IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Unveiling The Waterfall Mechanism: A Comprehensive Analysis Of Claim Prioritization In India's Insolvency And Bankruptcy Code

Author: Dr. Shwetta Bajaj, Professor (Adjunct)Law, Gurugram University, Gurugram

Abstract:

The enactment of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) in 2016 revolutionized the resolution of insolvency and bankruptcy cases in India, introducing a structured approach to the process. A pivotal aspect of the IBC is the Waterfall Mechanism, delineating the hierarchical distribution of proceeds from the sale of a corporate debtor's assets. This paper delves into Section 53 of the IBC, elucidating the prioritization of claims ranging from insolvency resolution costs to equity shareholders. Emphasizing the equitable treatment of stakeholders, the mechanism ensures that secured creditors are given precedence while also addressing the claims of unsecured creditors and other interested parties. Recent amendments, notably the inclusion of homebuyers as financial creditors, underscore the dynamic nature of the IBC in response to stakeholder dynamics. As the IBC evolves, ongoing reforms and judicial interpretations will refine its efficacy in managing corporate insolvency and bankruptcy cases in India.

1.Waterfall Mechanism:

The implementation of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) in 2016 marked a pivotal moment in India's legal landscape, offering a structured framework for the resolution of insolvency and bankruptcy cases. While providing creditors with much-needed relief in recovering dues from corporate debtors, the IBC also emphasizes the importance of a time-bound resolution process aimed at revitalizing distressed companies. Central to this process is the Waterfall Mechanism, a cornerstone of the IBC, which governs the systematic distribution of proceeds following a successful resolution bid.

Section 53 of the IBC serves as the blueprint for the Waterfall Mechanism, meticulously detailing the order and priority of distribution of proceeds among a corporate entity's stakeholders. This section ensures clarity and consistency in the distribution process, even in the presence of conflicting statutes, through the inclusion of a non-obstante clause that unequivocally affirms the mechanism's overriding effect.

The prioritization of claims under Section 53 follows a structured hierarchy that reflects a careful balance of stakeholder interests. The mechanism begins by ensuring the full satisfaction of insolvency resolution process costs and liquidation costs, providing a foundation for the subsequent distribution of proceeds. Subsequently, debts are equitably distributed among various stakeholders, including workmen, secured creditors, non-workmen employees, and unsecured creditors. Notably, government dues and debts owed to secured creditors post-security interest enforcement are accorded equal priority, emphasizing the impartiality of the distribution process.

Finally, any remaining debts and dues are distributed among preference shareholders and, ultimately, equity shareholders or partners, reflecting a holistic approach that considers the interests of all stakeholders involved.

The prioritization of claims under Section 53 is detailed hereunder:

1. Insolvency resolution process costs and liquidation costs are paid in full.
2. Debts are distributed equally among:
   - Workmen's dues for the preceding 24 months.
   - Debts owed to secured creditors after relinquishing security.
   - Wages and unpaid dues to non-workmen employees for the preceding 12 months.
   - Financial debts to unsecured creditors.
3. Government dues and debts owed to secured creditors for any unpaid amounts post-security interest enforcement are ranked equally.
4. Any remaining debts and dues, followed by preference shareholders, and finally, equity shareholders or partners, receive distribution.

The equitable distribution of proceeds ensures fair treatment across stakeholders, safeguarding the interests of secured creditors while providing for other claimants' rights. This structured hierarchy ensures the equitable distribution of proceeds, safeguarding the interests of secured creditors while also providing for the rights of other claimants. In essence, the Waterfall Mechanism serves as a cornerstone of the IBC, facilitating a fair and transparent resolution process that promotes confidence and stability in India's insolvency and bankruptcy framework.

2.Homebuyers Under CIRP:

In the context of the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) within India's Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), homebuyers who have invested in real estate projects play a significant role. Under the Waterfall Mechanism, homebuyers are positioned within the hierarchy of creditors. While they rank below secured creditors and workmen's dues in terms of priority, they hold a higher standing compared to unsecured financial creditors and government dues.

