INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2025

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN - 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – https://ijlr.iledu.in/

Journal's Editorial Page - https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/

Volume 5 and Issue 6 of 2025 (Access Full Issue on - https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-5-and-issue-6-of-2025/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 94896 71437 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2025

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INSURANCE REGULATION BETWEEN INDIA AND THE UNITED STATES

AUTHOR - MAYANK SINGH, STUDENT OF LAW AT AMITY LAW SCHOOL, NOIDA, UTTAR PRADESH

BEST CITATION - MAYANK SINGH, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INSURANCE REGULATION BETWEEN INDIA AND THE UNITED STATES, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (6) OF 2025, PG. 181-188, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

ABSTRACT

In this paper, a whole comparison of India and the United States insurance regulations will be analyzed to understand their centralized and decentralized system of governance. An example is that in India, the type of insurance regulation is dominated and exercised by the Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India (IRDAI) among other things, acting as a single national regulator, wherein all the rules and enforcement apply uniformly throughout the jurisdiction of the country. From licensing to solvency requirements to consumer protection and market conduct, common application is guaranteed.

One among centralization models of the IRDAI promotes regulatory clarity and national oversight for swift implementation of policy reforms, such as technology innovation and digital policies, but also raises challenges, such as bureaucratic rigidity and regional limitation. In the US, the whole scenario is different as the country works on a decentralized insurance regulation model. Each state has its own independent insurance market run through separate Departments of Insurance and coordinated along with National Association of Insurance Commissioners NAIC.

The NAIC would prepare model laws and best practices for insurance but with different state regulations; thus, fragmentation in regulation happens. Internal flexibility and innovation, along with responsiveness to local needs, make this decentralized approach good. Still, it can be detrimental to the consumer in inconsistencies in consumer rights and solvency standards among states, as well as product offerings. The research looks at structural, functional, and operational dimensions of both IRDAI and NAIC with respect to how well-they perform in terms of market stability, consumer protection, and risk management.

The paper also goes on to compare those consumer protection measures, grievance redressal systems, digital platforms, and legal guardrails existing in both nations. The study, therefore, highlights the positives and negatives of each model. While the Indian system enables a common practice and control, the decentralized American model allows for better adaptability and competition. Such a comparison serves as a learning opportunity for policy reform, recommending a balanced model with national standards combined with regional favourable flexibility in building a better insurance regulatory system and confidence among consumers.

INTRODUCTION

In modern economies, insurance is a fundamental role that helps to reduce financial risks for the private actors. The regulation of the insurance sector should be effective enough that it will guarantee market stability, protect the consumers from unjust business practices and also safeguard the integrity of the insurers. Different economic structures, legal traditions and policy objectives however make different

regulatory frameworks across jurisdictions. The purpose of this study is to compare insurance regulatory frameworks in India and USA, two large economies that have been following two opposite policies in terms of oversight and governance within the insurance industry.

Therefore, the regulation of insurance is centralized under Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India (IRDAI), to ensure that the institution is licensed, meets solvency requirements and is responsible of consumer protection[239]. In particular after liberalization in 2000, when there was the liberalization of the regulatory landscape, which is a regulatory landscape that allowed the private and foreign participation. On the other hand, the United States has a system rarely characterized as centralized with insurance regulation with respect to insurance regulation continuing to occur primarily at the state level with the help of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC)[240].

It is a comparative study in respect of structural features, functional frameworks and operational features of IRDAI and NAIC, and the degree of effectiveness of the analyzed and the decentralized regulatory apparatus, and the consumer protection measures applied by the two nations.

INSURANCE REGULATORY AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF INIDA (IRDAI)

STRUCTURAL ASPECT

IRDAI is a statutory regulatory authority constituted under insurance regulatory and development authority act of 1999. It is regulated by the Ministry of Finance, Government of India and is maintained as uniformly as much as the insurance market is in the country. The Chairman and the board of members consist of a number of people of numerous backgrounds, including financial, insurance, legal, and consumer affairs, nominated by the government. Through this centralized structure, IRDAI can have a common regulatory standard, take effective decisions, and monitor the evolution of insurance business case[241].

All insurance entities operating in India as defined under the Insurance Act, 1938 is under the purview of a single regulator viz IRDAI, i.e, life insurers, general insurers, reinsurance companies and intermediaries. Legally, it has its structure of providing different rules for licensing, solvency requirements, market behavior and protection of policy holders. With the IRDAI having 'one window' regulator, regulatory clarity is relatively simpler, bureaucracy delays are avoided and consistent insurance products across India can be planned.

