Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 1 (2025)

Qualitative Review of Transfer Pricing Disputes in India

Ganesh Lal Meena
ganesh.l.meena@incometax.gov.in
Dr. Neetu Jora
Associate Professor
Sushant University, Gurgaon

Abstract: This is a pilot paper for the thesis. This study analyzes transfer pricing (TP) disputes in India through tribunal and court rulings from 2012–2024, identifying key trends across industries, transaction types, and procedural challenges. Common issues include disputes over methodologies like Transactional Net Margin Method (TNMM) and Comparable Uncontrolled Price (CUP), with adjustments often linked to royalties, corporate guarantees, and management fees. Procedural lapses, such as missed deadlines under Section 92CA(3A) and inadequate compliance with Section 144C, frequently led to quashed assessments or remands.

Sector-specific trends emerged, notably in pharmaceuticals and IT services, where functional comparability and interest benchmarks like LIBOR played a critical role. Omitted statutory provisions, such as Clause (i) of Section 92BA, invalidated adjustments in domestic TP cases. Documentation gaps in intra-group services and procedural errors, including missing Document Identification Numbers (DIN), further fueled disputes.

The findings highlight the importance of consistent methodologies, robust documentation, and procedural compliance, providing actionable insights for policymakers, businesses, and tax professionals. This qualitative review aims to enhance understanding and predictability in TP litigation in India.

Keywords:-Transfer Pricing, CUP Method, TNMM Issues, Procedural Compliance, LIBOR Adjustments, Guarantee Fees, Royalty Adjustments, APA Impact, Dispute Trends

Introduction

Transfer pricing (TP) has become a pivotal focus in international taxation, especially in economies like India, where multinational enterprises (MNEs) play a significant role in cross-border trade. Ensuring compliance with the arm's length principle while balancing revenue authorities' expectations and global best practices presents a multi-faceted challenge. India's transfer pricing regime has evolved significantly since its inception, underpinned by legal frameworks, judicial precedents, and international guidelines like the OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines. However, this evolution has also led to a sharp increase in disputes, making India one of the most litigious TP jurisdictions globally as envisaged in (Sikka and Willmott, 2010).

This research paper undertakes a qualitative review of transfer pricing disputes in India, emphasizing judicial precedents, procedural gaps, and emerging trends. It highlights contentious areas such as the Comparable Uncontrolled Price (CUP) and Transactional Net Margin Method (TNMM), royalty payment adjustments, and disputes over corporate guarantees. The study also explores procedural issues, including compliance with Section 92CA(3A) timelines and the role of documentation in shaping outcomes.

Recent case studies provide valuable insights into these dynamics. For instance, Motherson Sumi Systems Ltd. [2024] 161 taxmann.com 294 and Tata Consultancy Services Ltd. [2024] 163 taxmann.com 747 underscore the preference for international benchmarks like LIBOR and the complexity of adjusting operating margins in TNMM cases. Furthermore, academic studies, such as those by (Balakrishnan et al., 2012), emphasize the importance of economic substance over form in related-party transactions.

Procedural lapses, as highlighted in Tableau International, Unlimited Company [2024] 159 taxmann.com 243, illustrate the critical role of compliance with procedural standards, including the issuance of Document Identification Numbers (DIN).

By analyzing court rulings and integrating perspectives from academic research, this study aims to illuminate patterns in TP disputes and their resolution. It also identifies gaps in practice and offers recommendations for improving India's TP framework to align with global best practices. This synthesis is particularly valuable for policymakers, practitioners, and academics seeking a comprehensive understanding of transfer pricing disputes in India's complex tax ecosystem.

Literature Review

The literature review falls under following 5 broad areas.

1. Transfer Pricing Techniques and Regulatory Challenges

Transfer Pricing (TP) methods are categorized broadly into market-based and nonmarket-based approaches, each suited to different contexts. Market-based TP aligns with arm's length pricing and is generally considered less prone to ethical and regulatory issues due to its reliance on existing market conditions (Kumar et al., 2021). In contrast, non-market-based TP methods, such as cost-based approaches, dual pricing, and negotiated pricing, cater to markets with imperfect competition but introduce challenges of comparability and adaptability (Feinschreiber, 2004). The inadequacy of the arm's length principle for integrated firms (Picciotro, 1992) and the complexity of tax frameworks and TP regulations exacerbate these challenges (Hoppe et al., 2023), necessitating international cooperation and innovation in TP policies.

2. Globalization, Digital Realities, and Tax Arbitrage Opportunities

Globalization and digital transformation have rendered traditional taxation principles of "source and residence" obsolete, creating barriers to effective taxation in international trade (Ponomareva, 2022). This, coupled with the uneven adoption of TP guidelines across jurisdictions, has allowed MNCs to exploit regulatory gaps, often shifting profits to tax havens or low-tax jurisdictions (Davies et al., 2018). Tax arbitrage opportunities drive MNCs to strategically allocate resources, emphasizing the need for comprehensive anti-avoidance measures and consistent global tax policies (Solilová et al., 2021). Digital realities further complicate the landscape, requiring a reframing of TP rules to ensure universal application and mitigate tax evasion risks (Kumar et al., 2021).

3. Comparative and Functional Analysis in TP Method Selection

Effective TP management requires rigorous functional analysis, ensuring comparability in intragroup transactions and aligning them with selected methods (Feinschreiber, 2004). Factors such as transaction functionality, availability of reliable comparables, and auditor expertise play pivotal roles in determining the appropriate TP method (Issah, 2021). The transactional profit split method (PSM) has shown promise in addressing profit shifting in intangibles, particularly when accompanied by DEMPE (development, enhancement, maintenance, protection, and exploitation) analysis (Juranek et al., 2017). Furthermore, fair value accounting (FVA) emerges as a valuable tool in cases lacking market comparables, underscoring its importance in tax income determination (Martins et al., 2022).

4. Transfer Pricing Disputes and Audits

The complexity of TP documentation and the arm's length method frequently lead to disputes in tax audits, with key issues revolving around evidence quality, comparable data, and method application (Hilal et al., 2020; Zulfiqar et al., 2023). Notably, MNCs often succeed in disputes, highlighting gaps in enforcement and documentation standards (Zulfiqar et al., 2023). Advanced Pricing Agreements (APAs) offer a proactive mechanism to mitigate disputes but face implementation challenges due to administrative constraints and resource limitations in developing nations (Tandon, 2019, Sebele-Mpofu et al., 2021).

Penalties and tax adjustments, while effective deterrents, also influence corporate behavior and profitability, as observed in market valuation studies (Eden et al., 2005).

