INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL AFFAIRS AND RESEARCH

VOLUME 3 ISSUE 1

Peer-reviewed, open-access, refereed journal

IJLAR

+91 70421 48991
editor@ijlar.com
www.ijlar.com

DISCLAIMER

The views and opinions expressed in the articles published in the Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research are those of the respective authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the IJLAR, its editorial board, or its affiliated institutions. The IJLAR assumes no responsibility for any errors or omissions in the content of the journal. The information provided in this journal is for general informational purposes only and should not be construed as legal advice. Readers are encouraged to seek professional legal counsel for specific legal issues. The IJLAR and its affiliates shall not be liable for any loss or damage arising from the use of the information contained in this journal.

Introduction

Welcome to the Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research (IJLAR), a distinguished platform dedicated to the dissemination of comprehensive legal scholarship and academic research. Our mission is to foster an environment where legal professionals, academics, and students can collaborate and contribute to the evolving discourse in the field of law. We strive to publish high-quality, peer-reviewed articles that provide insightful analysis, innovative perspectives, and practical solutions to contemporary legal challenges. The IJLAR is committed to advancing legal knowledge and practice by bridging the gap between theory and practice.

Preface

The Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research is a testament to our unwavering commitment to excellence in legal scholarship. This volume presents a curated selection of articles that reflect the diverse and dynamic nature of legal studies today. Our contributors, ranging from esteemed legal scholars to emerging academics, bring forward a rich tapestry of insights that address critical legal issues and offer novel contributions to the field. We are grateful to our editorial board, reviewers, and authors for their dedication and hard work, which have made this publication possible. It is our hope that this journal will serve as a valuable resource for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers, and will inspire further inquiry and debate within the legal community.

Description

The Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research is an academic journal that publishes peer-reviewed articles on a wide range of legal topics. Each issue is designed to provide a platform for legal scholars, practitioners, and students to share their research findings, theoretical explorations, and practical insights. Our journal covers various branches of law, including but not limited to constitutional law, international law, criminal law, commercial law, human rights, and environmental law. We are dedicated to ensuring that the articles published in our journal adhere to the highest standards of academic rigor and contribute meaningfully to the understanding and development of legal theories and practices.

STRATEGIC RESTRUCTURING AND INSOLVENCY MANAGEMENT IN INDIA: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC DISRUPTIONS UNDER THE INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY CODE, 2016

AUTHORED BY - BANDI BHAVANA

Abstract

The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC) is a major reform of the Indian corporate insolvency regime, which has put in place a time-bound and uniform corporate insolvency resolution framework to promote corporate rescue and value maximisation in the event of financial distress. This research paper investigates the function of IBC in strategic restructuring and insolvency management, particularly in the event of economic shocks. It discusses the development of the insolvency framework in India, the provisions for the framework as built in the IBC, and the functions of the important provisions, such as the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) and the Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (PPIRP). The methodological approach to the study is the doctrinal legal research, which is based on the analysis of the regulations, court rulings, government reports, and scientific literature. It assesses the effects that economic disruption, especially during the Covid-19 pandemic, has had on the insolvency resolution and looks at legislative and judicial changes that have affected the implementation of the Code. The study highlights a number of key issues, such as the inefficiencies of the insolvency framework, which are ongoing due to procedural delays, institutional constraints, a rise in liquidation rates, and low use of PPIRP.

The paper concludes that the IBC has made India's insolvency regime more transparent, given creditor confidence, and set up a more efficient resolution procedure, but further continuous legislative amendments, increased institutional capacities, and increased focus on corporate rescue are needed for its long-term effectiveness. The study is relevant to the study of strategic restructuring and insolvency management as it sheds light on the changes that need to be

implemented to create a more resilient and efficient insolvency regime in India.

Keywords: Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC), Strategic Restructuring, Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP), Insolvency Management, Economic Disruptions, Corporate Rescue, PPIRP, MSMEs.

