BLOGS

Act of God and Private Defence in Torts Law

Adtiya Aryan · 14 Oct 2025

In the Law of Torts, a plaintiff must prove that the defendant committed a wrongful act, resulting in legal injury. However, the defendant may escape liability by pleading a General Defence—a recognized set of justifications or excuses. Two fundamental defences that often appear in examination settings are Act of God and Private Defence.

Act of God

Definition: Imagine a disaster so sudden and massive, so completely out of the ordinary, that absolutely no one could have seen it coming or stopped it. The defence of Act of God is a legal argument that basically says, “This damage wasn’t my fault; it was caused by an unforeseen, extraordinary, and unavoidable natural event.”

The defence of Act of God refers to an unforeseen, extraordinary, and inevitable natural event that could not have been prevented by any human foresight or skill, and which is the direct cause of the damage. It is a defence particularly relevant in cases of strict liability (e.g., the rule in*Ryland v. Fletcher*).

Essential Conditions for the Defence

To successfully plead the defence of Act of God, the defendant must prove the simultaneous existence of two conditions:

1. Operation of Natural Forces: The event must be a result of natural causes, without any human intervention. Examples include tsunamis, unprecedented floods, earthquakes, or extraordinary heavy rainfall.
2. Extraordinary/Unforeseeable Occurrence: The event must be so unusual and extraordinary that human prudence could not reasonably be expected to anticipate it or guard against its consequences. Ordinary, recurring natural phenomena (like typical seasonal rain or predictable high winds) do not qualify.

Key Case Laws

Case Law	Principle Established
Nichols v. Marsland (1876)	The court held that an extraordinary rainfall, unprecedented in living memory, which caused artificial pools to collapse, was an Act of God, thereby absolving the defendant of liability.
Kallulal v. Hemchand (1958)	A building collapsed due to heavy rainfall, resulting in death. The court rejected the plea of Act of God, reasoning that even heavy rainfall is a normal occurrence in India and the defendant should have taken reasonable precautions by maintaining the structure.
Ramalinga Nadar v. State of T.N.	The defence was successful when goods in a lorry were damaged by an unprecedented cyclone and flood, an event that could not have been reasonably foreseen.

Private Defence

Definition: The right of Private Defence allows a person to use reasonable force to protect his own person, property, or the person or property of another, against threatened or actual tortious harm. The law recognizes that an individual should be allowed to repel force by force.

Essential Conditions for the Defence

The right to private defence is not unlimited and is subject to strict judicial scrutiny. The defendant must prove:

1. Necessity: The defendant's act must have been absolutely necessary and imminent to repel the threatened danger. The danger must be real or reasonably apprehended.
2. Reasonable Force: The force used by the defendant must be reasonable and proportional to the harm threatened. The defence fails if the retaliation is excessive.
3. No Premeditation: The act must be defensive, not retaliatory or punitive. The force must be used to ward off immediate danger, not to punish past aggression.
4. No Opportunity to Seek Recourse (Implied): The defence is usually strongest when there was no immediate opportunity to seek police or judicial protection.

Key Case Laws

Case Law	Principle Established
Bird v. Holbrook (1828)	The use of disproportionate force is actionable. The defendant used a spring gun to protect his property without posting a warning. The plaintiff was injured. The defence failed because the means used were excessive and there was no notice.
G. S. Sidhu v. State of Delhi (1988)	Emphasizes that the right of private defence is only available when the danger is imminent and the force used is only to avert that danger, not for punishment.
Ramanuja Mudali v. M. Gangan	The defendant used force to remove the plaintiff who was trespassing on the defendant's land. The court held that the use of reasonable force to protect property is justifiable.

Comparative Analysis

The core distinction lies in the source of the injury: Act of God deals exclusively with damage from natural forces (like unprecedented floods), and is most often deployed against strict liability claims, while Private Defence addresses damage caused by a defendant's necessary reaction to an immediate human threat and applies only to intentional torts.

Furthermore, Act of God requires the natural event to be completely unforeseeable, and the resulting damage does not require proportionality; conversely, Private Defence requires the human threat to be imminent and demands that the defensive force used must be strictly proportionate to the harm threatened, thereby justifying the action based on controlled human necessity rather than external natural inevitability.

Conclusion

Both the Act of God and Private Defence doctrines play essential roles in ensuring fairness within tort law, setting rational boundaries for human accountability. The defence of Act of God preserves justice by excusing defendants from liability when an unforeseen and extraordinary natural event is the unavoidable cause of damage, essentially limiting human responsibility where nature's force takes over.

In sharp contrast, the Private Defence doctrine acknowledges the fundamental human right to self-preservation, legally justifying a defendant's use of force to protect themselves against an immediate human threat.