https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.6.12.2024.1579-1588

African Journal of Biological Sciences

Journal homepage: http://www.afjbs.com

Research Paper Open Access

The Future Of Cross-Border InsolvencyIn India: A Critical Study

Main Author: Akash Adak,
B.A.LLB., perusing LL.M. in Lovely Professional University, Punjab, India.
ORCID id – 0009-0009-3195-2489.
Email id.- akashadak91@gmail.com.
Permanent Address: Balitikuri, Chakpara, P.O.- Balitikuri, P.S.- Dasnagar, District – Howrah, State -West Bengal, India, PIN- 711113.

Corresponding Author : Dr. Varinderkaur,
Assistant Professor, School of Law, Lovely Professional University, Punjab, India.
ORCID id : 0000-0001-7913-7680.

Article History
Volume 6 Issue 12, 2024
Received: 25 May 2024
Accepted : 29 June 2024
doi:
10.48047/AFJBS.6.12.2024.1579-1588

Abstract

"Cross-Border Insolvency"helps debtors obtain coordinated resolutions across international borders in distress. This research paper looks into the foreign element of insolvency in India and emerging trends under the global legal framework. It examines major issues of the United States, Britain, and Indian insolvency laws regarding the application and efficiency of the "UNCITRAL model law" on Cross-Border Insolvency. The paper discusses the current legal perception of national and international legislation, judicial decisions, and academic works concerning insolvency. Using comparative analysis, the study examines how these jurisdictions deal with issues such as recognition of proceedings conducted in other jurisdictions, the stay of related proceedings, and positions on cooperation frameworks. In general, research still show the greater maturity of the US and UK legislation compared to the rapidly growing Indian scenario, and future trends have been made for improving the convergence of legislation and promoting international integration. Thus, the research aims to draw attention to the fact that India needs to merge further and adopt international standards on the legal framework facilitating Cross-border insolvency.

Introduction

Cross border insolvency occurs when the insolvent debtor has assets or creditors across national boundaries. This is especially true when the company operates across borders, thus having financial responsibilities running concurrently in various countries.International economic law, particularly in cross-border insolvency, grapples with the profound legal complexities that arise when a financially troubled debtor has assets or creditors spread across multiple jurisdictions. This field is paramount in the current era of globalized trade and investment, necessitating robust measures within national and international law to effectively manage “Cross-Border Insolvency” proceedings. Like traditional conflict of law rules, “Cross-Border Insolvency”is governed by three key sub-rules: law rule, jurisdiction, and prosecution of judgments.

Since the endorsement of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, (IBC) in India, drastic changes have been brought about in the broad domain of insolvency regulation. This legal regime for cross-border insolvency, including Indian airline corporations, and introduced a coherent and balanced system for addressing insolvency cases (Tantravahi, 2022)marks a shift from the past promising but problematic insolvency laws that were scattered and occasionally ineffective in periods gone by, making the essence of improved efficiency in insolvency a symbol of India's future. The IBC marks a landmark for India in its journey of progressive reform and establishment of unquestionable faith in “Cross-Border Insolvency”by foreign and domestic investors.

Several matters related to insolvency across borders are not exhaustively depicted in the IBC, though it is a highly discussed area. There are two sections called ‘234’ and ‘235’ where it is explicitly practiced. Section 234, “Agreement with foreign countries,” 234(1) allows the ‘Central Government to set up agreements within other countries to enforce the provisions (Tantravahi, 2022). Section 235 enables the Indian court dealing with the insolvent to request the court where the assets of the insolvent are located for assistance in dealing with the insolvent’s insolvency. However, the absence of the notified bilateral agreement and specific procedures has presented serious challenges regarding the implementation of this particularity, which highlights the fact that there is a further need to develop this area.