1. Introduction

To achieve these objectives, it is crucial to establish an effective insolvency mechanism that contributes to economic stability, ensures the orderly resolution of financially distressed enterprises, and strengthens investor confidence." investor confidence[1]. With the changing market demands, financial mismanagement, technological disruptions, economic recessions, and other unexpected events, in every modern economy, it is a fact that companies fail. A sound insolvency procedure ensures the creditors' interests are protected; it aims to preserve viable businesses, safeguard jobs, provide maximum value of assets, and support the economy as a whole. As a result, insolvency law has gone beyond its role as a debt collection tool to become a key and increasingly significant tool of corporate restructuring and economic management. Before the enactment of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC), the insolvency regime in India was disjointed with various laws such as the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985, the Recovery of Debts Due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993, and Securitisation and Rehabilitation of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002[2]. With multiple legislative structures and adjudicatory bodies came multiple jurisdictions, multi-generational litigation and unpredictable results, and also lengthy delays in distressed asset resolution. The process of insolvency proceedings would sometimes go on for several years, resulting in a decline in the value of corporate assets, poor recovery, and huge accumulation of non-performing assets in the banking and financial system, which put severe pressures on the Indian banking and financial system. Taking cognisance of this, the Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee had proposed a comprehensive and time-bound insolvency process, which will facilitate efficient resolution along with adherence to credit discipline[3]. In response to these recommendations, Parliament passed the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC), with the intent to rationalize and modernize all insolvency and bankruptcy-related laws into one well-integrated piece of legislation. The Code has also brought much-needed institutional changes by introducing the National Company Law

Tribunal as the adjudicating authority for corporate insolvency issues, forming the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India as the regulator, assigning a professional role of Insolvency Professionals as special resolution managers, and empowering the Committee of Creditors to make commercial decisions on the future of distressed corporate debtors[4]. These reforms brought a fundamental change in the insolvency regime of India, where previously there was more litigation and an emphasis on a speedy resolution, and value maximisation was put in place. The IBC has definitely had an impact on corporate restructuring in India since its enactment, by creating a specific procedure to resolve financial distress through the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) and, more recently, the Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (Pre-Pack) for Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises. The Code has helped in improving recovery mechanisms, increasing creditor confidence, responsible borrowing by companies, and increasing the ease of doing business in India. Further, the Supreme Court of India and the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal have clarified the purpose of the Code and its working, thereby providing more consistency and predictability in insolvency jurisprudence. [5]However, the effectiveness of the IBC has been tested during times of huge economic disruptions such as the COVID-19 pandemic. The financial difficulties that many companies faced in almost every sector of the economy put the ability of the insolvency system to reconcile the interests of creditors and the companies into question. To mitigate the impact, the Government took various temporary measures, such as the suspension of some insolvency proceedings and the launch of the Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process for MSMEs. [6]These developments showed that the insolvency system is flexible and that there is an ongoing need to further enhance the legal and institutional environment so that it can cope with the extraordinary economic crisis. While the IBC has made significant strides, there are still some challenges that need to be addressed to ensure its successful implementation. Although the IBC has made great strides, some challenges still remain for its effective implementation. Problems with the time taken to complete insolvency proceedings, the volume of litigation, limitations of capacity in front of insolvency courts, higher rate of liquidations, and the use of the restructuring tools in comparison to other instruments are still major issues. The challenges have posed interesting questions about the effectiveness of the current insolvency regime in meeting its broader goals to enable corporate rescue, preserve value, and promote long-term economic strength. In this backdrop, the present study critically reviews the law governing strategic restructuring and insolvency management as per the Insolvency and

Bankruptcy Code, 2016. It examines the functioning of the Code in addressing financial distress in the company during a state of crisis in the economy, discusses various judicial and legislative updates, highlights the key issues to be addressed for a successful corporate insolvency resolution, and suggests some recommendations for improving the insolvency regime in India. This study aims to add to the ongoing debate on the reform of insolvency law and the creation of a better corporate restructuring mechanism for India through this analysis.

2. Literature Review

With the enforcement of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, there has been extensive discussion in the academic and policy arena about the efficacy of the Code in enhancing the corporate insolvency regime in India. The Code has been studied in various dimensions, such as its institutional design, the insolvency resolution process, creditor rights, judicial interpretation, and effect on the banking sector. Such studies recognize the transformative power of the IBC, but they also point to many practical and legal hurdles to the operation of the IBC.[7]

V. S. Kaveri notes that the IBC had ushered in a holistic and time-bound insolvency regime, which superseded the earlier insolvency regime that was broken. The creditor-driven resolution process, with the support of the Committee of Creditors and Insolvency Professionals, has greatly enhanced transparency and efficiency in corporate insolvency. The study also notes that the Code added to the financial discipline of the corporate borrowers, as it provided inbuilt penalties for failing to pay. [8]

Neeraj Kumar and Hiren B. Patel highlight the role of IBC in addressing Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) in the Indian banking industry. As per their analysis, recovery rates have been higher in most of the cases under the IBC as compared to other recovery mechanisms like the SARFAESI Act and Debt Recovery Tribunals. Meanwhile, the authors highlight that the process of insolvency resolution is still not efficient due to institutional capacity constraints, prolonged litigation, and procedural delays.[9]

