



Harmonizing The Cross-Border Insolvency: Legal Frameworks, Challenges And Future Direction In The Globalized Economy

¹ Anushu Priya Yadav, ² Dr. Monica Kharola,

¹ LLM Student, ² Faculty of Law,

¹ Law school,

¹ ICAFI University, Dehradun, India

Abstract: In the Globalized Economy the cross-border insolvency has become a common issue, where the businesses operate in the multiple countries and financial activities are interconnected with each other. When any company with assets or creditors in different countries becomes insolvent or legal complications arise due to the differences in the national laws and procedures. Then this makes the resolution process become slow, complex and often unfair to the stakeholders. In the cross-border insolvency the UNCITRAL Model Law was introduced to address these challenges by providing a uniform legal framework for the cooperation between the countries. It provides a coordination among courts, ensure the fair treatment of the creditors and improve the efficiency in the insolvency proceedings. The UNCITRAL Model Law focuses on the key concepts such as access to the foreign courts, recognition of the foreign proceedings and the cooperation between the Judicial authorities. This paper examines the role of the UNCITRAL Model Law in managing the cross-border insolvency in the Globalized world. It analyzed how the UNCITRAL Model Law helped in reducing the conflicts between the jurisdictions and facilitating the smoother resolution of the international insolvency cases. This Paper also highlights the Legal Framework of different countries, challenges and the future direction in globalized economy and certain limitations for example differences in implementations by countries and concerns related to the national sovereignty. It plays a significant role in the improving the international insolvency systems.

Keywords: cross-border insolvency. UNCITRAL model law, globalization, creditors rights, international legal framework

I. INTRODUCTION

In Insolvency the cross-border which affects the several important aspects such as state sovereignty, the conflict of laws, the domestic economic interest's rights of the creditors and debtors and Jurisdictional Issues. It also involves the Political, Cultural and International obligations which include the treaty commitments and global conventions. The legal framework of cross-border insolvency differs from country to country as each countries frames its laws based on their economic priorities and investment needs. The main objective of insolvency law is to manage the financial distress efficiently and it ensure fair outcomes for all the stakeholders. It also promotes the financial discipline and operational efficiency in the economy. In which the stakeholders include the creditors, debtors, banks, financial institutions, employees, investors and governments. The main difference between the domestic and cross- border insolvency.

Domestic insolvency is the territorial with clear Jurisdiction and some complications. However, the cross-border insolvency involves the multiple Jurisdictions which creating the uncertainty about the applicable laws whenever the multinational company has assets and creditors in different countries which making the resolution more complex. In today's time the growth of technology, international trade and the corporate sector has increased the number of the multinational companies and has created the close economic connections between countries. Almost every country is involved in the trade beyond its own borders. when the businesses operate in many countries and their creditors and debtors are also spread across the different jurisdictions and this makes the insolvency process more difficult because different countries have the different laws and the legal procedures. therefore, the domestic insolvency laws match or cooperate with the foreign insolvency laws which are very different from the domestic laws.

In India that deals with the insolvency and bankruptcy matters is the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016.[1] However, this code has improved the domestic insolvency system and it does not provide a complete legal framework to deal with the cross-border insolvency cases. Then the ministry of corporate affairs set up the committee on cross-border insolvency to review the code. Then the committee recommended that India should reconsider its existing insolvency legal framework and adopt the UNCITRAL Model Law on the cross-Border insolvency, 1997.[2] So that the cross-border insolvency issues can be handled more effectively.

II. UNCITRAL MODEL LAWS ON CROSS- BORDER INSOLVENCY, 1997

UNCITRAL Model Law on cross-border insolvency which was introduced in 1997, [3] which provides a common legal framework to help countries which deal with insolvency cases which are involving more than one country. Its main objective is to ensure a fair, efficient and practical system for handling the cross-border insolvency matters. Around 59 countries and including the major economies like the Canada, Australia, United States, Japan, Singapore and South Africa [4] have adopted this Model Law.

