Exceptional Taxation: UAE Supreme Court Rules on Domestic and Foreign Related Companies' Tax Liabilities

September 22, 2023

The recent judgment delivered by the Federal Supreme Court regarding the application of tax liabilities to related companies, even those situated outside the state, in exceptional circumstances where the tax event occurs within the state, is of paramount importance. It not only delineates the legal boundaries of tax obligations among interconnected corporate entities but also sets a precedent for how tax laws are interpreted and applied in cross-border corporate scenarios. This judgment underscores the necessity of a nuanced understanding of the legal and fiscal framework governing such entities, thereby providing a robust foundation for tax planning and compliance, especially in an increasingly globalized business environment.

Tax events amongst related entities

The Federal Supreme Court's analysis concerning a tax event and the separation of liabilities among multi-entity enterprises is a nuanced examination of the legal and fiscal responsibilities that these entities bear. The court's reasoning on the matter sheds light on the intricate fabric of corporate law and tax obligations, particularly in the context of parent and subsidiary companies or branches.

The court underscores the distinct legal persona of a subsidiary company, which is conceived through the

collaboration of another company, yet operates independently from its parent company. This independence is manifested in its legal and moral personality, enabling it to acquire rights and bear obligations. The subsidiary, with its unique name and domicile, operates as a separate legal entity, its nationality remaining unblended with that of its partners or parent company.

On the other hand, the tax event, as delineated by the court, is a pivotal circumstance that triggers tax liability. The court adopts a clear standard in identifying the tax event, which is fundamentally the supply of goods within the state. This standard is instrumental in determining the tax liability, which is incumbent upon the entity where the tax event is realized.

The separation of liabilities among multi-entity enterprises is a complex domain, necessitating a meticulous examination of the legal and fiscal dynamics that govern the relationships between parent companies, subsidiaries, and branches. The court's analysis provides a robust framework for understanding these dynamics and the legal parameters that define tax liability in the context of multi-entity enterprises and multinational companies.

The Supreme Court says in this regard:

"The subsidiary company is the company that is co-founded by another company and is independent. Originally, from a legal standpoint, it is independent of the parent company, and its legal and moral personality is established, which qualifies it to acquire rights and bear obligations. It is considered a separate legal entity from the partners and the parent company. The subsidiary company has an independent name and domicile, which is the place where its main administration is located. Also, its nationality does not mix with the nationality of the partners. The person liable for tax is the one in whom the event established by law is available. The

legislator adopted a clear standard in determining the event that creates the tax liability.”

Tax liabilities for out-of-state entities

The Federal Supreme Court’s analysis on the application of tax liabilities to related companies, even those situated outside the state, in exceptional circumstances where the tax event occurs within the state, unveils a nuanced understanding of the legal and fiscal framework governing such scenarios. The Court emphasizes the sanctity of the distinct legal persona of each company, underscoring the principle that the tax liabilities of one cannot be arbitrarily imputed to the other. However, it carves out an exception to this rule in extraordinary circumstances, thereby introducing a layer of complexity to the tax liability discourse.

The Court’s stance is rooted in a logical necessity that once the tax event is realized, the tax assessment becomes anchored in the legal truth. This notion of a tax event is pivotal as it triggers the tax liability, and its occurrence within the state’s jurisdiction is a critical factor in determining the tax obligations of related companies. The Court highlights that the tax liability is not merely a function of the corporate structure or the domicile of the companies but is intricately tied to the locus of the tax event.

This analysis brings to the fore the concept of exceptional circumstances as a determinant of tax liability. The Court posits that in such rare scenarios, the veil of separate legal persona of related companies may be pierced, allowing for the tax liabilities to be assessed in a manner that transcends the conventional boundaries of corporate separateness. This is a significant departure from the traditional understanding of tax liability as being confined to the entity where the tax event is realized.

Furthermore, the Court’s discourse illuminates the legal

rationale underpinning this exception. It underscores the imperative of a rational and equitable assessment of tax liability, particularly in scenarios where the strict adherence to corporate separateness may lead to an unjust enrichment or evasion of tax obligations. The Court's analysis is grounded in a pragmatic understanding of the fiscal realities, recognizing the potential for cross-border corporate structures to be employed in circumventing tax liabilities.

The Court's exposition also hints at a broader legal and fiscal paradigm wherein the principles of equity and justice are harmonized with the tenets of corporate law and tax policy. It invites a reevaluation of the legal doctrines governing the assessment of tax liability, particularly in the context of multi-company enterprises with cross-border operations.

Moreover, the Court's narrative underscores the imperative for a meticulous examination of the circumstances surrounding the tax event, advocating for a judicious approach in the assessment of tax liabilities. This nuanced understanding of tax liability, as expounded by the Court, provides a robust framework for navigating the complex terrain of tax law, particularly in scenarios involving related companies with cross-border operations.

The Supreme Court says in this regard:

"It was decided, according to the judgment of this court, that the legal personality of both companies must be respected, and it is not permissible to penetrate it or decide the liability of one for the tax debts of the other, except in exceptional cases… As by logical necessity, as long as the tax event has occurred, the tax assessment becomes based on the correct law."

Takeaway

In light of this judgment, tax planners should meticulously evaluate the legal and fiscal landscape governing the operations of related companies, especially those with cross-border operations. The clear distinction between the legal personas of related companies, as emphasized by the court, necessitates a thorough examination of the tax implications arising from the activities of each entity. Moreover, the exceptional circumstances clause introduced by the court warrants a careful analysis to ensure that tax planning strategies are robust enough to withstand legal scrutiny, particularly when the tax event occurs within the state's jurisdiction.

Furthermore, tax planners should consider adopting a holistic approach that takes into account not only the legal stipulations but also the ethical and reputational considerations associated with tax liabilities. The judgment serves as a reminder of the intricate interplay between corporate law, tax policy, and the overarching principles of justice and equity. By fostering a comprehensive understanding of the legal doctrines and fiscal realities underscored in the judgment, tax planners can better navigate the complex terrain of tax law, ensuring that the tax strategies devised are in compliance with the legal stipulations, and are resilient in the face of evolving legal and fiscal landscapes.

Additionally, in structuring contractual commitments and arrangements, it becomes imperative to meticulously consider the position articulated by the Federal Supreme Court. The judgment accentuates the significance of clearly delineating the legal and fiscal responsibilities of each entity involved, especially in scenarios where related companies engage in transactions that could trigger tax events within the state. Contractual arrangements should be crafted with a keen eye towards the legal nuances that could potentially impact tax liabilities, ensuring that the terms and conditions encapsulated within the contracts are in alignment with the

legal framework elucidated by the court. This entails a thorough review and, if necessary, a revision of existing contractual commitments to ensure they are robust and resilient against the backdrop of the court’s stance. By proactively addressing the implications of this judgment in contractual agreements, companies can mitigate risks, ensure compliance with prevailing tax laws, and foster a conducive environment for transparent and equitable business transactions.

Author: Mahmoud Abuwasel
Title: Partner – Disputes
Email: mabuwasel@waselandwasel.com
Profile: https://waselandwasel.com/about/mahmoud-abuwasel/

Lawyers and consultants.
Tier-1 services since 1799.
www.waselandwasel.com
business@waselandwasel.com