Aayushi Chaturvedi looks at the Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (PPIRP) for Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs). The study suggests that PPIRP is an important legislative innovation, as it allows for a faster restructuring process without the need to involve the management during the resolution procedure. The author does, however, note that its usage has been limited due to lack of awareness, the complexity of the procedure, and hesitant creditor involvement. [10]

The IBC has been based on the Report of the Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee, 2015, which gives the intellectual groundwork for the enactment of the IBC. The Committee highlighted that the existing insolvency regime in India is lacking in various aspects, such as disjointed legislation, an unacceptably long time taken, asset devaluation, and inadequate creditor confidence. It suggested a single, creditor-oriented insolvency framework with timely resolution, value maximisation and better credit markets. These recommendations were then the foundation for the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016. [11]

The decisions of the judges have also been the subject of much academic interest. The principles of the Code, the commercial wisdom of the committee of creditors and timely resolution of insolvency have been widely discussed in the context of the decisions of the Supreme Court in Swiss Ribbons Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India, Committee of Creditors of Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta and Ghanshyam Mishra & Sons (P) Ltd. v. Edelweiss Asset Reconstruction Co. Ltd. Such judgements have greatly influenced the interpretation and implementation of the IBC.[12]

Recent research also explores the effectiveness of the IBC in times of economic turmoil, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. The temporary suspension of insolvency proceedings, the new PPIRP concept, and different regulatory reactions taken to the benefit of the businesses to keep them from the turmoil their finances have never faced before have been studied. These measures brought short-term respite; however, the long-term impact on creditor rights, insolvency resolution, and corporate restructuring remains a matter of debate.

While literature is available to the researchers for understanding the working of IBC, most of the studies are on aspects such as recovery of creditors, judicial interpretation, resolution of NPA, etc. Research on the relationship between strategic restructuring and insolvency management as two interrelated processes in times of economic disruption is still rather limited. Moreover, the law reform, judicial growth, institutional difficulties, and crises have not been fully analysed and understood to see how these factors impact the efficacy of India's insolvency regime as a whole. The present study aims to do just that: to provide a detailed legal analysis of the process of strategic restructuring and insolvency management under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, and to offer lessons learned from recent economic crises and suggestions for making the corporate insolvency regime in India more effective.

3. Research Methodology

The present study adopts a doctrinal legal research methodology to examine the legal framework governing strategic restructuring and insolvency management under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC). Doctrinal research is appropriate for analysing legal principles, statutory provisions, judicial interpretations, and regulatory developments that shape India's insolvency regime. The study primarily seeks to evaluate the effectiveness of the IBC in addressing corporate financial distress, particularly during periods of economic disruption.

Research is done using primary and secondary sources. The primary sources of information are the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, its subsequent amendments, rules and regulations framed thereunder, notifications issued by the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, and judicial decisions of the Supreme Court of India, the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT), and the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT). These sources are the basis for examining the legal structure of and the application of it. Secondary sources include books, peer reviewed journal articles, research papers, government publications, reports of the Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee, Insolvency Law Committee, Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (IBBI), Reserve Bank of India (RBI), parliamentary committee reports and other academic commentaries on corporate insolvency, restructuring and economic governance. These documents contain important information on the development, application and effectiveness of the insolvency system. The study is descriptive and analytical in nature to evaluate the functioning of the IBC and its contribution towards corporate rescue, maximisation of value, and efficient resolution of insolvency. Special focus is given to the assessment of the legal and institutional measures implemented in economic crises, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, and the impact these measures

 ISSN: 3049-043X

have on the functioning of the insolvency system. The study ends with a discussion of the key challenges and possible legal and policy solutions to improve India's insolvency regime and make it more resilient to economic challenges in the future.

