Limits of the IBC Moratorium and the Role of Courts in Redevelopment Contracts: An Analysis of *A A Estates Pvt. Ltd. v. Kher Nagar Sukhsadan CHS Ltd.* (2025 INSC 1366)

Authored by: Lokesh Bhola, Managing Partner and Abhishekh Singh Chauhan, Associate

I. Introduction

The decision of the Supreme Court of India in *A A Estates Private Limited Through its Resolution Professional v. Kher Nagar Sukhsadan Co-operative Housing Society Ltd. & Ors.* marks an important moment in the evolving jurisprudence on the intersection between the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC) and urban redevelopment contracts. The case required the Court to determine whether a terminated redevelopment agreement could nonetheless be treated as an "asset" of the corporate debtor for the purposes of Section 14 moratorium, and whether a housing society may proceed with redevelopment through a new developer during the pendency of Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP). The Court's nuanced articulation of the limits of moratorium protection provides a corrective to attempts by defaulting developers to use insolvency law as a shield against contractual and statutory consequences.

II. Factual Matrix and Procedural Background

The dispute concerns a 60-member co-operative housing society in Bandra (East), Mumbai, whose 1956 building had been repeatedly declared dangerous (C-1 category) under municipal law. To facilitate redevelopment, the Society entered into a Development Agreement (2005) and Supplementary Agreement (2014) with A A Estates Pvt. Ltd. The agreements imposed strict timelines and significant obligations on the developer, including timely commencement of work and payment of transit rent to displaced residents. However, even after nearly two decades, the developer failed to commence reconstruction. The Transit Rent was intermittently paid only to 19 members; 41 members received none, and remained in unsafe dwellings despite multiple evacuation notices.

In response to chronic non-performance, the Society issued notices culminating in termination of the agreements through resolutions and letters dated 09.06.2019, 02.12.2019, and 06.11.2021. A new developer, Tri Star Development LLP, was appointed in November 2021, followed by execution of a fresh Development Agreement in December 2023. Parallelly, insolvency proceedings were initiated twice against A A Estates—first in 2019 (terminated upon settlement), and subsequently on 06.12.2022. After commencement of the second CIRP, the Resolution Professional sought to prevent statutory authorities from granting approvals to the new developer, invoking the Section 14 moratorium. This led the Society to file a writ petition before the Bombay High Court, which granted directions to MHADA and the municipal authority to process redevelopment permissions. The present appeal challenged that order.

III. Validity of Termination and the Nature of Development Rights

The Court first considered whether the termination of the 2005 and 2014 agreements was valid in law. It held unequivocally that termination was lawful and effective prior to the commencement of CIRP. Redevelopment agreements, particularly those involving dilapidated and dangerous buildings, are inherently time-sensitive. The developer's inability to initiate the project for nearly twenty years, coupled with failure to pay rent to a majority of members, constituted a sustained material breach. The agreements themselves expressly permitted termination upon such breach.

Critically, the Court relied on *Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Ltd. v. Amit Gupta*[1] and *TCS v. SK Wheels*[2] to reiterate that NCLT may intervene in termination only where (i) the termination is solely on account of insolvency; and (ii) termination would result in the "corporate death" of the debtor by extinguishing its sole or core income-generating contract. In the present case, termination preceded CIRP by years and was grounded in chronic breach, not insolvency. Thus, no contractual right survived on the insolvency commencement date.

IV. Whether Development Agreements Constitute "Assets" under Section 14 IBC

A central issue was whether a terminated development agreement could nonetheless constitute a protected "asset" or "property" of the corporate debtor. The Court rejected this proposition, applying the analytical framework from *Sushil Kumar Agarwal v. Meenakshi Sadhu*[3], which distinguishes between development agreements that confer proprietary interests and those that create only contractual licences.

---

[1] (2021) 7 SCC 209
[2] (2022) 2 SCC 583
[3] (2019) 2 SCC 241

A A Estates never received physical, juridical, or constructive possession of the property. The Society and its members continuously occupied the premises. Relying on *Associated Hotels of India Limited v. R.N. Kapoor*[4] and *Qudrat Ullah v. Municipal Board, Bareilly*[5], the Court reaffirmed that a licence to enter property for development does not create any estate or interest in land. Since the development agreements were terminated before CIRP, all that remained was a potential monetary claim for damages—an unsecured claim that does not attract moratorium protection. The Court also distinguished *Victory Iron Works Ltd v. Jitendra Lohia and another*[6], where the corporate debtor had proprietary incidents amounting to quasi-ownership; in the present case, no such rights existed.

The Court thus held that moratorium under Section 14 does not revive extinguished contractual rights. The IBC is designed to preserve the debtor's existing estate—not to resurrect lapsed rights or confer property interests retroactively.

V. Writ Jurisdiction and Redevelopment During CIRP

The Court next considered whether the High Court properly exercised writ jurisdiction. It affirmed the High Court's order, noting that the Society sought only administrative directions requiring MHADA and the planning authority to process redevelopment applications. No relief was sought against the corporate debtor, nor did the High Court adjudicate contractual disputes. Once the Court found that the developer held no surviving rights, the statutory authorities were not barred by the IBC from processing the project. The Court also held that insolvency law cannot be weaponized to freeze public welfare projects in the absence of legitimate proprietary rights of the corporate debtor.

VI. Natural Justice and Participation Before the High Court

The appellants argued that the High Court acted in violation of natural justice by deciding the writ without permitting them to file a reply. The Supreme Court rejected this claim, noting that counsel for the appellants was present, made submissions, and never sought time to file a counter-affidavit. Participation without objection constituted waiver. No prejudice was shown.

[4] AIR 1959 SC 1262
[5] (1974) 1 SCC 202
[6] (2023) 7 SCC 227

VII. Doctrinal and Practical Significance

This judgment has substantial implications for redevelopment jurisprudence and insolvency law. *First*, it reaffirms that Section 14 moratorium protects only those rights and assets that subsist on the insolvency commencement date. Terminated agreements cannot be revived by insolvency proceedings. *Second*, it places a crucial constraint on developers seeking to invoke moratorium to stall statutory processes in redevelopment. *Third*, the judgment reinforces the need to balance insolvency objectives with public welfare, particularly where residents face existential risks due to unsafe buildings. *Fourth*, it clarifies that writ jurisdiction remains available to compel statutory performance even during CIRP, provided no legitimate asset of the corporate debtor is implicated.

Taken together, these principles prevent the IBC from becoming a refuge for defaulting or non-performing developers, while ensuring that redevelopment projects—especially those involving vulnerable populations—are not unduly obstructed. The Court's reasoning reflects a maturing jurisprudence that harmonizes insolvency law with broader socio-economic realities.

VIII. Conclusion

The Supreme Court's decision in *A A Estates Pvt. Ltd.* marks a significant step in defining the contours of insolvency protection in the redevelopment context. By holding that moratorium does not revive extinguished rights and cannot be used to halt redevelopment in the absence of a subsisting proprietary interest, the Court has struck a principled balance between contractual accountability and public interest. The judgment serves as an authoritative guide for future cases where stalled redevelopment intersects with corporate insolvency, reinforcing that the IBC is a resolution mechanism—not a mechanism for perpetuating delay or evading contractual responsibility.

*****