IRSHAD International Journal of Law and Policy | Volume: 2, Issue: 9
2024

Legal Nature and Classification of Smart Contracts in Crypto Exchanges: Challenges to Traditional Contract Law

Nazarov Azizjon Takhirdjanovich
Crypto Currency Consultant
nazarov.lawyer@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper examines the legal nature and classification of smart contracts within the context of cryptocurrency exchanges, exploring the challenges they pose to traditional contract law. As blockchain technology continues to evolve, smart contracts have emerged as a novel form of agreement execution, blurring the lines between code and legal obligations. This study analyzes the unique characteristics of smart contracts, including their self-executing nature, immutability, and decentralized structure, and how these features interact with established legal principles. The research investigates the potential gaps in current legal frameworks and the difficulties in applying traditional contract law concepts such as offer, acceptance, consideration, and breach to smart contracts. Furthermore, it explores the jurisdictional and enforcement issues that arise in the decentralized and borderless realm of crypto exchanges. By synthesizing legal theory, technological understanding, and practical implications, this paper aims to contribute to the ongoing dialogue on how to effectively regulate and integrate smart contracts into existing legal systems, while addressing the specific challenges they present in the dynamic landscape of cryptocurrency exchanges.

Keywords: Smart Contracts, Blockchain Technology, Cryptocurrency Exchanges, Contract Law, Legal Classification, Regulatory Challenges

APA Citation:

Nazarov, A. (2024). Legal Nature and classification of smart contracts in crypto exchanges: Challenges to traditional contract Law. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(9), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.224

I. Introduction

The advent of blockchain technology has ushered in a new era of digital transactions, with smart contracts emerging as a revolutionary tool for executing agreements without traditional intermediaries. In the context of cryptocurrency exchanges, smart contracts have become increasingly prevalent, automating trades, managing assets, and facilitating complex financial operations (Cong & He, 2019). However, the unique characteristics of smart contract, their self-executing nature, and immutability, and decentralized structure, present significant challenges to established legal frameworks, particularly in the realm of contract law (Werbach & Cornell, 2017). This research examines the legal nature and classification of smart contracts within cryptocurrency exchanges, exploring how these digital agreements interact with and challenge traditional contract law principles.

As the blockchain ecosystem continues to evolve, it becomes crucial to understand the legal implications of smart contracts and their potential to reshape contractual relationships in the digital age (Governatori et al., 2018). The significance of this study lies in its potential to bridge the gap between emerging technology and existing legal structures. By analyzing the unique features of smart contracts and their application in crypto exchanges, this research aims to contribute to the ongoing dialogue on how to effectively regulate and integrate these digital agreements into current legal systems (Finck, 2019). The findings of this study may inform policymakers, legal practitioners, and industry stakeholders in developing appropriate regulatory frameworks and legal interpretations for smart contracts in the cryptocurrency sector.

Smart contracts, first conceptualized by Nick Szabo in 1994, are self-executing agreements with the terms of the contract directly written into lines of code (Szabo, 1994). With the advent of blockchain technology, particularly the Ethereum platform, smart contracts have found practical implementation and widespread adoption (Buterin, 2014). In essence, smart contracts are programs stored on a blockchain that run when predetermined conditions are met, automating the execution of agreements without the need for intermediaries (Wang et al., 2019). Cryptocurrency exchanges, which facilitate the trading of digital assets, have embraced smart contracts to streamline operations, enhance security, and offer innovative financial products (Fisch, 2019). These exchanges utilize smart contracts for various purposes, including automated order matching, decentralized trading protocols, and the creation of complex financial instruments such as decentralized finance (DeFi) applications (Chen & Bellavitis, 2020).The key characteristics of smart contracts that distinguish them from traditional contracts include:

- **Automation:** Smart contracts execute automatically when predefined conditions are met, reducing the need for human intervention (Cong & He, 2019).

- **Immutability:** Once deployed on a blockchain, smart contracts cannot be altered, ensuring transparency and reducing the risk of tampering (Zheng et al., 2018).
- **Decentralization:** Smart contracts operate on distributed networks, eliminating single points of failure and reducing reliance on centralized authorities (Davidson et al., 2018).
- **Transparency:** The code of smart contracts is visible to all participants, promoting trust and allowing for public auditing (Atzei et al., 2017).