The United Nations commission on the International Trade Law actively promotes its adoption worldwide. However, working with the international organizations such as the world bank, international bar association and international association of restructuring the insolvency and bankruptcy professionals. The world Bank which also recognizes the importance of the Model law in its principles on the insolvency systems which encourages the countries to align their laws with the UNCITRAL Model which guide on the insolvency law and it supports the nations in developing or improving their domestic insolvency laws.

The UNCITRAL Model Law which applies all the types of the debtors and has a wide scope. Therefore, it allows countries to exclude the certain entities, such as banks and insurance companies which are governed by the special insolvency laws in their own jurisdictions. The UNCITRAL Law does not require the reciprocity meaning a country can apply it even if the other country has not adopted the same law. However, Some Countries which including the British Virgin Islands, Mexico and South Africa have chosen to adopt the UNCITRAL Model Law either fully or in practice. [5]

The Model Law which contains Several important features and which allows the foreign creditors and representatives to approach the courts of the country that has adopted the law during the insolvency proceedings. Another important feature is recognition which means that the foreign insolvency proceedings can be recognized as either main or non-main proceedings through a simple application process and under article 15-17 of the UNCITRAL Model Laws on cross-Border Insolvency. Under this Model Law also provides for the relief which include the temporary measures to protect the creditors interests and automatic relief once a foreign main proceeding is recognized under the articles 19-20. In the last the cooperation and coordination which allows the courts to directly communicate and work together with the foreign courts in the cases where the insolvency proceedings are taking the place in more than one country as provided under articles 25-30 of the Model Law.

In Cross-border Insolvency the UNCITRAL Model Law is an important and practical way to deal with the cross-border insolvency cases. Therefore, in some issues still need the clearer rules for deciding the Centre of Main Interest (COMI) of a company which ensure the proper legal procedures which recognizing the decisions made by the foreign courts and deciding which country law should apply. So, Despite these challenges the Model Law remains a very useful laws for handling the complexities of the cross-border insolvency.

In the 2018 the insolvency law committee [6] proposed the UNCITRAL Model Law on the cross-border insolvency into the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 through the Draft Part Z which deal with the cross-border insolvency. It allows the foreign creditors to participate but it depends on the reciprocal

agreements in which India has not yet made. The Draft improves access to the foreign assets and explains the Jurisdiction rules and lacks clarity on the concurrent proceedings and practical use. [7]

III. COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE GLOBAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK INDIA, USA AND SINGAPORE

3.1 LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF USA

In the chapter 15 of the United States Bankruptcy Code, [8] which talks about the important rules for which is dealing with the cross-border insolvency cases. The chapter 15 was introduced by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act, 2005 and it replaced the earlier section 304 of the Bankruptcy Code. [9] The change was made to align the US legal system with the UNCITRAL Model Law. The United States aims to work in the coordination with other countries that have also adopted the UNCITRAL Model Law, This Model Law helping to create a more uniform and constant legal system for handling the cross-border insolvency cases.

The Objective of this chapter is to show the clear and practical approach United States Bankruptcy. It encourages the cooperation between the United States courts and foreign courts and all those parties who involved in the cross-border insolvency cases. It creates the legal certainty which ensure the fairness and efficiency which protect the interests of all the stakeholders which increase the value of the debtors' assets and help in recover the financial troubled in the businesses.

In the year 2005 the United States adopted the UNCITRAL Model Law which was important step taken by the US legal system. However, The Chapter 15 of the US Bankruptcy Code [10] which acts as a legal framework that encourages between the cooperation between US and Foreign Courts. It helps in maximize the value of the Debtors' assets and it also support the effective resolution of insolvency cases.