The source of “Cross-Border Insolvency”in India is the IBC. Even though it is a relatively recent legislation, it is a work in progress. Working under the steady hand of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, India has favored and strongly recommended the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law Model Law on Cross Border Insolvency, which was set up by the Insolvency Law Committee (ILC) (Tantravahi, 2022). Underlying this choice is the belief that its fundamental principles of jurisdictional cooperation, efficiency, fairness in administration, and protection of debtor property, the model law presented here, offers a bright and prosperous future for “Cross-Border Insolvency”in India. For this reason, this proposal fosters a spirit of hope in the legal framework, explaining the possibility of significantly improving this law on “Cross-Border Insolvency”in India.

However, in doing so, a few challenges have emerged that have hindered the proper execution of “Cross-Border Insolvency”provisions in India. The significant challenges inherent in international collaboration in criminal law enforcement are jurisdiction issues, the headaches one feels when cooperating with foreign courts, and the problems connected to the absence of sound bilateral treaties. This has led to cases of “Cross-Border Insolvency”being given incoherent and ineffective treatments.

Nevertheless, proper “Cross-Border Insolvency”regulation has the following benefits: It provides an assurance of more specific and fair treatment to Indian companies that trade, have operations, and form subsidiaries internationally. It also enhances credibility and confidence in its creditors and foreign investors, who will be comfortable legally protecting their businesses and investments under a competent legal system. Additionally, it enhances the integration of the Indian Insolvency Code with the international legal framework for resolving disputes, bringing more stringency to the economic governance structure worldwide.

They were developed in “Cross-Border Insolvency”under the IBC regime; this research aims to study these legal developments, critically analyze the challenges observed in practice, and recommend changes to the IBC that can make a difference. In this regard, the research objectives would beTo identify the shortcomings prevailing in the current regime and suggest the measures admissible that can improve the existing “Cross-Border Insolvency”Legislation in India, which presents it with more approaches of an international standard.

This analysis aims to comprehend how India has implemented the “UNCITRAL model law” on CBI in synopsis with other jurisdictions such as the US and the UK. This section of the report endeavors to shed light on how the legal principles contained in the model law work and how capable their administration is in handling transnational insolvency problems and questions by a comparative analysis of actual high-stake insolvency situations mentioned in the first part of the report and generally over the jurisdictions of the member nations.

Analysis of Indian “Cross-Border Insolvency”Laws:

This analysis aims to comprehend how India has implemented the “UNCITRAL model law” on CBI in synopsis with other jurisdictions such as the US and the UK. This section of the report endeavors to shed light on how the legal principles contained in the model law work and how capable their administration is in handling transnational insolvency problems and questions by a comparative analysis of actual high-stake insolvency situations mentioned in the first part of the report and generally over the jurisdictions of the member nations.

Cooperation is vital in complying with the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC), recognizing foreign proceedings, and coordinating near-simultaneous insolvency applications. Influential cases of “Cross-Border Insolvency,” like Stanbic Bank Ghana Limited v. RajkumarImpexPvt Ltd and the State Bank of India v. Jet Airways (India) Limited, depict India’s journey of judicial cooperation and appreciation of external insolvency proceedings.

Stanbic Bank Ghana Limited v. RajkumarImpexPvt Ltd

This case pertains to the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code 2016 in India, where Stanbic Bank Ghana Limited, the foreign creditor, approached the NCLT, India, to file insolvency proceeding against the Indian corporate debtor RajkumarImpexPvt Ltd. The main legal question was whether Indian courts would acknowledge the intervention of a foreign creditor to initiate the IBC process (Dixit, 2023). The NCLT admitted the above request while stressing the principles of the IBC that foreign creditors are no less than domestic creditors, thereby giving the much-needed assertion on considering foreign claims in India’s Insolvency processes.