These features, while offering numerous benefits, also raise significant legal questions. Traditional contract law concepts such as offer, acceptance, consideration, and breach may not readily apply to smart contracts, creating challenges in their legal classification and enforcement (Raskin, 2017). Moreover, the borderless nature of blockchain technology and crypto exchanges introduces jurisdictional complexities that further complicate the legal landscape (Rühl, 2020). As smart contracts continue to gain prominence in cryptocurrency exchanges and beyond, it becomes imperative to examine their legal nature and classification. This research seeks to analyze how these digital agreements align with or deviate from established contract law principles, and to explore the potential adaptations necessary in legal frameworks to accommodate this emerging technology (Goldenfein & Leiter, 2018).

The primary objective of this research is to examine the legal nature and classification of smart contracts within the context of cryptocurrency exchanges, and to analyze the challenges they pose to traditional contract law. Specifically, this study aims to:

Evaluate the extent to which smart contracts in crypto exchanges align with or deviate from established legal principles of contract formation and execution.

Analyze the legal implications of the self-executing and immutable nature of smart contracts in relation to contract modification, termination, and breach.

Investigate the jurisdictional and enforcement issues arising from the decentralized and borderless nature of smart contracts in cryptocurrency exchanges.

Assess the adequacy of current legal frameworks in addressing the unique characteristics of smart contracts and identify potential gaps in regulation.

Explore potential adaptations or innovations in legal doctrine necessary to accommodate smart contracts within existing contract law.

Based on these objectives, we propose the following hypotheses:

H1: The self-executing nature of smart contracts in crypto exchanges significantly challenges traditional notions of offer, acceptance, and consideration in contract law.

H2: The immutability of smart contracts on blockchain platforms creates novel

legal issues regarding contract modification and termination that are not adequately addressed by current contract law.

H3: The decentralized structure of smart contracts in crypto exchanges poses substantial jurisdictional challenges for contract enforcement and dispute resolution.

H4: Existing legal frameworks are insufficient to fully address the unique characteristics of smart contracts, necessitating new legal doctrines or significant adaptations of current laws.

II. Methodology

To address the research objectives and test the hypotheses, this study employs a mixed-method approach combining legal doctrinal analysis, case studies, and comparative legal research. A comprehensive review of existing contract law principles, statutes, and case law will be conducted to establish a baseline understanding of traditional contract formation, execution, and enforcement (Hutchinson & Duncan, 2012). This analysis will focus on key jurisdictions including the United States, European Union, and select Asian countries with significant cryptocurrency exchange activity. An examination of the technical aspects of smart contracts used in major cryptocurrency exchanges will be performed to understand their structure, functionality, and limitations (Bartoletti & Pompianu, 2017). This will involve reviewing smart contract code, blockchain protocols, and technical documentation of prominent crypto exchanges.

Several case studies of smart contract implementations in leading cryptocurrency exchanges will be analyzed to provide real-world context to the legal issues identified (Yin, 2018). These case studies will include examples of successful smart contract executions as well as instances of smart contract failures or disputes. A comparative analysis of how different jurisdictions are approaching the regulation and legal classification of smart contracts will be conducted (Siems, 2018). This will include examining emerging legislation, regulatory guidance, and court decisions related to smart contracts and cryptocurrency exchanges across various legal systems. Based on the findings from the above methods, an assessment of the adequacy of current legal frameworks in addressing smart contracts will be performed. This will involve identifying gaps in existing laws and evaluating proposed regulatory approaches (Mik, 2017).

Primary data will be collected through expert interviews and analysis of smart contract code and documentation. Secondary data will be gathered from legal databases, academic journals, regulatory publications, and industry reports. Qualitative data analysis techniques, including thematic analysis and content analysis, will be employed to identify key themes and patterns in the collected data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The analysis will focus on comparing the characteristics of smart contracts with traditional contract law principles, identifying areas of conflict or ambiguity, and evaluating potential legal solutions. Special attention will be given to issues of

contract formation, performance, breach, and enforcement in the context of cryptocurrency exchanges. The intersection of smart contracts, cryptocurrency exchanges, and traditional contract law has garnered significant attention from legal scholars, technologists, and policymakers. This literature review synthesizes key findings and debates in the field, providing a foundation for our research.

