International Journal of Computing and Business Research (IJCBR)
ISSN (Online) : 2229-6166
International Manuscript ID : 22296166V12I3202204
Volume 12 Issue 3 July 2022

Corporate Laws towards Defaults and Bankruptcy in India

Sudhir Kumar
Principal
Government College for Women
Bhiwani, Haryana

Abstract

The purpose of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code of 2016 (IBC) is to modernise and simplify the laws governing the liquidation and reorganisation of financially troubled businesses, partnerships, and individuals. Infirmed Industrial Companies Act of 1985 (which was abolished in 2003) was the only law that attempted to identify struggling businesses and offer solutions for their recovery; the IBC was an attempt to fill that gap. In addition, the IBC has superseded the previous framework under the Firms Act 2013 for the "closing up" of companies due to nonpayment of debt. The IBC is now one of the most widely used debt settlement and collection laws. As of December 31, 2020, the National Company Law Tribunal (Tribunal) has admitted 4117 petitions related to the IBC, as reported in the Economic Survey 2020-21. Comparatively, as of December 2020, 1112 businesses had been effectively liquidated. To help alleviate the burden on businesses that have become financially or operationally indebted as a result of the COVID-19 epidemic, It was also communicated that no legal action could be taken on account of any defaults that occurred between March 25, 2020, and March 25, 2021, and that any defaults that occurred during the suspension period would be considered to have been permanently cured.

Keywords : Corporate Law, Bankruptcy Law in India

Introduction

Corporate people include legal entities like corporations and limited partnerships that can act independently of their owners. However, the Code does not apply to financial organisations like as banks and insurance companies as well as other investment vehicles including mutual funds, UCITS, and pension funds.

Except for financial service providers, the term "corporate person" in Section 3(7) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 refers to a company as defined in Section 2(20) of the Companies Act, 2013, a limited liability partnership (LLP), or any other person incorporated with limited liability under any law for the time being in force [1].

A "financial service provider" is defined as "a person engaged in the business of providing financial services in line with an authorisation issued or registration granted by a financial sector regulator" under Section 3(17) of the Insolvency Code, 2016.

The Reserve Bank of India, the Securities and Exchange Board of India, the Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India, the Pension Fund Regulatory Authority, and any other regulatory authorities that may be notified by the Central Government are all included in the definition of "financial sector regulator" in Section 3(18) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 [2].

How IBC Works

Specific laws were implemented in a stepwise way as recently as April 2021 governing the beginning of actions under the IBC against corporate debtors (companies), partnership firms/individuals, and personal guarantors. To date, the IBC has been primarily employed in the settlement and recovery from corporate creditors, i.e., businesses. When a creditor who is still owed money files an application with the Tribunal, legal action might be taken

against the firms in question. Owing to the providing of goods and services or the use of a financial instrument, such individuals may be indebted to third parties (operational debt). In the event of a financial or operational debt default, the corporation or its members may initiate these actions. The corporate insolvency resolution procedure begins upon the acceptance of an application submitted by a financial creditor, an operational creditor, or the corporate debtor. When such an application is approved, any pending or future litigation against the corporation is put on hold. Until the settlement process is complete, the moratorium will remain in effect. The next step is to organise a Committee of Creditors (COC) and appoint an Interim Resolution Professional (IRP) [3].

The IRP steps in to run the firm and collects all claims from creditors into one place. When an IRP steps down, a Resolution Professional (who may or may not be an IRP) often issues an invitation to prospective buyers of the failing firm, asking them to submit a "resolution plan" that addresses how they will pay back their creditors. Following approval of the resolution plan by the COC and the Tribunal, the submitting firm or consortium would buy the defaulting company. If the COC or the Tribunal does not approve the resolution plan, the corporate debtor will go into liquidation. When the resolution plan is approved or when assets are sold in a liquidation, money is distributed in accordance with a "waterfall method." The 'waterfall mechanism' establishes the order of payment to creditors: resolution or liquidation expenses come first, followed by workmen's compensation and secured creditors. Finally, unsecured creditors and the general public receive their share [4].

Pros and Cons

Resolution and recovery processes have undergone significant reform as a result of the IBC, with a decently high rate of completion. According to the Economic Survey for 2020-21, close to 1500 enterprises have been wound down or acquired under the IBC, and

another 1800 are in the midst of winding down or acquisition. Although Indian courts' delays are well-known, the IBC stipulates a maximum of 330 days before a case must be closed (with valid exceptions, of course). The Economic Survey 2020-21 reports that the median time for a company to be resolved is 441 days, more than the median time for a company to be liquidated at 328 days [5].

