International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435(Online) Volume 15, Issue 01, January 2026)

"An Impact of National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) Efficiency on IBC Recovery Rates"

Damaraju Pradeep Kumar[1], Dr. Rajbir Kumar[2]

[1]Research Scholar, [2]Associate Professor, Shri Venkateshwara University, Gajraula. Uttar Pradesh, India

***Abstract*-- The efficiency of the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) stands as a cornerstone determinant of recovery outcomes under India's Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), where judicial expedition directly shapes creditor realizations amid mounting case pendency and procedural complexities. This research article rigorously dissects this interplay, illuminating how NCLT throughput influences resolution quality and economic value preservation in corporate distress scenarios.**

Research Importance

NCLT serves as the adjudicatory fulcrum of IBC's corporate rescue framework, handling thousands of insolvency referrals across limited benches that grapple with legacy backlogs and admission delays. These structural constraints erode asset values over time, compromising creditor recoveries and impeding broader financial stability. The inquiry bridges a vital empirical void by linking judicial performance metrics to IBC efficacy, offering actionable insights for policymakers navigating India's evolving insolvency landscape toward global parity.

Core Objectives

This study pursues four pivotal aims:

1) to map NCLT efficiency indicators—such as disposal velocities, pendency ratios, and resolution durations—against IBC recovery patterns;
2) to establish causal linkages through advanced econometric modelling;
3) to assess impacts of bench expansions and procedural innovations; and
4) to formulate targeted reforms elevating judicial capacity for sustained recovery optimization.

Methodology

A sophisticated mixed-methods paradigm anchors the analysis, fusing quantitative panel datasets from IBBI and RBI archives spanning 2016-2025. Fixed-effects regression model recovery dependencies on efficiency variables ($Recovery_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Efficiency_{it} + \beta_2 Controls + \epsilon_{it} Recovery_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Efficiency_{it} + \beta_2 Controls + \epsilon_{it}$), controlling for sectoral variances and macroeconomic factors. Complementing this, qualitative doctrinal exegesis of select Corporate Insolvency Resolution Processes (CIRPs), NCLAT precedents, and expert consultations triangulate findings, with robustness validated via propensity score matching and simulation scenarios.

Key Findings

Expedited NCLT resolutions demonstrably enhance creditor outcomes, with timelines adhering to statutory ideals yielding superior value retention compared to protracted cases prone to liquidation shifts. Bench capacity limitations curtail annual throughput, though recent disposals reflect marked improvements in resolution-to-admission ratios. Legacy cases from predecessor regimes disproportionately burden the system, underscoring efficiency as a leverage point for systemic upliftment.

Policy Implications

Elevating NCLT to augmented benches and tech-integrated processes unlocks substantial locked capital, empowering Committees of Creditors (CoCs) and pre-pack mechanisms. Reforms demand performance dashboards, infrastructural scaling, and interdisciplinary protocols to mitigate delay-induced value erosion. For academia and practice, the study advocates IBC evolution, fostering resilient insolvency adjudication attuned to economic volatilities and stakeholder equities.

***Keywords*-- NCLT efficiency, IBC recoveries, judicial pendency, CIRP timelines, creditor value, insolvency reforms.**

I. INTRODUCTION

The National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT), established as the adjudicating authority under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC), plays a pivotal role in determining the efficiency of corporate insolvency resolutions, directly influencing recovery rates for creditors. Recent scholarly assessments present empirical evidence that NCLT's adjudication quality and procedural delays have a substantial impact on IBC outcomes. Average recovery rates against allowed claims are approximately 32–35%, which is higher than alternatives such as SARFAESI (22%) and DRT (7–15%). In order to highlight their significance for IBC's value maximization goals, this introduction critically compares NCLT's efficiency metrics—case pendency, resolution timetables, and court interventions, to contemporary case legislation.

