

## **Concerns with Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code**

### **What is the issue?**

\n\n

\n

- Insolvency and bankruptcy code was introduced in 2016 to address the bad loan issues.

\n

- In practical scenario there new legal issues are arising with in Insolvency Act.

\n

\n\n

### **What is Insolvency and bankruptcy code?**

\n\n

\n

- The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) was enacted in 2016 for the recovery of giant bad debt volume built up in recent years.

\n

- Under IBC, either the creditor (banks) or the loaner (defaulter) can initiate insolvency proceedings.

\n

- It is done by submitting a plea to the adjudicating authority, in this case, the National Companies Law Tribunal (NCLT).

\n

- The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code stipulates cases should be heard within 14 days.

\n

- After admission, the insolvency resolution process has to be completed in 180 days (extendable by 90 days).

\n

- IBC provides for Insolvency Resolution Professionals (IRPs) who will take charge of a company when it's taken to the bankruptcy court.

\n

\n\n

### **What is the significance of Insolvency act?**

\n\n

\n

- The time period prescribed under the Code was held to be procedural in nature, a tool in the expeditious dispensation of justice and is directory.
- India's Insolvency Act has been modelled on similar codes in the UK and the US.
- But one big difference from the US is that when a company there files for bankruptcy, the management stays in place.
- Here, the management is immediately replaced by the IRP, who has six months to sort out the company's affairs.
- This is because in India, top management is usually also the main shareholder and that's one reason why it can't be left in place.

\n

\n\n

## **What are the practical concerns with India's IBC?**

\n\n

\n

- **Clogging Tribunals** - The NCLT started off well but they are clogging up now, they're taking much longer than they did earlier.
- More than 9,000 cases are before the 11 NCLT tribunals that have been set up around the country.
- National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT) and that includes more than 2,500 insolvency cases.
- **Concerns with time stipulation** - Regarding the time stipulation, in few cases the tribunal laid down that the 14-day period is only directive and not mandatory.
- Also, the NCLAT has held that the provisions of the Limitation Act, which sets out the time-limits under which a complainant can approach the courts for redress, do not apply to proceedings under the Insolvency Code.
- **Authoritative IRPs** - The IBC's provision to throw the management out and replacing them with IRPs is consider to be draconian.

\n

- IRPs are a mix of chartered accountants, cost accountants, MBAs and retired public sector executives but there are many concerns has raised over the quality of the IRPs.  
\n
- **Drafting loopholes** - Inevitably, there are loopholes in the Insolvency Act and some lawyers complain of poor drafting too.  
\n
- For instance, the act has no provision for an amicable settlement once a case has been admitted.  
\n

\n\n

### **What measures needs to be taken?**

\n\n

- \n
- There is need for setting up more tribunals in different parts of the country to handle the greater-than-expected volume of cases.  
\n
- IBC must consider that there are distinct advantages if the existing management is allowed to keep running the company such as knowledge, information and expertise.  
\n
- India is more concerned with the recovery of NPA, not with the running of units, thus the first priority is to save the banking system.  
\n
- Thus the banks also must push policy makers towards this move because they're unlikely to get more if the case comes before the NCLT.  
\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: Business Line**

\n

