



# LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL RESEARCH

[ISSN: 2583-7753]

Volume 3 | Issue 4

2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70183/lijdlr.2025.v03.177>

© 2025 LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

Follow this and additional research works at: [www.lijdlr.com](http://www.lijdlr.com)

Under the Platform of LawFoyer – [www.lawfoyer.in](http://www.lawfoyer.in)

---

*After careful consideration, the editorial board of LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research has decided to publish this submission as part of the publication.*

---

*In case of any suggestions or complaints, kindly contact ([info.lijdlr@gmail.com](mailto:info.lijdlr@gmail.com))*

*To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research, To submit your Manuscript [Click here](#)*

---

# FROM PLEDGES TO PROSECUTION: THE ROLE OF CLIMATE LITIGATION IN ENFORCING NET-ZERO COMMITMENTS

---

Nitesh Kumar<sup>1</sup>

## I. ABSTRACT

*Net-zero pledges have become the most important part of modern climate policy. This is because countries and businesses have agreed to cut or balance their greenhouse gas emissions by the middle of the century to meet the Paris Agreement's temperature objectives. But the lack of instruments that can be used to enforce the rules has created a big gap in accountability between goals and actions. In response, climate litigation has developed worldwide as an effective means of transforming political climate promises into binding legal obligations. This report examines the evolution of climate litigation in enforcing net-zero commitments via local courts, regional tribunals, and international human rights institutions. It looks at important cases like "Urgenda Foundation v. State of the Netherlands," "Milieudefensie v. Royal Dutch Shell," "Juliana v. United States," and "Neubauer v. Germany" to show how ideas like human rights, fairness between generations, and tort-based responsibility are now the basis for judicial efforts to force stronger action on climate change. The research further examines the matters of standing, causation, scientific ambiguity, and compliance, alongside emerging trends such as corporate fiduciary lawsuits, global enforcement, and the increasing importance of climate attribution science. In the end, it says that climate lawsuits are both a way to fix problems and a way to get things done in global climate governance. They move net-zero promises from wishful thinking into legal, scientific, and moral obligations.*

## II. KEYWORDS

Climate litigation, net-zero commitments, human rights, corporate accountability, environmental law.

---

<sup>1</sup> Prof. at Vijaybhoomi University (School of Law), (India). Email: nkniteshkumar657@gmail.com

### III. INTRODUCTION

Climate change constitutes one of the most severe existential concerns facing contemporary civilization, with growing scientific data proving that fast decarbonization is required to avert catastrophic warming. The Paris Agreement, which was signed in 2015 as part of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), is the first time that the whole world has agreed that global temperature rise needs to be kept "well below 2°C" while also working to keep warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels (Paris Agreement art. 2). Central to accomplishing these objectives is the idea of net-zero emissions a condition in which human greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are matched by removals via natural or technology sinks. National governments, towns, businesses, and financial institutions have increasingly made net-zero commitments, with over 140 nations and thousands of private organizations openly vowing to achieve carbon neutrality by mid-century.

Yet despite broad acceptance, the legitimacy and enforcement of net-zero agreements remain challenged. Many national commitments are designed as soft objectives without legally enforceable procedures or repercussions for non-compliance. Corporate promises typically lack transparency, defined milestones, or independent verification, generating concerns about greenwashing and the gap between stated aspirations and actual achievement. Reports such as the United Nations Environment Programme's Emissions Gap Report (2023) have underlined that even if existing promises are fully fulfilled, the globe would still fall drastically short of Paris Agreement targets. Thus, net-zero pledges have expanded faster than the tools necessary to hold actors responsible for their fulfillment.

In this governance vacuum, climate litigation has arisen as a vital mechanism for enforcing climate obligations and pressing governments and companies to align their activities with scientific imperatives. Initially focused on administrative and environmental law concerns, climate litigation has grown into a rights-based and

accountability-driven campaign. Courts throughout the globe increasingly decide claims asserting that insufficient climate mitigation violates constitutional rights, infringes upon human dignity, or breaks common-law duties of care. Landmark decisions in Europe, Latin America, and the Pacific have established that governments have affirmative obligations to protect citizens from foreseeable climate harm, while recent cases have extended these responsibilities to multinational corporations whose operations contribute significantly to global emissions.