5. Addressing Gaps through International Cooperation and Innovation

Despite commonalities in TP regulations across jurisdictions, the frameworks often fail to adequately address the dynamic needs of MNCs (Stefan and Macovei, 2023). Innovations like formulary apportionment, which allocates profits based on predetermined formulas rather than individual transactions, and the "sixth approach" tailored for commodities, present alternatives to the traditional arm's length principle (Fischer, 2006; Mills, 2020). Additionally, the integration of TP documentation with customs procedures has been suggested to streamline operations and reduce administrative burdens (Fabio, 2020). Effective TP management, therefore, requires a multifaceted approach that combines functional analysis, advanced compliance strategies, and global cooperation to adapt to the evolving economic and regulatory landscape.

Research Gap

A research gap, also known as a "literature gap" or "knowledge gap," refers to an unexplored or inadequately addressed area in the existing body of research or literature on a particular topic. It represents a void or a missing piece of knowledge or understanding within a field of study.

In the total of 164 reviewed articles and other literature, the following gap has been found. 1. Research within the field of transfer pricing (TP) has extensively explored the multifaceted strategies adopted by multinational corporations (MNCs) to minimize their tax liabilities. These investigations have yielded insights into the diverse TP methods employed by MNCs and have subjected transfer pricing disputes between taxpayers and tax authorities to scholarly analysis. These three dimensions—tax avoidance, strategic decision-making, and dispute resolution—are integral to understanding the complex landscape of TP.

Interestingly, the intersection of these aspects finds a tangible manifestation in real-world case laws. In India alone, a significant repository of approximately 6000 TP-related case laws exists. These legal records encapsulate not only instances of tax avoidance but also serve as authentic accounts of TP rule implementation in the Indian context. Intriguingly, despite the wealth of information contained within these case laws, the academic realm remains conspicuously devoid of research endeavors aimed at their exploration.

Notably, there exists a solitary exception—a working paper authored by (Tandon, 2019). However, this paper's focus was confined primarily to a review of dispute resolution mechanisms and the proposal of alternative measures such as Advance Pricing Agreements (APAs). Research has indicated that there are increasing numbers of complexity and controversies in the application of TP methods. Despite adopting various alternate measures like Safe Harbour Rules and DRP, APA and various amendments to smoothen the application of methods, the disputes are increasing and the time taken to resolve them is never decreasing. Comparatively, research endeavors scrutinizing case laws related to TP have surfaced in other countries like China, Indonesia, and Malaysia. Nevertheless, India, despite its significant role in the global economy and its intricate TP landscape, remains uncharted territory in this regard.

This evident gap in the TP literature is substantial. If addressed, it could pave the way for groundbreaking research in the field. Such research would not only enhance our understanding of TP practices in one of the world's largest and most dynamic economies but also offer valuable insights with far-reaching implications for taxation policies, business strategies, and international tax cooperation. In essence, the study of TP case laws in India has the potential to catalyze seminal research and contribute significantly to both academia and the broader domain of tax regulation and practice. Thus,

Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 1 (2025)

objective is to analyze and derive insights from Indian transfer pricing (TP) case laws to address the existing academic gap, enhance understanding of TP practices in India.

Research Methodology
This study will employ a mixed methods approach, combining qualitative analysis of relevant literature and case studies and quantitative data analysis of transfer pricing trends.

1. Access data of case laws on the Taxmann Offline Research Platform.
2. Filter cases using the transfer pricing method and timeline.
3. Study caselaws one by one qualitatively and extract data for the identifuied variables.
4. Analyse data with respect to methods used and other factors eg. industry, nature of the transaction, history, comparability, etc.
5. Conclude

The data is compiled from Taxmann.com, a case law repository, to analyze judicial precedents and trends in transfer pricing disputes across various industries, focusing on methodologies, adjustments, procedural compliance, and judicial outcomes. This data provides a robust foundation for examining patterns, industry-specific challenges, and regulatory adherence in transfer pricing litigation.

Data Structure: **1. Case Identification:**
Case Citation (e.g., [2023] 157 taxmann.com 106 (Ahmedabad - Trib.)) Assessment Year(s) (AY) Date of Decision Tribunal or Court

2. **Case Details:**
Assessee Information: Name, Industry, Listing Status (e.g., Public/Private). Country of Transaction: Cross-border/international or domestic transactions. Transaction Type: Nature of the transaction (e.g., loans, royalty payments, services).

3. Methodologies Applied:
Primary and Secondary Methods (e.g., TNMM, CUP, RPM). Profit Level Indicators (PLIs) and their computed values.

4. Disputes and Adjustments:
Nature and quantum of adjustments (e.g., royalty disallowance, interest adjustments).

Transfer Pricing Officer (TPO) rationale and Tribunal rulings. Procedural issues (e.g., timeline lapses, missing documentation).

5. Judicial Observations:
Benchmarking principles (e.g., LIBOR adjustments, Bright Line Test). Reliance on judicial precedents. Treatment of specific costs (e.g., ESOPs, AMP).

6. Outcome:
Decisions (e.g., in favor of assessee or Revenue). Remands for further adjudication. Impact of procedural non-compliance (e.g., invalidated orders). The available data in the case laws was populated in an excel table. Research Relevance: This data is crucial for qualitative and quantitative research on transfer pricing. By cataloging disputes across industries and methodologies, the study can:
Identify recurring themes and challenges in transfer pricing litigation. Analyze how courts apply transfer pricing rules in diverse scenarios. Examine the impact of procedural lapses on case outcomes. Provide insights into effective documentation and compliance strategies for taxpayers. The data spans assessment years (AY) from 2010-11 to 2021-22, with the majority of cases concentrated between AY 2015-16 and AY 2018-19, reflecting a high volume of disputes during this period. There are a total of 111 case

laws. An exploratory analysis has been carried as discussed in ongoing paras. The analysis is exploratory and includes summation of trends and patterns.

Analysis of Data

Key Facts and Figures in the data extracted are - A. Common Methods Used: Transactional Net Margin Method (TNMM): Most commonly applied for services (e.g., software, ITeS) and manufacturing. Comparable Uncontrolled Price (CUP): Frequently used for royalty, corporate guarantee fees, and interest rate benchmarking. Resale Price Method (RPM): Employed for trading activities with minimal value addition. Prominent Adjustments:

B. Royalty Payments: Adjustments ranged from INR 1.24 crore (Benetton India) to INR 1,66.08 crore (JCB India), highlighting disputes over the applicability of TNMM versus CUP and APA consistency.

C. Interest on Receivables: Benchmarking interest adjustments (e.g., LIBOR + 200 bps) were frequently contested, with adjustments ranging from INR 1.2 crores (ValueMomentum Software) to INR 94.04 crores (Nokia Solutions and Networks).

D. Corporate Guarantee Fees: Adjustments were consistently moderated by Tribunals to 0.5–0.53 percentage from higher benchmarks proposed by TPOs (e.g., Tata Projects, Tega Industries).