Importantly, unlike the previous regime under the Sick Industrial Companies Act and the Companies Act, the IBC aims to resolve debts while allowing the firm to remain as a 'going concern,' meaning that its operations would continue even after a change of management. IBC now prioritises time bound settlement, which is crucial in keeping the debtor economically viable, unlike the previous system.

IBC has also made certain that the promoters give significant thought to any debt, since doing otherwise might result in the promoters losing complete control of the firm. While the IBC has many positive aspects, it also has certain drawbacks. The Committee of Creditors (COC), often made up of representatives from financial creditors, may not be fully educated to appreciate the business ramifications of its judgments. Even if a proposed "resolution plan" is in line with the company's best interests, the COC may nonetheless decide against adopting it. Another difficulty with IBC implementation is that after the resolution plan has been adopted, there is no longer any oversight or advice from the IRP/RP or the Tribunal. The absence of a sufficient number of Resolution Professionals and benches for the country's Tribunals has been a problem regardless of any gaps in the law [6].

Even if growing pains in newly enacted laws are to be expected, the judicial system has played a crucial role in creating the IBC. Despite the fact that the area of law known as the

IBC has shown to be reasonably strong and well-intended, it is crucial that judicial meddling should not lead to unforeseen effects in its interpretation.

Highlights of the Ordinance

The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code allows the debtor corporation or the insolvent corporation's creditors to initiate insolvency resolution. The Ordinance prohibits the commencement of bankruptcy operations based on defaults beginning March25, 2020 and lasting for a period of six months (extendable up to one year).

When bankruptcy proceedings are unavoidable, a director or partner may be held liable for failing to take reasonable steps to mitigate the potential impact on creditors.The Ordinance does away with this clause about defaults throughout the aforementioned time frame.

Key Issues and Analysis

A number of concerns have been raised in light of the insolvency resolution process being put on hold. To begin, it forbids resolution even when it would be in everyone's best interest and would help keep assets' value at a minimum. Second, it takes away a debtor's legal recourse to the bankruptcy court's reorganisation procedures. Third, the long-standing ban on insolvency procedures due to certain defaults raises more questions than it answers [7].

For failures that do not qualify the corporate debtor for insolvency procedures, it is unclear whether the personal guarantor of that debtor should go through insolvency proceedings.

The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 establishes a time-bound process for dealing with monetary difficulty for both organisations and individuals. To be termed "insolvent," an individual or company must be unable to fulfil their financial commitments. The World Bank identifies two significant challenges for an insolvency framework as a result of the COVID-19 problem. I the growth in the number of companies that will not survive the crisis without resolution of insolvency, and (ii) the necessity to avoid otherwise viable enterprises from being prematurely driven into insolvency. The Indian threshold for filing for bankruptcy has raised from a hundred thousand rupees to one billion. [2] Furthermore, regulations have been modified such that time spent in lockdown no longer counts toward the completion of outstanding procedures. [3] The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Ordinance, 2020 was passed for this purpose on June 5, 2020. As stated in paragraph [4] of the Ordinance, COVID-19 has produced uncertainty and fear for enterprises for reasons beyond their control, and it is difficult to gather a sufficient number of resolution applicants to rescue a corporate debtor who may default in meeting their duty. 4

Key Features

The Code allows the corporate debtor or its creditors to launch the bankruptcy resolution process; nevertheless, there are some defaults that prevent the insolvency procedure from being initiated. In the six months commencing March25, 2020, the corporate debtor and its creditors are precluded from initiating any bankruptcy proceedings based on defaults that occurred during that time (extendable up to one year).

Individual payments to the assets of the corporate debtor may be needed when a director or partner is held liable for unlawful trading. If the person knew that insolvency proceedings were inevitable but yet did nothing to protect their creditors, they will be

held accountable for this. The resolution expert might apply to the NCLT for culpability against such parties. According to the Ordinance, the resolution professional is not allowed to submit an application for insolvency if the default is related to a matter for which insolvency proceedings have been blocked.

Restrictions on filing for bankruptcy due to specific types of defaults

The Bankruptcy and Bankruptcy Code of 2016 establishes a process for the settlement of insolvency that can be initiated either by the corporate debtor or by its creditors (IBC). Neither the corporate debtor nor any of its creditors may apply for insolvency if a default occurs within six months (extendable up to one year) of March 25, 2020, under the Ordinance. A number of the difficulties associated with this will be discussed below.

It is imperative that all efforts to resolve corporate insolvency be put on hold.

The Ordinance forbids the beginning of insolvency procedures due to defaults occurring during that time frame. This leads us to wonder if a total stop is really necessary. On the one hand, it's important to prevent businesses that were financially stable before the epidemic and whose current difficulties are just transitory from going under. 1 However, if insolvency procedures are halted entirely, a financially troubled firm may lose its right to seek relief under the IBC. The postponement of insolvency procedures can worsen a company's financial situation and reduce its value. However, the Ordinance also notes that it might be challenging to locate a sufficient number of resolution applicants during this time.

