The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Act, 2026

A clause-by-clause analysis of amendments to the Code and the CIRP, Liquidation and Personal Guarantor Regulations

Covers amendments only: unchanged provisions are not restated.

Compiled by:

NAAVICK LEGAL

What this deck covers

PART ONE

The amendments to the Code

Section 7(5): Admission becomes mandatory

Subject: **Time-bound, mandatory admission of a financial creditor's application**

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
The Tribunal 'may' admit a case once default was proven: but that one word left it room to say no. In Vidarbha (2022) the Court used that discretion to refuse admission even where the default was clear, for reasons such as the company looking solvent. Nothing spelt out what the Tribunal was allowed to weigh.	Now the Tribunal must decide within 14 days: admit if the default is made out, the papers are complete and the proposed professional has no disciplinary case pending; otherwise reject, but only after a seven-day chance to cure. Once those three things are satisfied, no other ground can defeat admission. A default recorded with an Information Utility is treated as sufficient proof. And if the 14 days pass without an order, the delay has to be explained in writing.

In essence: section 7(5) is rewritten, the old proviso to 7(4) drops away, and two Explanations are added (Clause 4).

Why: to restore the old certainty that a proven default means admission, protect the 14-day deadline, and cut down fights at the admission stage.

Case-law: it effectively overrules Vidarbha Industries v. Axis Bank (2022).

In practice, file with a clean IU record and expect admission, the debtor's room to resist at this stage has largely gone.

Section 12A: Withdrawal of CIRP

Subject: Withdrawal of an admitted CIRP (ss. 7/9/10)

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
A withdrawal was moved by the applicant, with 90% of the committee in favour. When it could be done was left to the case-law (Swiss Ribbons, Brilliant Alloys), which pulled in different directions on pre-committee and last-minute exits.	Now it is the resolution professional who applies, still with 90% committee support. But there is a firm window: not before the committee is formed, and not once resolution plans have first been invited. The Tribunal must decide within 30 days, or record why it hasn't.

In essence: section 12A is replaced in full (Clause 8).

Why: to end the conflicting case-law and stop value being destroyed by withdrawals at the eleventh hour.

Case-law: it takes the timing question away from Swiss Ribbons and Brilliant Alloys.

In practice: any settlement has to be brokered before plans are invited; after that, the exit door is effectively shut.

Section 14(3)(b): Guarantor cannot sue the company

Subject: Does the CIRP moratorium stop a surety/guarantor acting against the corporate debtor?

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
Guarantors sat outside the moratorium. So a guarantor who had paid, or been sued, could turn around and chase the company for repayment during its CIRP. That quietly drained the very assets the process was trying to save.	A new Explanation makes clear the moratorium also stops a guarantor from starting or continuing any action against the company under the guarantee. In other words, the guarantor cannot sue, or enforce a right of subrogation, against the company while the CIRP runs. Creditors, though, can still pursue the guarantor: that part is unchanged.

In essence: an Explanation is added to section 14(3)(b) (Clause 9).

Why: to protect the company's assets during CIRP and break the circular claim of creditor to guarantor to company.

Case-law: it sits alongside SBI v. V. Ramakrishnan rather than overruling it, and pairs with section 31, where subrogation is extinguished.

In practice: the RP should treat a guarantor's suit against the company as a moratorium breach; lenders' rights against the guarantor are untouched.

Section 30(2)(ba): Dissenting creditor floor fixed

Subject: Minimum payable to a financial creditor who does not vote for the plan

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
A plan had to pay a dissenting creditor at least what it would get in liquidation. But after Essar Steel, the Amit Metallics and DBS-Ruchi Soya line let the committee's view on distribution override even that floor, so it stopped being a reliable minimum.	Now the floor is fixed by statute: a dissenter gets the lower of two figures: its liquidation value, or what it would receive if the plan money were shared out in the liquidation order of priority. And under section 30(4), the committee must record its reasons for approving the plan.

In essence: part of 30(2)(b) is dropped, a new clause (ba) goes in, and 30(4) gains a few words (Clause 18).