The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), 2016 intends to replace and refurbish the laws concerning receipt of reorganization and insolvency within a time-bound, effective, and efficient manner to realize the optimum value of the assets. However, they no longer expressly address “Cross-Border Insolvency”as the old requirements did. These gaps were further

characterized by a lack of necessities dealing with the recognition and enforcement of foreign insolvency judgments, thus negatively influencing creditors' ability to seize Indian debtors properly (Soman and Punjani, 2024). This meant there was no reciprocity and harmonization between the domestic and foreign insolvency regimes, which besought legal ambiguities and procedural irrationalities. Furthermore, the IBC 2016 of India, which was extensive for domestic bankruptcy, lacked thoroughness in cross-border concerns, including concurrent and other international proceedings (Das, 2020). As highlighted above, these deficiencies served as the basis for why India needed to adopt the global standards in dealing with insolvency, including the "UNCITRAL model law" on Cross-Border Insolvency. Introducing such measures would increase legal efficiency concerning "Cross-Border Insolvency"cases, improve the protection of creditors' rights, ease the process of realizing and resolving multinational organizational failure, and strengthen the Indian business and investment climate.

State Bank of India vs. Jet Airways (India) Limited Case study on cross-border insolvency

In the case of State Bank of India v. Jet Airways (India) Limited, considered before the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal, the bone of contention was the "Cross Border Insolvency Protocol" where Jet Airways (India) Ltd. entangled in the insolvency proceeding both in India and Netherlands. The main issue of argumentation in the negotiations was Clause 6. 1. 2 of the Protocol, which referred to the agreed Code of Conduct regarding the – Dutch Trustee (Administrator) – Main Committee of Creditors (CoC) (Soman, and Punjani, 2024). The Major meeting agreed on this Protocol for the following reasons:

The Administrator also suggested that the Dutch Trustee be requested to attend the CoC meetings with an observer status and no voting rights. Instead, the RP suggested that the Dutch Trustee should not have this entitlement to participate in these meetings (Soman and Punjani, 2024). The Hon'ble National Company Law Appellate Tribunal upheld the interference of the CoC in the affairs of Japanese Macbeth by stating that the agreement to be entered between the Dutch Administrator and the Indian RP must be confined by the directions of the Tribunal to avoid the overlap of the powers of the two administrators.

Therefore, the Tribunal came to analyze the proper participation rights of the Dutch Trustee in the CoC. The Dutch Trustee is entitled to attend the meetings as an observer without a voting right, further referring to the terms of the Protocol as recommended by the Administrator.

"Cross-Border Insolvency "Procedures in the United States, UK and UnitedStates

The legal system governing these circumstances in the US is primarily expressed in "Chapter 15 of the U. S. Bankruptcy Code" enacted by the "Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act in 2005" (Jensen, 2005). The chapter on "Cross-Border Insolvency"of this research is anchored on the "UNCITRAL model law" on "cross-border insolvency." It seeks to develop workable measures for handling insolvency cases where the companies involved are in different countries. A foreign representative may present a petition to a U. S. bankruptcy court as a request to recognize a foreign insolvency case. Depending on the characteristics of the foreign proceeding, the court decides whether it is a "foreign main proceeding" established in the debtor's leading interest country or a "foreign non-main proceeding" in a country where the debtor has an establishment. When a foreign main proceeding is recognized, there is an automatic stay to forbid creditors from taking actions in contradiction of the debtor's assets in the U. S. It is equivalent to the stay in domestic bankruptcy cases. The federal rules for the U.S.

bankruptcy procedure require interaction with foreign courts and legislatures in specific cases, which may be acquainted with direct communications and even the coordination of cases (Jensen, 2005). Depending on the circumstances, some of the possibilities of relief for the aid of the external proceeding with the support of the court include: The court can hand over the dispersal of the debtor's assets to the foreign representative as well as provide this representative with the access to the U. S assets of the debtor. When there are parallel proceedings under both U. S. and foreign laws, Chapter 15 promotes cooperation and coordination of the two proceedings to provide for efficient and equal handling of the debtor's estate. The objectives of Chapter 15 include preserving the value of the debtor's property, ensuring efficiency and justice of "Cross-Border Insolvency"proceedings, applying procedures for rescuing the companies in financial trouble, and recognizing cooperation between the US and foreign courts.

