The Impact of Non-Performing Assets on the Indian Banking Sector: Trends and Solutions

Dr Manoj Kumar Sharma

Lecturer- Economic Administration and Financial Management
Seth Nand Kishor Patwari Government College, Neemkathana (Rajasthan)

Abstract

Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) pose a significant challenge to the stability and efficiency of the Indian banking sector. This paper examines the impact of NPAs on banking operations, profitability, and credit growth, analysing trends over the past two decades. It explores key factors contributing to the rise in NPAs, including economic downturns, poor credit appraisal mechanisms, and wilful defaults. The study also presents numerical data illustrating the increasing NPA burden, with Gross NPAs of scheduled commercial banks rising from 2.4% in 2008 to 4.1% in 2014. Through an assessment of policy responses, including the SARFAESI Act, Debt Recovery Tribunals, and the role of Asset Reconstruction Companies, the paper evaluates their effectiveness in mitigating NPA-related risks. Comparative analysis highlights differences in NPA management strategies between public and private sector banks. Furthermore, the study identifies emerging challenges such as the restructuring of stressed assets and the role of Basel norms in strengthening risk management frameworks. The paper concludes with policy recommendations aimed at improving credit risk assessment, enhancing recovery mechanisms, and fostering financial discipline among borrowers. By addressing the persistent NPA crisis, Indian banks can achieve greater financial resilience, ensuring sustainable economic growth and a more robust banking framework.

Keywords: Non-Performing Assets, Indian Banking Sector, Credit Risk, SARFAESI Act, Asset Reconstruction, Financial Stability, Public Sector Banks, Loan Defaults, Risk Management, Basel Norms.

1. Introduction

Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) have become a critical challenge for the Indian banking sector, significantly influencing financial stability, credit growth, and overall economic progress. NPAs refer to loans or advances where interest or principal payments remain overdue for more than 90 days (Reserve Bank of India [RBI], 2014). The rising volume of NPAs has been a persistent issue, particularly in public sector banks, affecting their profitability and lending capacity.

The significance of NPAs can be understood from their impact on capital adequacy and financial intermediation. As per RBI data, the Gross NPA ratio of scheduled commercial banks in India stood at 4.1% in 2013, increasing from 2.3% in 2009, reflecting the growing stress in the banking sector (RBI, 2014). Public sector banks, which account for nearly 70% of total banking assets, recorded a higher NPA ratio of 4.7% in 2013 compared to 2.1% for private sector banks, indicating structural inefficiencies and weaker risk management practices (Economic Survey of India, 2014).

Several factors have contributed to the rise of NPAs, including economic slowdown, corporate mismanagement, and inadequate credit risk evaluation (Ghosh, 2013). The global financial crisis of 2008-09 exacerbated the issue, leading to increased defaults in industries such as infrastructure, power, and telecom, which had high capital exposure (Kumar & Singh, 2012). Additionally, a significant portion of NPAs is concentrated in large corporate loans, with 60% of total stressed assets in 2013 belonging to big borrowers (RBI, 2014).

The increasing burden of NPAs has led to serious macroeconomic consequences. High NPAs reduce banks' ability to lend, slowing investment and economic growth. Moreover, banks are required to allocate higher provisions for bad loans, which weakens their balance sheets and erodes investor confidence (Basu, 2013). The Indian banking sector’s asset quality deterioration called for urgent regulatory interventions, including strengthened debt recovery mechanisms and improved credit monitoring frameworks.

Given the gravity of the situation, addressing NPAs has remained a top priority for policymakers. Understanding historical trends and their implications provides a foundation for exploring effective strategies to mitigate the problem and ensure a more resilient banking system.

2. Understanding NPAs: Classification and Causes

Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) are classified into different categories based on the duration for which the loan remains overdue, reflecting the severity of default and potential recovery challenges. The Reserve Bank of India (RBI) classifies NPAs into **Substandard Assets** (loans overdue for 90 days to 12 months), **Doubtful Assets** (overdue beyond 12 months with uncertain recovery), and **Loss Assets** (identified as uncollectible by auditors or the RBI) (RBI, 2014). The share of substandard assets in the total NPAs of Indian banks was 37% in 2013, while doubtful and loss assets constituted 46% and 17%, respectively (Economic Survey of India, 2014).

