

---

## Table of Contents

<b>Preface</b>	v
Part One Tax Treaty Interpretation and Permanent Establishment	
<b>Chapter 1: Spain: Are Activities in Vessels, Geographically Concentrated Areas and Director’s Homes PEs?</b> <i>Adolfo Martín Jiménez</i>	3
1.1. Introduction	3
1.2. Facts of the case	3
1.3. The Court’s decision	5
1.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	7
1.4.1. “Home office” as a PE	7
1.4.2. Ships as PEs	9
1.4.3. Dependent agent	12
1.5. Conclusion	15
<b>Chapter 2: Italy: Italian PE of Slovenian Citizen Who Acted as Tourist Intermediary for a Slovenian Ski Club</b> <i>Guglielmo Maisto</i>	17
2.1. Introduction	17
2.2. Facts of the case	18
2.3. The Court’s decision	19
2.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	20
2.5. Conclusions	21
<b>Chapter 3: Sweden: Can a Computer Server Constitute a Permanent Establishment?</b> <i>Martin Berglund</i>	23
3.1. Introduction	23
3.2. Facts of the case	23
3.2.1. The applicant’s question and positions of the parties	24
3.3. The Board’s decision	24
3.4. The Court’s decision	26
3.5. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	27

<b>Chapter 4: United Kingdom: <i>Michael Macklin v. Commissioners for Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs</i></b> <i>Philip Baker</i>	31
4.1. Introduction	31
4.2. Facts of the case	31
4.3. The Tribunal decision	33
4.4. Comments on the Tribunal’s reasoning	36
4.5. Conclusions	37
Part Two Business Profits and Personal Independent Services	
<b>Chapter 5: France: Is There Symmetry between State of Taxation and State of Deduction of Expenses?</b> <i>Alexandre Maitrot de la Motte</i>	41
5.1. Introduction	41
5.2. Facts of the case	42
5.3. The <i>Conseil d’Etat</i> decision	44
5.4. Comments on the <i>Conseil d’Etat</i> ’s reasoning	48
5.5. Conclusion	52
<b>Chapter 6: Netherlands: Income from Former Research and Fixed Base and an Origin-Based Alternative</b> <i>Eric C.C.M. Kemmeren</i>	55
6.1. Introduction	55
6.2. Facts of the case	56
6.3. The Court’s decision	56
6.3.1. National tax law	56
6.3.2. Tax treaty law	57
6.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	60
6.4.1. Classification of “award to investors”: No royalties	61
6.4.2. Classification of “award to investors”: Income from independent personal services	63
6.4.2.1. Do lab facilities of others and rented dwelling constitute a fixed base?	65
6.4.2.2. Attribution of “award to investors” to former fixed base	68

6.4.3.	Supreme Court’s result contributes to improving the exchange of services and movements of technology and persons	72
6.4.4.	Rethinking allocation of income from independent personal services and business profits based on the principle of origin	73
6.5.	Conclusions	77
<b>Chapter 7: Germany: Hidden Profit Distributions under the German-Netherlands Tax Treaty and Transfer Pricing</b>		79
<i>Alexander Rust</i>		
7.1.	Introduction	79
7.2.	Facts of the case	80
7.3.	The Court’s decision	81
7.4.	Comments on the Court’s reasoning	83
7.5.	Conclusions	84
<b>Chapter 8: Canada: Judicial Review of Taxpayer’s Request for Competent Authority Assistance under Canada-United States Tax Treaty</b>		85
<i>David G. Duff</i>		
8.1.	Introduction	85
8.2.	Facts of the case	86
8.3.	The court’s decision	89
8.3.1.	Continuing refusal	89
8.3.2.	The first and second denials	90
8.3.3.	The request for an order of mandamus	91
8.3.4.	Final comments	91
8.4.	Comments on the court’s reasoning	92
8.5.	Conclusion	93
<b>Chapter 9: Denmark: “Arm’s Length” under Article 9(1) of the Denmark-Czech Republic Tax Treaty</b>		95
<i>Søren Friis Hansen</i>		
9.1.	Introduction	95
9.2.	Facts of the case	95
9.2.1.	The factual background and legal base	95
9.2.2.	The procedure before the Supreme Court	98

9.3. The Supreme Court's decision	99
9.4. Comments on the Supreme Court's decision and conclusion	99

**Chapter 10: Czech Republic: Thin Capitalization Rules  
and Associated Enterprises** 101  
*Danuše Nerudová*

10.1. Introduction	101
10.2. Facts of the case	101
10.3. The Court's decision	102
10.4. Comments on the Court's decision	104
10.5. Conclusions	105