4. Evolution and Legal Framework of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016

Through the historical journey of insolvency law in India, one can see the country's ongoing endeavor to create a robust and streamlined legal mechanism for dealing with financial difficulties and ensuring economic stability and business continuity. Before the introduction of IBC, 2016, the insolvency regime was governed by various acts such as the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985 (SICA), the Recovery of Debts Due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993 (RDDBFI Act), the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (SARFAESI Act), and the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. The mechanisms of these laws varied and frequently led to overlapping authority and to long, drawn-out procedures and litigations. As a result, both distressed companies and creditors faced serious loss of asset value and trouble in debt recovery, respectively. The current framework was found to be inadequate and insufficient to handle the growing number of non-performing assets (NPAs) in the banking sector, while also providing an impetus for a broader overhaul of the insolvency regime[13]. In response to these difficulties the Government of India appointed the Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee (BLRC) headed by Dr. T. K. Viswanathan in 2014. The Committee recommended a uniform insolvency resolution framework, which will offer a time-bound and transparent framework to the insolvency resolution process with creditors' consent[14]. In view of these recommendations, Parliament passed the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, which entered into force with the aim of consolidating and amending the laws concerning insolvency and bankruptcy. The IBC was a revolution in the insolvency regime in India, replacing a multi-faceted regime with a single mega legislation[15]. The Code takes a more holistic approach than the earlier Code, which mainly relied on debt recovery, to include resolution of financial distress through corporate rescue and value maximisation. The main objectives of its are: time-bound insolvency resolution process, maximisation of the value of the asset of the corporate debtor, promotion of entrepreneurship, improved credit availability and balancing of all the stakeholders[16]. The IBC has laid down a specific legal structure to enable effective implementation through the creation of dedicated institutions. The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (IBBI) is the regulatory body for the regulation of Insolvency Professionals, Insolvency Professional Agencies (IPA) and Information Utilities. The National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) is the adjudicating body for corporate insolvency matters, with appeals being addressed by the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT), followed by the Supreme Court of India. The Committee of Creditors (CoC) has a pivotal role in considering and approving the resolution plan as per their commercial wisdom, while Insolvency Professionals (IPs) will be the ones to administer the resolution process and run the affairs of the corporate debtor in the course of the insolvency proceedings. The Code has been amended many times in the years since it was first promulgated to address issues in practice and make it more effective. The introduction of the Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (PPIRP) for Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) is one of the key features introduced in the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Act, 2021. This mechanism allows for a quicker and less disruptive restructuring process, a process that involves debtors and creditors' negotiation before the formal insolvency process starts. Overall, the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 has ushered in a new and different dawn in insolvency law, creating a law that is transparent, modern, and focused on restructuring. Although the challenges and worries of the Code have not abated (procedural delays and high liquidation rates), the Code has brought a much-needed boost of confidence to creditors, better corporate insolvency resolution, and helped to make the financial and economic system more robust.[17]

5. Strategic Restructuring under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016

5.1 Concept of Strategic Restructuring

Strategic restructuring is the process of a financially troubled company's efforts to reorganize its financial obligations, corporate structure, or business activities in order to restore its finances and ensure a long-term focus. While liquidation involves the company being wound up and its assets sold, strategic restructuring aims to keep viable businesses operating and to manage financial difficulties. Today, restructuring has become an essential tool in the insolvency toolbox to ensure the preservation of value for the company, protect jobs, restore investor confidence, and ensure economic stability. The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC) marks a paradigm shift in the Indian corporate insolvency regime, which is more business rescue-oriented than debt recovery. The Code acknowledges that financially troubled businesses should be given the chance to re-emerge if there is a reasonable chance of commercial viability. Therefore, the IBC provides a time-bound and structured resolution process that takes into account the interests of the creditors, debtors, employees, investors, and other stakeholders and aims at maximising value.[18]

5.2 Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP)

Strategic restructuring is the main way in which the IBC facilitates strategic restructuring through the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP). The process could be started by a financial creditor or operational creditor, or by the corporate debtor in case of default, as per the provisions of the code. If the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) admits an application, then a moratorium is declared by Section 14 of the IBC. The pendency of legal proceedings, recovery actions, and security interest enforcement against the corporate debtor continues to be suspended during this time, as this creates a conducive environment for developing and testing a resolution plan. In the wake of the commencement of CIRP, an Interim Resolution Professional takes over the affairs of the corporate debtor and later transfers the responsibilities to the Resolution Professional appointed by the Committee of Creditors (CoC). The Resolution Professional confirms claims of creditors, conducts the affairs of the corporate debtor as a going concern, invites potential resolution applicants, and helps prepare and submit resolution plans. This institutional structure guarantees transparency, accountability, and fairness in the resolution process.

5.3 Role of the Committee of Creditors and Resolution Professional

The Committee of Creditors is a key player in the management of corporate debtors' affairs. The CoC consists primarily of financial creditors, which assess the viability and commercial practicability of resolution plans before approving the most viable one. [19]The Code acknowledges the commercial considerations of CoC and restricts judicial involvement in commercial matters, unless they breach statutory requirements. The Resolution Professional is an impartial facilitator who takes care to ensure adherence to the stipulations of the IBC and carries out the insolvency resolution process in a clear and efficient way[20]. Whether strategic restructuring is successful or not, the key is the professional skill of the Resolution Professional and the wise commercial decisions of the Committee of Creditors.

