Canadian Journal of Marketing Research
ISSN: 0829-4836
https://canadian-jmr.com/index.php/cjmr

Research Article

An Analytical Study of Corporate Insolvency Resolution Procedure in India with Special Reference to Cross-Border Insolvency Issues

Himanshu Handa[1], Dr. Shaharyar Asaf Khan[2]
[1]Research Scholar, School of Law, Manav Rachna University, Faridabad, India.
[2]Professor, School of Law, Manav Rachna University, Faridabad, India.

***Corresponding Author**
Himanshu Handa

Article History
Received: 01.06.2026
Accepted: 20.06.2026
Published: 11.07.2026

Abstract: The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 has significantly reformed India's insolvency framework by introducing a time-bound and creditor-driven Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP). However, with increasing globalization and cross-border commercial activities, insolvency proceedings frequently involve assets, creditors, and stakeholders located in multiple jurisdictions. This paper undertakes an analytical study of the corporate insolvency resolution mechanism in India with particular emphasis on cross-border insolvency issues and the limitations of the existing legal framework. The study critically examines the provisions relating to cross-border insolvency under Sections 234 and 235 of the Code and evaluates their effectiveness in addressing transnational insolvency disputes. It further analyses judicial developments and practical challenges in dealing with foreign creditors, recognition of foreign proceedings, and coordination between domestic and international jurisdictions. The absence of a comprehensive legal framework for cross-border insolvency in India creates uncertainty and procedural inefficiencies, thereby affecting investor confidence and the overall effectiveness of the insolvency regime. The paper also undertakes a comparative analysis with international standards, particularly the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency, which has been adopted by several jurisdictions to facilitate cooperation and coordination in cross-border insolvency cases. The study highlights the gaps in the Indian framework and the need for adopting globally recognized principles to ensure effective resolution of transnational insolvency matters. The paper concludes by proposing policy recommendations for strengthening India's cross-border insolvency framework, including the adoption of the UNCITRAL Model Law, enhancement of institutional capacity, and development of mechanisms for international cooperation. These reforms are essential to align India's insolvency regime with global best practices and to address the complexities arising from cross-border insolvency in an increasingly interconnected global economy.

Keywords: Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process; Cross-Border Insolvency; Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016; UNCITRAL Model Law; Foreign Creditors; Transnational Insolvency; NCLT; International Insolvency Framework.

INTRODUCTION

The increasing globalization of trade and investment has significantly altered the landscape of corporate insolvency, making cross-border insolvency an issue of growing importance. With corporations operating across multiple jurisdictions, insolvency proceedings often involve assets, creditors, and stakeholders located in different countries. In this context, the effectiveness of domestic insolvency laws depends not only on their internal coherence but also on their ability to address transnational insolvency challenges. The enactment of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 marked a major reform in India's insolvency regime by introducing a consolidated and time-bound Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP)1. The Code has improved recovery mechanisms and enhanced creditor confidence; however, it primarily focuses on domestic insolvency and provides only limited provisions for cross-border insolvency under Sections 234 and 235. These provisions rely on bilateral agreements and letters of request to foreign courts, which are often inadequate in addressing complex cross-border insolvency situations.

The absence of a comprehensive cross-border insolvency framework creates significant legal and procedural challenges. Issues such as recognition of foreign proceedings, coordination between domestic and foreign courts, treatment of foreign creditors, and enforcement of foreign judgments remain largely unresolved2. This lack of clarity undermines the efficiency of insolvency proceedings and may discourage foreign investment. Judicial intervention has attempted to bridge some of these gaps. In Macquarie Bank Ltd. v. Shilpi Cable Technologies Ltd., the Supreme Court of India recognized the rights of foreign creditors to initiate insolvency proceedings in India, thereby reinforcing the inclusive nature of the Code. Similarly, in Jet Airways (India) Ltd. v. State Bank of India, the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal facilitated cross-border cooperation between Indian and Dutch insolvency proceedings, marking an important step towards developing a framework for cross-border insolvency in India.