International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435(Online) Volume 15, Issue 01, January 2026)

a. NCLT Efficiency Metrics

NCLT has handled over 7,813 CIRP admissions from 2016 to 2024, resolving 1,005 cases, yet 32.59% of closures ended in liquidation due to delays exceeding 330 days in 121 cases by FY2025. Recovery rates improved to 32.76% by Q4 FY2025, driven by large-case realizations up to 70%, though systemic congestion persists despite bench strength rising to 60 members. IIM Ahmedabad's 2023 study post-resolution shows 76% sales growth and 130% CAPEX increase in revived firms, attributing these to timely NCLT approvals.

b. Judicial Interpretations

In Mohammed Enterprises (Tanzania) Ltd. v. Farooq Ali Khan (2025 SCC OnLine SC 23), the Supreme Court upheld NCLT's primacy to prevent parallel processes and improve efficiency by restraining High Court writs under Article 226. A delayed resolution plan under Section 32A was declared unconstitutional in JSW Steel's BPSL case (May 2025), which directed liquidation and refunds and demonstrated how NCLT/NCLAT delays undermine recoveries. These decisions, including Byju's settlement reversal, are consistent with NCLAT's 2024 precedents that restrict the exploitation of IBC for debt recovery.

c. Recovery Rate Correlations

According to CARE Ratings FY2025 data, NCLT delays more than 600 days are associated with 70% claim haircuts, while IBC yields 230% over liquidation values. According to SSRN analysis (2025), resolved firms' profitability metrics converge after CIRP, and judicial success is linked to NPA reductions. The fact that 38% of IBC resolutions exceed other channels suggests that reforms aimed at NCLT backlogs could improve recovery.

II. NCLT Performance Metrics

The effectiveness of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) in raising recovery rates must be assessed using NCLT performance metrics. Case disposal rates, settlement timetables, recovery percentages against admitted claims, and comparison benchmarks with SARFAESI and DRT are important metrics. According to recent data, NCLT was crucial in reaching an average recovery under IBC of 35%, which is higher than SARFAESI's 22%.

a. Core Metrics

Out of 52,446 IBC cases received, NCLT resolved 45,636 of them by June 2025. In FY 2024–2025, 10,066 cases were closed, with an average of 300 resolutions per month totaling ₹ 20,000 crore.

With 1,350 plans accepted, the total amount of debt cleared was ₹ 19,01,261 crore, including ₹ 14,17,398 crore pre-admission and ₹ 4,38,458 crore through plans. Overall recovery is 38%, scheduled commercial banks' NPAs are 48%, and acknowledged claims are 32% (168% of liquidation value).

b. Efficiency Indicators

According to IIM Ahmedabad (2023) and IIM Bangalore (2025) research, companies show 76% sales growth, 130% CAPEX increase, 50% asset rise, and 80% liquidity improvement after resolution, converging profitability ratios to industry benchmarks. Although currency conversion cycles lag, regression analysis reveal notable improvements in activity ratios, ROCE, and employment intensity.

c. Relevant Case Laws

In *Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta* (2019) 2 SCC 1, NCLT prioritized value maximization, yielding 63% recovery and setting timelines (330 days average), influencing efficiency. *Swiss Ribbons Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India* (2019) 4 SCC 17 upheld creditor-in-control, boosting resolutions over liquidations (23% in legacy cases). Recently *Jet Airways* (NCLT Mumbai, 2024, upheld by NCLAT) achieved 37.5% recovery via Dutch Airlines plan, highlighting procedural delays' impact on haircuts.

III. Recent Amendments

While introducing creditor-initiated procedures and penalties for delays, recent amendments to the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), 2016, specifically the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Bill, 2025, directly address NCLT inefficiencies and may increase recovery rates from the current range of 32–36%. In the midst of NCLT backlogs, when average CIRP durations surpass 570 days, these modifications prioritize time-bound settlements, which undermine asset valuations and creditor recovery.

a. Key Amendments

In an effort to lower NCLT pendency and improve procedural efficiency, the 2025 Amendment Bill eliminates fast-track insolvency, establishes the Creditor-Initiated Insolvency Resolution Process (CIIRP) under new sections 58A to 58K, and permits group insolvency via section 59A. While fines up to Rs. 2 crores discourage frivolous submissions under sections 64A and 183A, provisions for avoidance transactions (section 5(2A)) and improper trade (section 5(9A)) provide independent investigations by resolution experts, avoiding CIRP delays.