III. Results

A. Legal Nature of Smart Contracts

The legal status of smart contracts remains a subject of intense debate. Savelyev (2017) argues that smart contracts represent a paradigm shift in contract law, challenging core principles of traditional legal doctrine. In contrast, Werbach and Cornell (2017) contend that while smart contracts introduce novel elements, they can still be accommodated within existing legal frameworks. Giancaspro (2017) explores the extent to which smart contracts satisfy the traditional requirements for contract formation, such as offer, acceptance, and consideration. He concludes that while smart contracts can meet these criteria in many cases, their automated nature may complicate the establishment of true consensus ad idem.

B. Classification Challenges

The classification of smart contracts within existing legal categories presents significant challenges. Durovic and Janssen (2018) analyze whether smart contracts should be considered as traditional contracts, sui generis agreements, or merely tools for executing conventional contracts. They highlight the difficulties in applying traditional contract interpretation methods to code-based agreements. Grimmelmann (2019) proposes taxonomy of smart contracts based on their level of integration with legal systems, ranging from "code-only" contracts to hybrid models that combine code with natural language terms. This classification scheme offers a nuanced approach to understanding the varied forms smart contracts can take.

C. Challenges to Traditional Contract Law

Several studies have identified specific challenges that smart contracts pose to established legal principles. Levy (2017) examines the implications of smart contracts' immutability for contract modification and termination, arguing that traditional doctrines of mistake and frustration may need to be reconceptualized in the context of blockchain-based agreements. Raskin (2017) explores the enforcement challenges posed by smart contracts, particularly in cases of breach or unforeseen circumstances. He suggests that the self-executing nature of smart contracts may shift the focus of contract law from ex-post enforcement to ex-ante design. DiMatteo and Poncibò (2018) investigate the applicability of good faith and fair dealing principles to smart contracts, questioning how these subjective standards can be incorporated into code-based agreements.

D. Regulatory Approaches

The regulatory landscape for smart contracts in cryptocurrency exchanges is evolving rapidly. Finck (2019) provides a comprehensive overview of blockchain regulation in Europe, including approaches to smart contract governance. She highlights the tension between the need for legal certainty and the desire to foster innovation in the blockchain space. Reyes (2018) proposes a "law-and-blockchain" approach to regulation, advocating for a balanced framework that leverages the strengths of both traditional legal systems and blockchain technology. This perspective suggests potential pathways for integrating smart contracts into existing regulatory structures.

E. Jurisdictional and Enforcement Issues

The decentralized and borderless nature of blockchain networks raises complex jurisdictional questions. Ortolani (2019) examines the challenges of determining applicable law and forum for smart contract disputes in cryptocurrency exchanges. He argues for the development of specialized dispute resolution mechanisms tailored to the unique characteristics of blockchain-based transactions. Goldenfein and Leiter (2018) explore the concept of "code as law" in the context of smart contracts, questioning the implications of embedding legal norms directly into technological systems. Their work highlights the potential for smart contracts to reshape traditional notions of legal authority and enforcement.

F. Gaps in the Literature

While the existing literature provides valuable insights into the legal nature and challenges of smart contracts, several gaps remain:

- Limited empirical studies on the practical implementation of smart contracts in cryptocurrency exchanges and their legal implications.
- Insufficient analysis of the interplay between smart contract code and natural language terms in hybrid agreements.
- Lack of comprehensive comparative studies on smart contract regulation across different jurisdictions.
- Inadequate exploration of potential adaptations to contract law doctrines specifically tailored to address smart contract characteristics.

This research aims to address these gaps by providing a comprehensive analysis of smart contracts in cryptocurrency exchanges, combining legal theory with practical insights and comparative perspectives.

G. Findings and Analysis

Our research has yielded several key findings regarding the legal nature and classification of smart contracts in cryptocurrency exchanges, as well as the challenges they pose to traditional contract law. We present these findings organized around our research objectives and hypotheses.

1. Legal nature classification of smart contracts

Our analysis reveals that smart contracts in cryptocurrency exchanges occupy a unique legal position that doesn't neatly fit into existing contract law categories. While they embody many characteristics of traditional contracts, their code-based nature and automated execution introduce novel elements that challenge conventional legal classifications.

Finding 1.1: Hybrid Legal Nature

Smart contracts in crypto exchanges often exhibit a hybrid legal nature, combining elements of traditional contracts with automated, code-based execution (Governatori et al., 2018). This duality complicates their classification within existing legal frameworks.

Finding 1.2: Lex Cryptographica

The immutable and self-executing nature of smart contracts on blockchain platforms gives rise to what some scholar term “lex cryptographica” - a form of private is ordering through code that operates alongside traditional law (De Filippi & Wright, 2018). This creates a parallel system of rules that may not always align with established legal principles.

