INDIALAW



INSOLVENCY & BANKRUPTCY

Resolving the Guarantee Conundrum: Supreme Court’s Landmark Judgment on Concurrent CIRP Proceedings Under the IBC

AUTHOR Shrishail Kittad, Rahul Sundaram

PUBLISHED 27 February 2026

The corporate insolvency landscape in India witnessed a landmark clarification with the Supreme Court's comprehensive judgment in ICICI Bank Limited v. Era Infrastructure (India) Limited and connected matters, delivered in 2026. This pivotal ruling addressed one of the most contentious issues in insolvency law: whether financial creditors can simultaneously initiate Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) proceedings under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 against both a principal borrower and its corporate guarantor. The Supreme Court's decisive intervention resolved conflicting interpretations by lower tribunals and reaffirmed the fundamental principle that the liability of a guarantor is co-extensive with that of the principal debtor, thereby permitting simultaneous proceedings while establishing clear safeguards against unjust enrichment.

Table of contents

- The Genesis of Legal Uncertainty
- Factual Matrix and Parties Involved
- NCLAT's Divergent Approaches and Impugned Orders
- Comprehensive Legal Arguments and Rival Contentions
- Legal Provisions and Judicial Precedents Under Scrutiny
- Supreme Court's Comprehensive Legal Analysis
- Definitive Legal Pronouncement and Operational Guidelines
- Broader Implications for India's Insolvency Ecosystem
- Conclusion: Strengthening India's Insolvency Framework

The Genesis of Legal Uncertainty

The present appeals arose from a series of conflicting decisions by the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) and the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT) across multiple jurisdictions. The fundamental issue emerged from practical scenarios where financial institutions had extended credit facilities to corporate borrowers, secured by corporate guarantees from related entities. Upon default by the principal borrower, these financial creditors sought to maximize their recovery prospects by initiating insolvency proceedings against both the defaulting entity and its guarantor.

The legal uncertainty was primarily triggered by the NCLAT's earlier precedent in Vishnu Kumar Agarwal v. Piramal Enterprises Ltd., which had established a restrictive interpretation suggesting that creditors must elect between pursuing either the principal borrower or the guarantor, but not both simultaneously. This precedent created a doctrine of election that significantly limited creditors' remedial options and contradicted established principles of contract law governing surety relationships.

The conflicting judicial approaches resulted in an inconsistent application of insolvency law across different benches, with some tribunals permitting simultaneous proceedings while others rejected such applications based on the Vishnu Kumar Agarwal precedent. This divergence necessitated Supreme Court intervention to establish uniform jurisprudence and provide much-needed clarity to the insolvency ecosystem.

Factual Matrix and Parties Involved

The consolidated appeals involved prominent financial institutions as appellants, including ICICI Bank Limited, State Bank of India, International Finance Corporation, Bank of India, and Phoenix Arc Private Limited. These institutions had extended various credit facilities ranging from cash credit facilities to project financing, with loan amounts varying from Rs. 70 crore to over Rs. 1,139 crore in different cases.

The respondents comprised corporate entities across diverse sectors, including Era Infrastructure (India) Limited, Hyderabad Ring Road Project Private Limited, RNA Corp. Pvt. Ltd., Punj Lloyd Upstream Limited, and several others. These entities had either directly borrowed funds or provided corporate guarantees for facilities extended to related companies. The cases also involved individual directors and suspended directors who challenged the initiation of insolvency proceedings.

In Civil Appeal No. 6094 of 2019, ICICI Bank had sought to initiate CIRP against Era Infrastructure (India) Limited, which had provided a corporate guarantee for facilities extended to Hyderabad Ring Road Project Private Limited. The NCLT had rejected this application, citing the ongoing CIRP proceedings against the principal borrower. Similarly, in Civil Appeal No. 6093 of 2019, ICICI Bank's application against Hyderabad Ring Road Project Private Limited was rejected due to existing proceedings against the guarantor.

The International Finance Corporation's case in SLP No. 21778 of 2019 presented a particularly complex scenario involving a USD 25 million loan to Punj Lloyd Upstream Limited, guaranteed by Punj Lloyd Limited. When the corporation sought to initiate proceedings against the principal borrower while CIRP was ongoing against the guarantor, the NCLT rejected the application based on the restrictive interpretation of simultaneous proceedings.

NCLAT's Divergent Approaches and Impugned Orders

The NCLAT's treatment of simultaneous proceedings varied significantly across different cases, reflecting the absence of settled jurisprudence on this critical issue. In several impugned orders, the NCLAT had mechanically applied the Vishnu Kumar Agarwal precedent without considering the fundamental differences in factual scenarios and the underlying principles of guarantee law.

In Civil Appeal No. 2715 of 2020, the NCLAT had allowed an appeal by Bijay Kumar Agarwal against the initiation of CIRP proceedings against Greengrow Commercial Pvt Ltd, which had guaranteed facilities to Gee Pee Infotech Pvt Ltd. The NCLAT held that since proceedings against Gee Pee were already ongoing, simultaneous proceedings against the guarantor were impermissible. This decision effectively closed all proceedings against Greengrow, thereby limiting the creditor's recovery options.