The expanding collection of climate jurisprudence demonstrates a dramatic change in the role of courts in climate policy. No longer constrained to interpreting narrowly defined environmental regulations, courts are increasingly called upon to examine scientific data, consider policy trade-offs, and enforce climate pledges established in human rights, constitutional safeguards, and tort principles. This move from political commitments to legal responsibilities poses fundamental theoretical, doctrinal, and practical problems about authority, legitimacy, and institutional competence.

This paper addresses these changes by exploring the legal and policy background of net-zero promises, tracking the path of climate litigation, reviewing major case law, addressing important issues, and assessing upcoming trends. Ultimately, it argues that climate litigation is increasingly becoming a vital enforcement instrument in the worldwide quest for net-zero emissions.

#### **A. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

- To examine the role of climate litigation in enforcing net-zero commitments.
- To analyze the evolution of climate litigation across different jurisdictions and its impact on legal frameworks.
- To explore the intersection of climate litigation with human rights, corporate accountability, and environmental law.
- To assess the effectiveness of judicial rulings in holding governments and corporations accountable for climate commitments.

- To identify emerging trends and challenges in climate litigation as a tool for global climate governance.

## **B. RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

- How has climate litigation evolved as a tool for enforcing net-zero commitments?
- What role do courts play in transforming climate pledges into legally binding obligations?
- How do human rights and constitutional principles intersect with climate litigation in enforcing climate policies?
- What are the key challenges in holding corporations accountable for their role in global emissions through litigation?
- What emerging trends are shaping the future of climate litigation and its impact on global climate governance?

## **C. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This study adopts a qualitative approach, analyzing case law, legal frameworks, and international agreements related to climate litigation and net-zero commitments. The research involves a detailed review of landmark legal cases, legislative developments, and international treaties such as the Paris Agreement. Secondary data sources, including scholarly articles, reports from international organizations, and legal judgments, are critically examined to understand the evolving role of litigation in enforcing climate obligations. The methodology also incorporates comparative analysis across jurisdictions to highlight emerging trends and challenges in climate governance.

## **IV. LEGAL AND POLICY CONTEXT OF NET-ZERO COMMITMENTS**

The rise of net-zero as a major pillar of global climate policy demonstrates the interaction between rising scientific confidence, moral ambition, and legal innovation.

While the phrase “net-zero” first came from scientific modeling undertaken by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), it has grown into a normative standard impacting national laws, business strategy, and international collaboration.

### **A. NET-ZERO IN INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE LAW**

The Paris Agreement is the most significant international agreement embracing net-zero principles. Article 4(1) urges parties to attain “a balance between anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases” in the second half of the century. Although the rule does not establish an exact timeframe or impose enforceable mitigating responsibilities, it situates net-zero trajectories within a legally recognized framework. The Agreement’s architecture depends on Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), transparency systems, and the notion of “progressive ambition,” which obligates parties to make progressively strict climate pledges (Paris Agreement art. 4(3)).

Despite these procedural duties, the Paris Agreement does not demand precise emission reduction outcomes or impose penalties for non-compliance. Scholars such as Lavanya Rajamani have defined the Agreement as a combination of hard and soft law, combining enforceable procedural requirements with non-binding content obligations. This mixed character has permitted wide engagement but has also contributed to implementation gaps, needing supplemental enforcement mechanisms such as domestic litigation.

### **B. NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND BINDING NET-ZERO TARGETS**

Several countries have transformed net-zero promises into enforceable domestic legislation. The European Union’s Climate Law (Regulation (EU) 2021/1119) legally binds all EU institutions and member states to attaining climate neutrality by 2050, establishing emissions paths commensurate with scientific guidelines and necessitating periodic progress assessments. The United Kingdom updated its Climate Change Act 2008 in 2019 to establish a legally enforceable net-zero by 2050 aim the first large

economy to do so. A similar law has been implemented in New Zealand via the Zero Carbon Act (2019), which established an independent Climate Change Commission to oversee progress.