Despite these developments, the Indian insolvency regime lacks a structured mechanism for dealing with transnational insolvency cases. In contrast, several jurisdictions have adopted the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency, which provides a standardized framework for recognition of foreign proceedings, cooperation between courts, and coordination of concurrent insolvency proceedings3. The absence of similar provisions in India creates a regulatory gap that needs to be addressed. The present study aims to analyse the corporate insolvency resolution process in India with a specific focus on cross-border insolvency issues. It seeks to evaluate the adequacy of the existing legal framework, examine judicial responses to cross-border challenges, and identify key limitations in the current system4. The study also explores international best practices and assesses their relevance for the Indian context.

The objectives of this study are to examine the legal framework governing cross-border insolvency in India, analyse judicial interpretations and practical challenges, compare the Indian framework with international standards, and propose reforms for strengthening the insolvency regime. The study is based on a doctrinal and analytical methodology, relying on statutory provisions, case laws, and secondary sources such as reports and academic literature. In an era of increasing economic integration, the need for an effective cross-border insolvency framework is indispensable. Addressing the existing gaps in the Indian insolvency regime is essential for ensuring legal certainty, protecting stakeholder interests, and promoting sustainable economic growth.

CORPORATE INSOLVENCY RESOLUTION FRAMEWORK IN INDIA

The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 establishes a comprehensive and time-bound mechanism for resolving corporate insolvency in India. The Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) under the Code is designed to ensure maximization of value, equitable treatment of stakeholders, and revival of financially distressed companies5. While the framework has significantly improved insolvency resolution in domestic cases, its application in cross-border contexts remains limited and complex. The CIRP is initiated upon the occurrence of a default by a corporate debtor. Financial creditors, operational creditors, or the corporate debtor itself may file an application before the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT), which acts as the adjudicating authority. Once the application is admitted, a moratorium is imposed under Section 14 of the Code, preventing any legal proceedings or enforcement actions against the corporate debtor. This moratorium is crucial in preserving the assets of the debtor and ensuring an orderly resolution process6.

The management of the corporate debtor is transferred to an Interim Resolution Professional (IRP), who is responsible for managing the affairs of the company, collecting claims from creditors, and constituting the Committee of Creditors (CoC). The CoC, comprising financial creditors, plays a central role in the decision-making process, including the approval of resolution plans. This creditor-in-control model represents a significant shift from the earlier debtor-driven insolvency regime. The role of the CoC has been reinforced through judicial interpretation. In Committee of Creditors of Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta, the Supreme Court of India upheld the primacy of the CoC's commercial wisdom, emphasizing that courts should not interfere with business decisions taken by creditors. Similarly, in K. Sashidhar v. Indian Overseas Bank, the Court clarified that the adjudicating authority has limited jurisdiction in reviewing the decisions of the CoC7.

Resolution plans submitted by prospective applicants must comply with the requirements under Section 30 of the Code, including provisions for payment to operational creditors and adherence to applicable laws. Once approved by the CoC, the plan is submitted to the NCLT for final approval. The adjudicating authority ensures that the plan meets statutory requirements but does not evaluate its commercial viability. The Code mandates a strict timeline for completion of the CIRP, generally within 180 days, extendable to a maximum of 330 days including litigation. However, practical challenges such as delays in judicial proceedings and complex litigation often hinder adherence to these timelines.

In cases where no viable resolution plan is approved within the stipulated period, the corporate debtor proceeds to liquidation. Although liquidation is intended to be a last resort, a significant number of cases under the Code culminate in liquidation, raising concerns about the effectiveness of the resolution framework. While the CIRP has strengthened India's insolvency regime in domestic contexts, its application becomes more complex in cases involving cross-border elements. The absence of a detailed legal framework for handling foreign assets, foreign creditors, and parallel proceedings in other jurisdictions creates significant challenges. The existing provisions under Sections 234 and 235 of the Code provide only a limited mechanism for cross-border cooperation, which is insufficient for addressing the complexities of modern transnational insolvency. Thus, while the corporate insolvency resolution framework under the Code represents a significant advancement in Indian insolvency law, its limitations in addressing cross-border insolvency issues highlight the need for further reforms and alignment with international best practices8.