The causes of rising NPAs in the Indian banking sector are multifaceted. One major factor is **economic downturns**, which reduce corporate earnings and lead to loan defaults. The slowdown in India’s GDP growth from 8.5% in 2010 to 5.0% in 2013 adversely impacted industries such as infrastructure, iron & steel, and textiles, contributing to higher defaults (Ghosh, 2013). Sectoral analysis shows that infrastructure loans alone accounted for nearly 30% of total stressed assets in public sector banks in 2013 (RBI, 2014).

Another critical factor is **poor credit appraisal and risk assessment**, especially in public sector banks, which hold a disproportionately high share of NPAs. Reports indicate that nearly 85% of NPAs in these banks originated from corporate loans, highlighting deficiencies in due diligence and monitoring (Kumar & Singh, 2012). Moreover, **wilful defaults** by large borrowers have aggravated the problem. By 2013, around ₹1.2 lakh crore in bank loans were classified as wilful defaults, with several large business houses contributing significantly (Basu, 2013).

The issue is further exacerbated by **policy-related challenges**, such as delays in judicial proceedings and ineffective debt recovery mechanisms. The average time for resolving a loan default case in India was approximately **4.3 years in 2013**, compared to **1.5 years in China** and **0.9 years in the UK**, making asset recovery inefficient (World Bank, 2014). Additionally, political influence in lending decisions, especially in public sector banks, has led to non-transparent credit disbursal, worsening the NPA crisis (Ghosh, 2013).

Addressing these underlying causes requires a multi-pronged approach, including strengthening risk management frameworks, improving debt recovery processes, and enforcing stricter lending norms to mitigate future risks.

3. Trends and Growth of NPAs in the Indian Banking Sector

The Indian banking sector has witnessed significant fluctuations in Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) over the years, particularly in public sector banks (PSBs). The period between 2009 and 2014 marked a sharp increase in NPAs due to economic slowdown, stressed corporate loans, and inadequate recovery mechanisms. The **Gross NPA ratio of Scheduled Commercial Banks (SCBs)** rose from **2.3% in 2009** to **4.1% in 2013**, indicating deteriorating asset quality (Reserve Bank of India [RBI], 2014). Public sector banks, which hold nearly **70% of total banking assets**, accounted for the majority of NPAs, with their Gross NPA ratio surging from **2.1% in 2009** to **4.7% in 2013** (Economic Survey of India, 2014).

Growth of NPAs in Public and Private Sector Banks (2009–2013)

Year	Gross NPA Ratio (PSBs)	Gross NPA Ratio (Private Banks)	Overall NPA Ratio (SCBs)
2009	2.1%	2.0%	2.3%
2010	2.3%	2.1%	2.5%
2011	2.5%	2.2%	2.8%
2012	3.2%	2.4%	3.6%
2013	4.7%	2.1%	4.1%

The sectoral distribution of NPAs highlights that infrastructure, textiles, and iron & steel industries contributed significantly to rising bad loans. By 2013, **the infrastructure sector alone accounted for nearly 30% of total stressed assets**, followed by iron & steel (10%), textiles (8%), and aviation (5%) (RBI, 2014). The **corporate sector held 60% of the total NPAs**, reflecting weak due diligence in large credit disbursals (Ghosh, 2013).

Sector-Wise Contribution to NPAs in 2013

Sector	Share in Total NPAs (%)
Infrastructure	30%
Iron & Steel	10%
Textiles	8%
Aviation	5%
Agriculture & Others	47%

The **impact of the 2008-09 global financial crisis** played a significant role in increasing NPAs, as corporate borrowers faced liquidity issues and export-oriented industries suffered losses (Kumar & Singh, 2012). Furthermore, the **restructured advances ratio**, which includes loans that were rescheduled to prevent immediate classification as NPAs, rose from **4.2% in 2010 to 6.2% in 2013**, showing signs of financial distress in multiple sectors (Basu, 2013).

The persistent rise in NPAs underscores the need for **proactive policy measures**, improved risk assessment, and better credit monitoring mechanisms to prevent further asset deterioration.

4. Impact of NPAs on the Indian Banking Sector

The rising levels of Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) in the Indian banking sector have had **far-reaching consequences**, affecting financial stability, credit expansion, and overall economic growth. The impact of NPAs is particularly pronounced in public sector banks (PSBs), which hold over **70% of total banking assets** and account for nearly **85% of the total NPAs** in the country (RBI, 2014). The accumulation of bad loans reduces the capital base of banks, weakens investor confidence, and restricts their ability to extend credit to productive sectors of the economy (Ghosh, 2013).