By contrast, several nations, notably in the Global South, have stated net-zero objectives without corresponding legislative frameworks, putting implementation reliant on political will, resource availability, and administrative capability. The discrepancy between legally enforceable and simply political pledges underscores the unequal picture of global climate responsibilities.

### **C. CORPORATE NET-ZERO COMMITMENTS AND ESG FRAMEWORKS**

In the commercial sector, net-zero pledges have grown under voluntary programs like as the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) and the United Nations Race to Zero campaign. Corporations spanning sectors from energy and automotive to banking and technology have vowed to achieve net-zero emissions throughout their value chains. However, the lack of established definitions, methodology, and verification procedures has raised issues regarding legitimacy. Many agreements depend significantly on carbon offsets of different quality, poor disclosure of Scope 3 emissions, or long-term objectives without intermediate milestones.

Regulatory agencies are progressively working to rectify these issues. The European Union's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) demands full climate disclosures and third-party certification. In the United States, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) has proposed climate-related disclosure requirements mandating extensive reporting on emissions, risks, and governance structures. These events imply a steady transition from volunteer to mandated climate accountability.

### **D. ACCOUNTABILITY GAPS IN GLOBAL CLIMATE GOVERNANCE**

Despite these efforts, considerable accountability gaps continue. UNEP's Emissions Gap Report 2023 demonstrates that existing policies set the world on a track toward at least 2.5°C of warming, even if NDCs are fully implemented. Corporate disclosures usually

lack comparability and trustworthiness, and voluntary climate promises are sometimes unaccompanied by legally enforceable requirements.

The Paris Agreement's compliance mechanism, created under Article 15, is facilitative rather than punitive and lacks jurisdiction to enforce fines. This contrasts with more robust regimes such as the Montreal Protocol, which includes trade measures and compliance aid. Consequently, the responsibility of enforcement has moved upon domestic courts, who are increasingly called upon to interpret constitutional rights, legislative obligations, and common-law responsibilities in light of climate commitments.

In the commercial sector, net-zero pledges have grown under voluntary programs like as the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) and the United Nations Race to Zero campaign. Corporations spanning sectors from energy and automotive to banking and technology have vowed to achieve net-zero emissions throughout their value chains. However, the lack of established definitions, methodology, and verification procedures has raised issues regarding legitimacy. Many agreements depend significantly on carbon offsets of different quality, poor disclosure of Scope 3 emissions, or long-term objectives without intermediate milestones.

Regulatory agencies are progressively working to rectify these issues. The European Union's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) demands full climate disclosures and third-party certification. In the United States, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) has proposed climate-related disclosure requirements mandating extensive reporting on emissions, risks, and governance structures. These events imply a steady transition from volunteer to mandated climate accountability.

#### **E. JUDICIALIZATION OF NET-ZERO ENFORCEMENT**

The incorporation of net-zero aims into legal reasoning has led to what experts characterize as the judicialization of climate regulation. In decisions like *Urgenda Foundation v. State of the Netherlands*, courts have interpreted human rights duties as



obliging nations to implement more aggressive emissions reductions compatible with scientific data. Similarly, in *Milieudefensie v. Royal Dutch Shell*, the duty of care under Dutch tort law was construed in connection with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights to impose a legally enforceable emissions reduction responsibility on a multinational firm.

Thus, the legal and policy environment of net-zero commitments is characterized by growing norms, rising judicial intervention, and greater convergence between international law, domestic laws, corporate governance, and human rights. These trends present fertile ground for climate litigation as a vehicle to enforce net-zero promises and solve the deficiencies of current governance mechanisms.

## **V. CLIMATE LITIGATION: CONCEPT AND EVOLUTION**

Climate litigation comprises a variety of legal techniques aiming at holding parties responsible for their contributions to climate change or failures to mitigate its impacts. While early forms of climate litigation focused largely on environmental regulation, the area has grown into a complex, multi-jurisdictional body of jurisprudence encompassing human rights, constitutional law, corporate governance, and tort liability.