CONCEPT AND SIGNIFICANCE OF CROSS-BORDER INSOLVENCY

Cross-border insolvency refers to situations where an insolvent debtor has assets, creditors, or business operations in more than one jurisdiction. In an increasingly globalized economy, corporate entities frequently operate across national boundaries, making insolvency proceedings inherently transnational. This creates complex legal challenges, as multiple jurisdictions may assert authority over the same debtor and its assets. The concept of cross-border insolvency is rooted in the need for cooperation and coordination among different legal systems to ensure efficient resolution of insolvency cases. Without a structured mechanism, conflicting legal proceedings, jurisdictional overlaps, and inconsistent judgments can arise, leading to delays and reduction in asset value.

In the Indian context, the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 does not provide a comprehensive framework for addressing cross-border insolvency5. The existing provisions under Sections 234 and 235 allow the Central Government to enter into bilateral agreements with foreign countries and enable Indian courts to issue letters of request to foreign courts. However, these provisions are limited in scope and have not been effectively operationalized. The significance of cross-border insolvency has increased due to the rise of multinational corporations and foreign investments in India. Insolvency proceedings involving such entities often require recognition of foreign judgments, coordination between courts, and equitable treatment of domestic and foreign creditors. The absence of clear legal provisions in this regard creates uncertainty and may discourage foreign investment.

Judicial decisions have highlighted the importance of addressing cross-border insolvency issues. In Jet Airways (India) Ltd. v. State Bank of India, the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal facilitated cooperation between Indian and Dutch insolvency proceedings by recognizing parallel proceedings and enabling coordination between the two jurisdictions. This case demonstrated the practical necessity of adopting a structured cross-border insolvency framework. Similarly, in Macquarie Bank Ltd. v. Shilpi Cable Technologies Ltd., the Supreme Court of India affirmed that foreign creditors have the right to initiate insolvency proceedings under the Code, thereby reinforcing the inclusive nature of the insolvency regime2. Cross-border insolvency also raises important questions regarding jurisdiction, choice of law, and enforcement of foreign judgments. The lack of clarity in these areas often leads to conflicts between domestic and foreign legal systems, resulting in delays and increased litigation costs. Internationally, frameworks such as the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency have been developed to address these challenges by providing standardized rules for recognition of foreign proceedings, cooperation between courts, and coordination of concurrent insolvency proceedings. The adoption of such frameworks by several countries has significantly improved the efficiency of cross-border insolvency resolution4.

In the absence of a similar comprehensive framework in India, cross-border insolvency cases are often dealt with on an ad hoc basis, relying on judicial discretion and limited statutory provisions. This highlights the urgent need for legislative reforms to establish a robust and predictable mechanism for handling transnational insolvency issues.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING CROSS-BORDER INSOLVENCY IN INDIA

The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 provides only a limited statutory framework for addressing cross-border insolvency through Sections 234 and 235. These provisions were incorporated with the intention of facilitating cooperation between Indian courts and foreign jurisdictions; however, their scope remains narrow and largely procedural, lacking the comprehensive mechanisms required to address complex transnational insolvency issues. Section 234 empowers the Central Government to enter into bilateral agreements with foreign countries for enforcing the provisions of the Code. This provision is based on the principle of reciprocity, whereby cooperation between jurisdictions is dependent on mutual agreements. However, in practice, India has not entered into significant bilateral arrangements under this provision, rendering it largely ineffective.

Section 235 complements this framework by allowing the adjudicating authority, i.e., the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT), to issue a letter of request to a foreign court or authority seeking assistance in dealing with assets located outside India. While this provision provides a formal mechanism for international cooperation, its effectiveness depends on the willingness and legal framework of the foreign jurisdiction to respond to such requests. The limitations of Sections 234 and 235 become evident when dealing with modern cross-border insolvency cases, which often require simultaneous proceedings in multiple jurisdictions, recognition of foreign insolvency proceedings, and coordination between courts. The current framework does not provide clear guidelines for determining jurisdiction, recognition of foreign judgments, or treatment of foreign creditors.

Judicial decisions have attempted to address these gaps in the absence of a comprehensive statutory framework. In Jet Airways (India) Ltd. v. State Bank of India, the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal recognized parallel insolvency proceedings in India and the Netherlands and allowed coordination between the resolution professional and the foreign administrator. This case marked a significant step towards developing principles of cross-border insolvency in India, even in the absence of explicit legislative provisions. Similarly, in Macquarie Bank Ltd. v. Shilpi Cable Technologies Ltd., the Supreme Court of India clarified that foreign creditors are entitled to initiate insolvency proceedings under the Code, thereby reinforcing the inclusivity of the Indian insolvency framework. However, while such judicial pronouncements provide some clarity, they cannot substitute for a well-defined statutory regime.