2. Alignment with traditional contract law principles

Our examination of smart contracts in relation to fundamental contract law principles reveals both areas of alignment and significant divergence.

Finding 2.1: Contract Formation

Smart contracts can satisfy traditional requirements for contract formation (offer, acceptance, consideration) in many cases, but the automated nature of their execution can complicate the establishment of true consensus ad idem (Millard, 2018). This is particularly evident in complex, multi-party smart contracts used in decentralized exchanges (DEXs).

Finding 2.2: Performance and Breach

The self-executing nature of smart contracts fundamentally alters concepts of performance and breach. Once initiated, smart contracts execute automatically, potentially performing or "breaching" without further human intervention (Kolber, 2018). This challenges traditional notions of contractual performance and remedies for breach.

3. Challenges to traditional contract law

Our research confirms that smart contracts in cryptocurrency exchanges pose significant challenges to established contract law principles and practices.

Finding 3.1: Immutability and Contract Modification

The immutable nature of smart contracts on blockchain platforms conflicts with

traditional contract law's flexibility in allowing for modification and termination (Rohr, 2019). This rigidity can lead to unforeseen consequences when circumstances change or errors are discovered post-deployment.

Finding 3.2: Interpretation and the Code/Natural Language Divide

Many smart contracts in crypto exchanges combine code with natural language terms, creating potential conflicts between the two (Gudkov, 2019). Traditional methods of contract interpretation struggle to reconcile discrepancies between coded instructions and written intentions.

Finding 3.3: Automated Remedies and Judicial Intervention

Smart contracts often include automated remedies (e.g., liquidation of collateral in DeFi protocols) that execute without the possibility of judicial intervention (Zetzsche et al., 2018). This challenges traditional roles of courts in contract dispute resolution and enforcement.

4. Jurisdictional and enforcement issues

The decentralized and borderless nature of blockchain-based smart contracts in crypto exchanges presents unique jurisdictional and enforcement challenges.

Finding 4.1: Jurisdictional Ambiguity

Determining the appropriate jurisdiction for smart contract disputes in decentralized exchanges is highly problematic due to the distributed nature of blockchain networks (Ortolani, 2019). This ambiguity complicates the application of choice of law principles and forum selection.

Finding 4.2: Enforcement Limitations

Traditional enforcement mechanisms struggle to address smart contract issues due to the autonomous and potentially anonymous nature of blockchain transactions (Fitzgerald, 2020). This limits the effectiveness of conventional legal remedies in smart contract disputes.

5. Regulatory approaches and legal adaptations

Our analysis of current regulatory approaches and potential legal adaptations reveals a landscape in flux, with various jurisdictions experimenting with different strategies.

Finding 5.1: Regulatory Divergence

There is significant divergence in how different jurisdictions approach the regulation of smart contracts in crypto exchanges (Finck, 2019). This ranges from attempts to fit smart contracts into existing legal frameworks to the development of entirely new regulatory regimes.

Finding 5.2: Legal Innovations

Some jurisdictions are exploring innovative legal concepts to address smart contract challenges, such as the recognition of "code as contract" or the development of specialized dispute resolution mechanisms for blockchain-based agreements (Reyes, 2018).

These findings support our initial hypotheses and highlight the complex interplay between smart contracts, cryptocurrency exchanges, and traditional contract law. They underscore the need for continued legal innovation and interdisciplinary collaboration to address the unique challenges posed by this emerging technology.

IV. Discussion

The findings of our research illuminate the complex and evolving relationship between smart contracts in cryptocurrency exchanges and traditional contract law. This discussion explores the implications of our findings and their significance for legal theory, practice, and regulation.

A. Reconceptualizing Contract Formation and Execution

Our findings suggest that smart contracts challenge fundamental assumptions about contract formation and execution. The automated, self-executing nature of these agreements blurs the lines between offer, acceptance, and performance (Sklaroff, 2017). This raises important questions about the role of human intent and agency in contract law. For instance, in decentralized exchanges (DEXs) where smart contracts facilitate peer-to-peer trading, the traditional sequence of offer and acceptance may be replaced by a simultaneous, automated matching of buy and sell orders. This calls for a reevaluation of how we conceptualize the moment of contract formation and the parties' manifestation of assent. Moreover, the immutability of smart contracts on blockchain platforms introduces a new paradigm of contractual "performance." Once initiated, these contracts execute automatically, potentially fulfilling or breaching their terms without further human intervention. This challenges traditional notions of contractual duty and the opportunity for parties to cure defects or negotiate modifications in light of changing circumstances (Werbach, 2018).

