Deloitte.

India | Tax & Regulatory | For private circulation only | 30 March 2017



Global Business Tax Alert Sharp Insights

The Mumbai Tribunal in the case of Atos Information Technology HK Ltd. v. DCIT (I.T.A. No. 237-240/Mum/2016), held that payments received by the taxpayer for data processing support through a network of computers systems in Hong Kong is not taxable as royalty under section 9(1)(iv) of the Income Tax Act ('the Act') or as Fees for Technical Service ('FTS') under section 9(1)(vii) of Act.

Issue no: GBTA/25/2017

In this issue:

Background Ruling of the Tribunal Conclusion Do you know about Dbriefs? Contacts

Background

- The taxpayer is a non-resident company, engaged in the business of providing services/facilities for data processing through computer hardware and software from Hong Kong.
- The taxpayer had entered into a contract for provision of computing services, for the provision of data process support to Standard Chartered Bank India ('SCB'), which is engaged in banking business in India.
- Under the contract, the taxpayer processed data for SCB in Hong Kong. The input
 data was fed by SCB India users via their workstations in India and transmitted to
 the taxpayer data centre in Hong Kong. The taxpayer does not supply or install
 any hardware or software in the premises of SCB India. The transactions/ data are
 processed in the data centre of the taxpayer in Hong Kong. The processed data is
 transmitted electronically to SCB India. A copy of the data is backed up and stored
 in the Hong Kong Centre for recovery purposes.
- The said services were provided by the taxpayer to SCB since August 2005.
 Considering the involvement of 68 countries, the agreement contained detailed
 framework for providing adequate safeguards to SCB and the requisite services to
 be performed by the taxpayer at certain standards so as to meet the outsourcing
 objectives of SCB.
- The Assessing Officer ('AO') observed that the taxpayer is not only providing data processing services to SCB, but is also providing technology in the form of data centre, infrastructure, connectivity and application technology for SCB's banking operations. The AO further contended that the taxpayer has created and provided facility in the form of dedicated centres for exclusive use of SCB with disaster recovery facility and storage facility.
- This infrastructure facility is translated into functional process by a defined service flow for various geographic locations and for different business applications, which would constitute "process". Accordingly such transactions shall qualify as being in the nature of "royalty" as defined in Explanation 2 to Section 9(1)(vi) of the Act.
- Further, the taxpayer has also provided technical, managerial and consultancy services to SCB, which clearly falls within the nature of technical services defined in Explanation 2 to section 9(1)(vii) of Act.
- On appeal, Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) [CIT(A)] upheld the order of the AO.
- Aggrieved by the order of the CIT(A), the taxpayer preferred an appeal with the Tribunal.

Ruling of the Tribunal

 As the taxpayer is from Hong Kong, the payment made to the taxpayer has to be seen from the perspective of the Act and not under any tax treaty, in the absence of a tax treaty with Hong Kong.

Royalty

- The Tribunal observed that the main objective of the agreement was to provide processing of data through a network of computer systems in Hong Kong. There was no technology transfer or application of technology in the agreement. Further, the Tribunal observed various stages of data processing and observed that the reference to the various details in the agreement are merely to ensure quality, standard and various safeguards which are to be adopted in the course of processing data, especially looking at the volume of data required to be processed from all around the globe.
- There is no provision of or giving any use or right to use of any process to SCB.
 The technology, infrastructure, data centre, etc. was solely used by the taxpayer for its own purposes and not to make available any such thing to SCB. Further, there was no 'use' or 'right to use' any industrial, commercial or scientific equipment.
- The Tribunal further observed that the Explanation 5 to section 9(1) (vi) of the Act (in respect of any right, property or information) and Explanation 6 to section 9(1) (vi) of the Act, enlarging the scope of process to include transmission by satellite, cable, fibre optic etc. relating to use or right to use any industrial, commercial or scientific equipment were inserted by Finance Act 2012 to be applicable with a retrospective effect from 1 June 1976. However, the clause (iva) pertaining to the use or right to use any industrial, commercial or scientific equipment was inserted from 1 April 2002. Therefore, relying on the decision of Mumbai Tribunal¹, it was held that Explanation 5 and 6 cannot be applicable to the taxpayer since that clause did not exist as on 1 April 1976.
- The Tribunal also observed that there is absolutely no transfer of any technology, information, know-how or any of the terms used in Explanation 2 or any kind of provision of technology in the form of data centre, infrastructure, connectivity and application technology by the taxpayer for SCB's banking operations.
- Accordingly, the Tribunal held that the payment made by SCB to the taxpayer does not fall within the definition of royalty and hence cannot be taxed in India as royalty.