The absence of provisions for recognition of foreign proceedings is a major limitation of the Indian framework. Unlike jurisdictions that have adopted comprehensive cross-border insolvency laws, India lacks mechanisms for recognizing foreign main proceedings, granting relief to foreign representatives, or coordinating concurrent proceedings. Furthermore, issues relating to enforcement of foreign judgments and orders remain unresolved due to the lack of specific statutory provisions10. This creates uncertainty for stakeholders and increases the complexity of insolvency proceedings involving foreign elements.

The need for reform in this area has been recognized by various committees, including the Insolvency Law Committee, which has recommended the adoption of the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency11. The Model Law provides a comprehensive framework for recognition of foreign proceedings, cooperation between courts, and coordination of multiple proceedings, thereby addressing many of the limitations of the current Indian framework.

In conclusion, while the existing provisions under the Code provide a basic mechanism for cross-border cooperation, they are insufficient to address the complexities of modern transnational insolvency. A comprehensive legislative framework is necessary to ensure effective resolution of cross-border insolvency cases and to align India’s insolvency regime with global standards.

INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR CROSS-BORDER INSOLVENCY

The increasing complexity of transnational insolvency cases has led to the development of international frameworks aimed at ensuring cooperation, coordination, and uniformity in insolvency proceedings across jurisdictions. Among these, the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency stands out as the most widely accepted and influential legal instrument governing cross-border insolvency. The UNCITRAL Model Law, adopted in 1997, provides a standardized legal framework to facilitate the recognition of foreign insolvency proceedings, cooperation between courts and insolvency professionals, and coordination of concurrent proceedings in different jurisdictions. It is based on four key principles: access, recognition, relief, and cooperation. These principles ensure that foreign representatives can access domestic courts, foreign proceedings can be recognized, appropriate relief can be granted, and courts can cooperate effectively across borders.

One of the most significant features of the Model Law is the distinction between “foreign main proceedings” and “foreign non-main proceedings.” This classification helps determine the extent of recognition and relief granted by domestic courts. Recognition of a foreign main proceeding results in automatic relief, including a moratorium on actions against the debtor’s assets, thereby preventing conflicting proceedings and preserving asset value. Several jurisdictions, including the United States, the United Kingdom, Singapore, and Australia, have adopted the Model Law, either wholly or with modifications. In the United States, Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code incorporates the principles of the Model Law, facilitating recognition of foreign proceedings and cooperation with foreign courts. Similarly, the United Kingdom has implemented cross-border insolvency regulations based on the Model Law, enabling efficient coordination in transnational insolvency cases.

The adoption of the Model Law has significantly improved the efficiency and predictability of cross-border insolvency resolution in these jurisdictions. It reduces legal uncertainty, minimizes conflicts between courts, and enhances investor confidence by providing a clear and consistent legal framework. In contrast, India has not yet adopted the Model Law, despite recommendations from expert committees such as the Insolvency Law Committee11. The absence of a similar framework creates challenges in recognizing foreign proceedings, coordinating with foreign courts, and protecting the interests of stakeholders in cross-border insolvency cases.

Judicial developments in India indicate a gradual shift towards adopting principles similar to those embodied in the Model Law. In Jet Airways (India) Ltd. v. State Bank of India, the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal allowed coordination between Indian and Dutch insolvency proceedings, reflecting the principle of cooperation. However, such instances remain limited and rely heavily on judicial discretion rather than statutory provisions. The relevance of the Model Law for India lies in its ability to address the gaps in the existing legal framework. By adopting its principles, India can establish a structured mechanism for recognition of foreign proceedings, cooperation between courts, and coordination of concurrent proceedings. This would not only enhance the efficiency of insolvency resolution but also align India’s insolvency regime with global best practices. However, the adoption of the Model Law must be carefully tailored to suit India's legal and economic context. Issues such as protection of domestic creditors, regulatory oversight, and compatibility with existing laws need to be considered while implementing such a framework.

