

## **SC Ruling on Taxing Foreign Companies**

### **What is the issue?**

\n\n

\n

- The Supreme Court has recently ruled that the income of two US companies in India cannot be taxed in India.

\n

- This has again raised the demand for clarity on identifying and defining the nature of Permanent Establishments (PE).

\n

\n\n

### **What is a Permanent Establishment?**

\n\n

\n

- A PE is a fixed place of business, wholly or partly carried out by a foreign enterprise operating in India.

\n

- It could be a branch office, a place of management, a factory, a warehouse, a workshop etc.

\n

- The complexity is that the definition of PE differs in each tax treaty and the identification of PE itself is a controversial area.

\n

- The concept of PE determines the taxability of a foreign company in India.

\n

- Usually, foreign companies get tax concession under Double Taxation Avoidance Treaties, and they pay taxes in their home countries.

\n

- But if they have PEs in India, they should pay taxes for the income they have created in India i.e. profits that are attributable to the PE.

\n

\n\n

### **What is the recent case?**

\n\n

- \n
- The case relates to two US-based companies, e-Fund Corporation (e-Fund Corp) and e-Fund IT Solutions Group Inc (e-Fund Inc).
  - These companies have paid taxes on their global income in the US.
  - e-Fund Corp is a holding company with almost a 100% stake in IDLX Corporation, another company based in the US.
  - IDLX Holding BV holds a 100% stake in e-Funds International India Private Ltd.
  - IDLX International BV is also a holding company having almost a 100% stake in e-Fund Inc.
  - The revenue department has held that the income of e-Fund Corp and e-Fund Inc was attributable to India as the two assesses had a PE in India.
  - This means that their income should be taxed in India, irrespective of whether they had paid taxes in the US.
  - The Income Tax Appellate Tribunal (ITAT), Delhi, had upheld the position of the revenue department.
  - But, the Delhi High Court had rejected both the revenue department's plea and the ITAT order.
- \n

\n\n

### **What is the judgement?**

\n\n

- \n
- The Supreme Court has held that no part of the main business and revenue-earning activity was carried on through a fixed business place in India.
  - The Indian company only rendered support services, which enabled the assesses, in turn, to offer services to their clients abroad.
  - Thus the outsourcing of work to India by MNCs in itself would not give rise to a fixed place permanent establishment (PE).
  - The High Court had also earlier said that a holding company or a subsidiary company by itself cannot constitute a PE.

\n

- Consequently, the global income of these MNCs attributable to this back-office work cannot be taxed in India.

\n

- The judgment will perceivably have repercussions for taxing outsourcing businesses as well as subsidiaries of MNCs.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: Business Standard**

\n