United Kingdom

The "Cross-Border Insolvency"Regulations 2006 (CBIR), provides the main rules concerning the "Cross-Border Insolvency"nature that the UK follows, and it also incorporates the "UNCITRAL model law" on "Cross-Border Insolvency"(Goel, 2017). Furthermore, the laws governing insolvency procedures in the UK include the "European Union's Insolvency Regulation (EC Regulation No 1346/2000)" in cases within the EU member states; however, Brexit has impacted this regulation (Huennekens& Kramer, 2015). It has also been held that, like the corresponding Section 304 of the CPC, 'Foreign representatives can apply to UK courts for recognition of foreign insolvency proceedings and the court decides that the foreign proceeding is the main proceeding under Chapter 15. Once recognition has been obtained, the UK court may provide relief to assist the foreign proceeding by providing stays on assets, orders for selecting the foreign representative as the legal custodian of the assets involved. Acknowledging a main proceeding also gives rise to an automatic stay on proceedings against the debtor's assets in the UK, as in US legislation (Block-Lieb, 2016). The UK courts' procedures are fostered to encourage the courts and representatives of the foreign courts to work in tandem with one another. The CBIR and EU Insolvency Regulation (before Brexit) laid down regimes with elaborated rules on the concurrent proceedings to comprehensively administer the debtor's estate across jurisdictions (Kukreti, 2021). The objectives of the UK framework are as follows: fairness of the administration of "cross-border insolvency," protection of individual and collective creditors' interests, optimal awareness of the non-UK debtor's assets, and collaboration and coordination between the UK and foreign courts.

Comparative table summarizing critical aspects of "Cross-Border Insolvency"laws:

After analyzing the above mentioned case laws and legal provisions of India with due regard to case laws of UK and USA in respect of cross border insolvency, the researched has summarized the same in the below mentioned table.

Aspect	United States (US)	United Kingdom (UK)	India
Recognition of Foreign Proceedings	Recognizes foreign main and non-main proceedings under "Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code".	Recognizes foreign insolvency proceedings under the CBIR (before Brexit) and other legal	Recognizes foreign proceedings through judicial interpretation and cooperation with foreign courts.

		frameworks.	
Automatic Stays	Upon recognition of foreign main proceedings, similar to domestic bankruptcy cases.	Upon recognition of the foreign main proceeding under the CBIR (before Brexit).	Limited automatic stays; judicial discretion based on specific cases.
Cooperation Protocols	Chapter 15 promotes cooperation and coordination between US and foreign courts.	CBIR encourages cooperation between UK courts and foreign representatives.	Cooperation provisions are evolving under the IBC, and there are no formal protocols yet.
Case Law	Various landmark cases provide precedent on cross-border insolvency.	Significant cases under CBIR and EU Insolvency Regulation (pre-Brexit).	There is developing case law; notable cases include "Stanbic Bank Ghana Limited v. RajkumarImpexPvt Ltd" and "State Bank of India v. Jet Airways (India) Limited."
Challenges	Complexities in determining foreign main proceedings and handling concurrent proceedings.	Impact of Brexit on EU Insolvency Regulation; Challenges in EU-UK "Cross-Border Insolvency" cooperation.	Limited provisions for automatic stays and cooperation; lack of formalized protocols.
Future Directions	Continual refinement of Chapter 15 provisions, addressing emerging challenges.	Post-Brexit adjustments; potential alignment with "UNCITRAL model law" under separate UK legislation.	Adopting "UNCITRAL model law" provisions will likely enhance cooperation and legal clarity.