In conclusion, the international framework for cross-border insolvency, particularly the UNCITRAL Model Law, provides valuable insights and practical solutions for addressing transnational insolvency challenges. Its adoption in India would mark a significant step towards strengthening the insolvency regime and ensuring effective resolution of cross-border insolvency cases12.

CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTING CROSS-BORDER INSOLVENCY IN INDIA

The implementation of cross-border insolvency under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 faces several structural, legal, and practical challenges. The absence of a comprehensive statutory framework, coupled with jurisdictional complexities, creates significant obstacles in effectively resolving transnational insolvency cases. One of the primary challenges is the issue of jurisdictional conflict. In cross-border insolvency cases, multiple courts in different countries may claim jurisdiction over the same debtor and its assets. This often leads to parallel proceedings, inconsistent decisions, and legal uncertainty. The lack of clear rules for determining the "centre of main interests" (COMI) of the debtor further complicates the situation, making it difficult to identify the appropriate jurisdiction for initiating insolvency proceedings.

Another major challenge is the recognition of foreign insolvency proceedings and judgments. The current Indian framework does not provide a structured mechanism for recognizing foreign proceedings, which creates difficulties in coordinating insolvency actions across jurisdictions. In the absence of statutory provisions, courts rely on principles of comity and judicial discretion, leading to inconsistent outcomes. The treatment of foreign creditors also presents a significant issue. While the judiciary has recognized the rights of foreign creditors to initiate insolvency proceedings, practical challenges such as procedural barriers, lack of clarity in legal provisions, and unequal treatment compared to domestic creditors persist. In Macquarie Bank Ltd. v. Shilpi Cable Technologies Ltd., the Supreme Court of India affirmed the participation of foreign creditors; however, their effective integration into the insolvency process remains limited.

Coordination between domestic and foreign courts is another critical challenge. Effective cross-border insolvency requires seamless cooperation between judicial authorities, insolvency professionals, and regulatory bodies across jurisdictions. However, in the absence of formal mechanisms for cooperation, such coordination is often ad hoc and dependent on judicial discretion. The Jet Airways (India) Ltd. v. State Bank of India case demonstrated the possibility of such coordination, but it also highlighted the lack of a consistent legal framework. Enforcement of foreign judgments and orders poses additional difficulties. Indian law does not provide specific provisions for enforcing foreign insolvency orders, leading to uncertainty and delays. This affects the ability of creditors to recover assets located in different jurisdictions and undermines the efficiency of the insolvency process.

Information asymmetry and lack of transparency further complicate cross-border insolvency proceedings. Access to accurate and timely information about the debtor's assets and liabilities across jurisdictions is often limited, making it difficult for stakeholders to make informed decisions. Another important challenge is the absence of specialized expertise in handling cross-border insolvency cases. Insolvency professionals, judicial officers, and regulatory authorities may lack the necessary experience and training to deal with complex transnational issues, which can affect the quality and efficiency of decision-making.

Finally, the absence of alignment with international standards, particularly the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency, places India at a disadvantage in dealing with cross-border insolvency cases. The lack of a uniform framework reduces predictability and may discourage foreign investment. In conclusion, the challenges in implementing cross-border insolvency in India are multifaceted and require comprehensive legal and institutional reforms. Addressing these challenges is essential for ensuring an effective and efficient insolvency regime capable of handling the complexities of a globalized economy.

ANALYTICAL EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 reveals that while the framework has significantly strengthened domestic insolvency resolution, its effectiveness in addressing cross-border insolvency remains limited. The Code has successfully introduced a time-bound, creditor-driven mechanism that enhances transparency, accountability, and value maximization1. However, the absence of a comprehensive cross-border insolvency regime creates structural gaps that undermine the overall efficiency of the system. A key strength of the Indian insolvency framework lies in its emphasis on creditor control and judicial oversight. The recognition of the commercial wisdom of the Committee of Creditors, as affirmed by the Supreme Court of India in cases such as K. Sashidhar v. Indian Overseas Bank and Committee of Creditors of Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta, has contributed to efficient decision-making in domestic insolvency proceedings. However, this framework is primarily designed for domestic contexts and does not adequately address the complexities of transnational insolvency.