FUNCTIONAL ASPECT

Its main task includes policy making, licensing, protecting consumer along with solvency control. It sets a national insurance policy and verifies that insurers are conforming to financial and operational criteria. IRDAI is a crucial task because it approves the insurance businesses, the intermediaries and agents in accordance with their financials, business goals and comply with law standards.

At the same time, the steps taken by the IRDAI regarding the consumer protection of the policyholders are quite commendable. Full disclosures on insurance contracts, outlined grievance procedures, and levying devastating fines if discharge procedures are not followed are necessary. It is a program that enables policyholders to register grievances through online, which is meant for promotion of openness and accountability[242].

Another important component of the operations of IRDAI comprises risk and solvency

[239] Government of India, "The Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority Act, 1999," Ministry of Law and Justice, Act No. 41 of 1999, (10 December 1999).
[240] U.S. Department of Treasury, "The Financial Crisis and Information Gaps: Report to the G-20 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors," Federal Insurance Office, (October 2009).
[241] Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India, "IRDAI (Registration of Indian Insurance Companies) Regulations, 2000," Gazette of India, Extraordinary Part III, Section 4, (July 2000).
[242] Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India, "IRDAI (Protection of Policyholders' Interests) Regulations, 2017," Notification No. IRDAI/Reg/8/145/2017, (22 June 2017).

requirements. Risk based capital (RBC) rules are enforced by the authority, there are regular financial inspections and insurers are required to hold sufficient solvency buffers. It is therefore guaranteed that it is possible for insurers to carry out their duties to policyholders while in adverse financial condition.

OPERATIONAL ASPECT

Under the headquarters of this organization our archiving and issuing of new insurance policies across India are controlled by a centralized regulatory process. This contrasts very much with other governments' decentralized regulatory frameworks. Along with the authority, approve premiums and insurance products. Prevent market manipulation and competition just in case the market is to protect the interests of the customers.

Insurers' financial health is monitored in terms of solvency monitoring by IRDAI through periodic disclosures, Risk based capital models as well as through audit. Technology & innovation has been given a top priority by IRDAI in insurance business at the cost of which Digital insurance, fintech collaboration and Insure-Tech development have been encouraged to improve market penetration & efficiency in the business.

Taken overall, it is a centralized management by IRDAI which guarantees the stability and uniform regulation so that all these insurers fulfill the national criteria. Nevertheless, regulatory delays, bureaucratic rigidity, and a few other obstacles can sometimes stifle the market dynamism.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS (NAIC)

STRUCTURAL ASPECT

In contrast to IRDAI, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) of the United States is a non-governmental, self-regulating body made up of insurance regulators from all 50 states, Washington, D.C., and US territories. Founded in 1871, the NAIC is a coordinating body that supplies regulatory models, model legislation, and best practices to state insurance departments, who retain the capacity to regulate insurers doing business within their jurisdictions[243].

The NAIC is decentralized in structure, and local state governments hold primary responsibility for the regulation of insurance companies. Every state employs its own commissioner of insurance to oversee compliance with regulations in their state. The NAIC promotes cooperation among the different authorities so that laws and procedures are standardized yet still controlled by the states.

FUNCTIONAL ASPECT

The main functions of the NAIC are to develop model legislation, standardize rules, and offer solvency monitoring systems. NAIC advises state regulators but does not have direct enforcement powers. States may adopt, modify, or refuse NAIC suggestions based on their respective regulatory requirements.

NAIC is a vital activity in the issuing of licenses and accreditation. Although there are different states that issue insurance licenses, the NAIC issues certification programs so that regulatory needs would be comparable across jurisdictions. This accreditation process is part of national standards for solvency, market conduct, and consumer protection.

With regard to consumer protection, the NAIC established standards and tools but left enforcement up to state regulators. Consumer protection statutes are not uniform across states, leading to differences in dispute resolution systems, policyholders' rights, and market conduct rules.

OPERATIONAL ASPECT

NAIC adopts a decentralized approach to regulation, where every state regulates its own insurance. As opposed to IRDAI, which has direct authority over all the insurers in India, the NAIC is a facilitator that enables states to regulate

[243] National Association of Insurance Commissioners, "State Insurance Regulation: History, Purpose and Structure," NAIC State Regulatory Brief, (2011).

independently while providing a platform for standardization.