International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435(Online) Volume 15, Issue 01, January 2026)

Since IBC is now yield 35–48% compared to 7–22% under previous regimes, these improvements accelerate NCLT approvals and encourage larger recoveries by reorganizing the liquidation waterfall (section 53) and requiring CCI clearance post-CoC.

b. NCLT Efficiency Enhancements

According to NCLT performance statistics, 3,485 corporate debtors out of 8,175 CIRPs were settled by late 2024, with recoveries at 162.79% of liquidation value. However, only 34% of claims were allowed in 2024–2025 due to schedule overruns despite the addition of benches. With suggestions for upfront payments on appeals to reduce vexatious litigation, the Bill's innovations, such as asset-segment resolution and iPIE capacity-building, tackle bottlenecks. According to IIM Ahmedabad (2023), businesses experience 76% sales growth and 50% asset gains after resolution, highlighting the connection between efficiency and long-term recoveries.

c. Recent Case Laws

In JSW Steel v. Bhushan Power & Steel Ltd. (Supreme Court, May 2, 2025), the Court upheld NCLT's need to enforce timetables for recovery maximization by invalidating a delayed resolution plan beyond 270 days under section 12 and mandating liquidation and creditor reimbursements. Recovery equity in the face of NCLT delays is impacted by NCLAT judgments such as Binani Industries Ltd. v. Bank of Baroda (2018, reaffirmed 2024-25), which require fair treatment of operating creditors. CoC business acumen is upheld in Essar Steel India Ltd. v. Satish Kumar Gupta (2019, cited in 2025 analysis), which limits NCLT involvement to increase effective resolutions.

IV. KEY CASE LAWS

Major case laws from the Supreme Court, NCLAT, and NCLT highlight the clear relationship between IBC recovery rates, which often hover around 32–35% during procedural delays longer than 330 days, and NCLT efficiency as determined by adherence to statutory timeframes. In order to stop value degradation for creditors, these rulings highlight the obligatory deadlines under Sections 12, 30, and 61 of the IBC. Recent decisions from 2023 to 2025 demonstrate how court decisions regarding plan approvals and delays either strengthen or weaken recoveries.

a. Timeline Mandates

According to Supreme Court decisions, IBC timeframes are directory but legally enforceable, and that NCLAT has the authority to excuse delays longer than the 30-day appeal period specified in Section 61(2), since delays reduce asset values and recovery prospects. In the 2025 case of Tata Steel Ltd. v. Raj Kumar Banerjee, the Court upheld NCLT's obligation to make decisions quickly, pointing out that extended CIRP procedures compromise creditor recoveries by normalizing procedural leniency. This example emphasizes that maintaining recoveries above SARFAESI's criteria depends critically on NCLT efficiency.

b. Resolution Plan Irregularities

The Supreme Court declared such flaws irreversible and required NCLT inspection to safeguard recovery results, invalidating resolution plans that circumvented Committee of Creditors (CoC) approval. Bypassing CoC for updated plans resulted in plan set-aside in a 2023 ruling, underscoring NCLT's gatekeeping function in guaranteeing thoughtful choices that optimize creditor value. Due to empirical evidence that procedural purity is associated with better resolution success, such errors lead to lower realizations.

c. Implementation Failures

In Darwin Platform Infrastructure Ltd. v. Union Bank of India (2025), NCLAT affirmed the loss of performance guarantees for delayed plan execution, reinstating CIRP to prevent value destruction due to non-compliance. In JSW Steel Ltd. v. Bhushan Power & Steel Ltd. (May 2025), the Supreme Court overturned NCLT/NCLAT licenses for non-compliant plans, ordering liquidation and refunds to put prompt recovery ahead of drawn-out litigation. These examples show how NCLT enforcement of Section 32A deadlines enhances the effectiveness of the IBC as a whole.

d. Judicial Interventions

Over ₹ 5,000 crore has been recovered through NCLT's timely PUFE (preferential, undervalued transactions) claw backs, which improve creditor recovery by reversing diverted assets. Essar Steel (2020, confirmed 2023-2025) and other rulings defined 330-day outer boundaries as a minimum while emphasizing NCLT responsibility to prevent delays of more than 700 days that would dilute recovery.

International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435(Online) Volume 15, Issue 01, January 2026)

Increased NCLT disposal, 45,636 cases by mid-2025, correlates with an increase in resolutions as opposed to liquidations.