FTS

- As regards FTS, the Tribunal observed that the services provided by taxpayer to SCB is mainly a standard facility and there is no constant human endeavour or human intervention which is required to provide the service.
- The Tribunal also observed that looking at the number of volume of transactions transmitted by SCB to the taxpayer, it would be impossible for any number of persons to apply their mind and generate reports. Considering the magnitude of transactions undertaken, it substantiates the fact that it is standard facility through which data is processed.
- The Tribunal relied on the decision of Supreme Court² and Mumbai Tribunal³ wherein it was held that where there is no human intervention for rendering of technical services it cannot be considered as FTS.
- Accordingly, the Tribunal held that the payment made by SCB does not qualify to be in the nature of FTS and therefore the payment is not taxable.

¹ Yahoo India P. Ltd v DCIT (140 TTJ 195)

² M/s Kotak Securities (340 ITR 333)

³ Siemens Limited v CIT (ITA No. 4356/Mum/2010)

Conclusion

The Tribunal held that payments made to the taxpayer in respect of technology services provided in the form of data centre, infrastructure, connectivity and application technology are not in the nature of royalty or FTS as defined under section 9(1)(vi) and 9(1)(vii) of the Act and therefore not taxable.

It is a welcome ruling since even after considering the insertion of Explanations 5 and 6 to section 9(1)(vi) of the Act, the data processing services have been held as not taxable under the Act as royalty.

Do you know about Dbriefs?

Dbriefs are live webcasts that give valuable insights on important developments affecting your business. To register, visit the Dbriefs page





Download the report

Contacts

Ahmedabad

19th Floor, Shapath - V SG Highway, Ahmedabad - 380 015. Tel: + 91 (079) 6682 7300

Fax: + 91 (079) 6682 7300

Coimbatore

Shanmugha Manram 41, Race Course, Coimbatore Tamil Nadu - 641018 Tel: + 91 (0422) 439 2801

Tel: + 91 (0422) 439 2801 Fax: +91 (0422) 222 3615

Kolkata

Bengal Intelligent Park Building Alpha, 1st floor, Block EP and GP Sector V, Salt Lake Electronics Complex,

Kolkata - 700 091. Tel: + 91 (033) 6612 1000

Fax: + 91 (033) 6612 1001

Bangalore

Deloitte Centre, Anchorage II, 100/2, Richmond Road, Bangalore 560 025.

Tel: +91 (080) 6627 6000 Fax: +91 (080) 6627 6010

Delhi/Gurgaon

Building 10, Tower B, 7th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon 122 002

Tel: +91 (0124) 679 2000 Fax: +91 (0124) 679 2012

Mumbai

Indiabulls Finance Centre, Tower 3, 28th Floor, Elphinstone Mill Compound, Senapati Bapat Marg, Elphinstone (W),

Mumbai - 400013

Tel: + 91 (022) 6185 4000 Fax: + 91 (022) 6185 4101

Chennai

No.52, Venkatanarayana Road, 7th Floor, ASV N Ramana Tower, T-Nagar,

Chennai 600 017.

Tel: +91 (044) 6688 5000 Fax: +91 (044) 6688 5050

Hvderabad

1-8-384 and 385, 3rd Floor, Gowra Grand S.P.Road, Begumpet, Secunderabad – 500 003. Tel: +91 (040) 6603 2600

Tel: +91 (040) 6603 2600 Fax:+91 (040) 6603 2714

Pune

106, B-Wing, 7th Floor, ICC Trade Tower, Senapati Bapat Road, Pune – 411 016.

Tel: + 91 (020) 6624 4600 Fax: +91 (020) 6624 4605













Deloitte makes an impact that matters

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee, and its network of member firms, each of which is Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee ("DTTL"), its network of member firms, and their related entities. DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL (also referred to as "Deloitte Global") does not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about for a more detailed description of DTTL and its member firms.

This material and the information contained herein prepared by Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India LLP (DTTI LLP) is intended to provide general information on a particular subject or subjects and is not an exhaustive treatment of such subject(s). This material contains information sourced from third party sites (external sites).

DTTI LLP is not responsible for any loss whatsoever caused due to reliance placed on information sourced from such external sites. None of DTTI LLP, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, its member firms, or their related entities (collectively, the "Deloitte Network") is, by means of this material, rendering professional advice or services. This information is not intended to be relied upon as the sole basis for any decision which may affect you or your business. Before making any decision or taking any action that might affect your personal finances or business, you should consult a qualified professional adviser.

No entity in the Deloitte Network shall be responsible for any loss whatsoever sustained by any person who relies on this material.

©2017 Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India LLP. Member of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited