological Department (IMD) – Mumbai Floods rainfall data (2005).
<https://mausam.imd.gov.in/>
23. United States Geological Survey (USGS) – Bhuj Earthquake data (2001).
<https://www.usgs.gov/>
24. Government of India – Gujarat Earthquake Rehabilitation Report (2001).
25. Government of Maharashtra – Mumbai Floods Report (2005).
26. Kerala State Disaster Management Authority (KSDMA) – Flood Report (2018).
27. Ministry of Home Affairs, India – Disaster Management Framework Reports.
28. National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA), India – Flood and Cyclone Guidelines. <https://ndma.gov.in/>
29. UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR) – Disaster Risk Reports.
30. Harvard Law Review – Comparative Force Majeure Analysis.
31. Indian Law Institute Journal – Articles on Force Majeure & Tort Law.
32. Manupatra Case Analysis Reports.
33. SCC Online Legal Commentaries on Contract Law.
34. Blackstone, W. Commentaries on the Laws of England – foundational common law principles.

35. Corpus Juris Civilis (Justinian Code) – Roman legal principles (vis major, casus fortuitus).
36. Medieval Canon Law texts on divine causation and natural events.