International Journal of Law
www.lawjournals.org
ISSN: 2455-2194
Received: 06-06-2025, Accepted: 07-07-2025, Published: 22-07-2025
Volume 11, Issue 7, 2025, Page No. 68-70

Smart contracts & Indian law legally binding or technically blinded

Swati Suman[1], Sheershadeb Das[2]
[1] Department of Law, Legal Intern, Lex Resolutio, West Bengal, India
[2] CEO, Department of Law, Institution- Lex Resolutio State- West Bengal, Country- India

Abstract
Smart contracts, powered by blockchain technology, are reshaping the way agreements are formed and executed across sectors—from finance to supply chains. These self-executing contracts operate on coded instructions and eliminate the need for intermediaries, making transactions faster and more secure. However, their innovation raises pressing questions within the domain of contract law, particularly concerning their legal validity, enforceability, and dispute resolution under existing statutory frameworks such as the Indian Contract Act, 1872 and the Information Technology Act, 2000. This paper examines the compatibility of smart contracts with established legal doctrines, evaluates the adequacy of the current legislative apparatus in India, and explores international models to propose a legally coherent approach for integrating smart contracts into the Indian legal system.

Keywords: Smart contracts, blockchain technology, contract law, legal validity, enforceability, Indian Contract Act, 1872, legal frameworks, technological innovation, international models, digital transactions, self-executing contracts, comparative legal analysis

Introduction
The digital revolution has transformed nearly every aspect of modern life, and the realm of contract law is no exception. Among the most disruptive innovations in recent years is the emergence of smart contracts—agreements written in computer code and executed on decentralized blockchain platforms. Smart contracts—digital agreements autonomously executed on blockchain platforms—pose novel questions about the applicability of conventional legal principles to a technologically altered transactional framework. Unlike traditional contracts, which rely on human interpretation and judicial enforcement, smart contracts are encoded with logic-based commands that self-execute upon the fulfilment of pre-defined conditions. While this technology holds enormous potential for improving efficiency and reducing transaction costs, it also raises complex legal questions. Can a code-based agreement be considered a valid contract under Indian law? How are disputes to be resolved when human interpretation is bypassed? This blog delves into these pressing questions.

What Are Smart Contracts?
The term "smart contract" was first coined by cryptographer Nick Szabo in the late 20th century to denote digital protocols that facilitate, verify, or enforce contractual performance [1]. A smart contract is a digital agreement that runs itself and has its conditions encoded directly into lines of code. These contracts operate on blockchain platforms such as Ethereum, ensuring transparency, immutability, and automation [2]. The main characteristics of smart contracts include automation, where the execution of contract terms occurs without third-party intervention; immutability, which means once the contract is deployed it cannot be altered; and a trust less environment where parties do not need to trust each other, but only the code. From a legal standpoint, smart contracts may be categorized as either fully automated (executed entirely via code) or hybrid contracts (where coded instructions are supplemented by traditional contractual language).
Smart contracts generally fall into two categories: fully automated smart contracts, which are entirely governed by code and execute without manual intervention (such as automatic release of crypto tokens upon payment), and semi-automated contracts, which combine code with traditional contractual terms and are often used in supply chain or asset tracking systems. This bifurcation bears relevance when determining the contractual elements under the Indian legal framework.

Compatibility with the Indian Contract Act, 1872
The Indian Contract Act, 1872, governs the formation and enforceability of contracts in India. Under Section 10 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, a valid contract must be constituted by free consent, lawful consideration, lawful object, competent parties, and mutual intention to create legal obligations [3]. Assessing smart contracts against these parameters reveals interpretative ambiguities. When applied to smart contracts, these elements pose interpretative challenges. The formation of offer and acceptance in smart contracts is primarily conducted through algorithmic protocols. Though such exchanges may constitute valid expressions of assent, the legal characterization of consent—as defined under Sections 13 and 14—raises critical concerns about whether such acceptance can be truly considered ‘free’ and ‘informed’ [4].
Furthermore, while consent exists in a coded structure, the intent behind it is difficult to ascertain in the absence of traditional expressions or negotiations. The absence of negotiation, potential opacity of the code, and asymmetry in technical understanding may compromise the voluntariness and informed nature of consent. Moreover, consideration, typically in the form of cryptocurrency or tokenized assets, while lawful under general principles, lacks regulatory clarity in India [5]. The legal capacity and lawful object remain relatively unaffected by the technological medium. Thus, while smart contracts may align with the statutory

criteria theoretically, the lack of judicial interpretation and codified recognition casts uncertainty on their enforceability under Indian laws in case of disputes.