Conversely, in other cases such as Civil Appeal Nos. 827-828 of 2021 and Civil Appeal No. 4018 of 2023, the NCLAT had permitted simultaneous proceedings by distinguishing the Vishnu Kumar Agarwal precedent. In these instances, the NCLAT recognized that the precedent involved simultaneous proceedings against two guarantors rather than between a principal borrower and guarantor, thereby justifying a different legal treatment.

The NCLAT's approach in Civil Appeal No. 7231 of 2024 demonstrated a more nuanced understanding, where it dismissed an appeal challenging simultaneous proceedings and explicitly held that the liability of a guarantor and principal debtor is co-extensive. This decision aligned with established contract law principles but created further confusion given the conflicting precedents.

Comprehensive Legal Arguments and Rival Contentions

The appellants, primarily financial creditors, advanced several compelling arguments supporting the maintainability of simultaneous proceedings. They emphasized that under the Indian Contract Act, 1872, particularly Section 128, the liability of a surety is co-extensive with that of the principal debtor unless the contract provides otherwise. This fundamental principle grants creditors the right to proceed against either or both parties without being compelled to exhaust remedies against one before pursuing the other.

The financial creditors particularly relied on Sections 60(2) and 60(3) of the IBC, which explicitly contemplate scenarios where CIRP proceedings against both the corporate debtor and its corporate guarantor are pending simultaneously. They argued that if the legislature intended to prohibit such proceedings, these provisions would not have been framed to address the consolidation of simultaneous proceedings before the same adjudicating authority.

Crucially, the appellants clarified that their objective was not double recovery but rather maximizing the prospects of debt realization through resolution plans from both entities. They emphasized that while they sought simultaneous proceedings, any recovery from one entity would appropriately adjust the claim against the other, ensuring no unjust enrichment.

The respondents, comprising corporate debtors and guarantors, raised substantial concerns about potential double recovery and the duplication of claims. They argued that allowing simultaneous proceedings would enable creditors to file identical claims in multiple proceedings, potentially leading to recoveries exceeding the actual debt amount. This concern was particularly acute given that creditors typically file claims for the full outstanding amount in each proceeding.

The respondents strongly defended the Vishnu Kumar Agarwal precedent, contending that it correctly established the principle that creditors cannot pursue multiple remedies for the same debt simultaneously. They argued that once a creditor chooses to file a claim in one proceeding, the debt comes under resolution in that forum, precluding additional proceedings against other liable parties.

Legal Provisions and Judicial Precedents Under Scrutiny

The Supreme Court's analysis extensively examined the interplay between various statutory provisions and established judicial precedents. Section 7 of the IBC, which empowers financial creditors to initiate CIRP, formed the foundational framework for the

Court's examination. The provision does not explicitly restrict creditors from filing multiple applications against different entities for the same underlying debt obligation.

Sections 60(2) and 60(3) of the IBC emerged as particularly significant in the Court's reasoning. These provisions specifically address jurisdictional issues when proceedings against both corporate debtors and their guarantors are pending, contemplating their consolidation before the same adjudicating authority. The Court interpreted these provisions as clear legislative recognition that simultaneous proceedings are permissible and anticipated.

The Court also examined the Indian Contract Act, 1872, particularly the principles governing surety relationships. Section 128 establishes that unless otherwise agreed, the liability of the surety extends to the same degree as that of the principal debtor. This co-extensive liability principle has been consistently upheld in numerous judicial decisions.

Most significantly, the Court referenced its recent decision in BRS Ventures Investments Ltd. v. SREI Infrastructure Finance Ltd. & Anr. (2025) 1 SCC 456, which had already settled the legal position regarding simultaneous proceedings. This precedent provided the foundational legal framework for the Court's analysis, though the present judgment offered more comprehensive reasoning and addressed specific concerns raised in various cases.

Supreme Court's Comprehensive Legal Analysis

The Supreme Court's analytical approach was methodical and comprehensive, addressing each argument raised by the contending parties while establishing clear legal principles. The Court began by acknowledging that the issue was no longer res integra, having been previously addressed in BRS Ventures, but proceeded to provide detailed reasoning given the extensive arguments presented and the need for comprehensive clarity.

The Court's interpretation of Section 60 proved pivotal in its reasoning. The judges observed that subsections (2) and (3) of Section 60 clearly envisage situations where proceedings against corporate debtors and their guarantors run concurrently. The provision for consolidating such proceedings before the same adjudicating authority would be meaningless if simultaneous proceedings were inherently impermissible.

The Court emphasized the fundamental distinction between recovery proceedings and resolution processes. While traditional recovery mechanisms might support an election doctrine, CIRP represents a comprehensive resolution framework aimed at reviving corporate debtors or maximizing asset value through organized liquidation. This distinction justified allowing creditors to pursue resolution opportunities against multiple entities simultaneously.