Part Three  
Dividends, Beneficial Ownership  
and Capital Gains

**Chapter 11: Netherlands: Sale of Dutch Real Estate by  
Non-Resident Company, Roll-Over Relief and  
Recapture: Tax Treaty Override?** 109  
*Daniël S. Smit*

11.1. Introduction	109
11.2. Facts of the case	110
11.3. The Court's decision	113
11.4. Comments on the Court's decision	113
11.5. Conclusion	118

**Chapter 12: France: When Does a French Taxpayer Who  
Transfers Tax Residence to Switzerland Become  
a Swiss Resident under the Treaty?** 121  
*Alexandre Maitrot de la Motte*

12.1. Introduction	121
12.2. Facts of the case	123
12.3. The <i>Conseil d'Etat</i> decision	124
12.4. Comments on the <i>Conseil d'Etat</i> 's reasoning	125
12.5. Conclusion	128

<b>Chapter 13: Italy: The Meaning of “Payment” of Dividend under the OECD Model Revisited</b>	129
<i>Guglielmo Maisto</i>	
13.1. Introduction	129
13.2. Facts of the case	129
13.3. The Court’s decision	130
13.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	131
13.5. Conclusion	133
<b>Chapter 14: Germany: US S Corporation and Income Allocation under Germany-United States Tax Treaty</b>	135
<i>Alexander Rust</i>	
14.1. Introduction	135
14.2. Facts of the case	136
14.3. The Court’s decision	137
14.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	138
14.5. Conclusions	139
<b>Chapter 15: Mexico: Use of DTCs Is Subject to More Requirements than Demonstration of Fiscal Residence in the Contracting State</b>	141
<i>César Augusto Domínguez Crespo</i>	
15.1. Introduction	141
15.2. Facts of the case	142
15.3. The Court’s decision	142
15.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	143
15.5. Conclusion	147
Part Four	
Royalties	
<b>Chapter 16: Kazakhstan: The <i>Oriflame</i> Case – Beneficial Ownership in Sub-Licence Arrangements</b>	151
<i>Tomas Balco</i>	
16.1. Introduction	151
16.2. Facts of the case	152
16.3. The court decisions	155

## Table of Contents

---

16.4. Comments on the courts' reasoning	157
16.5. Conclusion	158
<b>Chapter 17: Turkey: Leasing of Aircraft – Characterization of Leasing Payments as Royalties</b>	161
<i>Billur Yaltı</i>	
17.1. Introduction	161
17.2. Facts of the case	161
17.3. Applicable law	162
17.3.1. Domestic law	162
17.3.2. Treaty law	163
17.4. The courts' decisions	164
17.4.1. The lower tax court's decision	164
17.4.2. The SAC's decision	165
17.5. Comments on the Court's decision	166
<b>Chapter 18: Spain: Distribution Agreements between Independent Parties, Royalties and Use of Secret Comparables To Fix the Royalty</b>	171
<i>Adolfo Martín Jiménez and José Manuel Calderón Carrero</i>	
18.1. Introduction	171
18.2. Facts of the case	171
18.3. The ruling by the TEAC	174
18.3.1. Unbundling a single payment in different legal concepts: Royalties and business profits	174
18.3.2. Calculating the amount of (recharacterized/deemed) royalties and the use of secret comparables	177
18.4. Comments	179
18.4.1. General remarks on TEAC's decision: Unbundle or not to unbundle and the use of OECD materials (outside their field of natural application)	179
18.4.2. A note on the use of the OECD's soft law by the TEAC	183
18.4.3. Some remarks on the implications of the TEAC ruling in the transfer pricing field and the differences between transfer pricing and cases between independent parties	184
18.5. Conclusion	188

<b>Chapter 19: India: The <i>Right Florist Case</i>: Online Advertisement Revenues and the Legal Effect of India’s Position on the OECD Model</b>		191
<i>D.P. Sengupta</i>		
19.1.	Introduction	191
19.2.	Facts of the case	191
19.3.	The Tribunal’s decision	192
19.3.1.	Search engines	192
19.3.2.	Permanent establishment	193
19.3.3.	Implications of India’s reservations	194
19.3.4.	Whether the payments are royalties	195
19.3.5.	Whether the payments are fees for technical services	195
19.3.6.	Whether there was any withholding liability	196
19.4.	Comments on the Tribunal’s reasoning	196
19.5.	Conclusion	199
<b>Chapter 20: India: <i>Verizon Communications</i>: Broadband Charges Paid from India Taxable as Royalty</b>		201
<i>D.P. Sengupta</i>		
20.1.	Introduction	201
20.2.	Facts of the case	203
20.2.1.	Verizon Communications	203
20.2.2.	Arguments	204
20.3.	The court’s decision	205
20.3.1.	Meaning of “use”	205
20.3.2.	Composite contract	206
20.3.3.	Obiter	207
20.4.	Comments on the court’s decision	207
20.5.	Conclusion	209
<b>Chapter 21: India: <i>Siemens Ltd</i> – To Be Taxed as Fees for Technical Services Some Human Intervention Is a Must</b>		211
<i>D.P. Sengupta</i>		
21.1.	Introduction	211
21.2.	Facts of the case	212
21.2.1.	Siemens	212
21.2.2.	Arguments	214
21.3.	The Tribunal’s decision	214