B. The Emergence of Lex Cryptographica

The concept of lex cryptographica, or code-based private ordering, represents a significant departure from traditional legal frameworks. Our research indicates that smart contracts in crypto exchanges often operate in a parallel system of rules alongside conventional law. This dual nature creates potential conflicts and jurisdictional ambiguities that current legal systems are ill-equipped to handle (Wright & De Filippi, 2015). The emergence of lex cryptographica raises profound questions about the future of contract law and legal authority. As more economic activity shifts to blockchain-based systems, we may see a corresponding shift in the locus of contractual governance from human-interpreted legal texts to machine-executed code. This trend could have far-reaching implications for the role of courts, lawyers, and

traditional legal institutions in contract formation, interpretation, and enforcement.

C. Challenges in Contract Interpretation and Dispute Resolution

The hybrid nature of many smart contracts, combining code with natural language terms, presents significant challenges for contract interpretation and dispute resolution. Traditional hermeneutic approaches struggle to reconcile potential discrepancies between coded instructions and written intentions (Cohney & Hoffman, 2020). This is particularly problematic in complex smart contracts used in advanced crypto exchange operations, such as decentralized finance (DeFi) protocols. Furthermore, the automated execution of smart contracts can limit opportunities for judicial intervention or alternative dispute resolution. In cases where smart contract outcomes diverge from parties' intentions or produce unintended consequences, traditional legal remedies may be insufficient or inapplicable. This suggests a need for new approaches to dispute resolution that can bridge the gap between code-based and human-readable contract elements.

D. Regulatory Implications and the Need for Legal Innovation

Our analysis of current regulatory approaches reveals a fragmented landscape, with different jurisdictions adopting varied strategies to address the challenges posed by smart contracts in crypto exchanges. This regulatory divergence creates uncertainty for market participants and potentially hinders the development of cross-border blockchain applications (Finck, 2018). The findings underscore the need for legal innovation to keep pace with technological advancements. Traditional regulatory frameworks designed for centralized financial systems may be inadequate for the decentralized, borderless nature of blockchain-based smart contracts. This calls for a rethinking of regulatory approaches, potentially involving:

- Development of internationally harmonized standards for smart contract design and implementation
- Creation of specialized legal frameworks that recognize the unique characteristics of blockchain-based agreements
- Integration of regulatory compliance mechanisms directly into smart contract protocols
- Establishment of new forms of dispute resolution tailored to the technical and legal complexities of smart contracts
- Implications for Legal Practice and Education

The rise of smart contracts in cryptocurrency exchanges has significant implications for legal practice and education. Lawyers working in this field will need to develop new skills that bridge legal expertise with technical understanding of blockchain systems and smart contract coding (Fenwick et al., 2017). This may lead to the emergence of new legal specialties and the need for interdisciplinary training programs that combine law, computer science, and cryptography. Moreover, the automation of certain contractual processes through smart contracts may change the

nature of legal work, shifting focus from contract drafting and interpretation to smart contract auditing and risk assessment. Legal education will need to adapt to prepare future lawyers for these new roles and challenges.

Conclusion

Our research demonstrates that smart contracts in cryptocurrency exchanges represent a paradigm shift in how we conceive of and operationalize contractual relationships. While these innovative agreements offer potential benefits in terms of efficiency, transparency, and automation, they also pose significant challenges to established legal principles and regulatory frameworks. The hybrid nature of smart contracts, combining code-based execution with traditional legal concepts, necessitates a reevaluation of fundamental aspects of contract law. Issues of contract formation, performance, interpretation, and enforcement all require fresh examination in light of the unique characteristics of blockchain-based agreements.

Furthermore, the emergence of lex cryptographica as a parallel system of rules alongside traditional law raises profound questions about the future of legal governance in an increasingly digital and decentralized world. As smart contracts become more prevalent in cryptocurrency exchanges and beyond, legal systems will need to adapt to ensure effective regulation and dispute resolution in this new technological landscape. To address these challenges, we call for increased interdisciplinary collaboration between legal scholars, computer scientists, economists, and policymakers. Only through such collaborative efforts can we develop comprehensive legal frameworks and regulatory approaches that harness the potential of smart contracts while safeguarding the rights and interests of all stakeholders.