### **A. EARLY PHASE: ENVIRONMENTAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW FOUNDATIONS**

The initial climate lawsuits generally included challenges to administrative decisions or failures to limit emissions. An important early decision was *Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency* (549 U.S. 497 (2007)), in which the U.S. Supreme Court decided that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases fit under the definition of “air pollutants” under the Clean Air Act. This case required the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to limit GHG emissions from motor vehicles, providing a crucial precedent for further regulatory measures. Early lawsuits in Australia, Canada,

and Europe also tried to force environmental authorities to include climate consequences in permits and land-use decisions.

**These early judgments helped to establish two essential principles:**

- That climate change is a cognizable environmental damage susceptible to judicial review, and
- That governments have legislative duties to control activities contributing to climate change.

However, these instances did not comprehensively touch human rights or constitutional elements.

## **B. RIGHTS-BASED PHASE: CONSTITUTIONALIZATION OF CLIMATE OBLIGATIONS**

Beginning in the 2010s, litigants increasingly characterized climate lawsuits as a human rights or constitutional rights problem. Courts were instructed not merely to interpret environmental statutes but to determine whether insufficient climate action violated fundamental rights to life, health, property, dignity, or a healthy environment.

The seminal case *Urgenda Foundation v. State of the Netherlands* (ECLI:NL:HR:2019:2007) symbolizes this rights-based era. The Dutch Supreme Court concluded that insufficient national emissions reductions infringed Articles 2 and 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), highlighting governmental responsibility to safeguard persons from foreseen climate damage. The Court founded its argument on scientific facts and international climate agreements, establishing the duty of care as a judicially enforceable climate obligation.

**Other significant rights-based cases include:**

- *Future Generations v. Ministry of Environment* (Supreme Court of Colombia, 2018), recognizing the Amazon rainforest as a rights-bearing entity and ordering deforestation mitigation.

- *Leghari v. Federation of Pakistan* (Lahore High Court, 2015), where inadequate implementation of climate policy was deemed a violation of fundamental rights.
- *Torres Strait Islanders v. Australia* (UNHRC, 2022), where climate inaction was found to violate rights to home, private life, and cultural integrity under the ICCPR.

These cases signal a growing judicial willingness to treat climate obligations as intrinsic to human dignity and constitutional rights.

### C. ACCOUNTABILITY PHASE: CORPORATE AND FINANCIAL LIABILITY

The most recent phase of climate litigation adds duties to private actors, notably businesses whose cumulative emissions match those of nation-states. *Milieudefensie et al. v. Royal Dutch Shell* (ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2021:5339) constituted the first instance of a court directing a firm to match its emissions trajectory with the Paris Agreement, proving that the duty of care under Dutch tort law embraces worldwide corporate emissions.

**Corporate litigation increasingly focuses on:**

- **Greenwashing:** misleading claims about emissions or sustainability (e.g., cases against ExxonMobil and Volkswagen).
- **Fiduciary duties:** suits against corporate directors or pension fund trustees for failing to manage climate risks (*McVeigh v. RET*, Australia).
- **Securities fraud:** misleading climate disclosures under investor protection laws.

These instances illustrate that climate litigation has grown into a multidimensional instrument not just for environmental preservation but also for imposing financial, ethical, and governance duties.

#### **D. GLOBAL DIFFUSION AND TRANSNATIONAL INFLUENCE**

Climate litigation is growing multinational. Courts quote international decisions, adopt concepts from other jurisdictions, and depend on worldwide scientific evaluations. For instance, the reasoning in *Urgenda* has affected instances in Belgium, France, Ireland, and the United Kingdom. Cases pending before the European Court of Human Rights, such as *Duarte Agostinho v. Portugal*, are likely to alter continental law. Advisory opinions before the ICJ and ITLOS may further clarify state duties under customary international law.

Thus, climate litigation has expanded from isolated national lawsuits into a worldwide movement, promoting convergence in legal concepts and altering the responsibility environment for net-zero pledges.