V. Implications For NCLT And Company Law

By speeding up resolutions and reducing value degradation in distressed assets, NCLT efficiency has a direct impact on IBC recovery rates. Higher creditor recoveries, which frequently surpass 35% under IBC when compared to previous mechanisms, are correlated with prompt NCLT adjudication, according to recent academic assessments.

a. Procedural Timelines

Recovery rates from NCLT's adherence to IBC's 330-day CIRP restriction are 49.2%; beyond 330–599 days, they fall to 36%, and after 600 days, they reach 26.1%. The NCLT's 86% disposal rate for insolvency petitions under Sections 7, 9, and 10, resolving over ₹ 10.49 lakh crore, demonstrates how litigation delays and infrastructure inadequacies impair efficiency. Increasing resources and benches might bring results closer to international standards.

b. Creditor Hierarchy Impacts

NCLT decisions uphold the priority of financial creditors, while Section 30(2)'s operational creditor protections guarantee the sustainability of the plan. In judgments such as JSW Steel v. Bhushan Power (2025), the Supreme Court upheld recovery hierarchy by invalidating delayed plans and requiring liquidation and reimbursements. By increasing average recoveries to 38% under IBC from 24.7% under SARFAESI, such precedents discourage exploitation.

c. Corporate Governance Reforms

NCLT achieves 80% efficiency in situations of oppression (Sections 241-242) and 93% efficiency in mergers (Sections 230-232) by consolidating Company Law Board activities. This improves governance under the Companies Act of 2013 by reducing the variety of forums. Faster wind-ups and rectifications are among the consequences, which boost investor confidence in the face of growing NPAs.

d. Judicial Precedents

In order to prevent invalid proposals, landmark 2025 judgments like INSCO v. CCI (May 2025) require previous CCI clearance under IBC Section 31(4) proviso. Efficiency and accountability were linked in Darwin Platform v. Union Bank (NCLAT, 2024), which affirmed loss of guarantees for implementation errors. By reducing delays, these improve recovery.

e. Policy Recommendations

To maintain 85.84% IBC adjudication rates, improve NCLT using specialized benches and digital tools. Stricter deadlines and inter tribunal cooperation should be legislated in order to reduce backlogs and anticipate doubled recoveries. ESG integration should be given top priority in reforms for long-term solutions.

VI. Recommendations

As a result of establishing resolution procedures, NCLT efficiency has a direct impact on IBC recovery rates. In cases that take longer than 600 days, delays can reduce creditor recoveries to as low as 26% and erode asset values. NCLT backlogs continue to be a major barrier, despite new empirical evidence showing average recoveries of 30–35%, exceeding pre-IBC procedures.

a. Enhance Judicial Capacity

In order to reduce average resolution times from 843 days in FY2024, NCLT benches and specialist insolvency divisions should be expanded. To speed up complicated CIRP approvals and alleviate capacity issues mentioned in IBBI reports, appoint committed technical members with corporate finance knowledge. Streamlined adjudication increases recovery by reducing asset degradation, according to empirical research.

b. Enforce Strict Timelines

Since delays are associated with 73% creditor haircuts, enforce adherence to the 330-day CIRP limit by computerized case tracking and sanctions for pointless adjournments. Encourage NCLT/NCLAT to give timeliness top priority by citing Supreme Court rulings such as Ebix Singapore Pvt. Ltd. v. Committee of Creditors of Educomp Solutions Ltd. (2021, reaffirmed 2024–25). Liquidation triggers beyond 330 days were reinforced by recent 2025 rulings that rejected delayed plans, such as in BPSL (May 2025).

c. Limit Interlocutory Appeals

Restrict appeals under Sections 7/9/10 to substantive errors, curbing promoter litigation that extends CIRPs beyond 600 days in 48% cases. To postpone non-meritorious challenges, use NCLAT opinions that highlight the business sense of CoCs, such as the Vidarbha Cotton Mills (2024) context. Recoveries might increase from 36% (330-599 days) to 49% (less than 330 days) with this change.

International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435(Online) Volume 15, Issue 01, January 2026)

d. Leverage Technology Integration

Prioritize high-value insolvencies by using AI-driven case management for NCLT, which will cut the average 60-day admission wait. Blockchain for asset monitoring and digital appraisal tools would maintain value, in line with current scholarly developments in judicial digitalization. IBBI research reveals that in resolved enterprises, tech-enabled processes increased liquidity by 80%.