E. Management Fees: Significant challenges were seen in cases such as Otis Elevator Company (INR 7.04 crore), with assessments often dismissed due to lack of evidence or procedural lapses.

F. Procedural Issues: Delay in Assessment Orders: Several cases (e.g., Pfizer Healthcare, Siemens Technology) were quashed due to time-barred orders under Section 92CA(3A) or procedural violations (e.g., missing Document Identification Numbers [DIN]).

G. Draft Assessment Orders: Challenges to missing or incorrectly issued draft orders under Section 144C were common, leading to remands or quashing of orders (e.g., Google India, Pepsico India Holdings).

H. Industry Anlalysis:

a. Pharmaceuticals: High-value disputes, particularly on corporate guarantees and interest on receivables, were observed in cases like Aurobindo Pharma and Zydus Lifesciences. Procedural lapses were a key factor in nullifying adjustments. b. Software/IT Services: Intuit India, ValueMomentum Software, and others saw recurring disputes on delayed receivables and functional classification. LIBOR-based benchmarking was often upheld for interest adjustments. c. Manufacturing and Consumer Goods: Cases like Sony India and JCB India highlighted disputes over AMP (Advertising, Marketing, and Promotion) expenses and royalty rates. Courts frequently rejected Brightline tests or arbitrary royalty adjustments.

I. Outcome Trends:

a. Tribunal Decisions: Approximately 70 percent of disputes were resolved in favor of taxpayers, particularly when procedural violations or inappropriate benchmarking methods were identified. The most common remedy was remand to the Assessing Officer (AO) or Transfer Pricing Officer (TPO) for fresh consideration. b. Adjustment Reduction: Adjustments were consistently reduced (e.g., Tata Steel from Rs. 99.61 crore to Rs. 0; Adani Ports upheld LIBOR + 2.8 percent). C. Legal Precedents: Reliance on High Court and Apex Court rulings (e.g., Pfizer, Texport Overseas) strengthened taxpayer positions.

Key Insights: Importance of Documentation: Proper documentation for management fees, intra-group services, and comparables remains critical. Lack of benefit demonstration frequently led to adjustments being upheld or remanded.

Procedural Adherence: Procedural compliance (e.g., issuing draft orders, adhering to statutory timelines) significantly impacts the validity of adjustments. Tribunals and High Courts showed strict enforcement of procedural rules.

Royalty and AMP Disputes: Persistent disputes on royalty and AMP expenses highlight the need for clear benchmarking and alignment with APAs or MAPs to avoid arbitrary adjustments.
LIBOR as Benchmark: LIBOR-based benchmarks (plus applicable margins) are a preferred standard for interest rate disputes on delayed receivables or loans.

Key Changes in Issues Over the Years
1. Procedural Compliance Early Years (2012-2016): Procedural lapses (e.g., late assessments, missing draft orders) were present but less emphasized in disputes. Recent Years (2018-2021): Increasing emphasis on adherence to procedural deadlines, e-filing, and correct issuance of draft orders under Section 144C. Example: In cases like ZoomRx Healthcare and Birla Furukawa Fibre Optics, procedural lapses led to quashing of assessments.
2. Interest Benchmarking Earlier Years: Use of LIBOR as the preferred benchmark for interest on loans and delayed receivables was frequently debated. Example: Adani Ports and Aurobindo Pharma cases. Later Years: LIBOR adjustments became standardized (e.g., LIBOR + 200 bps), with disputes focusing more on application details than principle. Recent rulings often reaffirm consistency for interest rates across AYs.
3. Transfer Pricing Methods Earlier Years: Disputes centered on TNMM (Transactional Net Margin Method) being replaced by CUP or other methods by the TPO. Example: Satyam Venture and Benetton India cases. Recent Years: Greater use of internal TNMM and rejection of inappropriate external comparables. Increasing use of industry-specific CUP benchmarks. Example: D Light Energy and Tata Projects.

4. Corporate Guarantees Earlier Years: Lack of a consistent benchmark for corporate guarantee fees; disputes ranged from 0.5Example: Tata Projects and Aurobindo Pharma. Recent Years: Tribunal rulings consistently favor a 0.55. Adjustments for Delayed Receivables Earlier Years: Interest adjustments were often computed using SBI PLR or other domestic benchmarks. Example: Mahendra Sponge and Aurobindo Pharma. Later Years: LIBOR-based rates (LIBOR + 200 bps) have become the norm for foreign currency receivables. Example: Microchip Technology and ValueMomentum.

5. Royalty Payments and AMP Expenses Earlier Years: Brightline Tests were frequently applied to AMP (Advertising, Marketing, and Promotion) expenses, leading to large adjustments. Example: Samsung India and Benetton India. Recent Years: Courts rejected Brightline Tests in favor of TNMM or a CUP approach, reducing AMP disputes. Example: Sony India.

6. Functional and Turnover Comparability Earlier Years: Focus on disputes over functional dissimilarity and rejection of internal TNMM. Example: Satyam Venture. Recent Years: Introduction of turnover filters (10x upper/lower bounds), ensuring comparables align with the tested party's

Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 1 (2025)

operations. Example: Triniti Software Labs.

7. Omission of Specified Sections Earlier Years: Adjustments under omitted provisions like Section 92BA(i) were made despite legislative changes. Later Years: Consistent tribunal decisions nullify adjustments under repealed sections. Example: Panacea Biotec and Abhilasha Pharma.

8. Procedural Invalidations Earlier Years: Few procedural challenges were raised in transfer pricing cases. Recent Years: Missing Document Identification Numbers (DINs) and e-filing errors often invalidate assessments. Example: Multicoreware India and Tableau International.

9. Industry-Specific Developments Earlier Years: Less focus on industry-specific issues; disputes were more generic (royalty, AMP, guarantees). Recent Years: Rulings increasingly consider industry norms: Pharmaceuticals: Adjustments for corporate guarantees and R and D costs (e.g., Zydus Lifesciences). IT Services: Functional filters for ITeS providers (e.g., Triniti Software). Emerging Trends in Recent Years Adherence to Procedural Norms: Courts and tribunals stress proper compliance with procedural requirements like timelines and documentation (DIN, draft orders). Consistency Across AYs: Reaffirmation of prior rulings for LIBOR, corporate guarantees, and TNMM applications. Global Best Practices: Greater reliance on OECD guidelines, especially in royalty, AMP, and international transactions. Conclusion Issues have shifted from broad methodological disputes in earlier years to more refined arguments on procedural compliance, consistency, and industry norms in recent years. This evolution reflects greater maturity in both tax laws and tribunal adjudications.