### **VI. CASE LAW ANALYSIS: FROM PLEDGES TO PROSECUTION**

The enforcement capacity of climate litigation becomes most obvious via important court rulings that have converted climate agreements into enforceable responsibilities. This section discusses five significant instances.

#### **A. URGENDA FOUNDATION V. STATE OF THE NETHERLANDS (2019)**

The Dutch Supreme Court's *Urgenda* ruling is generally considered the "birth of enforceable climate obligations." The Court found that insufficient national mitigation measures breached Articles 2 and 8 of the ECHR. Relying heavily on IPCC science, EU commitments, and the precautionary principle, the Court ordered the government to reduce emissions by at least 25% from 1990 levels by 2020. Crucially, it rejected the notion that the Netherlands' minuscule proportion of global emissions invalidated responsibility, stressing that "every reduction counts." This ruling maintained that human rights legislation imposes positive mitigation requirements commensurate with net-zero paths.

**B. MILIEUDEFENSIE ET AL. V. ROYAL DUTCH SHELL (2021)**

In this historic decision, the Hague District Court imposed a legally enforceable emissions reduction requirement on a multinational firm. The Court found that Shell had a duty of care to society under Dutch tort law, construed in light of international human rights principles. Shell was ordered to decrease Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions by 45% by 2030 compared to 2019. This ruling extends climate responsibility beyond governments to business players, providing precedence for corporate accountability in climate governance.

**C. NEUBAUER ET AL. V. GERMANY (2021)**

The German Constitutional Court decided that the Federal Climate Protection Act of 2019 was partly unconstitutional for establishing inadequate pre-2030 reduction requirements and pushing excessive responsibilities onto future generations. The Court developed the idea of “climate freedom,” holding that neglecting to act now hinders future freedom owing to the limited nature of the carbon budget. Germany was tasked to establish explicit post-2030 paths, reaffirming intergenerational justice as a fundamental norm.

**D. JULIANA V. UNITED STATES (2016–2020)**

Although rejected on justiciability grounds in January 2020, the Juliana v. United States case did not end there. The plaintiffs filed an amended complaint in 2023 to address the standing issues raised by the Ninth Circuit. However, in May 2024, the Ninth Circuit again dismissed the case for lack of standing, and in March 2025, the U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear the case, effectively ending this litigation. While the case remains significant in its role in bringing attention to the constitutional dimensions of climate change, its ultimate failure across multiple attempts at amendment and appeal underscores the significant barriers to climate litigation, particularly in terms of standing and justiciability. This outcome is critical for understanding the limitations and challenges within climate litigation, which are further discussed in Section 5.

**E. TORRES STRAIT ISLANDERS V. AUSTRALIA (UNHRC, 2022)**

The UN Human Rights Committee ruled that Australia breached the rights of indigenous islanders by failing to undertake necessary adaptation and mitigation measures. This verdict was the first time an international tribunal ruled climate inaction to be a human rights violation, increasing enforcement beyond local courts. Together, these cases indicate how courts are changing net-zero from voluntary promises into enforceable responsibilities anchored in duty of care, human rights, and constitutional principles.

**F. RIDHIMA PANDEY V. UNION OF INDIA**

A youth led case submitted in 2017 before the National Green Tribunal (NGT) by then nine-year-old Ridhima Pandey. She claimed that India's climate mitigation measures were insufficient under the public trust concept, India's responsibilities under the Paris Agreement, and principles of intergenerational equality. The NGT rejected the plea on January 15, 2019, and the case is currently pending before the Supreme Court of India at the pleadings stage. The next hearing is scheduled for July 30, 2025. In February 2025, the Supreme Court issued significant procedural orders, acknowledging the "inadequacies of extant legal framework" in addressing climate change challenges. The Court also appointed advocates as amici curiae in December 2024 and directed eight central ministries to coordinate on climate action, reflecting a growing judicial recognition of the need for comprehensive climate governance.