Why: to give dissenters a predictable, priority-based minimum and close off the litigation.

Case-law: it settles the Amit Metallics / DBS Bank v. Ruchi Soya debate and refines Essar Steel.

In practice: the committee should model both figures before dissenting, and the RP must build the floor into the plan.

Section 31: Clean slate codified & retrospective

Subject: Binding plan; extinguishment of past claims; licence continuity

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
The clean-slate idea, that old claims die once a plan is approved, was judge-made, from Ghanashyam Mishra. Licences weren't protected, competition approval had to come before the committee's vote, the Tribunal had no deadline, and a defective plan simply fell.	The Act now writes it in. On approval, every pre-approval claim against the company and its assets is extinguished, and no proceeding, tax assessments included, can carry on. The company's licences, permits and concessions cannot be pulled while their term runs, so long as the obligations are met. Guarantors and co-obligors stay liable and lose their subrogation; and these effects reach back to the Code's start, save for what is already final. There's a 30-day clock, the committee can cure defects, and competition approval now comes just before the plan reaches the Tribunal.

In essence: new provisos and sub-sections (2A), (5) and (6), plus three Explanations (Clause 19).

Why: to give buyers real certainty, protect the business as a going concern, and speed approval.

Case-law: it codifies Ghanashyam Mishra and Essar Steel, and shuts down the Rainbow Papers-style revival of old dues.

In practice: a resolution applicant buys a genuinely clean company with its licences intact; legacy tax and other claims cannot resurface.

Section 33(1A)/(1B): One-time CIRP restoration

Subject: **A statutory second chance before liquidation**

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
If no plan came, a plan was rejected, or the committee chose to liquidate, the Tribunal simply had to order liquidation: there was no second chance. And liquidation carried no freeze on the company's assets, only a bar on suits.	Now, before it liquidates, the Tribunal must consider a committee application (66% or more) to revive the CIRP and give it up to 120 more days. That revival is available once, and once only. A moratorium now protects the company's assets in liquidation too (subject to the secured creditor's rights under section 52). The liquidation order itself must come within 30 days.

In essence: **new sub-sections (1A), (1B) and (2A), with the moratorium sub-clauses (Clause 20).**

Why: to avoid killing a company that might still be saved, and to hand the decision to the committee.

Prior position: section 33 was read as requiring liquidation once the CIRP had failed, with no second attempt available.

In practice, a 66% committee can buy one more attempt at resolution, 120 days, instead of accepting liquidation.

Sections 34 and 34A: a fresh, committee-controlled liquidator

Subject: Who liquidates: and who can replace them

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
As a rule, the resolution professional simply carried on as liquidator. The committee had no say in the matter, and any change was left to the Tribunal.	The liquidator must now be a different professional, recommended by the Board: the company's own RP can't take the role. And a new section 34A lets the committee (66% or more) replace the liquidator at any time with a consenting professional. The outgoing RP hands over all of the CIRP records.

In essence: section 34(1) and (3)–(6) are recast and a new section 34A is added (Clauses 21–22).

Why: fresh eyes, real independence, and creditor control over who runs the liquidation.

Prior position: the resolution professional slid automatically into the liquidator's role, and the committee had no say.

In practice: line up a fresh, independent liquidator early; the committee keeps control and can change them if progress stalls.

Sections 21(11) & 35(2): CoC supervises liquidation

Subject: **The CoC (not the SCC) runs liquidation oversight**

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
Once liquidation began, the committee dissolved. In its place sat a Stakeholders' Consultation Committee that the liquidator only had to consult: and whose advice wasn't binding. The liquidator also re-invited and re-checked claims all over again.	Now the committee carries on and supervises the liquidator, much as it did in the CIRP. Other classes of creditor may sit in on meetings, but they don't vote. And rather than start again, the liquidator simply keeps the verified claim list up to date.

In essence: **section 21(11) is inserted and section 35(1)(a) and (2) are recast (Clauses 13, 23).**

Why: to put creditors in charge of liquidation and take out the duplication.

