



## Indian group company of a U.S. entity does not constitute a PE in India under the India-U.S. tax treaty

### Background

Recently, the Mumbai Bench of the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal (the Tribunal) in the case of SPE Networks India Inc<sup>1</sup> (the taxpayer) held that an Indian group company of a U.S. company does not constitute a Permanent Establishment (PE) in India under the India-U.S. tax treaty (tax treaty) since the taxpayer was carrying out its operations from the U.S. and not from India. The activities, i.e., sale of advertisement inventory and distribution of channels were not carried out in India and the taxpayer did not have office premises or fixed place of business in India at its disposal. The Tribunal observed that none of the employees are based in India through whom the taxpayer could render the services in India. Further, the revenue earned by the Indian subsidiary was not on behalf of the taxpayer. It was making payment for the purchases, and it was not subject to any control of the taxpayer as far as conducting of business in India was concerned. Further, the activities of the taxpayer were not devoted wholly or almost wholly for the taxpayer.

### Facts of the case

- The taxpayer, a U.S. resident, engaged in the business of operating satellite television channels, marketing, and distribution of the television channels. During the year under consideration, the taxpayer was operating two channels namely ANIMAX and AXN. For the purpose of marketing its channels, the taxpayer had appointed SET India Private Ltd. (SET India) as a non-exclusive advertising and sales agent for canvassing airtime for the taxpayer channel on a principal to principal basis.
- The taxpayer had also granted rights to SET India to distribute TV channels in India for an agreed consideration at 70 per cent of the revenues collected by SET India from the distribution of ANIMAX channel in India with a minimum guarantee and 75 per cent of the revenue collected and the bonus fee in the case of AXN channel.
- The taxpayer had claimed that it did not have a PE in India and therefore the income arising to it was not taxable in India under Article 7 of the tax treaty.
- The Assessing Officer (AO) held that the arrangements between the taxpayer and SET India was not of principal to principal and it was about sharing the actual revenue collected from advertisers and the cable operators. The taxpayer had a business connection in India, and hence, the income attributable to the business operations of the taxpayer was taxable in India. The taxpayer also had a dependent agent PE in India under Article 5(4) of the tax treaty. As per Rule 10 read with Rule 10(iii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 (the Rules) the AO estimated the taxpayer's income at 10 per cent of gross advertisements as well as subscription revenue received by SET India on behalf of the taxpayer in India.
- The Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals) [CIT(A)] upheld the order of the AO.

<sup>1</sup> SPE Networks India Inc. v. DCIT (ITA No. 652/Mum/2014) [2017-TII-208-ITAT-MUM-INTL

## Tribunal's decision

- From the perusal of the agreements, it becomes clear that the taxpayer was carrying out its operation from U.S. and not from India. Both the activities, i.e., Sale of advertisement inventory and distribution of AXN and ANIMAX channels were not carried out in India. The taxpayer did not have any office premises or a fixed place of business in India at its disposal, and none of its employees were based in India through whom it could render the services in India. Thus, it has been held there was neither fixed base PE nor service PE of the taxpayer in India.
- Though the CIT(A) has endorsed the view of the AO that the taxpayer had agency PE, but nothing has been brought on record to prove that the agreements between the taxpayer and SET India was not on principal to principal basis. SET India had no authority to conclude any contract on behalf of the taxpayer in India.
- On the other hand, while selling the airtime inventory and distributing AXN and ANIMAX channels in India, SET India would act in its own right and not on behalf of the taxpayer. It was not dependent on the taxpayer economically or legally. It is also a fact that SET India also carried out significant marketing and estimation activities for other channels namely Set, Set Max and HBO. Therefore, SET India has to be treated as an independent entity which carried out its own business employing its own capital and bearing connected risks. It cannot be treated an agent, a dependent agent, of the taxpayer. SET India would purchase airtime from the taxpayer and would sell the same in India in its own right, and the taxpayer had no control over it.
- The Tribunal observed that the revenue earned by SET India was not on behalf of the taxpayer. It was making payment to the taxpayer for the purchases made by it. It was not subject to any control of the taxpayer as far as conducting of business in India was concerned. The activities of SET India were not devoted wholly or almost wholly for the taxpayer.
- The Tribunal has also taken note of the facts that the revenue of the taxpayer was not entirely dependent on the earning of SET India. The employees of SET India would work only for SET India and not for any other entity of the group. The lower authorities have not alleged that the transaction between the taxpayer and SET India were not at arm's length. Further, in the Transfer Pricing (TP) orders the TPOs<sup>2</sup> have held that no TP adjustments were required to be made to the income of the taxpayer on account of advertisement revenue or distribution revenue.

<sup>2</sup> (AY.s. 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2010-11)

- Since the taxpayer did not have business connection India as well as agency PE/fixed base PE and SET India was not an agent of the taxpayer, it has been held that the AO had wrongly invoked the provisions of Rule 10<sup>3</sup> of the Rules.