Solvency monitoring is one of the main roles of the NAIC. It created the Risk-Based Capital (RBC) model, which states may utilize to assess the financial soundness of insurers. Although the NAIC provides these tools, their enforcement falls in the hands of state regulators. Due to this decentralized approach, ratings of financial health could vary by state.

In terms of market surveillance, the NAIC does not directly regulate premium rates or sanction insurance products. Rather, these decisions are reserved for state regulators, which leads to variations in insurance premiums, coverage types, and market competition across the United States. NAIC also facilitates the promotion of innovation and technology through funding state-level Insure-Tech programs.

Although the state-based strategy by the NAIC fosters decentralized control and flexibility, it generates variances within states. Regulation fragmentation may establish disparities in insurer compliance and consumer protection, which makes cross-state operations for insurance companies challenging.

EFFECTIVENESS OF CENTRALIZED AND DECENTRALIZED REGULATORY APPROACHES

Through the regulatory structures, the insurance sector ensures stability, protects customers, and ensures financial sanity. These may either be centralized, wherein one organization controls the entire sector nationally, or decentralized with different regulatory agencies working independently in different places. Both have wide-reaching advantages and disadvantages that bear upon market efficiency, compliance, and innovation. The applicability of any such model may depend upon a host of factors in general, such as the size of the insurance market, heterogeneity of the economy, legal systems, and policy objectives. Accordingly, this paper presents an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of centralized versus decentralized methods of regulation in general, along with a comparison of insurance regulation in India and the United States.

CENTRALIZED APPROACH

India's regulatory framework under the Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India (IRDAI) stands firmly on a central regulation being the norm, implying uniformity, consistency, and effective governance. Since one institution oversees all matters on the insurance regulatory front, regulations remain uniform across the country in areas such as licensing, capital requirements, solvency, and valuation. Thus, all insurers operate in the same regulatory and legal financial environment conducive to minimizing variation or discrepancies across location in India for clarity amongst both insurers and policyholders' Uniform regulation also prevents regulatory arbitrage where some insurers cross state lines to escape regulations that may impose undue burdens on them.

Regulatory clarity and stability are other major pros under a centralized system. Along with full-fledged enforcement of stringent compliance procedures by the national authority, IRDAI stipulates that insurers' maintain adequate solvency margins in keeping with risk-based capital and fair-pricing norms. These restrictions increase consumer confidence in the insurance sector knowing that policyholders are safeguarded under one coherent legal framework. Market stability is also enhanced because all insurers must meet the same solvency criteria with less room for systemic risk.

Another advantage of centralized regulation is effective implementation of regulation. Regulatory reforms, policy changes, and new compliance procedures can be quickly put in place and enforced because one body regulates the entire sector. For example, in India, IRDAI quickly established its insurance regulations concerning the digital policy, proposed new laws on consumer protection, and enforced them without seeking approvals

from rival state-level bodies. Such efficiency is particularly precious while attending to the exigencies that the fast-changing economy emerges with or the equally volatile developments concerning technology, since fast-tracking of decision-making is essential.

But centralized regulations come with their own set of problems. Bureaucratic ineffectiveness is among them. Every single regulatory decision is supposed to pass through a hierarchical approval system, making it extremely difficult for regulation modification to get rid of bureaucratic red tape. Such rigidity may result in the insurance industry failing to respond quickly enough to market changes. Unlike their decentralized counterparts, which allow states to test new policies, centralized systems sometimes provide a delayed response to economic fluctuations.

Another limitation lies in the application of one-size-fits-all models. One regulator may simply not cope with regional variations in insurance penetration, economic status, and consumer behavior. For example, rural areas may differ in their demand for insurance products and regulatory incentives as opposed to urban markets. Therefore, under a centralized regime, policies are framed from a national perspective which may not necessarily address particular needs.

DECENTRALIZED APPROACH

This approach applies to narrow geographical limits, as in the case of many Eastern state regulations ensuring a national model for property insurance, and it also applies to product lines. If a region permits out-of-state insurers to sell unauthorized products, that state effectively opens up to competitors from other areas, except for the license required for foreign companies.