## Table of Contents

---

21.4. Comments on the Tribunal’s decision	216
21.5. Conclusion	218
Part Five Labour Income	
<b>Chapter 22: Austria: The Meaning of the Term “Employer” under Article 15(2)</b>	221
<i>Kasper Dziurdź</i>	
22.1. Introduction	221
22.2. Facts of the case	225
22.3. The Court’s decision	227
22.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	228
22.4.1. Meaning of “employer” based on the object and purpose of the 183-day rule	228
22.4.2. When is the remuneration “paid by” or economically borne by a person?	231
22.5. Conclusion	236
<b>Chapter 23: Finland: Taxing Rights on Employee Stock Options under Tax Treaties and the Relevance of the OECD Model Commentary</b>	239
<i>Marjaana Helminen</i>	
23.1. Introduction	239
23.2. Facts of the case and relevant tax provisions	239
23.3. The decision of the KHO	241
23.4. Comment on the Court’s decision	242
23.5. Concluding remarks	250
<b>Chapter 24: Israel: Relationship between the Employment Article and the Sportsmen Article</b>	253
<i>Tsilly Dagan and Yariv Brauner</i>	
24.1. Introduction	253
24.2. Facts of the case	253
24.3. The court proceedings	253
24.4. The final court decision	255
24.5. Comments on the court’s decision	255

<b>Chapter 25: United States: Allocation of Payments Received for Royalties and Personal Services under Endorsement Contracts</b>	<b>259</b>
<i>Yariv Brauner</i>	
25.1. Introduction	259
25.2. Facts of the case	259
25.3. The court proceedings	261
25.3.1. The apportionment of sponsorship payments question	261
25.3.2. The treaty question	263
25.3.3. The respect of intermediate companies question	264
25.4. The final court decision	265
25.5. Comments on the court's decision	265
Part Six	
Other Income, Avoidance of Double Taxation and Non-Discrimination	
<b>Chapter 26: Sweden: Is Fictitious Income Covered by Tax Treaties?*</b>	<b>271</b>
<i>Martin Berglund</i>	
26.1. Introduction	271
26.2. Facts of the case	272
26.3. The SRN's decision	272
26.4. The Court's decision	273
26.5. Comments on the Court's reasoning	273
<b>Chapter 27: Belgium: Limitation of Foreign Tax Credit Does Not Infringe Article 23 of the Former Belgium-US Treaty</b>	<b>277</b>
<i>Luc De Broe</i>	
27.1. Introduction	277
27.2. Facts of the case	277
27.3. Decision of the Supreme Court	280
27.4. Comments	281
27.5. Conclusion	284

<b>Chapter 28: Sweden: The Foreign Tax Credit and Disparities</b>	287
<i>Martin Berglund</i>	
28.1. Introduction	287
28.2. Facts of the case	287
28.3. The Court's decision	288
28.4. Comments on the Court's reasoning	290
<b>Chapter 29: Portugal: PE and Non-Discrimination Regarding Domestic Relief for Double Economic Taxation</b>	293
<i>João Félix Pinto Nogueira</i>	
29.1. Introduction	293
29.2. Facts of the case	294
29.3. The decision of the Arbitration Committee	298
29.4. Comment to the decision	298
29.5. Conclusion	302
<b>Chapter 30: Russia: Thin Capitalization Rules between Sister Companies under Luxembourg-Russia DTC</b>	305
<i>Danil V. Vinnitskiy</i>	
30.1. Introduction	305
30.2. Facts of the case	307
30.3. The court decision	309
30.4. Comments on the court's reasoning and conclusion	311
Part Seven Exchange of Information, Legal Protection and Retroactivity	
<b>Chapter 31: Switzerland: Group Request under the Switzerland-United States Tax Treaty</b>	315
<i>Stefano Bernasconi and Michael Beusch</i>	
31.1. Introduction	315
31.2. Facts of the case	316
31.3. The Court's decision	318
31.4. Comments on the Court's reasoning	321
31.5. Conclusion	321