In the year 2008 the Lehman Brothers' Collapse due to financial crisis. At Global Level it was the major events that caused in this situation with the help of Chapter 15 recognized in the US Bankruptcy Courts. The Chapter 15, made it easier to coordinate with the Company's Assets across the different countries which helped in the handling the insolvency cases more efficiently. The decision which is discussed in the Indian Journal of law and legal research, which is that this approach had a big impact on the managing the Lehman Brothers insolvency at global level. It ensured that the assets were handled properly and distributed fairly among all the creditors in the different Countries. Therefore, this chapter has important role in dealing with the complex problems that arose after the collapse and showed the importance of the cooperation and fairness in such Global Cases. Therefore, there is an important exception which is mentioned in the Chapter 15 which allows the United States in wider range of the Foreign Insolvency Cases to be recognized which including the temporary interim and even some non-judicial proceedings as long as they are approved by a Court. It helps the foreign administrators even from countries without the strong cross-border insolvency systems and it seek recognition in the United States. The United States follows the public policy of fairness and it does not support any discriminatory treatment against with its creditors unless the other countries also provide the same recognition.

3.2 LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF INDIA

In India, the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 there are provisions related to cross-border insolvency mentioned but these are not fully implemented by the Central Government. In sections 234 and 235, it gives the power to the government to enter into bilateral agreements with other countries to deal with the cross-border insolvency matters. However, India has not yet created such reciprocal arrangements. Therefore, because of this gap, there are number of cases where court entered and the cases are Amtek Auto Ltd. v. Dinkar T. Venkatasubramanian, [11] Jet Airways Insolvency case [12] and SEBI v. Videocon Industries Ltd. [13] in these cases, it was shown that the sections 234 [14] and 235 [15] alone are not enough to deal with complex situations which involved the companies operating in different countries such as manufacturing the firms or oil companies with the global operations.

In India, the first major case was the Jet Airways case [16] which highlighted the cross-border insolvency issues and it showed the need for more developed legal framework in India. The Indian judiciary has helped in making the law by pointing out the weaknesses in the current system. However, Indian introduced the Insolvency Bankruptcy Code in 2016 [17] and it growing the nature of the international business which requires stronger and clear rules. By adopting the UNCITRAL Model Law on the cross-border insolvency and this benefited both, the Indian companies working in abroad and foreign companies working in India.

In the case of the Videocon Industries insolvency case [18] the national company law tribunal given the recognition of substantial consolidation. This decision allowed the group insolvency proceedings to take

place and it showing that the judiciary can adapt even when there are no specific laws on the issue. It highlights the difficulties and uncertainties in applying the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 outside the India. There are many countries that have not adopted the UNCITRAL Model Law on the cross-border insolvency due to the lack of proper laws or depend on the treaties to handle the such matters. Courts have supported the idea of including the model law principles in domestic laws to better the deal with the cross-border insolvency issues. Since the Insolvency Bankruptcy Code constantly evolving.

3.3 LEGAL FRAME WORK OF SINGAPORE

In Singapore there are changes in handling the cross-border insolvency. However, it followed the territorial approach which focuses on the local matters only but now it also follows some aspects of global coordination. Under the current law, the foreign company that is not registered in Singapore can still be wound up in Singapore in certain situations. Which include when the company has stopped doing the business has no physical presence in Singapore which can dissolved or cannot pay its debts and this rule can apply even if the company has already been dissolved in its home country. Which means the proceedings can happen in more than one country at the same time. If the foreign company starts winding up proceedings in its own country it must approach the Singapore courts to appoint a liquidator to manage its matter in Singapore. The liquidator must inform the creditors by publishing the notices in newspapers in the countries where the company operated. It allows the creditors to file their claims within the fixed time before the company's assets are distributed.

However, the insolvency laws in Singapore are mainly territorial, the courts are willing to cooperate with the foreign liquidators within the legal framework. In the case *China Union Lines Ltd. v. American Marine Underwriters Inc.* [19] And *Tohru Motobayashi v. Official Receiver* [20] and the courts are recognized the authority of the foreign liquidators even when there were no local insolvency proceedings.