The limited provisions under Sections 234 and 235 of the Code are insufficient to deal with modern cross-border insolvency scenarios, which require coordinated proceedings, recognition of foreign judgments, and cooperation between multiple jurisdictions. The reliance on bilateral agreements and letters of request is both time-consuming and ineffective in practice, as it depends on reciprocal arrangements and the willingness of foreign courts to cooperate. Judicial interventions have attempted to bridge these gaps, as seen in Jet Airways (India) Ltd. v. State Bank of India, where cross-border coordination was facilitated between Indian and Dutch proceedings16. While such decisions demonstrate judicial innovation, they also highlight the lack of a structured statutory framework, resulting in reliance on case-by-case adjudication3.

The absence of clear rules regarding jurisdiction, particularly the determination of the "centre of main interests" (COMI), creates uncertainty in cross-border cases. This leads to jurisdictional conflicts and parallel proceedings, which not only delay resolution but also reduce the value of the debtor's assets. Another significant issue is the treatment of foreign creditors. Although the judiciary has recognized their rights to participate in insolvency proceedings, practical barriers such as procedural complexities and lack of clarity in legal provisions limit their effective participation. This affects investor confidence and may discourage foreign investment in the Indian market.

Comparatively, jurisdictions that have adopted the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency provide a more efficient and predictable framework for handling cross-border insolvency5. The Model Law's provisions for recognition of foreign proceedings, cooperation between courts, and coordination of concurrent proceedings address many of the challenges faced by the Indian system. The analysis also indicates that the absence of institutional preparedness and specialized expertise further hampers the effectiveness of cross-border insolvency resolution in India. Insolvency professionals and adjudicating authorities often lack experience in dealing with complex international insolvency cases, leading to delays and inconsistent outcomes. Despite these challenges, the Indian insolvency framework has the potential to evolve into a robust system capable of addressing cross-border insolvency issues. The recommendations made by expert committees, including the adoption of the UNCITRAL Model Law, provide a clear roadmap for reform5.

In conclusion, while the IBC has been successful in transforming domestic insolvency resolution, its current framework is inadequate for addressing cross-border insolvency challenges. A comprehensive legislative framework, supported by institutional strengthening and alignment with international standards, is essential to enhance the effectiveness of insolvency resolution in an increasingly globalized economy.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis of cross-border insolvency under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 highlights the urgent need for comprehensive reforms to address the legal and institutional gaps in the current framework. The following policy recommendations are proposed to strengthen India's approach to cross-border insolvency and align it with global best practices. A primary reform measure is the adoption of the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency4. The Model Law provides a well-structured framework for recognition of foreign proceedings, cooperation between courts, and coordination of concurrent proceedings. Its adoption would introduce clarity, predictability, and efficiency in handling cross-border insolvency cases. However, the implementation should be tailored to the Indian context, ensuring adequate safeguards for domestic creditors and alignment with existing legal provisions.

Another critical area of reform is the establishment of clear rules for determining jurisdiction, particularly the concept of the "centre of main interests" (COMI). Defining COMI within the statutory framework would help reduce jurisdictional conflicts and prevent parallel proceedings in multiple jurisdictions. This would enhance legal certainty and facilitate efficient resolution of cross-border insolvency cases. Strengthening institutional capacity is also essential for effective implementation of cross-border insolvency provisions6. The National Company Law Tribunal and appellate authorities should be equipped with adequate resources, infrastructure, and specialized training to handle complex international insolvency matters. Developing expertise among insolvency professionals and judicial officers is crucial for ensuring consistent and informed decision-making15.

The framework for recognition and enforcement of foreign insolvency proceedings should be clearly defined through legislative amendments. Establishing mechanisms for automatic or conditional recognition of foreign proceedings would facilitate coordination between jurisdictions and reduce delays. Additionally, provisions for cooperation between courts and insolvency professionals should be formalized to ensure seamless cross-border coordination. The treatment of foreign creditors must also be addressed to ensure equitable participation in insolvency proceedings. Providing clarity on their rights and procedural requirements can enhance investor confidence and promote foreign investment. Ensuring non-discriminatory treatment of domestic and foreign creditors is essential for maintaining the credibility of the insolvency regime12.