**G. M.K. RANJITSINH & ORS. V. UNION OF INDIA & ORS. (2024)**

The Supreme Court of India accepted that the "right to be free from the adverse effects of climate change" is part of the fundamental rights guaranteed by Articles 21 (right to life) and 14 (equality) of the Indian Constitution. However, this judgment contains a critical judicial paradox. While the Court recognized this progressive climate right, it also ruled in favor of overhead transmission lines through the critically endangered Great Indian Bustard habitat, effectively prioritizing renewable energy development

over species conservation. This tension between climate mitigation and biodiversity protection represents a significant limitation in the judgment's practical application and should be noted in the broader context of balancing climate and environmental goals. It is also important to note that this right was established in obiter dicta rather than as the ratio decidendi of the case, as the primary issue concerned the protection of endangered bird species.

## **VII. CHALLENGES IN CLIMATE LITIGATION**

Despite its tremendous impact, climate litigation confronts major difficulties that restrict its consistency, reach, and effectiveness.

### **A. JUSTICIABILITY AND SEPARATION OF POWERS**

A common issue is the idea that climate policymaking is a political subject intended for the legislative and executive branches. Courts in the United States, Australia, and Canada have voiced reluctance about entering into areas considered policy-laden or needing technical competence. In *Juliana*, the Ninth Circuit found that although climate impacts were real and serious, the judge lacked the power to enforce national climate policies. This respect contrasts with the European courts' more interventionist approach.

### **B. STANDING BARRIERS**

Standing principles typically limit who may file climate claims. U.S. courts often demand actual, particularized harm, which is difficult to show in the global context of climate change. By contrast, European and Latin American courts have recognized expanded standing for NGOs, youth, and collective interests. These different methods lead to unequal access to climate justice.

### **C. CAUSATION AND ATTRIBUTION**

Establishing causation is one of the most challenging areas of climate lawsuits. Climate change occurs from cumulative contributions of many emitters, confounding attempts

to pinpoint particular damages to individual players. Courts have started embracing probabilistic causation and proportionate responsibility theories, although many remain unwilling to assign blame without proven causal connections. Advances in attribution science are helping overcome this gap by quantifying contributions to individual events, although court approval differs.

#### **D. EVIDENTIARY COMPLEXITY**

Climate litigation typically incorporates sophisticated scientific data that judges may struggle to comprehend. Burdens of proof, admission criteria, and conflicting expert evidence create hurdles. Wealthy defendants, particularly companies, generally have more access to scientific and legal resources, generating asymmetries that disfavor plaintiffs.

#### **E. ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE**

Even a successful lawsuit has problems in execution. Court rulings may lack enforcement tools, especially in situations involving governments with conflicting economic goals or limited resources. Corporations with worldwide supply chains further complicate compliance, since activities span many countries. The Shell case highlights how even a landmark ruling may find challenges in guaranteeing compliance outside domestic limits.

#### **F. POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CONSTRAINTS**

Climate lawsuit does not work in a vacuum. Political reaction, lobbying by fossil fuel interests, and conflicting domestic objectives may undermine court rulings. In certain nations, courts may experience pressure, weakening judicial independence. These restrictions underline that litigation must function alongside, rather than replace, effective legislative and regulatory structures. Overall, the problems underline the need for integrated methods combining litigation with policy change, institutional capacity development, and technical assistance to increase enforcement.



## **VIII. EMERGING TRENDS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

Climate litigation continues to develop, spurred by improvements in research, rising legal creativity, and increasing social demand for climate responsibility.

### **A. CORPORATE AND FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

Recent years have witnessed an increase in climate claims against corporate actors, notably those in the fossil fuel, automobile, aviation, and finance industries. Fiduciary obligations are becoming a crucial legal instrument, with instances asserting that corporate directors and pension trustees must account for climate risks in their decision-making. Securities lawsuits based on incorrect climate statements are also growing.

### **B. TRANSNATIONAL LITIGATION AND INTERNATIONAL COURTS**

Litigation increasingly spans national boundaries. Advisory opinions currently before the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS) seek clarification on states' responsibility to avoid transboundary climate damage under customary international law. Regional human rights tribunals, notably the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) and Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR), are ready to issue important verdicts outlining climate duties.