However, debt restructuring is another potential conclusion of an insolvency resolution procedure, in which financial obligations are reorganised to resolve insolvency without selling the firm to a third party. For example, in June 2020, the insolvency legislation in

the United Kingdom was updated to include new choices for firms going through financial difficulties. [5]

It also begs the question of whether all defaults over the time frame in question must be handled in the same way. Defaults may occur that are unrelated to the spread of COVID-19 but rather stem from preexisting financial difficulties at the affected businesses. However, the question of whether or not COVID-19 constitutes an inducement of a default is up to interpretation and might lead to conflicts and, ultimately, more litigation.

It is forbidden for the corporate debtor to file for bankruptcy. It is illegal for a corporate debtor to begin insolvency procedures under the Ordinance. Should the corporate debtor be prevented from filing for bankruptcy protection? It may be more appropriate for the corporate debtor to determine if the recourse under the insolvency framework is necessary. If an insolvent debtor initiates bankruptcy procedures voluntarily and quickly, everyone involved has a better chance of coming out ahead. It is important to keep in mind that nations like Spain, Germany, and France have enabled debtor-initiated voluntary bankruptcy procedures while simultaneously limiting creditor-initiated insolvency proceedings and reducing the debtor's obligation to file for insolvency. 1,[6]
The indicated defaults are permanently immune from insolvency procedures. According to the Ordinance, throughout the designated time period, insolvency procedures may never be brought about due to defaults. This may lead to a situation in
[7] Such a person personally guarantees a company's debt.

Changes in Indian Corporate Bankruptcy Law

Having a set of laws governing insolvency and bankruptcy is crucial for any economy to function normally.

so that the maximum value of their assets may be realised. Enhancing opportunities for business ownership and access to capital is also essential. Having insufficient funds to meet ongoing operating costs and debt obligations is a hallmark of insolvency.

It is claimed that a court is in bankruptcy when it admits and accepts insolvency while refusing directions for resolving it. If a court rules that a firm cannot pay its debts, it will issue an order allocating the assets to the various creditors. The average time it takes to conclude bankruptcy proceedings in India is approximately 4 years, which is substantially longer than in the United States or the United Kingdom.

There is less of an emphasis on liquidation and termination of bankruptcy issues under current insolvency laws and finance commitment reconstruction legislation, and more on the gradual restoration and operation of firms by account holders experiencing financial difficulties.

The same holds true for insolvency and bankruptcy. When a modern company needs to expand, it takes out a loan to do so. It will need to borrow money, but if it can't keep up with its payments, its lenders will lose interest. Lenders' rights must be safeguarded to ensure that lending and borrowing may continue to fuel economic expansion. Since we can see how everything is interrelated and mutually beneficial, we know that debt regulation is essential to guarantee its continued operation and safeguard the rights of creditors. We find that the Bankruptcy Act has been violated after conducting an investigation.

Evolution

It wasn't until 1828 that legislation established special courts to hear cases involving insolvency in the municipalities that made up the Presidency. The primary purpose of

these courts is to help people who are having problems making their debt payments. Every case was heard by a judge, and the decisions were recorded. If a citizen is dissatisfied with the verdict of the court described above, they have the right to take their case to the Supreme Court, the highest court in the land. The Supreme Court established jurisdiction to hear and forward such applications or demands as it characterised as fair and substantial, and the same application or demand is to be postponed via the courts for insolvent or borrower mitigation.

Personnel of the insolvency court were entrusted to them by the Supreme Court. A "regular appointee" was used to describe one of these people. Debtor's property interest would be vested in the simple chosen one by uprightness of the request if an appeal for mediation was begun or initiated by one lender and an order for arbitration was made. It was also decided that the orders to violate the assurance would be followed.

The Act for the Relief of Debtors in India, 1848

In 1848, the Indian Insolvency Act was passed, and the earlier licences were revoked. All businesspeople and people who are not brokers have the Act's provisions ingrained in their brains. This Act's primary goal was to relocate the Courts set up in 1828. Like any other piece of legislation, the Indian Insolvency Act has its flaws. The Act consistently and severely underserved lenders while benefiting borrowers. Unfortunately, real obstacles prevented this from working. As a result, in 2013, a new Companies Act was enacted, with most of its provisions mirroring those of the last reform, which took place in 2002. Issues with corporate insolvency provisions' execution were addressed in the Companies Act's 2013 revision.

Improvements to the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act of 2016

The Ministry of Finance appointed Dr. T. K. Viswanathan to lead the Bankruptcy Law Reforms Committee (BLRC) in 2014, with the goal of enacting comprehensive changes to the country's insolvency laws. The BLRC was tasked with replacing the present bankruptcy system in India with one that applies to non-financial businesses and individuals.