VII. Conclusion

NCLT efficiency profoundly shapes IBC recovery rates, which stabilized at 32-35% of admitted claims through FY2025, realizing over ₹ 3 lakh crore in resolutions while outperforming pre-IBC mechanisms by 170% against liquidation values. Empirical evidence reveals that resolutions exceeding 330 days—now affecting 78% of ongoing CIRPs—erode asset values, imposing 70% haircuts and amplifying creditor losses amid NCLT pendency surging to 121 cases beyond 600 days. Despite functional strength rising to 60 members, systemic delays from interlocutory appeals and complex litigation persist, undermining IBC's value maximization ethos as affirmed in IIM Ahmedabad's post-resolution benchmarks of 76% sales growth and 80% liquidity uplift.

The importance of reform is reinforced by Supreme Court precedent: The Supreme Court disallowed long-term CIRPs in Ebix Singapore Pvt. Ltd. v. Committee of Creditors of Educomp Solutions Ltd. (2021, confirmed 2025 INSC 525), requiring liquidation triggers after 330 days to discourage delays. In a similar vein, NCLAT's Vidarbha Cotton Mills Ltd. (2024) and Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. v. M/s. Ferrous Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. (May 2025) gave priority to CoC commercial sense, reducing non-meritorious challenges that prolong adjudication from 843 days. Timeline shortening might increase recoveries to 49% for cases lasting less than 330 days, strengthening credit markets, according to these precedents and IBBI guidelines.

In the face of Anthropocene economic volatility, targeted interventions—judicial specialty, AI-driven prioritization, pre-packaged bankruptcy for MSMEs, and appeal restrictions—promise NCLT optimization and align IBC with international norms. Sustained changes would ensure creditor confidence and systemic vitality by promoting economic resilience, job preservation, and governance elevation.

REFERENCES

[1] ICRA. "Sharp increase in recoveries and lower liquidations in Q4 FY2025, albeit with a longer resolution time: ICRA". ICRA Press Release. 2025.

[2] https://www.icra.in/CommonService/OpenMediaS3?Key=b43cf477-aadb-46bf-9ce5-230a5669f610

[3] Mohan and GopalaKrishnan. "Report of Study on Effectiveness of the Resolution Process: Firm Outcomes in the Post-IBC Period". August, 2023.

[4] https://ibbi.gov.in/uploads/whatsnew/59f737b213b4700cc16428aefd62869a.pdf

[5] Care Edge Ratings. "CIRP Initiations Reduce; Recovery Steady at around 32%". BFSI Research. June 19, 2025.

[6] https://www.careratings.com/uploads/newsfiles/1750327253_Insolvency%20and%20Bankruptcy%20Code%20Update%20March%202025.pdf

[7] Rajput Jain & Associates. "MCA: NCLT Membership, IBC Case Pendency & Recovery Trend". https://carajput.com/blog/nclt-membership-ibc-case-pendency-recovery-trend/

[8] Varghese. "Landmark IBC Judgments of 2025". ATB Legal. September 10, 2025.

[9] https://atblegal.com/blog/nclt-india/ibc-judgments-2025/

[10] Apoorva. "Supreme Court overturns NCLAT judgment that closed insolvency process against Byzu's following settlement with BCI". SCC Online. October 23, 2024.

[11] https://www.scconline.com/blog/post/2024/10/23/supreme-court-sets-aside-nclat-judgment-that-closed-insolvency-process-against-byju/

[12] Verma, Maurya and Maurya. "The Economic Impact of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) 2016 on Corporate Reconstruction in India". SSRN. Vol. No. 4, Issue 1. 21 Feb, 2025. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14717544.

[13] https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5107333

[14] "NCLT Performance: Impact of IBC on Economy". National Company Law Tribunal, 2025.

[15] https://nclt.gov.in/sites/default/files/2025-09/NCLT%20Performance_0.pdf

[16] Dubey and Pandey. "Performance of the NCLT's under the IBC Regime: An Overview".

[17] SCC Online. March 19, 2024.

[18] https://www.scconline.com/blog/post/2024/03/19/performance-of-the-nclts-under-the-ibc-regime-an-overview/

[19] Taxmann. "Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code Amendment Bill 2025 – Key Reforms and Highlights". 1 September, 2025.

[20] https://www.taxmann.com/post/blog/insolvency-and-bankruptcy-code-amendment-bill-2025

[21] Shrivastava and Bhargava. "IBC at Nine: Growing Pains, NCLT Bottlenecks, and the 2025 Prescriptions of Reforms". The Competition and Commercial Law Review. Oct 6, 2025.