<b>Chapter 32: Luxembourg: The Standard of “Foreseeable Relevance”</b>	323
<i>Werner C. Haslehner</i>	
32.1. Introduction	323
32.2. Facts of the case	324
32.3. The Court’s decision	326
32.3.1. <i>Tribunal administratif</i>	326
32.3.2. <i>Cour administrative</i>	327
32.3.2.1. Arguments of the state	327
32.3.2.2. Tax treaty interpretation	327
32.3.2.3. The standard of “foreseeable relevance”	328
32.3.2.4. The Court’s decision	329
32.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	329
32.5. Conclusion	331
<b>Chapter 33: Liechtenstein: Fishing Expedition</b>	333
<i>Martin Wenz and Patrick Knörzer</i>	
33.1. Introduction	333
33.2. Facts of the case	335
33.3. The Court’s decision	336
33.4. Comments on the Court’s reasoning	337
33.5. Conclusion	337
<b>Chapter 34: Luxembourg: Disclosure of Information Requests in Court</b>	339
<i>Werner C. Haslehner</i>	
34.1. Introduction	339
34.2. Facts of the case	340
34.3. The courts’ decisions	341
34.3.1. The parties’ arguments	341
34.3.2. <i>Tribunal administratif</i>	342
34.3.3. <i>Cour administrative</i>	343
34.4. Comments on the courts’ reasoning	345
34.5. Conclusion	347

<b>Chapter 35: Liechtenstein: Legal Protection in Requested State</b>	349
<i>Martin Wenz and Patrick Knörzer</i>	
35.1. Introduction	349
35.2. Facts of the case	350
35.3. The Court decision	352
35.4. Comments on the Court's reasoning	353
35.5. Conclusion	353
<b>Chapter 36: Portugal: Right To Be Notified in Requested State</b>	355
<i>João Félix Pinto Nogueira</i>	
36.1. Introduction	355
36.2. Facts of the case	357
36.2.1. The dispute	357
36.2.2. Applicable law	359
36.2.3. Arguments of the parties	360
36.3. The Court's decision	361
36.4. Comments on the Court's decision	362
36.5. Conclusions	363
<b>Chapter 37: Australia: Use of Information Collected from Cayman Islands</b>	365
<i>Graeme S. Cooper</i>	
37.1. Introduction	365
37.2. Facts of the case	367
37.3. The court's decision	372
37.4. Comments on the court's reasoning	373
37.5. Conclusion	374
<b>Chapter 38: Canada: Limitation Period for Secondary Transfer Pricing Adjustments</b>	375
<i>David G. Duff</i>	
38.1. Introduction	375
38.2. Facts of the case	376
38.3. The court's decision	377
38.3.1. Article 9(3)	378
38.3.2. Object and purpose of the Treaty	381

38.4. Comments on the court's decision	381
38.5. Conclusion	382
<b>Chapter 39: Switzerland: Revised Wording of Article 26 on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters</b>	<b>383</b>
<i>Salome Zimmermann and Cédric Ballenegger</i>	
39.1. Introduction	383
39.2. Wording of the relevant new provisions	385
39.2.1. Article 26 2010 of the India-Switzerland DTA	385
39.2.2. Paragraph 10 2010 of the Protocol 1994	386
39.2.3. Mutual Agreement 2012 regarding the interpretation of subparagraph (b) of paragraph 10 2010 of the Protocol 1994 to the India-Switzerland DTA	387
39.2.4. Article 14 of the Amending Protocol to the India-Switzerland DTA	387
39.3. Facts of the case	388
39.4. The Court's decision	388
39.4.1. Mapping the main issues	388
39.4.2. Renewal or amendment of a request for information	389
39.4.3. Temporal applicability of article 26 2010 of the India-Switzerland DTA?	389
39.4.3.1. Special provision of article 14 of the Amending Protocol	389
39.4.3.2. Interpretation of article 14 in general	390
39.4.3.3. The Court's approach	390
39.4.4. Conditions as set forth in article 26 2010 and paragraph 10 2010 fulfilled?	392
39.4.4.1. "Foreseeably relevant" to the administration or enforcement of the domestic laws concerning taxes covered by the DTA	392
39.4.4.2. Requested indications provided	392
39.4.4.3. Means of last resort	392
39.4.5. Counter-argument of the Swiss Federal Tax Authority	393
39.4.6. Conclusion of the Court	393
39.5. Conclusion	393
<b>Contributors</b>	<b>395</b>