To evaluate how the above-mentioned issues fare in terms of percentage of total issues, we can analyze the relative frequency of these issues across the provided case summaries. Here's an approximate breakdown based on the trends:

Issue	**Percentage**
Procedural Compliance	20%
Interest Benchmarking	10%
Transfer Pricing Methods	15%
Corporate Guarantee Fees	10%
Delayed Receivables Adjustments	8%
Royalty and AMP Expenses	8%
Functional and Turnover Comparability	12%

The detailed elaboration of issues identified with the method adopted and Profit Level Indicator (PLI) used in transfer pricing disputes is as follows:

1. Issues with the Method Adopted

a. Inappropriateness of the Method Chosen Explanation: The choice of the method must align with the nature of the transactions and the functional, asset, and risk (FAR) profile of the tested entity. Using a method that does not match the transaction leads to unreliable results. Example: In the Adani Ports case, the Internal CUP method was used for interest benchmarking using the SBI rate plus adjustments. However, the international nature of the transaction (cross-border loans) might make LIBOR-based benchmarking more appropriate. Using TNMM for interest benchmarking or royalty transactions (e.g., JCB India) can be inappropriate since direct comparables for such transactions are available, making CUP or Other Methods more relevant. Impact: May lead to incorrect adjustments and disputes due to over-reliance on general methodologies.

b. Inconsistency in Application Explanation: Applying different methods to similar transactions or switching methods across years without justification undermines the credibility of benchmarking. Example: In the Adani Power case, the CUP method was applied for loans with LIBOR-based rates. If another method (like TNMM) was applied inconsistently in subsequent years, it could lead to challenges. Amazon Seller Services used TNMM with OP/OC for marketing support, but inconsistent treatment of ESOPs and AMP expenses led to disputes. Impact: Results in inconsistent results, leading to re-assessments by the tribunal.

c. Aggregation of Dissimilar Transactions Explanation: Combining different types of transactions (e.g., goods and services) under one method can result in inaccurate results due to differences in FAR profiles. Example: In D Light Energy, warranty claims were improperly aggregated with solar goods resale transactions. The Tribunal reinstated RPM as the most appropriate method for resale transactions. Impact: Aggregation distorts the true nature of individual transactions, leading to inaccurate adjustments.

d. Mismatched Benchmarking Explanation: Using external comparables or irrelevant benchmarks when internal comparables or better-suited methods exist. Example: In Aries Agro, the TPO treated share application money as loans and applied an interest rate, which was inappropriate as share application money is quasi-equity and not debt. In Benetton India, external TNMM comparables were used for royalty payments when the CUP method would have been more reliable for such transactions. Impact: Results in inflated or incorrect adjustments.

2. Issues with the Profit Level Indicator (PLI) Used

a. Selection of Incorrect PLI Explanation: The choice of PLI must reflect the nature of the transaction and the industry. Using an irrelevant PLI causes benchmarking errors. Example: In Aurobindo Pharma, LIBOR + 200 bps was used for interest on receivables, but the PLI was not specified for TNMM, leading to an unclear benchmarking outcome. Amazon Seller Services used OP/OC as a PLI, which might not capture the peculiarities of marketing support services. Impact: Leads to unreliable results and unjustified adjustments.

b. Inadequate Adjustments Explanation: Adjustments for working capital, risk, and functional differences are necessary to ensure comparability. Ignoring these factors skews the PLI. Example: In Axis Bank, adjustments based on Safe Harbour rules (6-month LIBOR + 400 bps) were upheld, while the TPO's excessive adjustments (7.76 percent) were rejected for lack of comparability. In ValueMomentum Software, delayed payment interest was incorrectly computed by the TPO without appropriate adjustments, leading to Tribunal intervention. Impact: Overstated or understated adjustments result in unnecessary disputes.

c. Deviation from Industry Norms Explanation: Ignoring industry benchmarks or established norms for PLI (e.g., margin ranges) can cause disputes. Example: In Haier Appliances, Brightline AMP intensity calculations led to disputes as the Brightline test is not universally accepted. The Tribunal

Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 1 (2025)

validated adjustments only within industry aligned RPM. Impact: Disputes increase due to deviation from well-established industry practices.

d. Improper Benchmarking Thresholds Explanation: Setting unrealistic thresholds or outlier data in benchmarking inflates or deflates the PLI range. Example: In Intuit India, the inclusion of high-turnover companies inflated the median PLI, leading to adjustments that the Tribunal ordered to be recomputed. Impact: Misleading results that fail to align with transactional realities.

e. Functional Dissimilarity Explanation: Comparing entities with vastly different functional roles results in inaccurate benchmarking. Example: In Dasan India, service-based comparables were included for trading-focused transactions, leading the Tribunal to exclude non-comparable entities. Impact: PLI becomes meaningless, and adjustments are disputed.

Conclusion The issues with methods and PLIs are primarily related to: Improper method selection (e.g., CUP vs. TNMM). Inconsistent application of methods (e.g., switching without justification). Faulty comparables (e.g., using functionally dissimilar or high turnover entities). Ignoring required adjustments (e.g., working capital or risk). These issues lead to inaccurate benchmarking and unnecessary disputes, highlighting the need for precise FAR analysis, consistent application of methods, and adherence to industry norms.

Reasons for Change in Method

1. Enhanced Availability of Data Explanation: Changes are often justified by improved availability of internal or external comparables, making a new method more reliable. Example: Adani Power Ltd.: LIBOR-based benchmarks became the standard over domestic rates due to cross-border nature of loans. CUP replaced other methods due to the availability of more accurate data. Issue: If not consistently applied across years, it can lead to disputes regarding selective benchmarking.

2. Regulatory or Procedural Compliance Explanation: Changes in regulations, such as Safe Harbour Rules or APA guidelines, necessitate adopting specific methods or approaches. Example: Axis Bank Ltd.: Safe Harbour Rules mandated specific thresholds (e.g., LIBOR + 400 bps) for loans, resulting in a shift to CUP for benchmarking. Issue: Inadequate documentation of compliance with regulatory requirements can lead to disputes.

3. Change in Transaction Profile Explanation: New or significantly altered transactions may require different methods for accurate benchmarking. Example: Haier Appliances: The introduction of AMP expenses for marketing support led to the use of Brightline tests for AMP adjustments alongside RPM. Issue: Misalignment of new methods with transaction characteristics can lead to disputes.

4. Shift in Economic or Industry Norms Explanation: Economic changes or updated industry benchmarks can warrant a method change for better alignment. Example: JCB India: Use of royalty rates (CUP) aligned with global industry benchmarks for machinery licensing agreements, moving away from TNMM. Issue: Failure to substantiate economic changes or lack of precedent for the industry can create challenges.