A pivotal development occurred in 2018 with the introduction of amendments that bestowed financial creditor status upon homebuyers. This elevation in status granted them enhanced rights within the resolution process. Homebuyers gained participation rights, allowing them to have a say in the resolution proceedings concerning the real estate company. Additionally, they were endowed with the authority to initiate insolvency proceedings against real estate companies, providing them with a proactive role in safeguarding their interests.

To further fortify buyer protection and ensure the proper utilization of funds contributed by homebuyers, the concept of a "real estate allottees' account" was established. This dedicated account serves as a mechanism to segregate and allocate funds specifically for the completion of the project in question. By ensuring that the funds from homebuyers are exclusively directed towards project completion, this measure enhances transparency, accountability, and buyer protection within the insolvency resolution process.

Overall, the conferment of financial creditor status to the homebuyers, along with the establishment of the real estate allottees' account, reflect significant strides in recognizing and addressing the interests of homebuyers within the CIRP framework. These measures aim to provide homebuyers with greater participation, protection, and recourse in the resolution of insolvency cases involving real estate projects.

3. Disparities in Treatment of Operational Creditors and Financial Creditors Under the IBC

The Supreme Court of India's decision in Essar Steel (India) Ltd. Committee of Creditors v. Satish Kumar Gupta declared that operational creditors (OCs) do not need to be treated equally with financial creditors (FCs). This decision complicates the standing of OCs, as they typically do not have a strict financial relationship with the corporate debtor. In contrast, an earlier ruling in Rajputana Properties Pvt. Ltd. v. Ultratech Cement Ltd. & Ors held that OCs' dues should be treated on par with those of FCs. The Essar Steel judgment, however, has significantly changed this perspective. According to the waterfall mechanism in Section 53 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), 2016, the distribution of payments among creditors gives priority to FCs over OCs. This prioritization creates an unfair advantage for FCs, leaving OCs in a disadvantaged position.

While some level of preferential treatment for FCs is necessary to ensure economic stability, the inequitable treatment of OCs raises concerns and contradicts the primary objectives of the IBC. The IBC, 2016, aims to maximize asset value, promote entrepreneurship, ensure credit availability, and balance stakeholder interests. However, the unequal treatment of OCs conflicts with these goals. The preference for secured financial creditors in the composition of the Committee of Creditors (CoC) undermines the law's intent to be fair and equitable and violates principles of natural justice. To ensure a fair and equal opportunity for OCs to assert their claims, they should be given proportionate representation in the CoC. Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs), which make up the majority of OCs, are particularly disadvantaged by this lack of fair representation. Therefore, it is essential to provide OCs with representation in the CoC to bolster the MSME sector, a crucial component of the Indian economy.

4.Proposed Changes and Landmark Judgment:

Proposed changes in the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) aim to further streamline the resolution process and enhance stakeholder protection. One significant proposal involves approving multiple resolution plans for a single corporate debtor, allowing for more flexible and tailored approaches to resolving insolvency cases. This would enable the Committee of Creditors (CoC) to consider individual or collective assets of the debtor for resolution, ensuring optimal outcomes for creditors and maximizing asset value.

Additionally, there is a proposal to separate resolution plans from the distribution of proceeds received from successful resolution applicants. This segregation aims to provide greater clarity and transparency in the resolution process, ensuring that the distribution of proceeds aligns with the approved resolution plan. By presenting resolution plans and proceeds distribution schemes separately to the adjudicating authority (AA) for approval, the proposed amendment seeks to enhance procedural efficiency and legal certainty.

Furthermore, the proposed introduction of a separate waterfall mechanism for distributing proceeds received pursuant to a resolution plan represents a significant development. This mechanism would prioritize creditors' claims up to the corporate debtor's liquidation value in accordance with Section 53 of the IBC. Any surplus beyond the liquidation value would then be distributed proportionally among creditors based on their unsatisfied claims. Finally, remaining amounts or further surpluses would be allocated to equity shareholders or partners of the corporate debtor, as applicable. This proposed framework aims to ensure equitable distribution of proceeds and optimize creditor recovery in insolvency cases.