Insurance may be used as a sparring ground for regulation at the national and state levels. Because the direct energies of action groups from various fields are showered within this specific area and because it is ablaze with furious rhetoric and rhetoric, it is highly likely that the action-groups will make some move before long. Just think of political science and economics where these measures are justified from the perspective of franchise or other stratification. Then you will see that it is not just because some states have laws that permit insurance against some things that occur.

The mobile insurance companies can create competition with localized insurance service providers thus forcing them to offer more competitive prices and better service. As a result, it increases the willingness to pay by the end-user without reducing profit to the insurance company, enticing more coverage. Thus, once mobile insurance is introduced, the interdependence of various stakeholders in the industry will make its services differ according to requirements in different states.

Unarguably, decentralized financial innovations are useful and would attract insurance customers easily. These innovations would also be used by the insurance companies to survive competition by attracting sufficient customers. However, the customer satisfaction from these innovations will, in the long run, be proven useful by clearly establishing the relative efficiencies between the competing insurance companies[244].

CONSUMER PROTECTION MEASURES

CONSUMER PROTECTION IN INDIA

The IRDAI is key to protecting the interest of consumers in the Indian insurance marketplace by ensuring that insurance businesses are ethical, transparent, and offer easy redressal of complaints. Legislative build-up intent on consumer rights and insurers' practices would include the Insurance Act of 1938, IRDAI Act of 1999, and the Consumer Protection Act of 2019. The Consumer Protection Act of 2019 is the most definitive in respect of so many inequitable trade practices, delayed services, and

[244] U.S. Government Accountability Office, "Insurance Markets: Impacts of and Regulatory Response to the 2007-2009 Financial Crisis," GAO-13-583, (June 2013).

misleading advertisements in the insurance sector/financial service areas[245].

Among the most significant developments designed to provide policyholders with a speedy and amicable mechanism for the redressal of grievances would be the Insurance Ombudsman Scheme initiated by the IRDAI. This system helps policyholders resolve issues related to policy conditions, claim settlement, and premium payment without the need to venture into the maze of protracted judicial proceedings. IRDAI also mandates that every insurance enterprise has an Integrated Grievance Management System (IGMS) for speedy and fair grievance redressal. An insurer has a set time frame within which to redress the problems of its clients as prescribed by the online facility. The IRDAI, under the Guidelines of Protection of Policyholders' Interests of 2017, has also imposed strict parameters for the settlement of claims. These rules strengthen claims settlement by insurers within reasonable time frames and require paying interest penalty for late settlement. The regulator is designated to ensure maintenance of uniform and serious disclosure norms on the part of insurers related to the contents of the policy and benefits of the policy prior to sale through each insurer; regulations, for which, to prevent mis-selling as well as protect the insuring public from frauds, have been set forth by the IRDAI. Misleading advertisement or any potential fraudulent practices may lead to sanctions and termination thereof as imposed by the Insurance Act of 1938 and the Act of Consumer Protection, 2019.

IRDAI motivates the digitalisation of the insurance industry with programs like e-KYC authentication, paperless policies or online premium payments for the convenience and simplicity of the model. With Bima Sugam, the online insurance platform created by the IRDAI, the institution strives to shape the comparison of policies and thereby improve the speed of claim settlement for the benefit of the customer. The IRDAI requires each insurance company to have a Policyholder Protection Committee tasked with the duty to oversee ethical sales and consumer rights.

Despite India's unified system of regulations, controlling agencies often needlessly delay in filing complaints and grievance redressal. In terms of insurance policies, low financial coverage and consumer ignorance prevent policies from being efficiently enforced. Policyholders still face a reduction even in the protection of their rights.

CONSUMER PROTECTION IN UNITED STATES

Consumer protection laws related to insurance are available across states and are defined in each state by a Department of Insurance. The National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) provides model legislation for uniformity in enforcing consumer protection laws. With the McCarran-Ferguson Act of 1945, the federal government goes out of the picture and allows states to control insurance, hence creating a patchwork of consumer protection programs, allowing diversity across the country[246].

Each state has its version of Unfair Trade Practices Acts, modelled on the legislation promulgated by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC). These statutes bring out a specific denial of insurers selling their insurance products through fraudulently produced advertisement, misleading sales techniques, or coercive tactics. They also implement the fair Claims Settlement Practice Act so that insurers have to settle their claims rightfully, otherwise they will face anger, punishments, and perhaps lawsuits.