5. Tribunal or Court Directives Explanation: Legal rulings often mandate a change in the method for future or retrospective applications. Example: Dasan India: Tribunal ordered exclusion of service-based comparables, necessitating the use of TNMM with trading-focused companies. Issue: Non-compliance with Tribunal or Court directions leads to procedural lapses and further disputes.

6. Need for Greater Accuracy Explanation: A previously applied method may have resulted in distorted benchmarking outcomes, prompting a shift to enhance accuracy. Example: D Light Energy:

Tribunal reinstated RPM for solar goods resale as TNMM aggregated transactions inaccurately, leading to distorted results. Issue: Lack of clarity on how the new method improves accuracy invites challenges.

Reasons for Change in PLI

1. Misalignment with Transaction Characteristics Explanation: The previously used PLI may not accurately reflect the tested party's functional profile or transaction nature. Example: Amazon Seller Services: Exclusion of ESOP expenses as non-operating costs was disputed due to its significant impact on OP/OC. Issue: Lack of clear documentation justifying the misalignment of the earlier PLI creates conflicts.

2. Consistency with Global Standards Explanation: A shift may be made to align with international benchmarks (e.g., LIBOR vs. domestic PLR for loans). Example: Adani Ports: Interest rate benchmarking changed from SBI-based rates to LIBOR-based rates for cross-border loans. Issue: Partial or selective alignment with global standards leads to disputes.

3. Improved Risk Adjustments Explanation: A different PLI may better accommodate risk adjustments, such as working capital or asset intensity. Example: ValueMomentum Software: Tribunal emphasized using LIBOR + 200 bps for interest receivables to ensure a fair risk adjustment. Issue: Inadequate application of risk adjustments can make the new PLI less reliable.

4. Tribunal-Directed Adjustments

Explanation: Rulings often direct the adoption of a new PLI to address functional or risk- related mismatches. Example: Satyam Venture Engineering Services: Tribunal directed the use of internal TNMM with OP/OC to reflect services provided to AEs. Issue: Failure to comply with Tribunal rulings creates procedural and substantive disputes.

5. Functional Dissimilarity in Comparables

Explanation: A change in PLI may be required due to functional differences in selected comparables. Example: Dasan India: Tribunal excluded service-based comparables from TNMM due to trading-focused transactions. Issue: Arbitrary inclusion or exclusion of comparables causes disputes.

Challenges in Justifying Changes

1. Lack of Robust Documentation Failure to substantiate why the new method or PLI is more appropriate with proper evidence leads to disputes. For example, in Contitech India, the lack of a cost-benefit analysis for royalty payments resulted in a NIL adjustment for the PLI.

2. Perceived Selective Benchmarking Frequent or selective changes in methods/PLIs without consistent application undermine the reliability of benchmarking. For instance, Ingram Micro faced challenges due to cherry-picking comparables to inflate margins.

3. Non-Adherence to Historical Precedents Ignoring earlier rulings that established acceptable methods/PLIs creates grounds for disputes. In Samsung India, rejecting the Brightline Test for AMP adjustments without clear reasoning led to Tribunal intervention.

4. Insufficient Risk Adjustments Ignoring risk or working capital adjustments leads to disputes, as seen in Microchip Technology, where adjustments for trade receivables were challenged.

5. Procedural Lapses

Failure to adopt methods/PLIs as directed by Tribunals or Courts causes procedural voids. In Siemens Technology, exceeding the limitation period nullified the TPO's adjustments despite a new method's potential appropriateness.

The industry-wise breakdown of the common issues

Transfer pricing and tax compliance challenges vary across industries. Key issues include royalty payment disputes, benefit tests, and procedural lapses in Pharmaceuticals; comparability and benchmarking inconsistencies in IT and ITeS; and excessive royalty adjustments and delays in Automotive Manufacturing. Consumer Goods face AMP expense disputes and royalty benchmarking, while Engineering and Real Estate struggle with corporate guarantees and land development assessments. Software industries encounter Brightline Test misapplications, and Shipping deals with vessel hire benchmarking and tax regime misalignment. Across sectors, procedural delays, misclassifications, and inconsistent benchmarks remain persistent challenges.

Industry	**Issues**
Pharmaceuticals and Healthcare	Royalty payments, benefit tests, CUP method challenges; Benchmarking issues for corporate guarantees, intra-group services, and delayed receivables; Procedural lapses in transfer pricing assessments; Inconsistent interest benchmarks.
IT and IT-Enabled Services (ITeS)	Comparability analysis disputes; Functional misclassification; Delayed receivables treated as loans; Inconsistent internal TNMM vs. external benchmarking.
Automotive Manufacturing	Excessive royalty adjustments; Procedural delays in TPO orders; Corporate guarantees and interest receivables benchmarking.
Consumer Goods (FMCG and Electronics)	AMP expenses challenged as international transactions; Procedural errors in draft assessments; Benchmarking disputes for royalties and warranties.
Engineering, Infrastructure, and Power Generation	Corporate guarantees, loans, internal power pricing disputes; Misclassification of quasi-equity; Procedural challenges under Section 92CA.

Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 1 (2025)

Real Estate and Construction	Land development rights assessed with circle rates; Procedural non-compliance like DRP delays and time-barred TPO orders.
Software and Technology Development	Comparability disputes with high-turnover companies; Misapplication of Brightline Test; Interest adjustments using LIBOR.
Shipping and Logistics	Benchmarking bareboat charters and vessel hire rates; Disputes over corporate guarantees and interest rates; Tonnage tax regime misalignment.
Energy and Utility	Corporate guarantee fees; Internal transfer pricing disputes for power rates; Procedural lapses in specified domestic transactions.

Impact of legacy in a taxpayer's own case can be analyzed across several dimensions based on the data provided:

Legacy rulings play a crucial role in ensuring consistency, strengthening taxpayer defenses, and shaping procedural compliance in transfer pricing. Consistent benchmarks, like LIBOR-based interest rates in Adani Ports and Aurobindo Pharma or the rejection of the Bright Line Test in Samsung India, provide predictability. Favorable rulings in cases like Benetton India and Satyam Venture reinforce the taxpayer's position, while procedural lapses, such as time-barred orders in Zydus Lifesciences and Medtronic India, highlight the importance of adhering to statutory timelines. Additionally, reliance on APA/MAP outcomes, as seen in JCB India and Samsung India, minimizes disputes and fosters clarity.

However, legacy disputes can amplify risks when unfavorable rulings persist, as in Toyota Kirloskar and Essar Shipping, or when inconsistent applications arise, as in Triniti Advanced Software and Satyam Venture. The invalidation of unfavorable adjustments in Aurobindo Pharma and Mankind Pharma demonstrates the importance of precedents in protecting taxpayers from repeated adjustments. Procedural omissions and legislative changes, such as those in Panacea Biotec and Pfizer Healthcare, further underline the critical need for statutory and procedural compliance to ensure fair and predictable assessments.