### **C. TECHNOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENTS**

Climate attribution research is altering the evidential landscape by quantifying relationships between emissions and particular damages. Artificial intelligence (AI) facilitates analysis of emissions data, monitoring of company promises, and identification of greenwashing. As courts develop faith in probabilistic evidence, climate litigation may spread to new types of liability.

### **D. COLLECTIVE AND YOUTH-LED ACTIONS**

Youth movements and indigenous communities are changing climate lawsuit narratives by stressing intergenerational equality and cultural rights. Such lawsuits are

increasingly recognized by international authorities and certain national courts, helping democratize access to climate justice.

#### **E. TOWARD A GLOBAL CLIMATE ACCOUNTABILITY REGIME**

Emerging trends hint toward the creation of a multi-level climate accountability framework incorporating litigation, legislation, and market processes. As net-zero pledges become more legally anchored, litigation will increasingly concentrate on checking compliance, avoiding greenwashing, and guaranteeing conformity with scientific routes.

### **IX. CONCLUSION**

Climate litigation has become a distinguishing characteristic of modern climate policy, shifting net-zero promises from aspirational political pronouncements into enforceable legal duties. Through historic decisions across numerous countries, courts have established that governments and companies undertake a duty of care to mitigate climate damage and defend basic rights, including the rights to life, health, dignity, and cultural preservation. By interpreting constitutional and human rights principles in light of scientific knowledge, courts have reaffirmed the concept that climate protection is inherent to the rule of law.

Despite substantial hurdles, including concerns of standing, causality, scientific uncertainty, and enforcement climate, litigation continues to develop. Advances in attribution research, the increase of corporate fiduciary lawsuits, and current procedures before international courts imply that judicial monitoring of climate agreements will accelerate. Litigation also plays a key role in empowering disadvantaged groups, amplifying young voices, and driving openness in both public and commercial sectors.

While courts cannot replace solid legal and policy frameworks, they act as vital balances when political systems fail to appropriately address the climate catastrophe. As the world enters the key decades for attaining net-zero emissions, climate litigation will

remain a vital tool for ensuring that commitments made to future generations are followed not only in rhetoric but via enforced action anchored in law, science, and justice.

## **X. REFERENCES**

- *Affaire du Siècle* (Admin. Ct. Paris 2021).
- *ClientEarth v. Shell Board* (U.K. High Ct. 2023).
- *Future Generations v. Ministry of Environment*, STC4360-2018 (Sup. Ct. Colom. 2018).
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, AR6 Synthesis Report: Climate Change 2023.
- Inter-American Court of Human Rights, Advisory Opinion OC-23/17 (2017).
- *Leghari v. Federation of Pakistan*, W.P. No. 25501/2015 (Lahore High Ct. 2015).
- *Lliuya v. RWE AG*, 2 O 285/15 (Essen Regional Ct. 2017).
- *Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 549 U.S. 497 (2007).
- *McVeigh v. Retail Employees Superannuation Trust* (Fed. Ct. Austl. 2020).
- *Milieudefensie et al. v. Royal Dutch Shell*, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2021:5339.
- *Neubauer et al. v. Germany*, BVerfG, 1 BvR 2656/18 (Mar. 24, 2021).
- Paris Agreement, Dec. 12, 2015, U.N. Doc. FCCC/CP/2015/L.9/Rev.1.
- Peel, Jacqueline & Hari M. Osofsky, *Climate Change Litigation: Regulatory Pathways to Cleaner Energy* (2015).
- Rajamani, Lavanya, *The 2015 Paris Agreement: Interplay Between Hard, Soft and Non-Obligations*, 28 J. Envtl. L. 337 (2016).

- Setzer, Joana & Catherine Higham, *Global Trends in Climate Change Litigation: 2023 Snapshot* (Grantham Research Institute, LSE, 2023).
- *Torres Strait Islanders v. Australia*, U.N. Human Rights Comm., CCPR/C/135/D/3624/2019 (2022).
- *Urgenda Foundation v. State of the Netherlands*, ECLI:NL: HR:2019:2007.
- *Youth for Climate Justice v. Portugal*, App. No. 39371/20 (Eur.. Ct. H.R. pending).