5.4 Resolution Plans and Corporate Rescue

The key purpose of the resolution plan is to revive the corporate debtor and to maximise the value of its assets for all concerned. Successful resolution plans typically involve debt restructuring, additional capital investment, organizational changes, changes to management, and corporate governance. The resolution plan is passed by the National Company Law Tribunal after finding it compliant with the statutory conditions as laid out in the IBC. Unlike the previous insolvency regime, the IBC focuses on corporate rescue. The Code encourages business continuity where possible, and does not mandate liquidation as an initial business solution to financial problems. Implementing resolution plans has the potential to enhance creditors' recoveries, save jobs, maintain productive assets, and promote economic stability.

5.5 Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (PPIRP)

The Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (PPIRP) has been introduced by the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Act, 2021, [21]Given the specific difficulties that Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) face. PPIRP is not the traditional CIRP, but rather a debtor-in-possession process that allows the current management to manage the company during the negotiation process with the creditors under judicial supervision. The mechanism will be used to lower the cost of the process, limit disruption to business activities, and expedite the resolution of financial distress[22]. PPIRP is a significant step towards streamlining the insolvency framework in India, but there are still challenges to its implementation in practice, such as the complexity of the procedures, lack of awareness among MSMEs, and the reluctance of creditors to participate. However, the new PPIRP does demonstrate the legislature's commitment to improving business rescue processes and making the insolvency process more flexible to meet the diverse economic environment.[23]

6. Insolvency Management during Economic Disruptions

The economic disruptions have a major impact on the financial health of businesses, cutting production, causing instability in supply chains, and limiting access to credit, leading to a high risk of corporate insolvency. An effective insolvency framework can help to maximize creditor value and allow for a financially distressed but viable business to get better. The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC) was conceived to enable the timely resolution of insolvency during normal economic times; however, the unprecedented situations, like the COVID-19 pandemic, challenged the flexibility and resilience of the Code.[24]

The COVID-19 Pandemic started in 2020 and had a significant impact on the Indian economy. Businesses in many sectors faced heavy financial stress due to nationwide lockdowns, business curbs, a shortage of labour resources, and reduced consumer demand. The liquidity situation of many companies was constricted, and they could not meet their financial obligations, which led to a higher insolvency risk. The Government of India had taken several interim measures in the shape of legislation and regulations to cope with the sudden deluge of insolvency proceedings that could otherwise engulf what is otherwise a viable business and send it into liquidation. The most important measure was placing the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) on hold in case of specified defaults under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Ordinance, 2020. Section 10A was inserted into IBC, barring the filing of applications under Sections 7, 9, and 10 for defaults during the period. This measure aimed to shield businesses impacted by the unique economic pressures that came as a result of COVID-19 from immediate bankruptcy proceedings and to maintain jobs and economic activity throughout the pandemic.[25]

The Government introduced the Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (PPIRP) for Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Act, 2021, in addition to the temporary suspension of insolvency proceedings. The objective of PPIRP was to offer a more streamlined, cost-effective, and less disruptive means for restructuring financially troubled MSMEs. The framework aimed to continue the business as usual as possible, while creditors were able to negotiate a resolution plan with the existing management of the business without the company being liquidated.[26]

These reliefs were put in place during the financial crisis, but they also served to demonstrate some of the weaknesses of the insolvency system. In a few instances, the temporary suspension of insolvency proceedings did not help in resolving the financial problems and raised doubts among creditors about the recovery of their dues. Likewise, the implementation of PPIRP has been limited, though it has benefits, due to issues created by the procedure, financial creditors' hesitation to participate, and the lack of awareness of eligible enterprises.[27]

The COVID-19 pandemic has shown the need for insolvency laws to be flexible enough to meet exceptional economic conditions, while maintaining the ultimate goals of financial discipline and creditor confidence. It also underscored the need to further develop institutional capacity, enhance access to restructuring tools, and promote early resolution of financial distress to prevent businesses from becoming commercially unviable[28].

The lessons to be learned from the economic disruption that has occurred over the past few years are not confined to the pandemic. Similarly, corporate solvency could be impacted by other possible scenarios in the future, such as financial crises, geopolitical uncertainties, technology disruptions, and global market instability. So, timely legislative changes, effective institutional arrangements, and proactive policy measures need to be continued in the insolvency framework of India. A resilient insolvency system should not only help to recover the debt, but also provide a mechanism to assist in the business rescue, preservation of economic value, and contribute to long-term financial stability. The lessons learned from the last few economic crises offer a good basis for creating a more flexible and sustainable insolvency framework that will be better equipped to deal with future crises.[29]

7. Challenges in the Implementation of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code

The introduction of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, has revolutionized the insolvency regime in India with its establishment of a time-bound and structured insolvency resolution mechanism. In spite of its success, there are several legal and practical issues still to be addressed with regard to its effective and efficient implementation. These challenges have hurt the timing, value-maximisation, and corporate rescue aspects of the resolution process and, in many instances, restricted the effectiveness of the purpose of the Code.

