Haircuts in Insolvency Resolution: Testing Value Beyond the Debt Amount

Originally published: 16 October 2026

News context: 29 August 2026 | Insolvency resolution • Financial institutions | GS-III

A creditor not receiving their full claim is a loss, but the quality of a resolution cannot be measured by comparison with the original claim alone. The assets available, the viability of the business, the alternatives, and the fairness of the process must also be examined.

Why in the News

In an analysis published on 29 August 2026, the debate over large haircuts in insolvency processes was raised in the context of the repayment scheme of a personal guarantor. Rather than treating an individual's claim, a guarantee, and a company's debt as all alike, this subject is an opportunity to understand the right comparison for recovery and institutional accountability.

What Are a Haircut, a Resolution, and a Liquidation?

In an insolvency resolution, a haircut generally means the part of the admitted claim that the creditor does not get back under the plan concerned. A resolution seeks an orderly settlement of financial distress; in a liquidation, assets are sold and the proceeds are distributed according to law. A company as a going concern and its assets sold piece by piece do not hold the same value.

Key Facts

The basis of comparison: Only for understanding: if the admitted claim is 100 rupees and the plan delivers 40 rupees, then on the basis of that plan the recovery is 40% and the haircut is 60%. This is a hypothetical example, not a figure from any case.

Different measures of value: The admitted claim is the creditor's recognised amount due. The liquidation value is an estimate of the proceeds expected from liquidating the assets. When the two differ, different percentages can emerge about the same recovery.

The institutional process: In a corporate resolution, the professional, the valuer, the committee of creditors, and the adjudicating body have separate roles. Examining a commercial decision and checking compliance with the law are not the same task.

The separate context of a guarantee: The process for a personal guarantor and a company's insolvency process are different. Looking at the amount of one plan and assuming another borrower's entire liability has ended is not proper.

Why Is a Large Haircut Not by Itself the Final Conclusion?

Delay and erosion of value: The business staying shut, machinery lying idle, and customers leaving can reduce real value. That is why recognising distress early and deciding in time affects the capacity to recover.

Testing the alternatives: Even a plan with a smaller amount can be better than the available liquidation alternative. Still, before accepting a low bid, the competing offers, the assumptions of the valuation, and the capacity for implementation should be examined.

The fairness of the decision: Creditors' interests can differ. A conflict of interests, unequal information, or a weak market search cannot be justified merely by the decision of a majority.

Analysis and Way Forward

The goal of policy is neither to call every loss a success nor to call every haircut a scandal. Showing admitted claims, estimated values, actual payments, and the cost of time separately will make outcomes easier to understand. Independent valuation, adequate competition, clear reasons for decisions, and monitoring of the plan's implementation are necessary. These are reform suggestions; not a judicial conclusion on any specific pending dispute.

Distinction Between Concepts

Writing off a loan in accounting and a liability legally ending are different things. Similarly, a haircut states a recovery gap; it does not by itself prove fraud or an ideal resolution.

Mains Perspective

With financial discipline, connect viable business, employment, and credit culture. Speeding up the process should not mean reducing scrutiny and fairness.

UPSC CSE Mains Style: Original Practice Question

Measuring the success of insolvency resolution only by the recovery percentage compared with admitted claims is inadequate. Analyse with reference to value preservation and institutional accountability.

(Answer in 150 words) | 10 marks

Answer Outline

Answer Outline

Introduction: A haircut shows the difference between the admitted claim and the amount received under the plan. The recovery percentage alone does not fully assess the value preserved in resolution, the available alternatives and the fairness of the process.

Main Body: Show the admitted claim, the liquidation value, the actual payment and the time-cost separately. Delay can leave machines idle and drive customers away, reducing value; examine the chances of saving the viable business. A lower-amount plan can be better than liquidation, yet check the competitive bids, the valuation assumptions and the implementation capacity. The distinct roles of professionals, the committee of creditors and the adjudicating authority, and conflicts of interest, should be clear.

Conclusion: Along with a timely decision, independent valuation, transparency of reasons and monitoring of the plan's implementation are necessary. Do not treat every haircut as a success or a scam; and do not merge the separate processes of the personal guarantor and the company.

Sources

- Indian Express, 29 August 2026: analysis of insolvency haircuts
- IBBI, January-March 2026: official account of valuation and resolution outcomes
- India Today, 31 August 2026: the context of guarantees, claims and haircuts

Remember: Read a recovery figure together with its basis, the alternatives, and the time taken; a single percentage is not the whole story.