Legislative Recognition in India and Comparative Jurisdictions

India currently lacks legislation that expressly recognizes or defines smart contracts. Nevertheless, the Information Technology Act, 2000 provides partial support. Section 10A recognizes the validity of contracts formed through electronic means [6], while Sections 3 and 4 validate digital signatures and electronic records. However, these provisions do not resolve the legal ambiguity surrounding the enforceability of self-executing code on whether coded terms and blockchain-based execution fulfil the legal thresholds of contract formation, particularly where such code is not accompanied by human-readable legal language.

In the US, the states like Arizona and Tennessee have passed legislation that acknowledge blockchain contracts and smart records are legal [7]. The UK Law Commission, through its 2021 report, affirmed that English common law can accommodate smart legal contracts, albeit recommending judicial and legislative clarifications [8]. Similarly, Singapore's Smart Nation initiative and the EU's Digital Finance Package reflect proactive regulatory engagements and are actively working on integrated legal frameworks that acknowledge and regulate decentralized legal structures [9].

India, on the other hand, remains in a nascent stage, lacking both doctrinal clarity and regulatory infrastructure to facilitate the integration of smart contracts into mainstream legal practice. These global efforts provide valuable reference points for India to consider as it contemplates the integration of smart contracts into its legal system.

Enforceability and Jurisdictional Challenges

One of the most pressing issues surrounding smart contracts is their enforceability and the mechanisms for dispute resolution, these include- the interpretation of coded terms, redressal for coding errors, and the rigidity of automated execution. Unlike traditional contracts, which can be interpreted and modified through human judgment; smart contracts are rigid, operating strictly according to their code. This rigidity poses problems when ambiguities arise or when unintended consequences result from flaws in the code. The immutable nature of blockchain prevents any post-facto correction, even when unintended consequences emerge. Errors, once coded and executed, are typically irreversible due to the immutability of blockchain platforms and cannot be changed even if unintended consequences emerge.

The absence of judicial interpretation makes it difficult for courts to ascertain intent or offer equitable relief in cases of malfunction. The judiciary's conventional reliance on textual interpretation and equitable principles cannot easily be reconciled with the binary logic of code. Moreover, the global and borderless nature of blockchain complicates jurisdictional determination, raising the question of which court holds authority in the event of a dispute as blockchain systems are decentralized. The lex loci contractus becomes blurred when no clear territorial nexus exists between contracting parties and the digital platform [10].

For instance, in the event of wrongful execution due to a programming error, determining the locus of liability—whether it lies with the developer, user, or platform—requires a nuanced legal framework, potentially incorporating doctrines of negligence, misrepresentation, or product liability. Presently, Indian law does not provide adequate recourse for such situations unless parties opt for off-chain arbitration or incorporate dispute resolution clauses through hybrid models [11].

Regulatory and Institutional Lacunae in India

India's current legal and policy framework falls short in addressing the unique challenges posed by smart contracts. There is no statutory definition or classification of smart contracts, leaving them in a legal grey area. Furthermore, many legal practitioners, regulators, and members of the judiciary lack the technical expertise necessary to interpret and adjudicate disputes involving blockchain technology. Moreover, taxation, reporting, and compliance rules are ambiguous when contracts involve cryptocurrencies or cross-border obligations, adding another layer of legal complexity. To bridge these gaps, India should consider formulating specific regulations that define smart contracts and outline their legal implications. The regulatory authorities such as the RBI and SEBI have yet to evolve clear guidelines regarding blockchain-enabled transactions, especially those involving tokenized consideration to ensure financial compliance and transparency [12]. This knowledge gap creates a bottleneck in the legal acceptance and application of smart contracts.

So, it is suggested that the government should promote public-private partnerships and regulatory sandboxes to test innovative smart contract applications in a controlled environment [13]. A multi-stakeholder approach involving legislative bodies, regulators, legal professionals, and technologists is imperative. Regulatory sandboxes, as implemented in fintech sectors, could serve as experimental platforms to understand the implications and operational mechanics of smart contracts. Standardizing and certifying smart contract development could also enhance trust and reliability in these digital agreements. There is also a pressing need for educational reform to include legal-technical literacy in law curricula and judicial training modules.

