

Insights: Alerts

Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Force Majeure Defenses Under Illinois Law

May 4, 2020

Written by **Jason M. Wenker** and **Ronald L. Raider**

Please note: The below information may require updating, including additional clarification, as the COVID-19 pandemic continues to develop. Please monitor our main [COVID-19 Task Force page](#) and/or your email for updates.

We previously wrote about the contract defenses that business may rely on when an epidemic or government orders impairs contractual performance ([here](#) and [here](#)) and recently analyzed the *force majeure* defense under [Georgia](#), [North Carolina](#), and [Texas](#) law.

Here are some considerations when evaluating Illinois *force majeure* defenses:

- A “*force majeure*” is “an event or effect that can be neither anticipated nor controlled. The term includes both acts of nature (e.g., floods and hurricanes) and acts of people (e.g., riots, strikes, and wars).” *Stepnicka v. Grant Park 2 LLC*, 2013 IL App (1st) 113229-U, ¶ 6 n.2 (unpublished) (citation omitted); see also *Horwitz-Matthews, Inc. v. City of Chi.*, 78 F.3d 1248, 1251 (7th Cir. 1996) (applying Illinois law and explaining that a *force majeure* clause “excus[es] nonperformance under stated conditions”).
- Where a contract has specific *force majeure* requirements, those requirements will supersede Illinois common-law concepts of impossibility and impracticability. See *Commonwealth Edison Co. v. Allied-Gen. Nuclear Servs.*, 731 F. Supp. 850, 855 (N.D. Ill. 1990) (“[T]he [common-law] doctrine of impossibility is an ‘off-the-rack’ provision that governs only if the parties have not drafted a specific assignment of the risk otherwise assigned by the [*force majeure*] provision.”).
- To succeed on a *force majeure* defense, a defendant must prove that its nonperformance of contract obligations was proximately caused by an event contemplated in the *force majeure* clause. See *N. Ill. Gas Co. v. Energy Co-op., Inc.*, 122 Ill. App. 3d 940, 949–52, 461 N.E.2d 1049, 1057–58 (1984) (counter-claimant was entitled to summary judgment where counter-defendant’s breach was not proximately caused by *force majeure* event).
- Companies operating under fixed-price contracts should be wary of seeking to invoke a *force majeure* clause on the basis of price fluctuations. “A *force majeure* clause is not intended to buffer a party against the normal risks of contract[.], [and a] normal risk of a fixed-price contract is that the market price will change.” *N. Ind. Pub. Serv. Co. v. Carbon Cty. Coal Co.*, 799 F.2d 265, 275 (7th Cir. 1986).

- Companies should avoid exacerbating the business effects of COVID-19, since at least one Illinois federal court has determined that parties to a contract containing a *force majeure* clause have a duty to “take reasonable measures to prevent conditions constituting *force majeure* from arising, and to cure them if they do arise.” *Heritage Commons Partners v. Village of Summit*, 730 F. Supp. 821, 824 (N.D. Ill. 1990) (citing *Dezsofi v. Jacoby*, 36 N.Y.S.2d 672, 674 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1942)).

Our [COVID-19 Task Force](#) stands ready to help you navigate the unique business challenges posed by the pandemic and shelter-in-place orders. If you are interested in discussing a specific area of interest for your business, we recommend you reach out to your primary Kilpatrick Townsend point of contact. General questions may also be submitted via email to #COVID19TSTaskForce@kilpatricktownsend.com.

Related People



Jason M. Wenker

t 336.607.7416

jwenker@ktslaw.com



Ronald L. Raider

t 404.532.6909

rraider@ktslaw.com