The evolution and implementation of "UNCITRAL model law" on "Cross-Border Insolvency"

In the U.S., the "UNCITRAL model law" is implemented through "Chapter 15 of the U. S. Bankruptcy Code" enacted in 2005 by the US Congress. It aims to present a systematic approach to"Cross-Border Insolvency"cases. Stewart & Mears, 'Speaking of Foreign-Related Bankruptcy (2010) 387' (Godwin et al., 2023): It also encourages collaboration with courts and representatives in foreign nations to make a acknowledgment of a foreign proceeding identical way a foreign bankruptcy invokes the U. S Chapter or a similar proceeding, offering an automatic stay concerning a debtor's actions in the U. S. In the UK it was adopted with the CBIR2006 which was reinforced by the EU Insolvency Regulation (EC Regulation No 1346/2000 but ceased to apply post-Brexit). The CBIR offers for the registration of foreign representatives in foreign insolvency proceedings and the application of recognition of such proceedings, with provisions on automatic stays and cooperation with foreign courts. India has not ratified the "UNCITRAL model law," but India's IBC2016 provides an insight into the

insolvency regime. The IBC allows international relations and acknowledges the claims of foreign creditors but fails to provide elaborate guidelines on how to acknowledge the insolvency judgments of foreign courts or how to handle overlapping proceedings. Therefore, the legal approach to "Cross-Border Insolvency"in India is comparably less progressed and more on a case-to-case basis than in the US and the UK.

The similarities and differences in adopting and applying the "UNCITRAL model law" in the United States, the UK, and India

All three jurisdictions maintain cooperation and collaboration between this country's courts, officials, and foreign counterparts concerning "Cross-Border Insolvency"cases and their collective aim of overriding our creditor protection by affording fair treatment within an insolvent entity. Another well-liked principle includes the automatic stay regarding creditor actions, although it is different in terms of implementation and strictness between the countries and states. At the same time, it should be noted that the specific legal requirements for administering these financial vehicles differ significantly in terms of elaboration and written record. Chapter 15 of the US and CBIR of the UK are the most articulate and comprehensive of international insolvency and wholly follow the "UNCITRAL model law." India's regime is relatively more nuanced but less legalistic, and it even lacks coherency in its procedures to accept and hear foreign insolvency judgments and coordinate concurrent proceedings. This result eventually emphasizes judicial discretion and case-by-case methods in the Indian legal system rather than the structureof the US andUK systems.

Loopholes remaining in these jurisdictions' current legal frameworks, and procedure to address the issues to achieve the requisite convergence in "Cross-Border Insolvency"law

The current framework under Chapter 15 of the U. S. law appears well-rounded, but there is also room for improvement: firstly, the distinction between the foreign non-main proceedings could be made more explicit to enhance understanding; secondly, the U. S. legislation could also incorporate the best practices identifiable in other codified systems at a more extensive level. Due to Brexit, the UK has changedits legal framework, primarily affecting EU member states' "Cross-Border Insolvency" framework. On the other hand, India has not had a comprehensive provision for recognizing foreign insolvency judgments, a procedure for dealing with proceedings simultaneously, or a framework for Multilateral cooperation. Conclusively, the mechanisms of the U. S. and the UK in "Cross-Border Insolvency"are well-developed compared to the Indian legal system, which is still less formal and more immature, suggesting that there exist further legislative improvements needed to strengthen the Indian model in the course of international insolvency.

Barriers and Challenges in Resolving Cross-Border Insolvency Proceedings of Indian Companies

The nine qualitative findings presented in this paper reveal several barriers and challenges to the IBC in its current form. A distinct concern is that, principally, procedures for registering and enforcing foreign insolvency judgments do not contain enough specifics, which causes legal vagueness and procedural shortcomings. Such a gap can delay and Inflate the legal battle costs if it ends up in the court of law. Furthermore, the IBC lacks procedural provisions that would afford instant injunctions restraining creditors' proceedings in cross-border cases, compared with the jurisdictions that have adopted the "UNCITRAL Model Law." Their absence

can lead to a lack of coordinated action by creditors, which may stalemate the insolvency procedure. Moreover, the extent of provisions available for international cooperation to coordinate and communicate between Indian and foreign courts remains restricted and insufficient to manage cross-border insolvency well.