For the sake of creating an Insolvency Resolution Process (IRP) and giving unsecured creditors the chance or choice to participate in policymaking proceedings, a distinction between secured and unsecured creditors was drawn.

Since the aforementioned creditor will be compensated for the liquidation procedure, a functional lender can commence an IRP without participating in the decision-making process. Creditors who have already been promised at least the winding up value will have no say in further proceedings.

Regulations that are standardised

Under the code, all laws must be consistent with one another. This new bankruptcy and insolvency law must incorporate all existing laws and statutes on the subject. About half a dozen rules pertaining to insolvency and bankruptcy were revised, and a few acts were deleted. The Provincial Insolvency Act of 1920 and the Presidency Towns Insolvency Act of 1909 were both nullified.

Trigger

The primary goal of the Code is to stop the suffering as soon as possible and restore calm to the situation between the lender and the borrower. This is accomplished by enabling the initiation of the IRP in response to a single infraction. However, the

strategy varies depending on whether one is dealing with a debtor, a financial lender, or a functional creditor.Notifying the borrower after such an update is crucial for deciding whether or not to refund or offer reason in the face of a continuing genuine disagreement. The operative creditor (OC) has the right to submit a complaint with the competent authority, in this case the NCLT

During the IRP, the entity is under close watch.

The official acting as the Adjudicator during the IRP can only nominate information that has already been recorded with the controller as a Resolution Professional. During the insolvency resolution process (IRP), a Resolution Professional is needed to ensure the entity's smooth operation and the proper management of the entity's assets.supervising party to outline the necessary preparation for the Resolution Professional and maintain order during the IRP.

Moratorium

There is a suspension on all debt restoration actions and new cases filed against the borrower for the duration of the IRP, totaling 180 days. In the event that the authority responsible for adjudicating the dispute agrees, this moratorium might be extended by another 90 days. This process takes place primarily to provide comfort to the lender and borrower that the funds are secure throughout the negotiation phase and to gauge the viability of the agency. During the aforementioned moratorium, organised practitioners are responsible for overseeing the property, with the NCLT providing direction and advice (National Company Law Tribunal).

Bankruptcy Court

Each and every business lender in the problem is captured by the commission of commercial lenders. For example, the commission can hear cases involving the

expansion of agency responsibilities, trades of businesses or divisions, and the reorganisation of ongoing liabilities. A majority of lenders (at least 75% of them) must agree with the creditor committee's assessment of the borrower's financial obligations to them before the committee may convene.

Decisions on Insolvency in a Timely Manner

After the deal is finalised, the agency will be back on track as a going concern, and the NCLT will close the insolvency case (National Company Law Tribunal).

There are no constraints on potential ways out of the insolvency

According to the Code, the creditors committee is free to choose and select how the agency or corporation will be run so long as they provide their approval by a majority vote, just as happens when a bill is passed by the legislature. The proposal the RP made to the creditors committee does not impose any limitations on him either.

Conclusion

When crafting insolvency and bankruptcy laws, the Indian government should prioritise safeguarding the interests of individuals who may be affected by the process of debt recovery. The rules can't be made to benefit one group at the expense of another. There is always the possibility that a borrower won't pay back their loan in full and on time. There might be many causes of a person's or a company's demise. It is envisaged that the equity owners will get the directive as soon as the debtor's obligation is identified. In the event of a borrower failure, the equity owners will have complete management authority over the company. Therefore, in the event of a failure, creditors and debtors alike will rush to collect the debt as quickly as possible. In its absence, the company's lenders and debtor will have to work out an internal financial reorganisation in order to protect the business's core.

Insolvency and bankruptcy present unique difficulties that were not adequately addressed by the previous regulations. To have the debt paid off faster and more effectively, a national rule was needed.

References

[1]. COVID-19 Outbreak: Implications on Corporate and Individual Insolvency, World Bank, April 13, 2020.

[2]. "Aatma Nirbhar Bharat Package – Progress So Far", Press Information Bureau, Ministry of Finance, July 12, 2020.

[3]. "IBBI amends CIRP Regulations to provide relief in corporate insolvency resolution process due to COVID-19 outbreak", Press Information Bureau, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, March 30, 2020.

[4]. The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Ordinance, 2020.

[5]. The Corporate Insolvency and Governance Act 2020, United Kingdom.

[6]. "COVID-19: An international guide to changes in insolvency law", DLA Piper, June 22, 2020.

[7]. The Insolvency and Bankruptcy (Application to Adjudicating Authority for Insolvency Resolution Process for Personal Guarantors to Corporate Debtors) Rules, 2019.