The landmark judgment in Paschimanchal Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd v. Raman Ispat Private Limited and Others provides crucial insights into the interpretation and application of the Waterfall Mechanism under Section 53 of the IBC. The Supreme Court ruled that while the Electricity Act includes provisions for the recovery of dues, it does not establish a priority over claims under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC). Therefore, the IBC's rules for asset distribution during liquidation, including the priority of claims, take precedence over the Electricity Act's provisions.

The Court highlighted the necessity of interpreting the IBC in harmony with other laws to ensure effective insolvency resolutions. It suggested that legislative amendments to clarify these interactions would be beneficial.

The judgment reinforces the IBC's supremacy in insolvency matters and validates the structured approach to resolving financial distress in corporate entities. It ensures equitable treatment of all creditors according to the statutory distribution scheme, balancing sector-specific statutory rights with the IBC's objectives.

The Supreme Court's elaboration on the structured mathematical formula of the mechanism underscores its importance in establishing a hierarchical priority for debt payments. By emphasizing the potential destabilizing effects of altering any part of the mechanism, the judgment reinforces the need for consistency and adherence to the statutory framework in insolvency proceedings.

Furthermore, the judgment highlights the comparative benefits of the Waterfall Mechanism over alternative hierarchies, such as those outlined in the Companies Act, 2013. This analysis aligns with established precedents and reaffirms the IBC's objectives of promoting efficient resolution processes and protecting creditor interests. The decision is expected to bring much-needed clarity to the jurisprudence and operational framework of the IBC, potentially influencing cases beyond this particular instance

Overall, the proposed changes and landmark judgment signal continued efforts to strengthen the IBC's effectiveness and provide clarity in insolvency resolution. These developments are crucial for enhancing confidence in the insolvency framework and facilitating smoother resolution outcomes for all stakeholders involved.

5. Conclusion

India's Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code introduces a significant improvement in the country's insolvency and bankruptcy resolution framework. Through the Waterfall Mechanism, it establishes a transparent hierarchy for claim distribution, ensuring fairness and systematic resolution while considering the interests of all stakeholders. The prioritization of secured creditors, alongside addressing claims of workmen, unsecured creditors, and operational creditors, showcases a holistic approach to debt recovery. Recent amendments, such as recognizing homebuyers as financial creditors, underscore the IBC's adaptability to stakeholder needs. As the IBC evolves, ongoing reforms and judicial interpretations will refine its effectiveness in managing corporate insolvency and bankruptcy cases in India.

The ruling in Paschimanchal Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd v. Raman Ispat Private Limited and Others reinforces the IBC's primacy in resolving insolvency and bankruptcy cases. By clarifying the Waterfall Mechanism's application, the judgement establishes a more structured and predictable framework for debt repayment priorities. This decision not only aligns with established precedents but also enhances the overall efficacy of the IBC, ensuring a fair resolution process for all stakeholders. Its anticipated impact extends beyond the immediate case, offering clarity and stability to India's insolvency landscape.

References:

1 https://blog.ipleaders.in/all-you-need-to-know-about-non-obstante-clause/o
2. https://www.cornerofficejournal.com/news/bankruptcy/all-about-waterfall-mechanism-under-indias-bankruptcy-law
3. Essar Steel (India) Ltd. Committee of Creditors v. Satish Kumar Gupta & Ors [Civil Appeal No 8766-67 of 2019]
4. Rajputana Properties Pvt. Ltd. v. Ultratech Cement Ltd. & Ors [Civil Appeal No. 10998 of 2018].
5. Paschimanchal Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd. vs. Raman Ispat Private Limited & Ors [Civil Appeal Nos. 7976 of 2019]
6 Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016