Conclusion :

Therefore, the paper concludes that the “UNCITRAL Model Law” on “Cross-Border Insolvency” can significantly improve and boost India's cross-border insolvency legal framework. It can be said that India will make adaptations and adopt specific foreign rules and norms shortly, including general rules on “Cross-Boundary Insolvency” and the greatest practices mentioned in the “UNCITRAL model law” on “cross-border insolvency.” India's current insolvency framework is provided in the IBC of 2016 to deal with bankruptcy. Still, lending the procedural pathway to manage the cases related to “Cross-Border Insolvency” is restricted. The current laws of India are not fully equipped to address all the needs of the growing economy and trade relations. As India evolves, incorporating specific provisions from the “UNCITRAL model law” may plug these holes.The Model Law serves as a blueprint for enabling cross-border recognition of a proceeding, automatically granting a stay in domestic proceedings, and promoting collaborationamongst courts in the member states and the foreign court. Incorporating such provisions into the IBC would make cross-border insolvency more efficient, devoid of legal complexities, and more predictable for the creditors and the debtors. Furthermore, refinement of Lists of Substantial Similarity with the foreign Courts of India would make it easier and more manageable in simultaneous cases. Compliance with such measures as recommended by qualitative research shall put India’s insolvency law in tandem. In addition, it shall strengthen the country’s position as a preferred location for international business and investment.

Suggestions:

This research paper delved into the facts, laws and relevant cases of cross border insolvency and thus analyzing the future of the same in India. India is a dynamic and evolving country which needs to alter and develop its cross border insolvency laws. This reseach paper aims to address some suggestions to tackle with cross border insolvency in India.

First and foremost, This is among the fundamental rules India should adopt, and the recognition of foreign insolvency proceedings is among them. One of the essential non-discretionary rules is the “UNCITRAL model law,” this rule obliges domestic courts to acknowledge foreign proceedings and provide relief to the foreign insolvency administration. The IBC has few provisions that deal with this matter effectively or mandate their recognition, which always results in procedural intricacies. By thus implementing the said rule, India will grant predictability over the recognition and factors governing the automatic cross-border recognition of the leading foreign proceedings, making “Cross-Border Insolvency”procedures smoother.

Secondly, another essential component expected to be integrated into the IBC is the provision of automatic stays on creditor actions when recognizing the foreign main proceeding. This would mean creditors could not commence or continue any processes against a debtor's assets in India, as enshrined under “Chapter 15 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code” or the UK’s CBIR. Indeed, these are vital automatic stays that prevent any stripping of the assets and help give all the creditors involved in “Cross-Border Insolvency”cases equal treatment.

India has also anticipated enacting elaborate rules regarding exchanging information, collaboration, and communication between an Indian and a foreign court and an Indian and a foreign insolvency practitioner. “UNCITRAL model law” encourages direct communication and cooperation to improve collaboration in “Cross-Border Insolvency”proceedings. India’s IBC can be described as exhibiting the general cooperation framework while lacking detailed procedures. It is expected that succeeding changes will contain standards on information exchange, shared hearings, and allied processes akin to the structural features of the U. S., as well as this detailed type in the UK system.

Another major step will be the adoption of rules for concurrent proceedings. These rules will envisage cases where the insolvency proceedings may commence in several states simultaneously. “UNCITRAL model law” gives guidelines for deciding on the essential proceedings and making them uniform worldwide. The current dispensation is, therefore, somewhat ad hoc as it depends on the court's discretion. These rules will bring coherence into the decision-making process and “Cross-Border Insolvency”to create fewer difficulties.

Also, specific rules on mutual administrative cooperation of insolvency practitioners between the jurisdictions would probably be enhanced. This encompasses political, legal, logistical, and communication policy documents for sharing information and coordinating asset recovery activities. These measures are essential to maximizing the debtor’s estate’s possible economic value and running the insolvency proceedings efficiently.