Prior position: a stakeholders' consultation committee advised the liquidator, and its advice did not bind him.

In practice, liquidation now runs like the CIRP, minuted committee meetings and a rolling claim list, not a fresh process.

Section 52: Secured-creditor realisation disciplined

Subject: **Election, coordination and cost-sharing**

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
The timeline to tell the liquidator was loose, and often litigated. There was no rule for an asset charged to several lenders, and no clarity on who bore the costs or the workmen's dues.	A secured creditor now has 14 days to elect and point to its asset: miss that, and the security is treated as given up to the estate. Where an asset is charged to more than one lender, realising it needs 66% by value of them. And the process and liquidation costs, plus workmen's dues, come out of the proceeds and go to the liquidator.

In essence: **section 52(2) and (8) are recast and an Explanation is added (Clause 31).**

Why: to stop hold-outs and piecemeal enforcement, and to protect costs and workmen.

Prior position: realise-or-relinquish rested on the regulations, with no fixed election period and no rule for shared security.

In practice: secured creditors must decide within 14 days and coordinate on shared collateral, contributing their share of costs and workmen's dues.

Section 53 + 3(31): Waterfall reset (Rainbow Papers)

Subject: **Secured status, Government dues, and inter-se priority**

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
Because the section spoke of the 'amount owed to a secured creditor', a part-secured lender could claim full secured standing for its whole debt. Rainbow Papers (2022) then let government dues with a statutory charge rank as a secured creditor. And subordination deals between creditors were of uncertain effect.	A creditor is now secured only up to the value of the security it gives up; the rest ranks as unsecured. Section 3(31) says a 'security interest' does not include a charge created merely by operation of law: so statutory charges don't count. Government dues drop to clause (e)/(f), with a matching change in section 178 for bankruptcy. Two illustrations settle the point: a deal putting secured creditors ahead of workmen is ignored, but one between two secured creditors is respected.

In essence: **Explanations and Illustrations are added (Clauses 2, 32, 57).**

Why: to restore the intended order of payment and protect lenders and workmen.

Case-law: it overturns Rainbow Papers and lines up with PVVNL v. Raman Ispat.

In practice: government dues fall behind secured and financial creditors, and every security must be valued to fix each creditor's true rank.

Section 54: Liquidation on a hard clock

Subject: **180 (+90) days; proceeds survive dissolution; direct dissolution**

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
There was no real outer limit: the guidance was about a year, and it was routinely overshot. Dissolution came only after full liquidation, and pending avoidance or recovery actions could simply fall away. There was also no way to dissolve a company directly.	The liquidator must now finish and apply for dissolution within 180 days, with up to 90 more if the Tribunal allows. Where avoidance actions or lawsuits are still running, the committee decides how they are pursued and how the proceeds are shared: and they survive dissolution. The committee can also resolve to dissolve the company directly, with the order to follow within 30 days.

In essence: section 54(1) is recast and (1A), (1B), (2A), (2B) and (4) are added (Clause 33).

Why: to bring discipline to liquidation while keeping the recovery actions alive.

Case-law: it reverses the 'avoidance dies on dissolution' line seen in Venus Recruiters.

In practice: liquidation is now a 180-day project (270 at most), and avoidance recoveries no longer die when the company is dissolved.

Avoidance & fraud: ss. 43/46/50, 47, 26, 66

Subject: **Look-back, standing and survival of clawback actions**

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
The look-back for suspect transactions ran back from the admission date, so any delay in admission quietly shortened it. Creditors could only challenge undervalued transactions. Only the resolution professional could bring a fraudulent-trading claim, and whether these actions survived the case was doubted (Venus Recruiters).	The look-back now runs from the filing date, so tribunal delay no longer eats into it, and the key terms are defined in 5(2A) and 5(9A). A creditor, member or partner can pursue any of these actions if the office-holder won't, and a passive office-holder can be reported for discipline. Sections 26 and 54(1A) confirm the actions survive completion or dissolution, and the liquidator can bring fraudulent-trading claims too.