The Way Forward: A Hybrid Approach

India should pursue a hybrid approach that aligns traditional legal principles with modern technological innovations. Rather than viewing smart contracts as a replacement for conventional contracts, they should be seen as complementary tools that enhance legal and transactional efficiency. India must strive toward a harmonized framework that accommodates technological innovation within its legal architecture. Legal recognition can be achieved through amendments to the Indian Contract Act or the introduction of a new regulatory statute addressing digital transactions and decentralized technologies. Drafting smart contracts with both code and human-readable legal text can help bridge the gap between automation and legal interpretation this model is known as bifurcated contracts. [14]

The incorporation of dispute resolution clauses, either through off-chain arbitration or blockchain-based decentralized courts, may provide procedural safeguards. Alternatively, judicial pronouncements can incrementally evolve doctrines recognizing the functional equivalence of

code and written expression. India can also explore the concept of blockchain-based dispute resolution mechanisms, often referred to as "blockchain courts," to handle low-value or high-frequency digital contract disputes efficiently [15].

Ultimately, legal certainty, predictability, and accessibility must remain paramount, even as the law embraces emerging technologies. By combining legal foresight with technological adoption, India can establish a robust regulatory framework that promotes innovation without compromising the rule of law. Investing in legal education and judicial capacity building is essential to ensure the legal ecosystem is prepared for the challenges posed by smart contracts.

Conclusion

Smart contracts signify a transformative development in contract law and commercial practice and represent a transformative leap in the way contracts are formed, executed, and enforced. Using the power of blockchain technology offers unprecedented efficiency, transparency, and security. Their potential to automate transactions, reduce costs, and enhance trust is indisputable. However, these advantages come with significant legal and regulatory challenges, especially in jurisdictions like India where traditional legal doctrines have yet to catch up with digital realities. Their current deployment exists in a legal vacuum, as India still continues to rely on pre-digital legal constructs. Bridging this gap necessitates both legislative innovation and judicial adaptability.

The current absence of legal recognition, combined with enforcement and jurisdictional hurdles, highlights the urgent need for legislative clarity. By examining international legal models and tailoring them to adapt to India's unique socio-economic and legal context, a forward-looking framework can be envisioned—one that upholds legal sanctity while fostering technological advancement. Our lawmakers can pave the way for a future where smart contracts coexist seamlessly with conventional legal systems. Embracing a proactive and inclusive approach will ensure that technological innovation strengthens, rather than destabilizes, the legal foundations of commerce and society. The convergence of law and technology should not be seen as antagonistic, instead of that is should be seen as a synergistic evolution towards a more efficient and inclusive legal system.

References

1. Nick Szabo, Smart Contracts: Building Blocks for Digital Markets, 1996, https://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/rob/Courses/InformationInSpeech/CDROM/Literature/LOTwinterschool2006/szabo.best.vwh.net/smart_contracts_2.html
2. Vitalik Buterin, Ethereum White Paper: A Next Generation Smart Contract & Decentralized Application Platform 2014, https://ethereum.org/en/whitepaper/
3. The Indian Contract Act, No. 9 of 1872, § 10.
4. Id. §§ 13–14.
5. Reserve Bank of India, Master Direction – Know Your Customer (KYC) Direction, 2016 (Updated May 2021), para. 3.2.1(iv), https://rbi.org.in
6. The Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000, § 10A.
7. Arizona Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-7061 (2017); Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-10-202, 2018.
8. UK Law Commission, Smart Legal Contracts: Advice to Government, 2021, https://lawcom.gov.uk/project/smart-contracts/
9. Singapore Smart Nation and Digital Government Office, Smart Nation Overview, https://www.smartnation.gov.sg
10. James E. Bailey, Facing the Internet Jurisdiction Challenge, 33 Ga. J. Int'l & Comp. L. 111, 2004.
11. Max Raskin, The Law and Legality of Smart Contracts, 1 Geo. L. Tech. Rev. 305, 325–26 ,2017.
12. Reserve Bank of India, Report of the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Virtual Currencies 2019, https://dea.gov.in/reports/committee
13. SEBI, Framework for Regulatory Sandbox 2020, https://www.sebi.gov.in
14. UK Law Commission, Smart Legal Contracts, supra note [8], at 29–30.
15. Primavera De Filippi *et al*., Blockchain and the Law: The Rule of Code, 51 Harv. Int'l L.J. 1 2019.