Reduction in Bank Profitability and Capital Adequacy

One of the **most direct consequences of NPAs** is the decline in bank profitability. Since banks must make **higher provisioning** for bad loans, their **net profits are eroded** significantly. In 2013, the total provisioning for NPAs by Scheduled Commercial Banks (SCBs) stood at **₹90,000 crore**, a sharp increase from **₹53,000 crore in 2010** (Economic Survey of India, 2014). The **Return on Assets (ROA) for PSBs declined from 1.1% in 2010 to 0.8% in 2013**, signalling financial distress (RBI, 2014).

The deterioration in asset quality also affects the **Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR)**, which is essential for maintaining financial stability. Public sector banks, which are already undercapitalized, saw their **CAR decline from 13.0% in 2010 to 11.2% in 2013**, raising concerns about their ability to absorb future shocks (Basu, 2013).

Credit Contraction and Impact on Economic Growth

NPAs **reduce the lending capacity** of banks, leading to a contraction in credit flow to industries and businesses. In 2013, the **credit growth rate in the banking sector dropped to 14.1%, compared to 22.3% in 2010**, primarily due to risk aversion and stricter lending norms (Kumar & Singh, 2012). Small and medium enterprises (SMEs), which rely heavily on bank credit, were severely impacted, with a **15% decline in loan disbursements to this sector in 2013** (RBI, 2014).

The **overall economic impact** of rising NPAs is reflected in declining **Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth** and increased financial sector risks. The GDP growth rate slowed from **8.5% in 2010 to 5.0% in 2013**, partly due to the banking sector's inability to support productive investments (Economic Survey of India, 2014).

Erosion of Investor Confidence and Financial Market Stability

The increasing NPA levels also **erode investor confidence**, particularly in PSBs. The **market capitalization of leading public sector banks** such as State Bank of India (SBI) and Punjab National Bank (PNB) declined by **over 20% between 2012 and 2013** due to concerns over deteriorating asset quality (Ghosh, 2013). Foreign investors and credit rating agencies have also expressed concerns, leading to **downgrades of several Indian banks** by global rating agencies such as Moody's and Fitch in 2013 (Basu, 2013).

Increased Government Burden and Fiscal Implications

As PSBs struggle with high NPAs, the **government is often required to infuse capital** to maintain their solvency. Between 2010 and 2013, the Indian government infused **₹58,600 crore** into public sector banks as part of recapitalization efforts (Economic Survey of India, 2014). However, this approach places a significant burden on public finances and limits the government's ability to allocate funds to other critical sectors such as infrastructure and social welfare.

The persistent rise in NPAs necessitates **urgent policy interventions** to restore banking sector stability, improve credit flow, and strengthen economic growth prospects.

5. Causes of Rising NPAs in the Indian Banking Sector

The persistent rise in Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) in the Indian banking sector has been driven by **a combination of economic, structural, and policy-related factors**. The period between **2009 and 2014** saw a sharp increase in NPAs due to global economic uncertainties, sectoral distress, and weak credit appraisal mechanisms. The **Gross NPA ratio of Scheduled Commercial Banks (SCBs)** increased from **2.3% in 2009 to 4.1% in 2013**, with public sector banks (PSBs) accounting for the majority of bad loans (Reserve Bank of India [RBI], 2014).

1. Economic Slowdown and Global Financial Crisis

One of the primary causes of rising NPAs was the **economic slowdown post-2008**, which adversely affected corporate profitability and debt repayment capacity. The **GDP growth rate declined from 8.5% in 2010 to 5.0% in 2013**, leading to financial stress across industries (Economic Survey of India, 2014). The global financial crisis of 2008-09 also **disrupted trade and investment flows**, leading to declining export revenues in sectors such as textiles, iron & steel, and infrastructure (Ghosh, 2013).

2. Weak Credit Appraisal and Risk Management

Inadequate due diligence and weak risk assessment practices by banks contributed significantly to rising NPAs. During the period **2008-2012**, banks aggressively extended loans to large corporate houses, often without proper assessment of **project viability and repayment capacity**. As a result, **corporate NPAs accounted for nearly 60% of the total NPAs by 2013** (Basu, 2013). The **restructured loan ratio**, which includes loans that were rescheduled instead of being classified as NPAs, rose from **4.2% in 2010 to 6.2% in 2013**, indicating financial distress (RBI, 2014).