In essence: **word-changes across 43, 46, 47, 50 and 66, and section 26 recast (Clauses 3, 16, 26–30, 46).**

Why: to close the timing gap and make sure suspect deals are actually pursued.

Case-law: it overrides Venus Recruiters and fits with Anuj Jain.

In practice, recoveries are more robust, a longer look-back, creditors as a backstop, and actions that outlive the case.

Section 28A: Guarantor assets into the CD's plan

Subject: Monetising a guarantor's enforced asset within the CD resolution

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
There was no way to fold a guarantor's already-seized asset into the company's plan. That collateral sat outside the CIRP, splitting up the value on offer.	A creditor that holds such an asset can now let it be sold as part of the company's plan, with the committee's approval. If the guarantor is itself insolvent, extra consents apply: 66% for a corporate guarantor, over three-quarters for a personal one. The proceeds pay down the guarantor's debt after costs, and any surplus goes back to the guarantor.

In essence: a new section 28A is inserted (Clause 17).

Why: to allow cleaner, higher-value resolutions and coordinate the company's and guarantor's estates.

Prior position: a creditor's enforced guarantor collateral sat outside the CIRP, with no statutory route into the plan.

In practice: a lender's enforced guarantor collateral can be folded into the company's deal, lifting the overall recovery.

Personal guarantors: ss. 96/124, 106, 164A

Subject: Interim moratorium, bankruptcy route and fraud clawback

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
Simply filing an application gave a personal guarantor an automatic interim moratorium, which was often used to stall creditors. There was no clear path when no repayment plan emerged, and no way to unwind a guarantor's fraudulent transfers.	There is now no automatic interim moratorium for personal guarantors to a company. If no plan is put forward in time, the Tribunal ends the process and bankruptcy can follow. And a new section 164A lets the Tribunal undo undervalued transfers deliberately made to defeat creditors, mirroring section 49.

In essence: 96(4), 124(4) and 106(1A) go in, and section 164A is added (Clauses 51–56).

Why: to curb tactical filings and bring the personal regime into line with the corporate one.

Case-law: it changes how the scheme upheld in Dilip B. Jiwrajka (2024) works in practice.

In practice: guarantors can no longer stall by filing, and where no plan emerges the route to bankruptcy is now clear.

Decriminalisation & penalties

Subject: Criminal offences out; calibrated civil penalties in

POSITION BEFORE	POSITION AFTER
Breaching the moratorium or a plan (section 74), and giving false pre-pack information (section 76), were criminal offences. There was no specific penalty for frivolous or vexatious filings, and the general penalty in 235A was capped at about a crore.	Sections 74 and 76 are gone, though cases already on foot are saved. In their place: civil penalties for breaching the moratorium or a plan and for an operational creditor's concealment, up to 20% of the distribution. Frivolous filings draw ₹1 lakh to ₹2 crore, and the general penalty in 235A rises to at least ₹1 lakh a day, up to three times the loss or gain, capped at ₹5 crore.

In essence: 74 and 76 are omitted; 64A, 67B, 67C and 183A are added; 235A is recast (Clauses 44–68).

Why: to decriminalise routine breaches, deter abuse, and take pressure off the Tribunal.

Prior position: sections 74 and 76 made these breaches criminal; genuine fraud remains criminal under sections 66 and 69.

In practice, directors and creditors face civil penalties rather than prosecution, but the penalties bite, up to 20% of plan distributions.