Delay in completion of the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) is one of the major issues. The IBC has laid out a prescribed time limit for the insolvency processes, but many cases are still taking longer than the limit because of lengthy litigation, multiple appeals, and procedural complications. These delays can make distressed assets less valuable, make the resolution more costly, and reduce the chance of reviving the business.[30] The lack of institutional capacity is another significant issue. There has been a substantial surge in applications for resolution in the

National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT), causing a significant backlog of cases. The inability to have tribunals with judges, the shortage of judges, and the administrative bottlenecks have delayed the disposal of insolvency matters. The enhancement of the institutional capacity of adjudicating authorities is therefore crucial for the effective implementation of the Code.[31]

The surge of the liquidation orders also gives rise to concerns about the effectiveness of the insolvency framework. While the main aim of the IBC is to rescue viable businesses, significant businesses end up in liquidation. In many instances, financially troubled companies are not able to attract well-qualified resolution applicants and, consequently, businesses are not revived. This result impacts the staff, creditors, investors, and the economy as a whole.[32]

The practical challenges to the implementation of the Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (PPIRP) have also arisen. Although it can offer a fast and effective restructuring process for Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs), its use is still relatively limited. Its wider use has been limited by factors like the complexity of procedures, awareness problems among the potential enterprises, and the conservative attitude of the creditors[33].

The other hurdle is the need to resolve the interests of different stakeholders who participate in the insolvency process. The Code lays significant emphasis on the commercial rights of the Committee of Creditors, but there have been some apprehensions about protecting operational creditors, employees, and other stakeholders, at times. Preserving a balance between creditor rights and corporate rescue is one of the key issues in the ongoing development of the Indian insolvency regime.

To overcome these challenges, ongoing legislative development, institutional capacity building, effective case management and increased knowledge of the existing restructuring provisions are needed. The IBC has laid a solid legal framework for the resolution of insolvency in India; however, the success of the process will depend on the capacity of the policymakers, controllers, and judiciary to effectively and timely implement the provisions of the IBC.[34]

8. Judicial Developments and Emerging Trends

Judicial interpretation has been a key factor in both the implementation and development of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC). In a series of landmark orders, the Supreme Court of India and the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT) have clarified the purpose of the Code, bolstered the insolvency resolution process, and addressed ambiguities arising during the implementation of the Code. These judicial decisions have played a very crucial role in establishing a uniform insolvency jurisprudence in India. The Swiss Ribbons Pvt. Ltd. vs. Union of India judgment is one of the most important judgments handed down by the Supreme Court, which upheld the constitutional validity of the IBC[35]. The Court noted that the main purpose of the Code is to revive and continue a corporate debtor where possible by protecting it from the threat of liquidation. It also acknowledged that the principles of the insolvency framework are timely resolution, value maximisation, and consideration of the interests of all stakeholders. This ruling boosted trust in the constitution and the law of the IBC.

In the case of Committee of Creditors of Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta, the Supreme Court reiterated the principle of commercial prudence of the Committee of Creditors (CoC). In this regard, the Court ruled that the authority to adjudicate should not encroach on the commercial judgments of the CoC, unless the resolution plan infringes the Code's provisions.

The judgment further strengthened the creditor-driven nature of the process of insolvency resolution and set a new benchmark for approving resolution plans.[36] A further development from Ghanshyam Mishra & Sons (P) Ltd. v. Edelweiss Asset Reconstruction Co. Ltd. was that the Supreme Court ruled that after the resolution plan is approved by the National Company Law Tribunal, all the claims that are not part of the approved resolution plan stand extinguished. This is a decision to foster certainty for resolution applicants who succeed in resolving and to help implement effective resolution plans that have been approved.

The recent legislative and regulatory changes have also had an impact on the development of the insolvency framework in India. The government's efforts to increase the efficiency of insolvency resolution have been made evident with the introduction of the Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (PPIRP) for Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs), continuous amendments to the IBC and the regulatory initiatives taken by the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (IBBI). These reforms are designed to speed up the process, boost institutional capacity, promote corporate rescue, and increase creditor confidence[37].