## Our comments

Selling advertisement time through Indian companies is a common practice followed by global channel operating companies. The Mumbai Tribunal in the case of NGC Asia Network LLC<sup>4</sup> held that the Indian group company of a foreign company had been habitually exercising in India an authority to conclude contracts on behalf of the foreign company which are binding on the foreign company. Therefore, the Indian company has been treated as a dependent agent PE in India under the India-U.S. tax treaty. However, the Mumbai Tribunal in the case of B4U International Holdings Ltd.<sup>5</sup> held that the Indian agents of a Mauritian company do not create an agency PE under the India-Mauritius tax treaty since they neither have authority to conclude contracts nor habitually exercise such authority.

The Mumbai Tribunal in the present case held that the Indian group company of the U.S. company did not constitute a PE in India under the India-U.S. tax treaty since the taxpayer was carrying out its operations from the U.S. and not from India. The activities, i.e., sale of advertisement inventory and distribution of channels were not carried out in India, and it did not have office premises or fixed place of business in India at its disposal.

<sup>3</sup> Rule 10 - Where the AO is of the opinion that the actual amount of the income accruing or arising to any non-resident person whether directly or indirectly, through or from any business connection in India or through or from any property in India or through or from any asset or source of income in India or through or from any money lent at interest and brought into India in cash or kind cannot be definitely ascertained, the amount of such income for the purpose of assessment to income-tax may be calculated –  
(i) at such percentage of the turnover so accruing or arising as the AO may consider to be reasonable, or  
(ii) on any amount which bears the same proportion to the total profits and gains of the business of such person, as the receipts so accruing or arising bear to the total receipts of the business, or  
(iii) in such other manner as the AO may deem suitable.

<sup>4</sup> NGC Asia Network LLC v. JDIT [2016] 175 TTJ 403 (Mum)

<sup>5</sup> DDIT v. B4U International Holdings Ltd. [2012] 148 TTJ 274 (Mum)

[www.kpmg.com/in](http://www.kpmg.com/in)

**Ahmedabad**

Commerce House V, 9th Floor,  
902 & 903, Near Vodafone House,  
Corporate Road,  
Pralhad Nagar,  
Ahmedabad – 380 051  
Tel: +91 79 4040 2200  
Fax: +91 79 4040 2244

**Bengaluru**

Maruthi Info-Tech Centre  
11-12/1, Inner Ring Road  
Koramangala,  
Bengaluru – 560 071  
Tel: +91 80 3980 6000  
Fax: +91 80 3980 6999

**Chandigarh**

SCO 22-23 (1st Floor)  
Sector 8C, Madhya Marg  
Chandigarh – 160 009  
Tel: +91 172 393 5777/781  
Fax: +91 172 393 5780

**Chennai**

KRM Tower, Ground Floor,  
No 1, Harrington Road  
Chetpet, Chennai – 600 031  
Tel: +91 44 3914 5000  
Fax: +91 44 3914 5999

**Gurugram**

Building No.10, 8th Floor  
DLF Cyber City, Phase II  
Gurugram, Haryana – 122 002  
Tel: +91 124 307 4000  
Fax: +91 124 254 9101

**Hyderabad**

Salarpuria Knowledge City,  
ORWELL, 6th Floor, Unit 3, Phase  
III, Sy No. 83/1, Plot No 2,  
Serilingampally Mandal, Raidurg  
Ranga Reddy District,  
Hyderabad, Telangana – 500081  
Tel: +91 40 6111 6000  
Fax: +91 40 6111 6799

**Jaipur**

Regus Radiant Centres Pvt Ltd.,  
Level 6, Jaipur Centre Mall,  
B2 By pass Tonk Road  
Jaipur, Rajasthan, 302018.  
Tel: +91 141 - 7103224

**Kochi**

Syama Business Center  
3rd Floor, NH By Pass Road,  
Vytilla, Kochi – 682019  
Tel: +91 484 302 7000  
Fax: +91 484 302 7001

**Kolkata**

Unit No. 603 – 604,  
6th Floor, Tower – 1,  
Godrej Waterside,  
Sector – V, Salt Lake,  
Kolkata – 700 091  
Tel: +91 33 4403 4000  
Fax: +91 33 4403 4199

**Mumbai**

Lodha Excelus, Apollo Mills  
N. M. Joshi Marg  
Mahalaxmi, Mumbai – 400 011  
Tel: +91 22 3989 6000  
Fax: +91 22 3983 6000

**Noida**

Unit No. 501, 5th Floor,  
Advant Navis Business Park  
Tower-B, Plot# 7, Sector 142,  
Expressway Noida, Gautam Budh Nagar,  
Noida – 201305  
Tel: +91 0120 386 8000  
Fax: +91 0120 386 8999

**Pune**

9th floor, Business Plaza,  
Westin Hotel Campus, 36/3-B,  
Koregaon Park Annex, Mundhwa Road,  
Ghorpadi, Pune – 411001  
Tel: +91 20 6747 7000  
Fax: +91 20 6747 7100

**Vadodara**

iPlex India Private Limited,  
1st floor office space, No. 1004,  
Vadodara Hyper, Dr. V S Marg  
Alkapuri, Vadodara – 390 007  
Tel: +91 0265 235 1085/232 2607/232 2672

[Privacy](#) | [Legal](#)

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavour to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

© 2017 KPMG, an Indian Registered Partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative (“KPMG International”), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

The KPMG name and logo are registered trademarks or trademarks of KPMG International.

This document is meant for e-communication only