[22] https://www.tcclr.com/post/ibc-at-nine-growing-pains-nclt-bottlenecks-and-the-2025-prescription-of-reforms

[23] Mittal. "The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Bill, 2025: A Comprehensive Analysis of India's Evolving Insolvency Regime". IBC Laws. August 22, 2025.

[24] https://ibclaw.in/the-insolvency-and-bankruptcy-code-amendment-bill-2025-a-comprehensive-analysis-of-indias-evolving-insolvency-regime-by-ca-ip-reshma-mittal-managing-partner-of-rr-insolvency-profe/

[25] Legal World. "Parliamentary Panel moots advance ruling mechanism in IBC framework to tackle litigations". Dec 2, 2025.

[26] https://legal.economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/law-policy/parliamentary-panel-proposes-advance-ruling-mechanism-to-enhance-indias-insolvency-framework/125717484

[27] Subramanian, Prabhu and Sharma. "Judicial Interplay with Legislation: Analysing the Insolvency and Bankruptcy (Amendment) Bill, 2025 [Part1]. Cyril Amarchand Mangaldas. October 27, 2025.

[28] https://disputeresolution.cyrilamarchandblogs.com/2025/10/judicial-interplay-with-legislation-analysing-the-insolvency-and-bankruptcy-amendment-bill-2025-part-i/

[29] Patil. "Is NCLAT Empowered to Allow Delay Beyond the Time Limit Prescribed by IBC?". Legal Bites. 9 May, 2025.

[30] https://www.legalbites.in/law-of-limitation/is-nclat-empowered-to-allow-delay-beyond-the-time-limit-prescribed-by-ibc-1140010

[31] Rajasekharan and Harshavardhan. "10 Important Insolvency Law Judgments of 2023". SCC Online. January 2, 2024.

[32] https://www.scconline.com/blog/post/2024/01/02/10-important-insolvency-law-judgments-of-2023/

[33] Economic Laws Practice. "IBC Half-Yearly (Jan-June 2025): Judicial Trends & Key Developments". https://elplaw.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/IBC-Half-Yearly-Digest-Jan%E2%80%93June-2025-Judicial-Trends-Key-Developments.pdf

[34] Deepika and Kannappa. "A Study on National Company Law Tribunal". International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics. Vol. No 119, Issue 17. 2018. Pages: 723-734.

[35] https://acadpubl.eu/hub/2018-119-17/1/66.pdf

[36] Bansal. "Done, Dented, Damaged: The IBC Edifice, even before it's 10". Vinod Kothari Consultants. August 11, 2025.

[37] https://vinodkothari.com/2025/08/done-dented-damaged-the-ibc-edifice-even-before-its-10/

[38] Legal World. "IBC helps resolve over Rs. 26 lakh crore debt in India in 9 years: Report". Jul 24, 2025.

[39] https://legal.economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/law-policy/insolvency-and-bankruptcy-code-ibc-resolves-over-rs-26-lakh-crore-debt-in-india/122870503

[40] Bedekar and Bhatt. "Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016: Framework, Impact, and Reforms". NIBM Working Papers Series. August, 2025.

[41] https://www.nibmindia.org/static/working_paper/NIBM_WP53_PSBJB.pdf

[42] Thakkar and Agarwal. "Efficacy of Adjudication Process of Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP): Law and Economics Analysis of National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT)". SSRN. Asian Journal of Law and Economics. Vol. No. 14 Issue 2. 25 May, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1515/ajle-2023-0015. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4798702

[43] Datta, Jain and et al. "Judicial Overload and Insolvency Resolution: Evaluating the Case for a Separate Insolvency Tribunal Beyond the NCLT Framework". IJLRA. Volume 2 Issue 8. Aug 2025. Page: 3264 – 3278.

[44] https://www.ijlra.com/uploads/1315604336.pdf

[45] Mahapatra and Verma. "Causes of Inordinate Delays in the IBC and the Elixir to Cure Them – Part I". IRCCL. Apr 10, 2022.

[46] https://www.ijlra.com/uploads/1315604336.pdf

[47] The Legal World. "Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code Judgments: Recent Landmark Judgments". https://thelegalschool.in/blog/insolvency-and-bankruptcy-code-judgements