PART TWO

The new resolution tools

Chapter IV-A: the Creditor-Initiated Resolution Process

What it is

for notified corporate debtors

- A faster, largely out-of-court resolution route
- The company's board stays in charge throughout
- Meant for notified, usually smaller, corporate debtors

How it starts

ss. 58A - 58B

- A financial creditor of a notified class secures 51% of that class
- Gives the company 30 days' notice; re-confirms the 51%
- Appoints a resolution professional
- The public announcement starts the clock

How it runs

ss. 58E - 58G

- 150 days, extendable by 45
- Board runs the business; the RP attends and can veto resolutions
- A moratorium is available on the RP's application
- A plan needs 66% of the committee, then the Tribunal

If it fails or converts

ss. 58H - 58-I

- No plan, non-cooperation, or a 66% vote converts it to a full CIRP
- Withdrawal needs 90% of the committee
- Section 58K carries across the usual CIRP machinery

Group insolvency, cross-border insolvency and the electronic portal

Group insolvency

Chapter VA · s. 59A

- Connected companies handled together
- A common bench for the group
- Coordinated committees and a common professional
- A group committee of creditors
- A binding coordination agreement

Cross-border insolvency

s. 240C

- Recognition of foreign insolvency proceedings
- Relief, cooperation and coordination
- Benches designated to hear cross-border matters
- 'Corporate debtor' can include entities incorporated abroad

Electronic portal

s. 240B

- A single Government-notified online portal
- All insolvency and bankruptcy processes run on it
- Filings, records and reporting move online

- **The detail of each regime is left to Central Government rules, to be laid before Parliament.**

PART THREE

Practical impact, regulations and case law

What it means: Resolution Professional, Committee & Liquidator

RESOLUTION PROFESSIONAL

- Verify AND value every claim: it carries into liquidation (s. 18).
- File the s. 12A withdrawal; you cannot be the liquidator (ss. 12A, 34).
- Run asset-class valuation; widen the IM disclosures (Reg. 27/35/36).
- Apply the dissenting 'lower of' floor; get CoC reasons (s. 30).
- File forms on the portal by the 10th of the next month (Reg. 40B).
- Chase avoidance / fraud actions: or face discipline (ss. 25, 47).

COMMITTEE OF CREDITORS

- Admission is near-automatic on a clean IU record (s. 7).
- Supervise, choose and replace the liquidator at 66% (ss. 21/34A/35).
- Revive a CIRP once, or dissolve the company directly (ss. 33, 54).
- Cure plan defects; record reasons for approval (ss. 31, 30).
- Dissenting floor is the lower of two amounts (s. 30(2)(ba)).
- Decisions are reviewable; breaches attract penalties (s. 67B).

LIQUIDATOR

- A different professional, working under CoC supervision (ss. 34/35).
- Finish in 180 (+90) days and apply for dissolution (s. 54).
- Carry over the RP's claims: do not re-invite (s. 35).
- You can now sue for fraudulent / wrongful trading (s. 66).
- Report: Preliminary 30d · Asset Memo 30/45d · Progress quarterly.
- Asset moratorium applies; leave of the Tribunal to sue (s. 33).

The three 2026 regulations, aligned to the Act

Regulation set	Notification (date)	Headline change
CIRP	REG152 (01.06.2026); valuation via REG135 (25.02.2026) and REG141 (20.05.2026)	Withdrawal window · dissenting-creditor floor · IM disclosures · CoC conduct standards · asset-class valuation
Liquidation	REG151 (01.06.2026)	CoC (not the SCC) supervises the liquidator · 180 + 90-day clock · secured-realisation and waterfall fixes
Personal Guarantor	REG149 (01.06.2026); e-filing via REG131 (20.11.2025)	All-digital forms on the Board portal · wider asset disclosure · no interim moratorium

- **All three master notifications take effect on 02.06.2026.**

Judgments the Act engages: before and after

Judgment	What the 2026 Act does now
Vidarbha Industries v. Axis Bank (2022)	Set aside: admission on a proven default is now mandatory (s. 7(5)).
State Tax Officer v. Rainbow Papers (2022)	Reversed: Government dues are demoted; a statutory charge is not 'security' (ss. 3(31), 53, 178).
Amit Metallics / DBS v. Ruchi Soya	Settled: dissenting creditors get the 'lower of' floor (s. 30(2)(ba)).
Venus Recruiters v. Union of India	Overtaken: avoidance actions survive completion and dissolution (ss. 26, 47, 54).
Ghanashyam Mishra; Essar Steel	Codified: clean slate and creditor primacy written into s. 31(5)/(6).
Dilip B. Jiwrajka (2024)	Modified: the personal-guarantor interim moratorium is removed (ss. 96(4), 124(4)).
Innoventive Industries v. ICICI Bank	Reinforced: a proven default means admission.