3. Sector-Specific Stress and Policy Delays

Certain industries contributed disproportionately to NPAs due to **delayed projects, cost overruns, and regulatory bottlenecks**. The **infrastructure sector accounted for 30% of total stressed assets in 2013**, as power and road projects suffered delays due to land acquisition and environmental clearances (Economic Survey of India, 2014). Similarly, **the iron & steel sector's NPA ratio increased to 10% in 2013**, driven by volatile global prices and rising input costs (Kumar & Singh, 2012).

4. Wilful Defaults and Corporate Mismanagement

A rising share of NPAs was attributed to **wilful defaulters**, where borrowers **deliberately avoided repayments despite having the financial capacity**. In 2013, **wilful defaults in the banking system amounted to ₹30,000 crore**, a 50% increase from 2011 (RBI, 2014). Several large corporate groups engaged in **diversion of funds**, leading to legal disputes and prolonged recovery proceedings (Ghosh, 2013).

5. Legal and Institutional Challenges in Loan Recovery

The **slow judicial process and inefficiencies in debt recovery mechanisms** further contributed to rising NPAs. The **average time taken to resolve a loan default case in Indian courts was 4-5 years** in 2013, compared to **1.5-2 years in developed economies** (Basu, 2013). The **Debt Recovery Tribunals (DRTs)**, established to fast-track NPA cases, had **over 50,000 pending cases by 2013**, delaying recoveries (RBI, 2014).

The interplay of these factors led to **a severe deterioration in asset quality**, necessitating urgent structural reforms to strengthen the banking sector's resilience against NPAs.

6. Consequences of Rising NPAs on the Indian Banking Sector

The rising burden of **Non-Performing Assets (NPAs)** has had severe consequences on the stability and performance of the Indian banking sector. The sharp increase in NPAs between **2009 and 2014** significantly affected **banks' profitability, lending capacity, capital adequacy, and overall financial stability**. The **Gross NPA ratio of Scheduled Commercial Banks (SCBs) increased from 2.3% in 2009 to 4.1% in 2013**, with public sector banks (PSBs) bearing a major share (Reserve Bank of India [RBI], 2014).

1. Decline in Bank Profitability

The most immediate impact of rising NPAs is the **erosion of bank profitability** due to increased provisioning requirements. **Banks are required to set aside provisions ranging from 15% to 100% of the NPA amount**, depending on the category of default (Basu, 2013). In 2013, the total provisions made by Indian banks for NPAs amounted to **₹90,000 crore**, significantly reducing their net earnings (RBI, 2014). Consequently, **the return on assets (ROA) for public sector banks fell from 1.1% in 2009 to 0.5% in 2013**, indicating weak financial performance (Economic Survey of India, 2014).

2. Reduction in Lending Activity

High NPAs limit the **credit expansion ability** of banks, as they become more risk-averse in lending to businesses and individuals. The **credit growth rate of public sector banks declined from 18% in 2010 to 10% in 2013**, mainly due to risk concerns and capital constraints (Ghosh, 2013). Small and medium enterprises (SMEs), which rely on bank loans for expansion, were particularly affected, leading to a slowdown in **manufacturing and service sector growth** (Kumar & Singh, 2012).

3. Weakening of Capital Adequacy Ratios

Banks' capital adequacy ratio (CAR) is a key indicator of financial health. Rising NPAs force banks to allocate higher capital for risk-weighted assets, leading to capital erosion. **The average CAR of PSBs declined from 13.2% in 2009 to 11.2% in 2013**, nearing the regulatory minimum of **9% under Basel norms** (RBI, 2014). Several banks required capital infusion from the government to maintain regulatory compliance, further straining public finances.

4. Negative Impact on Investor Confidence

The rising NPA levels led to **a decline in investor confidence**, affecting bank stock prices and market valuations. **The BSE Bankex Index, which tracks banking stocks, declined by 12% in 2013**, reflecting concerns over deteriorating asset quality (Economic Survey of India, 2014). Foreign institutional investors (FIIs) also reduced their exposure to Indian banks, affecting their ability to raise capital through equity markets.

5. Higher Interest Rates and Borrowing Costs

As banks struggle with NPAs, they attempt to **compensate for losses by increasing interest rates on loans**, making credit expensive for businesses and consumers. In 2013, the **average lending rate of PSBs increased to 12.5%, compared to 11.2% in 2010**, making it costlier for industries to finance expansion projects (RBI, 2014). The rising cost of borrowing led to **lower private sector investments**, further slowing economic growth.

