

ESG AND THE LAW: HOW ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL, AND GOVERNANCE STANDARDS ARE SHAPING CORPORATE LIABILITY

Deity Yunin, Beijing Institute of Technology, China

ABSTRACT

Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) standards have evolved from voluntary corporate commitments to legally significant frameworks influencing corporate liability. As governments, investors, and civil society demand greater accountability, ESG compliance is increasingly enforced through legislation, litigation, and regulatory oversight. This article explores how ESG principles are reshaping corporate legal obligations, examining global trends, enforcement mechanisms, and the implications for risk management and corporate governance.

Keywords: ESG Standards, Corporate Liability, Sustainability Law, Governance, Social Responsibility, Environmental Regulation, Compliance, Stakeholder Accountability.

INTRODUCTION

In an era of climate urgency, social justice movements, and governance scandals, ESG has emerged as a powerful lens through which corporate behavior is scrutinized. Once considered a niche concern for ethical investors, ESG now influences legal frameworks, boardroom decisions, and shareholder activism. Companies that fail to align with ESG expectations risk reputational damage, regulatory penalties, and legal action (Mustapha et al., 2012).

The law is no longer a passive observer—it is becoming an active enforcer of ESG accountability. Historically, ESG disclosures were voluntary, guided by frameworks like the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) or the UN Principles for Responsible Investment. However, governments are increasingly codifying ESG into law. For example: The Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) mandates ESG disclosures for thousands of companies, with legal penalties for non-compliance. SEBI requires the top 1,000 listed companies to submit Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reports (BRSR), integrating ESG into regulatory filings (Near et al., 2004).

The SEC has proposed climate-related disclosure rules, signaling a shift toward mandatory ESG transparency. Environmental standards are central to ESG and have long been embedded in law through pollution controls, resource management, and climate regulations. However, ESG expands the scope by linking environmental harm to broader corporate responsibility. Companies are being sued for contributing to climate change or failing to disclose climate risks. Shell, ExxonMobil, and others have faced lawsuits from municipalities and shareholders. Misleading sustainability claims can lead to consumer protection lawsuits and regulatory fines. In 2023, Deutsche Bank's asset management arm was fined for overstating ESG credentials (Miceli et al., 1988).

The "S" in ESG covers labor rights, diversity, human rights, and community impact. Legal frameworks are evolving to hold companies accountable for social harms, especially in global supply chains. France's Duty of Vigilance Law and Germany's Supply Chain Act require companies to monitor and mitigate human rights abuses in their operations. ESG

metrics now influence legal scrutiny of corporate culture. Lawsuits over toxic workplaces or lack of diversity are increasingly framed within ESG failures (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Social impact claims—such as ethical sourcing or fair trade—are subject to legal verification, with false claims triggering liability. Governance failures—such as fraud, corruption, or lack of transparency—are traditional legal concerns now amplified by ESG standards. Directors may be held liable for ignoring ESG risks, especially if these lead to financial or reputational harm. Investors are suing companies for failing to disclose ESG risks or for misleading ESG statements. Agencies are probing governance lapses tied to ESG, such as data privacy violations or unethical lobbying. Governments and regulators are increasingly using ESG as a legal benchmark: Defines sustainable economic activities, guiding investment and compliance. Regulators in Australia, Canada, and Japan are mandating climate-related financial disclosures. ESG-related lawsuits have surged globally, with climate, human rights, and governance cases leading the way. Legal liability linked to ESG is reshaping corporate behavior: Companies are integrating ESG into enterprise risk frameworks to avoid legal exposure. Directors are receiving ESG education to fulfill fiduciary duties. ESG obligations are being embedded in supplier contracts and joint ventures (Collins, 1989).

CONCLUSION

ESG is no longer just a moral compass—it is a legal mandate. As laws evolve and enforcement intensifies, companies must treat ESG compliance as a core legal obligation. The convergence of ethics, law, and strategy demands proactive governance, transparent reporting, and stakeholder engagement. In the future, corporate liability will be measured not just by profits, but by purpose.

REFERENCES

- Collins, D. (1989). Organizational harm, legal condemnation and stakeholder retaliation: A typology, research agenda and application. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 8, 1-13.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 71(3), 500.
- Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1988). Individual and situational correlates of whistle-blowing. *Personnel psychology*, 41(2), 267-281.
- Mustapha, M., & Siaw, L. S. (2012). Will final year accountancy students whistle blow? A Malaysian case. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 3(5), 327.
- Near, J. P., Rehg, M. T., Van Scotter, J. R., & Miceli, M. P. (2004). Does type of wrongdoing affect the whistle-blowing process?. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 14(2), 219-242.

Received: 01-Aug-2025 Manuscript No. JLERI-25-16219; **Editor assigned:** 02-Aug-2025 Pre QC No. JLERI-25-16219(PQ); **Reviewed:** 16-Aug-2025 QC No. JLERI-25-16219; **Revised:** 21-Aug-2025 Manuscript No. JLERI-25-16219(R); **Published:** 28-Aug-2025