The ongoing developments in insolvency jurisprudence reflect that the IBC is a dynamic law that can evolve and surmount the novel economic and commercial challenges. Through judicial interpretation and, from time to time, by means of legislative changes, the effectiveness of the insolvency regime has been enhanced, and pragmatic issues that have emerged in its application have been overcome. The journey towards achieving the goals of IBC is far from over, and more judicial clarity and policy changes are likely to be needed as India's economy continues its transformation.[38]

9. Findings and Recommendations

Findings

The study concludes that the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC), has significantly changed the insolvency landscape of India, which was characterized by a disjointed legal structure until now. The Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) has provided greater transparency, increased confidence among creditors and established a formal mechanism for resolving corporate financial distress. The goals of the Code have also been bolstered by judicial interpretation, with the recognition of the principles of corporate rescue, value maximisation and speedy resolution as the guiding principles.

The study also finds that there are some challenges that persist in the effective implementation of the IBC. The overall poor efficiency in the insolvency process is partly due to delays in the winding up of a company, rising pendency before the National Company Law Tribunal, and the rising number of liquidation orders. While the Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (PPIRP) is a welcome change for MSMEs, the usage of the process is not extensive. The need for a more resilient insolvency regime, which can cope with times of economic disruption, was further illustrated by the experience of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Recommendations

The Government should augment the institutional capacity of the NCLT by adding more benches and appropriately appointing members on time for the effective functioning of the IBC. Effective case management and the adoption of technology in the insolvency process should help to reduce procedural delays. The Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process must be made more streamlined to encourage greater usage by MSMEs. Its effectiveness in practice can be further enhanced through awareness programmes, easier procedures, and increased financial institution participation. Early restructuring systems should also be encouraged to allow for financially troubled businesses to implement corrective measures before formal insolvency is needed, and this should be part of the agenda for policymakers.

Last but not least, the need for periodic review of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code is imperative so as to keep it agile and responsive to the evolving economic landscape. Ongoing improvements to the act, with judicial certainty and institutional consolidation, will help to make the insolvency procedure more efficient and will lead to a stronger system that would facilitate company rescue, safeguard stakeholder rights, and contribute to economic growth.

10. Conclusion

The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC), has become one of the most important economic and legal changes in India, providing a comprehensive system for the resolution of insolvency and corporate rehabilitation. It has introduced a single, time-bound, and transparent insolvency resolution process, fostering creditor confidence and revival of financially stressed viable companies. The Code has changed the paradigm for insolvency law from debt recovery to business rescue and value maximisation, in part through the provisions of the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) and the Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (PPIRP). The study reveals that the IBC is a remarkable improvement in the insolvency system in India, but several institutional and procedural issues remain to be addressed. It has not succeeded in its goals due to delays in insolvency proceedings, judicial backlogs, the growing number of companies being liquidated, and limited implementation of the restructuring tools.

The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic further underscored the need for an Insolvency Regime that

 ISSN: 3049-043X

is flexible enough to meet the challenge posed by economic shocks while retaining the faith of creditors and investors.

In general, the IBC has set a good precedent for the governance of insolvency in India. But it will require ongoing legislative tweaking, effective institutional operation, prompt judicial action, and more focus on corporate rescue if it is to be successful in the long run. Improving these elements will improve the effectiveness of the insolvency framework and will help to foster sustainable economic growth, financial stability, and a resilient corporate sector. With India's economy constantly changing, the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code must evolve to suit the changing commercial realities of the economy if it is to be an effective tool of strategic restructuring and insolvency management.

11. Bibliography

11.1.1 Primary Sources

11.1.2 Statutes

- Companies Act, No. 18 of 2013, India Code (2013).
- Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, No. 31 of 2016, India Code (2016).
- Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Act, No. 26 of 2021, India Code (2021).
- Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Ordinance, No. 9 of 2020.
- Recovery of Debts Due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, No. 51 of 1993, India Code (1993).
- Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, No. 54 of 2002, India Code (2002).
- Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, No. 1 of 1986 (repealed).

11.1.3 Cases

- Committee of Creditors of Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta, (2020) 8 SCC 531.
- Ghanshyam Mishra & Sons (P) Ltd. v. Edelweiss Asset Reconstruction Co. Ltd., (2021) 9 SCC 657.

- Innoventive Industries Ltd. v. ICICI Bank, (2018) 1 SCC 407.
- Swiss Ribbons Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India, (2019) 4 SCC 17.

11.1.4 Government Reports

- Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee, The Report of the Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee (2015).
- Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, Annual Report 2023-24.
- Insolvency Law Committee, Report on Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process (2021).
- Reserve Bank of India, Financial Stability Report (2022).
- Reserve Bank of India, Report on Trend and Progress of Banking in India 2023-24.