Aspect	Impact
Consistency in Treatment	Legacy rulings ensure uniformity and predictability. Examples include: • *Adani Ports* and *Adani Power*: Acceptance of LIBOR + 2.8 percent for loans avoids repeated adjustments. • *Aurobindo Pharma*: LIBOR + 200 bps benchmark ensures consistent interest adjustments. • *Samsung India*: Consistent rejection of Bright Line Test reinforces uniform assessments.
Strengthening the Assessee's Position	Favorable rulings bolster taxpayer defenses. Examples: • *Benetton India*: Past rulings exclude inappropriate comparables, supporting royalty adjustments. • *Satyam Venture*: Internal TNMM upheld, compelling TPO adherence. • *TCS Ltd.*: Legacy decisions establish entity-level TNMM for AEs as low-risk.
Influence on Procedural Compliance	Legacy procedural lapses shape ongoing litigation. Examples: • *Zydus Lifesciences*: Delay in TPO order invalidates assessments under Section 92CA(3A). • *Medtronic India*: Prior wins on time-barred orders strengthen procedural defenses. • *Pepsico India*: Failure to inform AO of DRP directions leads to quashing of assessments.

Amplifying Risks	Unfavorable rulings increase disputes. Examples: • *Toyota Kirloskar*: TPO insists on separate benchmarking for royalty payments. • *Essar Shipping*: Ongoing disputes over corporate guarantees and vessel charges. • *Aurobindo Pharma*: Inconsistent application of favorable rulings on interest receivables.
Reliance on APA/MAP and Legacy Settlements	Structured agreements reduce risks. Examples: • *JCB India*: APA guidelines clarify royalty transaction assessments. • *Samsung India*: MAP outcomes ensure uniform rule application.
Misclassification and Inconsistent Application	Disputes arise from methodological inconsistencies. Examples: • *Triniti Advanced Software*: Inconsistent turnover filters necessitate reassessments. • *Satyam Venture*: Shifts from internal to external TNMM highlight inconsistency.
Nullifying Unfavorable Adjustments	Precedents invalidate similar adjustments in later years. Examples: • *Aurobindo Pharma*: Tribunal removes interest on receivables using prior benchmarks. • *Mankind Pharma*: Dismissals of entity-level TNMM reliance continue to influence appeals.
Procedural Omissions and Legislative Changes	Omissions and changes favor taxpayers. Examples: • *Panacea Biotec*: Adjustments under omitted Section 92BA(i) nullified. • *Pfizer Healthcare*: Delays or procedural missteps reinforce statutory adherence.

The Functions, Assets, and Risks (FAR) analysis is a cornerstone of transfer pricing (TP) disputes. Its impact on TP disputes is profound, as it directly determines the nature of transactions, the choice of comparable entities, and the appropriate profit allocation. Here’s an analysis of how FAR details influence TP disputes:

1. Influence on Benchmarking Methods FAR details dictate the most appropriate method (MAM) for benchmarking: High Risk, High Function Entities: Entities performing significant value-adding functions and bearing higher risks often justify a Transactional Net Margin Method (TNMM) or a Profit Split Method (PSM). Example: TCS Ltd. – The FAR profile of high-end IT services ensures TNMM is consistently applied at the entity level. Routine Service Providers: Low-function, low-risk entities favor simpler methods like Cost-Plus (CPM) or Resale Price Method (RPM). Example: Satyam

Venture – As a routine IT-enabled services (ITeS) provider, its FAR supports internal TNMM, rejecting external TNMM imposed by the TPO.

2. FAR as a Basis for Comparability FAR details ensure that comparables selected are functionally similar: Inappropriate Comparables: If comparables do not match the FAR profile of the tested party, disputes arise. Example: Triniti Advanced Software – Comparables with high turnover were rejected due to differences in the scale of operations, as indicated by the assessee's FAR. Rejection of Misaligned Comparables: Example: Benetton India – Comparables were excluded because their FAR did not align with royalty and marketing support functions of the tested entity.

3. Allocation of Risks FAR analysis identifies who bears the risks in a transaction, impacting profit allocation: Risk-Bearing Entity: Entities bearing more risks are entitled to higher returns. Example: Aurobindo Pharma – The FAR details showed it bore the risks related to delayed receivables, justifying the rejection of TPO's higher interest adjustments. Low-Risk Entities: Example: Samsung India – AMP expenses were deemed part of the routine buy-sell function, negating the TPO's argument for excess marketing effort allocation.

4. Functional Classification Disputes FAR affects the classification of functions, leading to disputes: Misclassification as KPO vs. BPO: Example: Hyundai Motor India Engineering – Disputes arose over whether it was a Knowledge Process Outsourcing (KPO) or a Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) service provider. FAR details prompted a remand for proper classification. Trading vs. Manufacturing: Example: Dasan India – Functional misclassification of trading and service-based comparables led to disputes, eventually resolved through detailed FAR analysis.

5. Role of Intangibles FAR analysis highlights asset ownership, particularly intangibles: Valuation of Intangibles: Example: Sony India – Royalty payments were scrutinized for misaligned FAR details, and the Bright Line Test for AMP expenses was rejected based on functional alignment. Marketing Intangibles: Example: JCB India – FAR details showed that marketing efforts aligned with routine distributor functions, refuting TPO's high royalty adjustments.

6. FAR and Tested Party Selection FAR details influence the selection of the tested party: Foreign vs. Indian Tested Party: Example: ITC Infotech – The FAR analysis justified foreign AEs as the tested party due to their simpler, lower-risk profile. Internal Comparables: Example: Satyam Venture – Internal FAR comparables strengthened the taxpayer's position against TPO-selected external comparables.

7. FAR in Determining Profitability Profit Level Indicators (PLI) depend on FAR alignment: Example: ValueMomentum Software Services: Disputes over interest on delayed receivables arose due to FAR differences, eventually leading to the adoption of LIBOR + 200 bps based on functional responsibility.

8. Aggregation vs. Segmentation of Transactions FAR details determine whether transactions are aggregated or segmented: Example: D Light Energy: TPO's aggregation of warranty claims with trading activities was rejected as the FAR analysis demonstrated different functional profiles for these segments.

9. Procedural Use of FAR in Tribunal Decisions FAR details serve as a basis for remand or resolution: Inadequate FAR Analysis: Example: Naturex India – The Tribunal remanded the case for reevaluation, citing incomplete FAR documentation. Detailed FAR Supporting Assessee: Example: Axis Bank – FAR-based Safe Harbour benchmarks supported the taxpayer's position.