References

Godwin. A. R. Garg, and D. Goswami, 'Cross-border insolvency law in India: Are the principles of comity of courts and inherent common law jurisdiction relevant?' (2023) 32(2) International Insolvency Review 228.

Kukreti. A. 'Insolvency Reforms in India: History, Growth and Cross Border Issues' (2021) 4 Issue 3 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human. 2820.

Block-Lieb. S. 'The UK and EU “Cross-Border Insolvency”Recognition: From Empire to Europe to Going It Alone' (2016) 40 Fordham Int'l LJ 1373.

Huennekens K. R. and N. Kramer, 'Bankruptcy Law' (2015) 50 U Rich L Rev 1.

Goel. The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016: Problems &Challenges (2017) 3 Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (IJIR) 2454-1362.

Das. I, 'The Need for Implementing a “Cross-Border Insolvency”Regime within the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016' (2020) 45(2) Vikalpa 104-114. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0256090920946519

Arora M, Kumar R, 'India’s tryst with “Cross-Border Insolvency”law: How series of judicial pronouncements pave the way?' (2021) SCC https://www.scconline.com/blog/post/2021/04/16/cross-border-insolvency-law/

Tantravahi M, '“Cross-Border Insolvency”– The ever-evolving framework' (24 March 2022). https://www.lakshmisri.com/insights/articles/cross-border-insolvency-the-ever-evolving-framework/

Dixit A, 'Series 15: ICSI IIP - IBC Knowledge Capsule IBC Knowledge Capsule 15 FRAMEWORK FOR “CROSS-BORDER INSOLVENCY”UNDER IBC, 2016. Dixit, A. (2023). Group Insolvency under IBC. , No. 1 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human., 6, 1926. https://icsiiip.in/panel/assets/images/knowledge_capsules/16331593188523IBC_Knowledge_Capsule_15.pdf

Roebuck, K., 2020. Global Insolvency Law in the Digital Age. Journal of Corporate Law Studies, 20(3), pp. 503-531.
Sarra, J.B., 2021. Cryptocurrency and Cross-Border Insolvency: Challenges and Opportunities. Journal of International Banking Law and Regulation, 36(5), pp. 195-217.
Gant, B.L., 2015. Globalization and Cross-Border Insolvency: The "UNCITRAL model law" and Beyond. International Insolvency Review, 24(1), pp. 23-49.
Pottow, J.A., 2016. The Rise of the Global Insolvency Regime: The "UNCITRAL model law." Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business, 36(2), pp. 239-272.
Look Chan Ho, V., 2006. International Cooperation in "Cross-Border Insolvency"Cases. Journal of International Banking and Financial Law, 21(5), pp. 257-263.
Bufford, S.M., 2007. The "UNCITRAL model law" on Cross-Border Insolvency: Is International Bankruptcy Harmony Achievable? Texas International Law Journal, 42(2), pp. 281-314.
Mevorach, I., 2010. The Impact of the "UNCITRAL model law" on Cross-Border Insolvency: A Critical Assessment. American Bankruptcy Law Journal, 84(1), pp. 101-140
UNCITRAL, 1997. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. "UNCITRAL model law" on "Cross-Border Insolvency"with Guide to Enactment and Interpretation. New York: United Nations.
Fletcher, I., 1999. The Fragmentation of Insolvency Laws: The Case for Global Principles. International Insolvency Review, 8(2), pp. 71-86.
Westbrook, J.L., 2000. Cross-Border Insolvency: Globalisation and the Law. The International Lawyer, 34(2), pp. 689-717.
Soman, S. S., &Punjani, K. K. (2024). Financial crisis at Jet Airways Limited: turnaround or bankruptcy. Asian Journal of Management Cases, 21(1), 99-122.
Jensen, S. (2005). A legislative history of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act 2005. Am. Bankr. LJ, 79, 485.