In the recent cases such as *Beluga Chartering Case* [21] the court interpreted the section 377(3)(c) as a mandatory duty not just for a choice and it showing the strong support for the cooperation. And in the *RBG Resources Plc. v. Credit Lyonnais* [22] it shows that the Singapore courts follow a cooperative approach. In the *RBG Resources Plc. v. Banque Cantonale Vaudoise*, [23] the court clarified that the term local creditors include all the debts created in Singapore where there is no matter of the nationality of the creditor. This decision ensures that the both local and foreign creditors are treated equally without any discrimination.

Singapore mainly followed the territorial approach to protect the interests of the financial creditors in cross-border cases in past. Therefore, as a Singapore developed into a major global financial Centre which needed the more practical system. So, it gradually moved towards a modified universalist approach. However, this change became clear when the Singapore adopted the UNCITRAL Model Law on the cross-border insolvency in 2017 and the law was officially passed in 2018[24]. This was important step that showed the Singapore ability to adjust the changing nature of the international insolvency. However, the Singapore shift from territoriality to universalism which shows the strong commitment to handle the cross-border insolvency effectively. So, this approach helps in protecting the both local and foreign creditors and shows the Singapore effort to align its legal system with global standards.

IV. CHALLENGES IN INSLOVENCY CROSS- BORDER

The major challenge in cross-border insolvency are jurisdictional conflicts and it becomes difficult to decide which court or country has the authority to handle the case when the assets and creditors are spread across the different places and it can lead to delays and confusion in the legal process ad that can be harder to resolve the case efficiently to solve this issue which strong the international cooperation and clear legal rules are needed. [25]

To ensuring that foreign insolvency proceedings are recognized and it is very important in cross-border cases. Although the international laws like the UNCITRAL Model Law on the cross-border insolvency exist it differences in the national laws and level of the cooperation between the countries which can make recognition difficult. For the cross-border insolvency it is necessary to consistent recognition and it requires the countries to agree on the common standards to adopt the similar legal rules and it improve the cooperation between the different jurisdictions. [26]

Coordinating the different legal systems is major challenge in cross-border insolvency. There is difference in legal rules, traditions and cultures make it difficult to follow a common process and resolve the case smoothly. However, to improve this legal system the better international cooperation is needed along with the standard procedure and proper sharing of the information. So, these steps which can make

the process faster and more efficient which help to build a strong and effective global insolvency system. [27]

V. FUTURE DIRECTION

In this section it looks at ways to improve the cross-border insolvency systems by identifying the parts of the legal framework and practices that need to change. By examining the gaps in proceedings which are inconsistencies in laws and there are new challenges which helps the stakeholders to understand where the reforms are required. This analysis supports the development of the international legal frameworks to deal more effectively with the cross-border insolvency cases.[28]

There are new and emerging trends in the cross-border insolvency which focuses on the changes in the technology, business model and global developments which highlighting the need of understanding these trends in order to predict the future challenges. However, it encourages the proactive approach to handle the complexities and supports the continuous development of the cross-border insolvency practices. [29]

VI. CONCLUSION

In Conclusion the main findings on the cross-border insolvency which include its history, legal frameworks of different countries, challenges, case studies, recent development and the future scope. It gives the clear and complete understanding of the topic by highlighting the important points. However, analyzing these findings it explains about their practical use for lawyers and policymakers which helps in improving the laws and procedures to deal with the cross-border insolvency more effectively. It also encourages the further research and legal reforms to keep up with the changes in the global business and legal environment. Among the different stakeholders there are calls for cooperation such as academics, legal experts, policymakers and international organizations to strengthen the cross-border insolvency systems. It aims to ensure the continuous improvement better handling of the challenges and greater adaptability in the international practices.

VII. SUGGESTION

Harmonizing the cross-border insolvency in globalized economy. It is essential for the countries to adopt a uniform and cooperative legal framework. In the India domestic legal system adopting the UNCITRAL Model Law on cross-border insolvency it will be help to improve the coordination between the courts and insolvency professionals across the different jurisdictions. It also needs to strengthen institutional capacity by training the judges, insolvency practitioners and regulators in handling the international insolvency cases to establishing the clear guidelines for the cooperation between the domestic and foreign courts which can reduce the delays and improve efficiency in resolving the cross-border disputes. In the insolvency process the balancing interests of creditors and debtors while ensuring the fairness and predictability should focus on the future reforms. Cross-border insolvency framework will promote the investor confidence and support economic growth in an interconnected world.