The State Insurance Guarantee Fund is referred to as a major mechanism of consumer protection in the United States in the sense that it insures clients in the case of insolvency on the part of the insurer. In such a case, an unpaid

[245] Government of India, "The Consumer Protection Act, 2019," Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, Act No. 35 of 2019, (9 August 2019).

[246] U.S. Congress, "McCarran-Ferguson Act of 1945," Public Law 79-15, 59 Stat. 33, (March 9, 1945).

claim, refund, or unclaimed policy benefits would be paid to the state, thus saving clients from suffering losses through insuring. It is one of the major safety nets provided for insurance holders, yet, at the same time, it is making differences in consumer protection depending on the types of limits an individual holds and the ways a payment is made by states.

The National Insurance Consumer Protection Scheme has been made by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) and covers laws such as the Privacy Protection Regulations and the Insurance Data Security Model Law[247]. The regulations state that insurers are to protect consumers' data against cyber-attack and guarantee that there will not be abuse or sharing of citizens' private information without required consent. NAIC also provides such web-based resources as Consumer Information Source (CIS) and consumer education programs enabling policyholders to assess regulatory compliance, history of complaints, and the institution's financial viability.

Such market conduct inquiries are performed by state authorities and also involve regular audits of insurance companies to check compliance with consumer protection laws. Penalties and the suspension of their licenses may be incurred by insurers that behave inappropriately such as on accounts of rejection of valid claims, inflated premiums, or nondisclosure of policy conditions. Consumer hotlines for reporting immediate problems to insurers and general assistance on policy issues are available in several jurisdictions.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

India and America both have mature consumer protection regimes in the insurance sector, having very dissimilar structures based on centralized vs decentralized control. India's IRDAI-led model ensures that consistency in consumer protection regulations is ensured across the nation, with the single regulator exercising control only on grievance redressal, fraud management, and settlement of claims. Bureaucratic in nature, centralized control can lead to delay in policy change and enforcement actions.

Conversely, the United States has a state-by-state regulation regime that results in inconsistent consumer protection law between states. The regime accommodates more differential consumer protection law and regulation, but simultaneously contributes to variability as far as policyholder rights, claims handling, and insurer liability are concerned. While State Insurance Guarantee Funds make protection available if an insurer goes insolvent, the lack of a consistent national regulatory standard hinders compliance on the part of insurers operating across multiple states.

In summary, all regulatory systems have both strengths and weaknesses. The centralized consumer protection system in India provides ease of uniformity and rapid regulatory action, while the decentralized model in the United States offers flexibility and state-specific consumer protection. India can learn more regional autonomy in the future, while the United States can enhance regulatory uniformity to offer stronger nationwide consumer protection in the insurance sector.

CONCLUSION

Such contrasting centralized and decentralized systems of regulation between India and the United States of America are reflected in their comparison as applying insurance legislation. In India, IRDAI is the only regulatory authority, which ensures uniform rules across the country, organized policy enforcement and synonymous consumer protection measures. It also provides strict regulatory oversight, a consistent grievance redressal mechanism, and speedy modification in policy. However, there remain constraints of political delays and limited regional flexibility.

[247] National Association of Insurance Commissioners, "Insurance Data Security Model Law," NAIC Model Regulation Service, MDL-668, (October 2017).

By contrast, there is a decentralized regulatory structure in the United States. Each state has its own Department for insurance (DOI), and the NAIC provides a comprehensive framework for regulation. The U.S. regulatory structure is flexible; it permits states to change the rules according to the local standards and market conditions. However, this causes variations in consumer protection regulations across the country and as well leads to complications with administrative processes. Although this decentralized structure allows sovereignty to the states, it also comes with issues like regulatory arbitrage, defaults by jurisdictions, and disparities among consumer protection by states[248].

Strong measures have been adopted regarding consumer protection in both countries. With India consistent claim settlement process, fraud prevention, and grievance redressal; on the other hand, the United States concentrates on state consumer protection-related, market examinations conducted, and consumers protected from risks of insolvency.

While India has ensured a national uniformity in its framework, the United States has a specific statewide normative relating to consumer protections that exists depending on the local market. These structures come with their pros and cons. Yet, as both countries grow their global insurance markets, they may well, in accordance with such growth, need to adjust or amend their regulations so that there is a balance between safety to consumers and efficiency from the regulations.

[248] U.S. Department of Treasury, "How to Modernize and Improve the System of Insurance Regulation in the United States," Federal Insurance Office Report, (December 2013).