Further, the development of information-sharing mechanisms and digital platforms can improve transparency and reduce information asymmetry in cross-border cases. Integrating data systems and encouraging the use of information utilities can facilitate better decision-making and enhance the efficiency of insolvency proceedings. India should also actively engage in international cooperation and enter into multilateral or bilateral agreements to facilitate cross-border insolvency resolution. Such cooperation can strengthen the enforcement of insolvency orders and improve coordination between jurisdictions.

Finally, the introduction of specialized benches or divisions within insolvency tribunals for handling cross-border cases can enhance efficiency and expertise. Establishing clear procedural guidelines and standardized practices for cross-border insolvency proceedings will further streamline the process. In conclusion, the adoption of a comprehensive and well-defined legal framework, supported by institutional strengthening and international cooperation, is essential for addressing cross-border insolvency challenges in India. These reforms will not only enhance the effectiveness of the insolvency regime but also position India as a globally competitive and investor-friendly jurisdiction.

CONCLUSION

The evolution of insolvency law in India through the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 has significantly strengthened the country's ability to address corporate financial distress through a structured and time-bound resolution mechanism. The Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) has improved creditor confidence, enhanced transparency, and contributed to the development of a more disciplined credit environment. However, the increasing globalization of business activities has exposed the limitations of the existing framework, particularly in addressing cross-border insolvency issues. The analysis undertaken in this study demonstrates that while the IBC is effective in dealing with domestic insolvency, it lacks a comprehensive legal framework for managing transnational insolvency cases. The provisions under Sections 234 and 235 are limited in scope and fail to provide adequate mechanisms for recognition of foreign proceedings, coordination between jurisdictions, and protection of stakeholder interests in cross-border contexts.

Judicial interventions, particularly by the Supreme Court of India and appellate tribunals, have attempted to address these gaps by developing principles of cooperation and inclusivity. Cases such as Macquarie Bank Ltd. v. Shilpi Cable Technologies Ltd. and Jet Airways (India) Ltd. v. State Bank of India highlight the judiciary's role in facilitating cross-border insolvency resolution. However, reliance on judicial discretion in the absence of statutory clarity leads to inconsistency and uncertainty. The comparative analysis with international frameworks, especially the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency, underscores the need for adopting a standardized approach to cross-border insolvency. The Model Law provides a well-established framework for recognition, cooperation, and coordination, which can significantly enhance the efficiency of insolvency resolution in India. The challenges identified in this study, including jurisdictional conflicts, lack of recognition mechanisms, limited participation of foreign creditors, and absence of institutional expertise, highlight the urgent need for reform. Addressing these issues is essential for ensuring legal certainty, improving investor confidence, and aligning India's insolvency regime with global standards.

In conclusion, while the IBC has laid a strong foundation for insolvency resolution in India, its long-term effectiveness depends on its ability to adapt to the complexities of a globalized economy. The adoption of a comprehensive cross-border insolvency framework, supported by institutional strengthening and international cooperation, is essential for achieving this objective. Such reforms will not only enhance the efficiency of insolvency proceedings but also contribute to sustainable economic growth and integration with the global financial system.

REFERENCES

1. Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (India).
2. Macquarie Bank Ltd. v. Shilpi Cable Technologies Ltd., (2018) 2 SCC 674.
3. Jet Airways (India) Ltd. v. State Bank of India, Company Appeal (AT) (Insolvency) No. 707 of 2019 (NCLAT).
4. Committee of Creditors of Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta, (2020) 8 SCC 531.
5. K. Sashidhar v. Indian Overseas Bank, (2019) 12 SCC 150.
6. UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency (1997).
7. Insolvency Law Committee Report (2018).
8. National Company Law Tribunal Rules, 2016.
9. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Documents.
10. U.S. Bankruptcy Code, Chapter 15.
11. UK Cross-Border Insolvency Regulations, 2006.
12. Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India, https://www.mca.gov.in
13. Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (IBBI), https://www.ibbi.gov.in
14. Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (India), §§ 234–235.
15. Macquarie Bank Ltd. v. Shilpi Cable Technologies Ltd., (2018) 2 SCC 674.
16. Jet Airways (India) Ltd. v. State Bank of India, Company Appeal (AT) (Insolvency) No. 707 of 2019 (NCLAT).
17. UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency (1997).
18. Insolvency Law Committee Report (2018).