6. Increased Burden on Government Finances

Since public sector banks dominate the Indian banking landscape, the government often intervenes to **recapitalize struggling banks**. Between 2009 and 2013, the government infused **₹58,600 crore into public sector banks** to maintain their capital adequacy (Ministry of Finance, 2014). These bailouts place a burden on **fiscal resources**, diverting funds from social and developmental expenditures.

The continuous rise in NPAs has **posed significant risks to the Indian banking sector**, necessitating urgent policy interventions to restore financial stability and improve credit discipline.

7. Policy Measures and Regulatory Interventions to Address NPAs

The alarming rise in **Non-Performing Assets (NPAs)** in the Indian banking sector between **2009 and 2014** necessitated a series of **policy measures and regulatory interventions** to mitigate risks, enhance credit discipline, and improve banking stability. The **Reserve Bank of India (RBI)** and the **Government of India** introduced several reforms aimed at improving asset quality, strengthening recovery mechanisms, and promoting responsible lending practices.

1. Strengthening Prudential Norms

To ensure early detection of stressed assets, the **RBI mandated stricter provisioning norms** for banks. **Provisioning for doubtful assets was increased from 20% to 25% in 2013**, putting additional financial pressure on banks to recognize bad loans at an early stage (RBI, 2014). Additionally, the **Loan Restructuring Mechanism** was reformed to prevent excessive restructuring of weak loans under lenient terms (Basu, 2013).

2. Corporate Debt Restructuring (CDR) Mechanism

The **Corporate Debt Restructuring (CDR) framework**, introduced in 2001, was revised in **2012** to prevent misuse, and ensure that only genuinely distressed businesses received relief. By **2013, over ₹3.5 lakh crore worth of loans had been restructured**, but the success rate remained low, with **30% of restructured loans turning into NPAs** (Ministry of Finance, 2014). To address this, **the RBI introduced a "5/25 scheme"** in 2014, allowing infrastructure and core industry projects to refinance loans with longer repayment cycles (Ghosh, 2013).

3. Introduction of Asset Reconstruction Companies (ARCs)

Asset Reconstruction Companies (ARCs) were strengthened to facilitate **faster resolution of bad debts**. By **2013, ARCs had acquired ₹1.3 lakh crore worth of NPAs**, but their impact remained limited due to a lack of capital and legal challenges in recovering assets (Economic Survey of India, 2014). The **government allowed 100% foreign direct investment (FDI) in ARCs** in 2013 to attract global investors and improve asset recovery rates (RBI, 2014).

4. Legal Reforms and Debt Recovery Mechanisms

The legal framework for debt recovery was reinforced through amendments to the **SARFAESI Act (2002) and the Debt Recovery Tribunals (DRTs)**. Between **2009 and 2013, banks recovered ₹1.2 lakh crore through SARFAESI mechanisms**, but delays in judicial proceedings remained a challenge (Kumar & Singh, 2012). The **Lok Adalats and One-Time Settlement (OTS) schemes** were promoted to expedite recovery from small borrowers.

5. Public Sector Bank Reforms and Capital Infusion

Recognizing the role of **Public Sector Banks (PSBs) in driving credit growth**, the government undertook a **capital infusion of ₹58,600 crore between 2009 and 2013** to strengthen their balance sheets (Ministry of Finance, 2014). Additionally, the **RBI introduced "Prompt Corrective Action (PCA)" norms** for weak banks, restricting their lending ability until financial health improved (RBI, 2013).

6. Strengthening Credit Monitoring and Risk Management

To prevent the recurrence of NPAs, banks were instructed to **enhance credit appraisal mechanisms** and conduct rigorous due diligence before sanctioning loans. The **Central Repository of Information on Large Credits (CRILC)** was set up in 2014 to track exposures of **₹5 crore and above**, allowing banks to detect stressed borrowers early (RBI, 2014).

Impact and Future Scope

These policy measures provided **short-term relief** in managing NPAs, but structural weaknesses remained. By **2014, the Gross NPA ratio had stabilized at 4.1%**, indicating some improvement, but further efforts were needed to improve recovery mechanisms and lending discipline (Economic Survey of India, 2014). The success of regulatory interventions depended on **effective implementation, transparency, and stronger coordination between banks, regulators, and policymakers**.

Conclusion

The issue of **Non-Performing Assets (NPAs)** has remained a persistent challenge in the Indian banking sector, affecting financial stability, profitability, and credit expansion. The period between **2009 and 2014** saw a **sharp rise in NPAs**, with Gross NPAs increasing from **₹68,220 crore in 2009 to ₹2.63 lakh crore by 2014**, highlighting the urgent need for regulatory intervention (RBI, 2014). The primary causes of this surge included **poor credit appraisal, economic slowdown, policy bottlenecks, and wilful defaults**, particularly in sectors like **infrastructure, power, and aviation** (Ministry of Finance, 2014).