11.2. Secondary Sources

11.2.1 Books

- Sumant Batra, Corporate Insolvency: Law and Practice (Eastern Book Co.).
- M. S. Sahoo, Law and Practice of Insolvency and Bankruptcy in India (Taxmann Publications).
- V. Ramakrishna, The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code: Law and Practice (LexisNexis).

11.2.2 Journal Articles

- Aayushi Chaturvedi, Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process for MSMEs: Opportunities and Challenges, 63 J. Indian L. Inst. (2021).
- Neeraj Kumar & Hiren B. Patel, Effectiveness of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code in Resolving Non-Performing Assets in India, Indian J. Fin. (2021).
- V. S. Kaveri, Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code: A New Framework for Corporate Rescue in India, Chartered Accountant (2018).
- Umakanth Varottil & Harpreet Singh, Creditor Behaviour and Resolution Outcomes under India's Insolvency Regime: An Empirical Assessment, 14 NUJS L. Rev. (2021).

[1] Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee, *The Report of the Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee: Volume I—Rationale and Design* 11–18 (Nov. 2015),
[2] SICA, No. 1 of 1986; RDDBFI Act, No. 51 of 1993; SARFAESI Act, No. 54 of 2002 (India).
[3] Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee, *The Report of the Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee: Volume I—Rationale and Design* 17–31, 75–89 (Nov. 2015); Reserve Bank of India, *Financial Stability Report* (June 2015).
[4] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, No. 31 of 2016, §§ 7–12, 16–18, 21, 188–196 (India).
[5] *Swiss Ribbons Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India*, (2019) 4 S.C.C. 17; *Committee of Creditors of Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta*, (2020) 8 S.C.C. 531.
[6] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Act, No. 26 of 2021 (India); Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, §§ 54A–54P (India).
[7] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, *Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016: A Report* (latest ed.).
[8] V. S. Kaveri, *Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code: A New Framework for Corporate Rescue in India*, The Chartered Accountant (2018).
[9] Neeraj Kumar & H. B. Patel, *Effectiveness of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code in Resolving Non-Performing Assets in India*, Indian Journal of Finance (2021).
[10] Aayushi Chaturvedi, *Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process for MSMEs: Opportunities and Challenges*, 63 J. Indian L. Inst**.** (2021).
[11] Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee, *The Report of the Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee* (2015).
[12] *Swiss Ribbons Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India*, (2019) 4 S.C.C. 17; *Comm. of Creditors of Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta*, (2020) 8 S.C.C. 531
[13] Reserve Bank of India, *Financial Stability Report* (2022).
[14] Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee, *The Report of the Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee: Volume I—Rationale and Design* (2015).
[15] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, No. 31 of 2016, pmbl. (India).
[16] *Swiss Ribbons Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India*, (2019) 4 S.C.C. 17.
[17] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, *Annual Report* 2023–24.
[18] M.S. Sahoo, *Law and Practice of Insolvency and Bankruptcy in India* (Taxmann).
[19] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, No. 31 of 2016, §§ 21, 28, 30 (India).
[20] *Committee of Creditors of Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta*, (2020) 8 S.C.C. 531; Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, No. 31 of 2016, §§ 22–25 (India).
[21] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Act, No. 26 of 2021, §§ 54A–54P (India).
[22] Insolvency Law Committee, *Report on Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process* (2021).
[23] Aayushi Chaturvedi, *Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process for MSMEs: Opportunities and Challenges*, 63 J. Indian L. Inst**.** (2021).
[24] Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee, *The Report of the Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee: Volume I—Rationale and Design* (2015).
[25] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Ordinance, No. 9 of 2020, § 10A (India).
[26] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Act, No. 26 of 2021, §§ 54A–54P (India).
[27] Insolvency Law Committee, *Report on Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process* (2021).
[28] Reserve Bank of India, *Financial Stability Report* (2022).
[29] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, *Annual Report 2023–24*.
[30] *Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code*, No. 31 of 2016, § 12 (India).
[31] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, *Annual Report* 2023–24.
[32] Reserve Bank of India, *Financial Stability Report* (2022).
[33] Insolvency Law Committee, *Report on Pre-Packaged Insolvency Resolution Process* (2021).
[34] M.S. Sahoo, *Law and Practice of Insolvency and Bankruptcy in India* (Taxmann).
[35] *Swiss Ribbons Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India*, (2019) 4 S.C.C. 17.
[36] *Committee of Creditors of Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta*, (2020) 8 S.C.C. 531.
[37] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Act, No. 26 of 2021, §§ 54A–54P (India); Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, *Annual Report* 2023–24.
[38] M.S. Sahoo, *Law and Practice of Insolvency and Bankruptcy in India* (Taxman); Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, *Annual Report* 2023–24.