Addressing concerns about double recovery, the Court established clear safeguards while maintaining the permissibility of simultaneous proceedings. The judges clarified that while simultaneous proceedings are maintainable, double recovery is absolutely prohibited. Any partial recovery from one entity must result in proportionate adjustment of claims against other entities, ensuring that total recovery never exceeds the actual debt obligation.

The Court also addressed the practical realities of corporate group structures and guarantee arrangements. In many cases, the financial health of guarantors and principal borrowers are interlinked, making simultaneous proceedings essential for comprehensive resolution. Restricting creditors to sequential proceedings could result in significant value erosion and reduced recovery prospects.

Definitive Legal Pronouncement and Operational Guidelines

The Supreme Court's final ruling established clear operational guidelines for future cases involving similar fact patterns. The Court definitively held that simultaneous CIRP proceedings against principal borrowers and their corporate guarantors are maintainable under the IBC, thereby overruling restrictive interpretations that had created uncertainty in the insolvency ecosystem.

For cases where the NCLAT had incorrectly rejected simultaneous proceedings based on the Vishnu Kumar Agarwal precedent, the Court allowed the appeals and set aside the impugned orders. Specifically, Civil Appeal Nos. 6093/2019, 6094/2019, and 2715/2020 were allowed, with the Court directing fresh consideration of the applications for initiating CIRP proceedings.

Conversely, for cases where simultaneous proceedings had been correctly permitted despite challenges, the Court dismissed the appeals, thereby upholding the NCLAT decisions. Civil Appeal Nos. 827-828/2021, 4018/2023, and 7231/2024 were dismissed, confirming that the simultaneous proceedings in these cases were properly maintained.

The Court granted special leave in SLP No. 21778/2019 and allowed the appeal, recognizing that the International Finance Corporation's application had been wrongly rejected based on the now-discredited interpretation of simultaneous proceedings. This decision ensured that foreign financial institutions receive equal protection under India's insolvency framework.

In Civil Appeal No. 40/2020, the Court adopted a pragmatic approach, dismissing the appeal while noting that the underlying dispute had been resolved through settlement. However, the Court preserved the appellant's right to pursue independent proceedings before the adjudicating authority if circumstances warranted such action.

Broader Implications for India's Insolvency Ecosystem

The Supreme Court's judgment carries profound implications for India's insolvency and banking sectors, providing much-needed clarity and certainty to financial institutions, corporate borrowers, and insolvency professionals. The ruling enhances creditors' ability to maximize recovery prospects while maintaining appropriate safeguards against abuse of the legal process.

For financial institutions, the judgment provides greater flexibility in designing recovery strategies for complex corporate group structures. Banks and financial institutions can now pursue comprehensive resolution approaches that consider the interconnected nature of group entities and guarantee arrangements, potentially improving overall recovery rates in insolvency proceedings.

The ruling also clarifies the operational framework for insolvency professionals and adjudicating authorities, providing clear guidance on managing simultaneous proceedings while ensuring appropriate coordination and avoiding duplicative processes. The emphasis on consolidating proceedings before the same adjudicating authority promotes efficiency and reduces procedural complexities.

From a policy perspective, the judgment aligns India's insolvency framework with international best practices that recognize the co-extensive nature of guarantee liabilities. This alignment enhances the attractiveness of India's debt markets for international financial institutions and promotes greater confidence in the country's insolvency resolution mechanisms.

Conclusion: Strengthening India's Insolvency Framework

By definitively settling the question of simultaneous proceedings, the Supreme Court has eliminated a significant source of legal uncertainty that had plagued the insolvency ecosystem since the IBC's implementation. The judgment's emphasis on balancing creditor rights with debtor protections, while preventing unjust enrichment, reflects a mature understanding of the complex dynamics inherent in corporate insolvency resolution.

The Court's analytical approach, which harmonized statutory provisions with established contract law principles and practical commercial realities, provides a strong legal framework for addressing similar issues in the future. The explicit recognition that CIRP represents a resolution mechanism rather than merely a recovery process demonstrates the Court's appreciation of the IBC's far-reaching objectives and its role in India's broader economic ecosystem.

Most importantly, the judgment's clear operational guidelines and safeguards against double recovery ensure that the enhanced flexibility accorded to creditors does not come at the expense of fundamental fairness or legal integrity. This balanced approach reinforces confidence in India's insolvency framework among all stakeholders, from international financial institutions to domestic corporate entities, thereby contributing to the overall stability and effectiveness of the country's debt resolution mechanisms. The ruling shows the Supreme Court's commitment to developing coherent, practical, and just insolvency jurisprudence that serves India's evolving economic needs while maintaining the highest standards of legal rigor and commercial sensibility.

For further details write to contact@indialaw.in

Related Practice Areas

Insolvency & Bankruptcy