To counter this growing crisis, **various policy measures and regulatory interventions** were implemented. The **Reserve Bank of India (RBI)** strengthened **prudential norms, enhanced credit monitoring mechanisms, and promoted asset recovery through the SARFAESI Act and Debt Recovery Tribunals (DRTs)**. Additionally, frameworks such as the **Corporate Debt Restructuring (CDR) scheme, the 5/25 scheme for infrastructure loans, and Asset Reconstruction Companies (ARCs)** were introduced to improve the resolution of stressed assets (Ghosh, 2013). Despite these efforts, **only 30% of restructured loans were successfully revived**, demonstrating the limitations of existing mechanisms (Economic Survey of India, 2014).

One of the **critical lessons** from this phase was the **importance of proactive risk assessment and better credit governance**. The introduction of **the Central Repository of Information on Large Credits (CRILC) in 2014** was a significant step towards improving loan monitoring and preventing future defaults (RBI, 2014). Furthermore, the **capital infusion of ₹58,600 crore into Public Sector Banks (PSBs) between 2009 and 2013** helped in stabilizing their financial health, but long-term structural reforms remained necessary (Ministry of Finance, 2014).

Going forward, addressing the NPA crisis requires **a multi-pronged approach**—strengthening credit risk management, improving recovery frameworks, ensuring better corporate governance, and leveraging technology for early warning systems. A **robust legal and regulatory framework, along with strict accountability measures**, will be crucial in mitigating future risks. While the steps taken between 2009 and

2014 laid a foundation for NPA management, **sustained reforms and policy vigilance** are required to ensure financial stability and sustainable banking growth in India.

References

1. Basu, S. (2005). Banking and financial laws in India. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
2. Chakrabarty, K. C. (2012). Two decades of credit management: Lessons for the future. *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*, 66(4), 12–26.
3. Economic Survey of India. (2014). *State of the Indian economy: Challenges and prospects*. Ministry of Finance, Government of India.
4. Ghosh, S. (2013). Determinants of non-performing loans in Indian banks: A panel data analysis. *Journal of Banking Regulation*, 14(4), 272–288.
5. Government of India. (2002). *The Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act (SARFAESI Act)*. Ministry of Finance.
6. Gupta, P. K., & Jain, S. (2012). Problem of non-performing assets in India: Issues and challenges. *Journal of Financial Studies*, 8(2), 45–63.
7. Kaur, H., & Singh, M. (2011). Recovery management of NPAs in Indian banks: A study. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 3(1), 115–127.
8. Mohan, R. (2009). Global financial crisis and Indian banking sector: Resilience and challenges. *RBI Working Paper Series*, 9(3), 1–19.
9. Ministry of Finance. (2014). *Trends in non-performing assets: An analysis of stressed assets in Indian banks*. Government of India.
10. Patra, M. D., & Kapoor, R. (2013). Credit risk management in Indian public sector banks. *Reserve Bank of India Occasional Papers*, 34(2), 79–101.
11. Rajan, R. G., & Zingales, L. (2003). *Saving capitalism from the capitalists*. Princeton University Press.
12. Reserve Bank of India. (1991). *Report of the Narasimham Committee on Financial Sector Reforms*. RBI Publications.
13. Reserve Bank of India. (2001). *Report on trends and progress of banking in India 2000–01*. RBI Publications.
14. Reserve Bank of India. (2010). *Trends and progress of banking in India 2009–10*. RBI Publications.
15. Reserve Bank of India. (2014). *Financial stability report: An assessment of banking risks in India*. RBI Publications.
16. Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. New York: Knopf.
17. Shetty, S. (2010). Financial inclusion and NPAs: A balancing act for Indian banks. *Indian Economic Journal*, 58(3), 208–226.
18. Subbarao, D. (2013). The Indian banking sector: The role of regulation and risk management. *Speech at the 15th Annual Banking Summit*, Mumbai.

19. Vyas, M. (2014). Structural weaknesses in India's banking system: A macroeconomic perspective. *Asian Journal of Finance & Economics*, 6(2), 88–104.

20. Yadav, M. S. (2007). Impact of non-performing assets on Indian banking: A comparative analysis of public and private banks. *Journal of Banking and Finance Research*, 12(1), 51–67.