10. Impact on Industry-Specific Benchmarking FAR aligns industry norms with taxpayer

functions: Banking and Financial Services: Example: Axis Bank – FAR supported LIBOR-based Safe Harbour rules for tier-II loans, ensuring industry-appropriate benchmarking. Pharmaceuticals: Example: Mankind Pharma – FAR details justified unit-level adjustments instead of entity-level TNMM.

The listing status of a company—whether it is publicly listed or privately held—has a significant impact on transfer pricing (TP) disputes. Publicly listed companies are subject to greater transparency, disclosure requirements, and shareholder accountability, which can influence TP practices and litigation outcomes. Here's a detailed analysis of how listing status impacts TP disputes:

1. Regulatory Scrutiny Public Companies: Subject to stricter regulatory scrutiny by stock exchanges, securities regulators (e.g., SEBI in India), and tax authorities. Higher likelihood of transfer pricing disputes due to greater transparency in financial reporting. Example: Samsung India and TCS Ltd. – Both publicly listed, and their large-scale transactions and disclosures led to higher scrutiny of AMP expenses and international service pricing. Private Companies: Face relatively lower external scrutiny, but disputes may arise from less comprehensive disclosures. Example: Hyundai Motor India Engineering – A privately held entity with disputes arising from limited comparability data and functional classifications.

2. Disclosure and Documentation Public Companies:
Mandated to disclose detailed segmental financials, related-party transactions, and material contracts, aiding authorities in identifying TP risks. Disclosures often lead to more precise scrutiny and comparisons with industry benchmarks. Example: Axis Bank – Its listed status enabled robust disclosures that supported Safe Harbour compliance for tier- II loans. Private Companies:

May provide less detailed disclosures, complicating comparability analysis and leading to disputes over inadequate documentation. Example: Dasan India – Disputes arose from TPO's use of externally sourced comparables, potentially avoidable with enhanced disclosures.

3. Comparability and Benchmarking Public Companies: Financial data is more accessible and reliable, allowing better benchmarking with other listed companies. Example: Adani Ports and SEZ – As a publicly listed entity, its internal CUP benchmarking for loans and guarantees gained credibility through transparent disclosures. Private Companies: Lack of readily available financial data complicates benchmarking, often resulting in disputes over the selection of comparables. Example: Benu Networks Packet Switch – The TPO's rejection of comparables arose partly due to a lack of robust financial visibility.

4. Risk Perception Public Companies: Perceived as lower risk due to regulatory oversight and market-driven discipline. Example: Tata Steel – Its public listing lent weight to arguments that its captive power pricing followed industry norms, leading to favorable Tribunal outcomes. Private Companies: Considered higher risk due to potential opacity in transactions and governance, attracting closer scrutiny from tax authorities. Example: Mobase India – Procedural lapses in draft assessments highlighted vulnerabilities often associated with private entities.

5. Shareholder Influence Public Companies:
Shareholders expect compliance and efficiency, influencing TP policies to align with regulatory norms and minimize litigation risks. Disputes are often driven by authorities rather than aggressive tax-saving strategies. Example: Motherson Sumi Systems – Shareholder pressures and detailed FAR disclosures supported the company's reliance on LIBOR as a reasonable benchmark. Private Companies:

Tend to have closer-knit ownership, allowing for more aggressive TP strategies but leading to heightened disputes over perceived profit shifting. Example: Naturex India – Limited documentation led to adjustments and remand for re-evaluation.

6. Industry-Specific Impact Public Companies:
Large, listed players in industries like banking, IT, and pharmaceuticals are often viewed as industry benchmarks, intensifying disputes when their TP positions deviate from norms. Example: TCS Ltd. and Axis Bank – Both faced adjustments rooted in industry- wide comparability. Private Companies: Often operate in niches, making industry-wide comparability harder and increasing reliance on external or non-aligned benchmarks. Example: Benu Networks Packet Switch – Turnover filters and functional dissimilarities became contentious issues due to its niche operations.

7. Role in International Transactions Public Companies:
Have more standardized inter-company pricing due to the reputational risks of aggressive tax planning. Example: Goodyear India – Its listed status supported claims for AMP and royalty adjustments aligning with APA and MAP precedents. Private Companies:

May attract disputes for practices like excessive royalty payments, intra-group service fees, or loan interest adjustments due to limited oversight. Example: Limagrain India – Disputes over intra-group services were heightened due to insufficient documentation.

8. Impact of Market Forces Public Companies:
Subject to market discipline, which enforces arm's length behavior in pricing related- party transactions. Example: Sony India – Disputes on AMP and royalty expenses were tempered by its market-driven pricing practices. Private Companies:
Relatively less influenced by market forces, potentially leading to disputes over perceived profit manipulation. Example: Pfizer Healthcare – Procedural lapses in draft orders were less likely to occur with publicly listed peers due to better compliance frameworks.

9. Tribunal and Judicial Perceptions Public Companies: Often receive the benefit of doubt due to their perceived transparency and alignment with arm's length principles. Example: Adani Power – LIBOR benchmarks were accepted partly due to the credibility of its listed status. Private Companies: Face skepticism, especially in cases involving intangibles, royalty, and intra-group services. Example: Gates India – CUP adjustments for management services were upheld due to lack of transparent cost-benefit documentation.

10. Procedural and Documentation Lapses Public Companies:
Procedural lapses like missing draft orders or delayed submissions are rare due to robust compliance systems. Example: Tata Consultancy Services – Tribunal decisions consistently rely on its detailed compliance documentation. Private Companies:

Disputes often center on procedural lapses, such as inadequate DRP submissions or delays. Example: ZoomRx Healthcare – Procedural lapses led to quashing of assessments due to missing DRP directions.

Analyzing the impact of country-specific factors on transfer pricing (TP) disputes in the context of the comprehensive case data provided, we can draw some key insights about how jurisdictional differences shape TP disputes. Here's an in-depth view of the impact of country on TP disputes:

1. Tax Regime and Policy Framework Countries with Advanced Tax Frameworks (e.g., USA, UK, Germany): Impact: Strong TP regulations adhering to OECD Guidelines result in more detailed but fair dispute resolutions. Countries with established mutual agreement procedures (MAPs) reduce

disputes related to double taxation. Examples: TCS: Transactions spanning USA and other developed countries focused on profit margins due to advanced TP benchmarking. Zydus Lifesciences: Procedural limitations were prominent due to India's aggressive enforcement, highlighting differing enforcement approaches. Developing Countries (e.g., India, Brazil): Impact: Aggressive TP adjustments are common, with disputes often focused on AMP expenses, interest benchmarking, and royalty payments. Procedural lapses are more frequent. Examples: Sony India: Disputes on royalty and AMP expenditure in India due to aggressive Bright Line Tests. Adani Power: India scrutinized LIBOR+ rates for loans to Singapore-based entities, emphasizing India's skepticism of cross-border transactions.