- **Clean-slate and waterfall changes are substantive; several 'removal of doubt' Explanations still change the position.**

A decisive modernisation of India's insolvency framework

ANNEXURES

Process timeline and the full clause index

The CIRP clock: what is due, when, and under which provision

CIRP · PHASE 1

commencement to committee

Day	Event	Provision
T	Insolvency commencement; IRP appointed	s. 16
T + 3	Public announcement inviting claims	s. 13 / Reg. 6(1)
T + 14	Last date for creditors to submit claims	s. 15 / Reg. 12
T + 21	IRP verifies and values the claims	s. 18 / Reg. 13
T + 23	Report certifying constitution of the CoC	Reg. 17(1)
T + 30	First meeting of the CoC (5 days' notice)	s. 22(1) / Reg. 19
T + 47	Registered valuers appointed (asset-class wise)	Reg. 27

CIRP · PHASE 2

marketing to approval

Day	Event	Provision
T + 60	Invitation for expression of interest published	Reg. 36A
T + 75	EoIs due; RP forms opinion on avoidance	Reg. 35A / 36A
T + 95	Information Memorandum issued to the CoC	s. 29 / Reg. 36(1)
T + 105	Request for Resolution Plan and evaluation matrix	Reg. 36B
T + 130	RP files avoidance applications with the Tribunal	Reg. 35A(3)
T + 150	CoC-approved plan submitted to the Tribunal	s. 30(6)
T + 180	Tribunal approves the plan; outer limit 330 days	ss. 31, 12

● **New in 2026: the Tribunal must admit or reject within 14 days (s. 7), decide a withdrawal or a plan within 30 days (ss. 12A, 31(2A)), and may restore a failed CIRP once for up to 120 days (s. 33(1A)).**

The liquidation clock: what is due, when, and under which provision

LIQUIDATION · PHASE 1

order to claims and reports

- **LCD** — Liquidation order; moratorium over the assets — s. 33
- **+ 5 days** — Public announcement by the liquidator — Reg. 12(1)
- **+ 7 days** — Valuers appointed; first committee meeting — Regs. 35, 31A(6)
- **+ 14 days** — Secured creditor elects to realise or relinquish — s. 52(2)
- **+ 30 days** — Last date for claims; Preliminary Report; Asset Memorandum — Regs. 12, 13, 34
- **+ 45 days** — Asset Memorandum in regulation 35(2) cases — Reg. 34(1A)
- **+ 60 days** — List of stakeholders filed — Reg. 31

LIQUIDATION · PHASE 2

realisation to dissolution

- **+ 60 days** — Claims verified (30 days from the last claim date) — Reg. 30
- **+ 90 days** — Any scheme of compromise to be completed — Reg. 2B
- **Quarterly** — Progress Report within 15 days of quarter end — Reg. 15
- **Quarterly** — Committee meets: next within 30 days, one each quarter — Reg. 31A(6)
- **On receipt** — Proceeds distributed within 15 days of realisation — Reg. 42(2)
- **+ 180 days** — Liquidation complete; apply for dissolution — s. 54(1) / Reg. 44
- **+ 270 days** — Outer limit: 90-day extension by the Tribunal — proviso to s. 54(1)

● **New in 2026: the committee of creditors (not the stakeholders' committee) supervises the liquidator; claims carry over from the CIRP; and the Tribunal must pass the liquidation and dissolution orders within 30 days each (ss. 33(2A), 54(4)).**

The personal-guarantor clock: the three reports and every filing date

PERSONAL GUARANTOR · PHASE 1

filing to admission and claims

Day 0
Application filed; no interim moratorium for a PG
ss. 94/95, 96(4)

+ 7 days
Tribunal directs the Board to nominate an RP
s. 97(2)

+ 10 days
Board nominates the resolution professional
s. 97(4)

+ 21 days
REPORT 1: RP's report to admit or reject
s. 99(1)

+ 14 days
Tribunal admits or rejects on that report
s. 100(1)

On admission
Moratorium runs 180 days, or until the s. 114 order
s. 101

+ 7 / 21 days
Public notice; creditors file claims within 21 days
s. 102

PERSONAL GUARANTOR · PHASE 2

repayment plan to discharge

+ 30 days
List of creditors prepared from the notice date
s. 104(2)

+ 21 days
REPORT 2: repayment plan and RP's report filed
ss. 105, 106(1)

14 to 28 days
Creditors' meeting held; 14 days' notice given
ss. 106(4), 107(1)

At the meeting
Plan approved by over three-fourths in value
s. 111

After meeting
REPORT 3: report of the meeting to the Tribunal
ss. 112, 113

+ 120 days
Approved plan and report filed; Tribunal's order
Reg. 19 / s. 114

+ 14 days
Completion notice and report; then discharge
ss. 117, 119

● **New in 2026: the s. 99 report moves from 10 days to 21 days; no interim moratorium applies to a personal guarantor of a company (s. 96(4)); and where no repayment plan is submitted the Tribunal ends the process and bankruptcy may follow (s. 106(1A)).**

Clauses 1–18: definitions, admission, CIRP conduct

Cl.	Section	What changed (earlier → now)	Type
1	s. 1	Commencement on notification (different dates allowed)	New
2	s. 3	New defs: registered valuer & service provider; 'security interest' excludes statutory charges	Ins./Expl.
3	s. 5	New defs: avoidance & fraudulent trading; asset-sale plans; voting share	Ins./Subst.
4	s. 7	'May → shall' admit or reject in 14 days; IU record is sufficient proof	Substituted
5	s. 9	14-day reasons; information 'as specified'	Subst./Proviso
6	s. 10	Board recommends the IRP; 14-day reasons	Subst./Omit
7	s. 11	Bars a CLRP applicant too	Words ins.
8	s. 12A	RP-driven; 90% CoC; narrow window; 30-day clock	Substituted
9	s. 14	Guarantor cannot sue the company during the moratorium	Explanation
10	s. 16	IRP appointment cleaned up; Board recommends for s. 10	Subst./Ins.
11	s. 18	IRP now verifies AND values claims	Explanation
12	s. 19	Cooperation extended to past personnel & service providers	Substituted
13	s. 21	CoC continues and supervises liquidation	Inserted
14	s. 22	CoC's chosen RP is deemed appointed from the resolution date	Substituted
15	s. 25	RP files avoidance + fraudulent-trading applications	Substituted
16	s. 26	Avoidance/fraud proceedings survive completion of the case	Substituted
17	s. 28A	Sell a guarantor's seized asset within the plan	Inserted (new)
18	s. 30	Dissenting 'lower of' floor; implementation committee; record reasons	Ins./Subst.

Clauses 19–36: plan, liquidation, avoidance

Cl.	Section	What changed (earlier → now)	Type
19	s. 31	Statutory + retrospective clean slate; licences preserved; 30-day clock	Ins./Proviso
20	s. 33	Revive a CIRP once (120 days); liquidation moratorium; 30-day clock	Ins./Subst.
21	s. 34	A different professional is the liquidator; the RP is barred	Substituted
22	s. 34A	CoC can replace the liquidator (66%)	Inserted (new)
23	s. 35	Claims carried over from CIRP; CoC supervises liquidation	Substituted
24	s. 36	Avoidance/fraud/s. 47 proceeds excluded from the estate	Words subst.
25	ss. 38–42	Separate liquidation claims process & appeal removed	Omitted
26	s. 43	Preference look-back runs from the filing date	Words subst.
27	s. 46	Undervalued look-back runs from the filing date	Heading/words
28	s. 47	Creditors may pursue all avoidance/fraud; disciplinary referral	Substituted
29	s. 49	Adds 'related party' to defrauding-creditors	Words ins.
30	s. 50	Extortionate-credit look-back runs from the filing date	Words subst.
31	s. 52	14-day election; 66% for shared security; cost + workmen deduction	Substituted
32	s. 53	Secured only to security value; Govt dues demoted; inter-se illustrations	Expl./Illustr.
33	s. 54	180 (+90)-day liquidation; direct dissolution; proceeds survive	Subst./Ins.
34	s. 54A	PPIRP thresholds 66% → 51%; CLRP references	Words subst.
35	s. 54C	PPIRP application information 'as specified'	Substituted
36	s. 54F	PPIRP cooperation aligned with s. 19	Substituted