As the technology continues to evolve, further research will be crucial to refine our understanding of the legal implications of smart contracts and to develop innovative solutions to the challenges they present. The legal nature and classification of smart contracts in cryptocurrency exchanges will likely remain a dynamic and contentious area of study, reflecting the ongoing tension between technological innovation and legal tradition. A smart contract represents both a challenge and an opportunity for the legal system. By embracing legal innovation and adapting to the realities of blockchain technology, we can work towards a future where smart contracts enhance rather than undermine the foundational principles of contract law and effective regulation.

Bibliography

Akbar, A., & Dilnoza, S. (2024). Rights and Freedoms of Wives and Their Guarantees in the Republic of Uzbekistan. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(8), 42–47. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.217

AllahRakha, N. (2024). Addressing Barriers to Cross-Border Collection of E-Evidence in Criminal Investigations. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(6), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.193

AllahRakha, N. (2024). Constitutional Safeguards for Digital Rights and Privacy. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(4), 31–43. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.172

AllahRakha, N. (2024). Cybercrime and the Legal and Ethical Challenges of Emerging Technologies. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(5), 28–36. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.191

AllahRakha, N. (2024). Demystifying the Network and Cloud Forensics' Legal, Ethical, and Practical Considerations. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology*, 16(2), 119-132. https://doi.org/10.62271/pjc.16.2.119.132

AllahRakha, N. (2024). Legal Procedure for Investigation under the Criminal Code of Uzbekistan. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(3). https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.160

Atzei, N., Bartoletti, M., & Cimoli, T. (2017). A survey of attacks on Ethereum smart contracts (SoK). In *International Conference on Principles of Security and Trust* (pp. 164-186). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Buterin, V. (2014). Ethereum: A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform. *Ethereum White Paper*.

Cardellini Leipertz, R. (2024). Sovereignty beyond Borders: Unraveling the Enigma of Airspace and Outer Space Interplay. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(7), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.201

Chen, Y., & Bellavitis, C. (2020). Blockchain disruption and decentralized finance: The rise of decentralized business models. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, *13*, e00151.

Cohney, S., & Hoffman, D. A. (2020). Transactional scripts in contract stacks. *Minnesota Law Review*, *105*, 319-406.

Cong, L. W., & He, Z. (2019). Blockchain disruption and smart contracts. *The Review of Financial Studies*, *32*(5), 1754-1797.

Davidson, S., De Filippi, P., & Potts, J. (2018). Blockchains and the economic institutions of capitalism. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, *14*(4), 639-658.

De Filippi, P., & Wright, A. (2018). *Blockchain and the law: The rule of code*. Harvard University Press.

DiMatteo, L. A., & Poncibò, C. (2018). Quandary of smart contracts and remedies: The role of contract law and self-help remedies. *European Review of Private Law, 26*(6), 805-824.

Durovic, M., & Janssen, A. (2018). The formation of blockchain-based smart contracts in the light of contract law. *European Review of Private Law, 26*(6), 753-771.

Fenwick, M., Kaal, W. A., & Vermeulen, E. P. (2017). Legal education in the blockchain revolution. *Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment & Technology Law, 20*(2), 351-383.

Finck, M. (2018). Blockchains: Regulating the unknown. *German Law Journal, 19*(4), 665-692.

Finck, M. (2019). *Blockchain regulation and governance in Europe*. Cambridge University Press.

Fisch, C. (2019). Initial coin offerings (ICOs) to finance new ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing, 34*(1), 1-22.

Fitzgerald, J. M. (2020). Smart contracts, blockchain, and the next frontier of transactional law. *Washington Journal of Law, Technology & Arts, 15*(3), 47-112.

Gbaya, M. S. (2024). The Legal Framework for Regional Organisations in Africa and the Proactive Role in Addressing Threats to International Peace and Security . *International Journal of Law and Policy, 2*(8), 12–31. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.209

Giancaspro, M. (2017). Is a 'smart contract' really a smart idea? Insights from a legal perspective. *Computer Law & Security Review, 33*(6), 825-835.

Goldenfein, J., & Leiter, A. (2018). Legal engineering on the blockchain: 'Smart contracts' as legal conduct. *Law & Critique, 29*(2), 141-163.

Governatori, G., Idelberger, F., Milosevic, Z., Riveret, R., Sartor, G., & Xu, X. (2018). On legal contracts, imperative and declarative smart contracts, and blockchain systems. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 26*(4), 377-409.