REFERNCES

- [1] Government of India. (2016). THE INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY CODE, 2016. In *PART I*. https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/15479/1/the_insolvency_and_bankruptcy_code%2C_2016.pdf
- [2] Report of Insolvency Law Committee on Cross Border Insolvency, October, 2018.
- [3] UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency (1997). (n.d.). United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. https://uncitral.un.org/en/texts/insolvency/modellaw/cross-border_insolvency.
- [4] Status: UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency (1997). (n.d.). United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. https://uncitral.un.org/en/texts/insolvency/modellaw/cross-border_insolvency/status.
- [5] Westbrook, J.L., "Chapter 15 at Last"(2005) 79 American Bankruptcy Law Journal 713.
- [6] Report of Insolvency Law Committee on Cross Border Insolvency, October, 2018.
- [7] Andhra University, Visakhapatnam. (n.d.). INDIAN INSOLVENCY LAW INCLUDING THE INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY CODE-2016. In *INDIAN INSOLVENCY LAW INCLUDING THE INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY CODE-2016* (pp. 163–165).
- [8] United States Bankruptcy Code, 2015, Title 11.

- [9] United States Bankruptcy Code, 2015, S. 304 deals about the cases which are ancillary to foreign proceedings.
- [10] United States Bankruptcy Code, 2015, Ch. 15.
- [11] (2021) 4 SCC 457.
- [12] 2019 SCC OnLine NCLT 23875.
- [13] 2018 SCC OnLine NCLT 13182.
- [14] The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 Part-V Miscellaneous.
- [15] Government of India. (2016). THE INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY CODE, 2016. In *PART I*.
https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/15479/1/the_insolvency_and_bankruptcy_code%2C_2016.pdf.
- [16] Nahak, O. (2025). The Jet Airways Case: Addressing India's Cross-Border Insolvency Inadequacies. In *ibclaw.in* (Vol. 130, pp. 130–130).
- [17] Government of India. (2016). THE INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY CODE, 2016. In *PART I*.
https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/15479/1/the_insolvency_and_bankruptcy_code%2C_2016.pdf.
- [18] OnLine NCLT 13182.
- [19] 454 F. Supp. 198 (S.D.N.Y. 1978).
- [20] [2000] SGHC 113.
- [21] [2014] SGCA 14.
- [22] [2005] SGHC 204.
- [23] [2004] SGHC 123.
- [24] Insolvency, Restructuring and Dissolution Act 2018 (Act no. 40 of 2018) (Singapore).
- [25] Gobile, S., Awoyemi, O., & Ogunwale, B. (2024). Cross-Border insolvencies in the digital Age: Challenges and opportunities for international bankruptcy law. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 5(4), 1393–1400.
<https://doi.org/10.54660/ijmrge.2024.5.4.1393-1400>.
- [26] UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency (1997). (n.d.-b). United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. https://uncitral.un.org/en/texts/insolvency/modellaw/cross-border_insolvency.
- [27] Beckering, K. J. (2008). United States Cross-Border Corporate Insolvency: the impact of Chapter 15 on comity and the new legal environment. In *Law And Business Review of the Americas* (Issue 2, p. 281). <https://scholar.smu.edu/lbra/vol14/iss2/4>.
- [28] Jaipuria, S. S., 1* & SSJ Associates. (2022). CROSS BORDER INSOLVENCY IN INDIA - A NEW REGIME IN THE MAKING. *Manupatra*.
- [29] INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES [ISSN 2581-5369] Volume 9 | Issue 1 2026. (n.d.). <https://ijlmh.com/wp-content/uploads/Emerging-Trends-and-Challenges-in-Cross-Border-Insolvency.pdf>.