Clauses 37–54: new regimes, penalties, personal insolvency

Cl.	Section	What changed (earlier → now)	Type
37	s. 54L	PPIRP: CoC defect-cure; sub-clauses (ii)–(v)	Proviso/Subst.
38	s. 54N	PPIRP sub-clauses (ii)–(v)	Words subst.
39	Ch. IV (55–58)	Fast-Track CIRP removed	Omitted
40	Ch. IV-A (58A–58K)	Creditor-Initiated IRP (CLRP)	Inserted (new)
41	s. 59	Voluntary liquidation: 1-year cap + withdrawal route	Subst./Ins.
42	Ch. VA (59A)	Group insolvency framework	Inserted (new)
43	s. 61	NCLAT must decide appeals in 3 months	Inserted
44	s. 64A	Penalty for frivolous/vexatious proceedings (Part II)	Inserted (new)
45	s. 65	Fraudulent initiation extended to CLRP	Words subst.
46	s. 66	Liquidator too can sue for fraudulent/wrongful trading	Heading/ins.
47	s. 67A	PPIRP fraud provision extended to CLRP	Heading/words
48	ss. 67B/67C	Moratorium/plan-breach & OC-concealment penalties	Inserted (new)
49	s. 74	Criminal offence removed (decriminalised)	Omitted
50	s. 76	Criminal offence removed (decriminalised)	Omitted
51	s. 96	No interim moratorium for PGs (resolution)	Inserted
52	s. 99	PG report time 10 → 21 days	Words subst.
53	s. 106	No plan → terminate → bankruptcy; creditors' meeting	Inserted
54	s. 121	New bankruptcy-application ground (s. 106(1A))	Inserted

Clauses 55–72: personal insolvency, regulator, misc.

Cl.	Section	What changed (earlier → now)	Type
55	s. 124	No interim moratorium for PGs (bankruptcy)	Inserted
56	s. 164A	Fraud clawback in bankruptcy (mirrors s. 49)	Inserted (new)
57	s. 178	Bankruptcy waterfall: Government dues clarified	Explanation
58	s. 183A	Penalty for frivolous/vexatious proceedings (Part III)	Inserted (new)
59	s. 196	'Service providers'; CoC conduct standards & timelines	Subst./Ins.
60	s. 208	IP functions include CLRP	Inserted
61	s. 214	IU information 'in such manner as specified'	Words ins.
62	s. 215	OC must file with IU before s. 9; deemed authentication	Subst./Ins.
63	s. 217	Complaints against 'service providers'	Substituted
64	s. 218	Investigation of 'service providers'	Substituted
65	s. 219	Show-cause notice to a service provider	Substituted
66	s. 220	Disciplinary committee; ₹2 cr cap; appeal to NCLAT	Subst./Ins.
67	s. 224	Insolvency & Bankruptcy Fund: new sources & uses	Subst./Ins.
68	s. 235A	Civil penalty: ≥ ₹1L/day; up to 3× loss/gain; ₹5 cr cap	Substituted
69	s. 239	Rule-making powers for the new provisions	Subst./Ins.
70	s. 240	Regulation-making powers for the new provisions	Subst./Ins.
71	ss. 240B/240C	Electronic portal; cross-border insolvency rules	Inserted (new)
72	s. 242	5-year removal-of-difficulties power	Inserted