Grimmelmann, J. (2019). All smart contracts are ambiguous. *Journal of Law and Innovation, 2*, 1-21.

Gudkov, A. (2019). Control on blockchain network. *Nova Law Review, 43*(3), 353-374.

Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: Doctrinal legal research. *Deakin Law Review, 17*(1), 83-119.

Ismaylovna, B. J. (2024). Problems of Admissibility and Reliability of Metadata as Evidence. *International Journal of Law and Policy, 2*(8), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.208

Kolber, A. J. (2018). Not-so-smart blockchain contracts and artificial responsibility. *Stanford Technology Law Review, 21*, 198-234.

Kumar, S. (2024). Online Defamation in the Digital Age: Issues and Challenges with Particular Reference to Deepfakes and Malicious Bots. *International Journal of Law and Policy, 2*(8), 32–41. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.200

Levy, K. E. (2017). Book-smart, not street-smart: Blockchain-based smart contracts and the social workings of law. *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society, 3*, 1-15.

Mamanazarov, S. (2024). Intellectual Property Theories as Applied to Big Data. *International Journal of Law and Policy, 1*(7). https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.164

Mik, E. (2017). Smart contracts: Terminology, technical limitations and real world complexity. *Law,*

Innovation and Technology, *9*(2), 269-300.

Millard, C. (2018). Blockchain and law: Incompatible codes? *Computer Law & Security Review*, *34*(4), 843-846.

Ortolani, P. (2019). The impact of blockchain technologies and smart contracts on dispute resolution: Arbitration and court litigation at the crossroads. *Uniform Law Review*, *24*(2), 430-448.

Patel, M. (2024). Legal and Technical Challenges of Developing Robust Traceability Systems for Genetically Modified Organisms. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(6), 23–33. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.195

Raskin, M. (2017). The law and legality of smart contracts. *Georgetown Law Technology Review*, *1*(2), 305-341.

Reyes, C. L. (2018). If Rockefeller were a coder. *George Washington Law Review*, *87*, 373-429.

Rohr, J. (2019). Smart contracts and traditional contract law, or: The law of the vending machine. *Cleveland State Law Review*, *67*(1), 71-92.

Rühl, G. (2020). Smart (legal) contracts, or: Which (contract) law for smart contracts? In *Blockchain and the Law* (pp. 159-180). Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.

Savelyev, A. (2017). Contract law 2.0: 'Smart' contracts as the beginning of the end of classic contract law. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, *26*(2), 116-134.

Shahzady, R. (2024). The Role of Social-Media for Micro-Entrepreneurship of Young Startups. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(6), 10–22. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.194

Siems, M. M. (2018). *Comparative law* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Sklaroff, J. M. (2017). Smart contracts and the cost of inflexibility. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, *166*(1), 263-303.

Szabo, N. (1994). Smart contracts. Unpublished manuscript.

Turdialiev, M. (2024). Navigating the Maze: AI and Automated Decision-Making Systems in Private International Law. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(7), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.198

Wang, S., Ouyang, L., Yuan, Y., Ni, X., Han, X., & Wang, F. Y. (2019). Blockchain-enabled smart contracts: Architecture, applications, and future trends. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, *49*(11), 2266-2277.

Werbach, K. (2018). Trust, but verify: Why the blockchain needs the law. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, *33*, 487-550.

Werbach, K., & Cornell, N. (2017). Contracts ex machina. *Duke Law Journal*, *67*(2), 313-382.

Wright, A., & De Filippi, P. (2015). Decentralized blockchain technology and the rise of lex cryptographia. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2580664

Yakubova, M. (2024). The Legal Challenges of Regulating AI in Cybersecurity: A Comparative Analysis of Uzbekistan and Global Approaches. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(7), 7–10. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.202

Yekaterina, K. (2024). Challenges and Opportunities for AI in Healthcare. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *2*(7), 11–15. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.203

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage

Publications.

Zetzsche, D. A., Buckley, R. P., & Arner, D. W. (2018). The distributed liability of distributed ledgers: Legal risks of blockchain. *University of Illinois Law Review*, *2018*(4), 1361-1406.

Zheng, Z., Xie, S., Dai, H. N., Chen, X., & Wang, H. (2018). Blockchain challenges and opportunities: A survey. *International Journal of Web and Grid Services*, *14*(4), 352-375.