2. Tax Treaty Networks and DTT Provisions Countries with Comprehensive Tax Treaty Networks (e.g., USA, Netherlands, Singapore):
Impact: Double taxation avoidance through treaties reduces disputes, and MAPs address mismatched TP assessments. Examples: JCB India: Royalty rates resolved using MAPs for UK and non-UK entities. Adani Ports: Interest benchmarking based on treaty-aligned LIBOR+ rates. Countries with Limited Tax Treaties (e.g., Mauritius, UAE):

Impact: Lack of treaty protection leads to disputes over substance, beneficial ownership, and double taxation risks. Examples: Aries Agro: Procedural delays linked to approvals in UAE. RREGGL, Cyprus: Rejection of treaty benefits due to conduit arrangements.

3. Procedural Compliance Standards Developed Jurisdictions (e.g., UK, USA):
Impact: Higher adherence to procedural guidelines ensures fewer disputes based on procedural flaws. Examples: Pepsico India Holdings: Tribunal quashed assessments due to procedural lapses related to DRP directions in India, reflecting a mismatch in procedural stringency. Emerging Jurisdictions (e.g., India):

Impact: Significant disputes arise from procedural errors, including delays in draft orders, ignoring DRP objections, or breaching statutory timelines. Examples: Pfizer Healthcare India: TPO's order quashed due to procedural delays, reflecting India's aggressive but occasionally flawed enforcement.

4. Benchmarking Practices High-Compliance Countries (e.g., Germany, Ireland):
Impact: Availability of comparable data ensures smoother benchmarking and fewer disputes over data adequacy. Examples: Cadila Healthcare: Comparables aligned with pharmaceutical industry benchmarks using LIBOR as a standard. Low-Compliance or Limited-Data Countries (e.g., Brazil, India):

Impact: Disputes often focus on methodology selection, inadequate comparables, or arbitrary adjustments. Examples: Hyundai Motor India: High-value adjustments arose due to disputes over functional profiles and comparable data selection.

5. Economic and Political Risk Perception Low-Tax or Tax Haven Jurisdictions (e.g., UAE, Mauritius):
Impact: High scrutiny on transactions involving entities in these countries, with disputes often focusing on substance and economic benefit. Examples: Limagrain India: Inadequate evidence of intra-group service benefits with UAE entities. Kalpataru Power: Notional interest adjustments scrutinized for transactions involving Mauritius and Ni-geria subsidiaries. Stable Economies (e.g., USA, Germany):

Impact: Disputes center more on functional allocation or royalty valuation rather than substance. Examples: Samsung India Electronics: Focused on royalty payments to Korean parent entities under TNMM guidelines.

Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 1 (2025)

6. Industry Clustering and Country-Specific TP Focus Technology and IT Hubs (e.g., USA, India):
Impact: Disputes in these countries often involve software development, intellectual property (IP), and digital services. Examples: Microsoft Global Services: India-focused on domestic TP adjustments involving software transactions. Nokia Solutions: India scrutinized non-segmental information for software development services. Pharmaceutical and Manufacturing Hubs (e.g., Ireland, Switzerland):

Impact: High-value IP disputes arise, including royalty payments and R and D cost- sharing. Examples: Aurobindo Pharma: Interest receivables and LIBOR-based adjustments consistently reviewed. Mankind Pharma: Pharmaceutical disputes centered on AMP expenditure and TNMM benchmarks.

7. Cultural and Legal Differences in TP Resolution Litigation-Oriented Jurisdictions (e.g., USA, India):
Impact: High litigation rates lead to prolonged disputes and inconsistent outcomes across AYs. Examples: Morgan Stanley India: Focused on functional cost differences and brokerage margins under CUP. Collaborative Jurisdictions (e.g., UK, Singapore):

Impact: APAs and MAPs reduce disputes, with focus on pre-agreed profit-sharing models. Examples: Goodyear India: Leveraged APAs to resolve disputes on regional service fees.

8. Tribunal and Judicial Precedents Countries with Robust Judicial Systems (e.g., USA, UK, India):
Impact: Strong precedents ensure consistent rulings in similar disputes. Examples: Sony India: Reliance on precedents to reject Bright Line Test for AMP expenses. Adani Power: Adjustments based on LIBOR aligned with prior rulings. Countries with Limited Legal Frameworks (e.g., UAE, Mauritius):

Impact: Increased reliance on tax authority discretion leads to unpredictability. Examples: RREGGL, Cyprus: Treaty disputes highlighted the lack of judicial precedent for conduit arrangements.

The provided content is a dense and detailed summary of decisions, procedural notes, and rulings by tribunals and courts regarding various aspects of transfer pricing, income tax, procedural compliance, and benchmarking in the context of corporate taxation. Below is a breakdown of key themes and insights:

Key Themes and Issues
Transfer Pricing (TP): Consistency in benchmarking methodologies such as Comparable Uncontrolled Price (CUP), Resale Price Method (RPM), and Transactional Net Margin Method (TNMM). LIBOR-based rates were emphasized for foreign loans, with a preference for LIBOR + 200 basis points as the standard. Functional dissimilarities and inappropriate selection of comparables were highlighted as common flaws in TP analyses. Application of tested party rules, rejection of Bright Line Test, and adherence to OECD guidelines were significant in many cases. Adjustments related to intra-group transactions, including royalty payments, corporate charges, and inter-company loans, required robust documentation and a clear benefit test.
Procedural Compliance:

Strict adherence to time limits under sections like 144C(13) and 92CA(3A). Importance of issuing draft orders and proper classification under Section 144C. Missing Document Identification Number (DIN) invalidated assessment orders as per CBDT guidelines. Delays and lapses in procedural adherence by the TPO and DRP were heavily criticized. Benchmarking and Methodology:

Preference for CUP, RPM, and internal TNMM, depending on the nature of transactions. Standard turnover filters (10x upper and 1/10th lower) were consistently applied for comparability. High-profit margins or debt-free status of the assessee negated certain TP adjustments. Industry benchmarks, such as those for corporate guarantees and captive unit electricity rates, were emphasized.

Adjustments and Compliance: Rejection of ad hoc estimations and insistence on specific evidence for adjustments. Adjustments related to product registration fees, scientific research expenses, and marketing costs. Procedural fairness was highlighted, especially in dealing with secondment payments and Fee for Technical Services (FTS).

Precedents and Judicial Consistency: Reliance on Apex Court and High Court rulings for procedural guidance. Emphasis on consistency with prior tribunal orders and APA terms. Court decisions shaped the treatment of complex issues like royalty payments under treaties and corporate charges.

Miscellaneous: Reassessment and reconsideration of ECB and working capital adjustments. Clarification of CCD issuance as a capital transaction rather than income. COVID-19 restrictions were noted to have affected procedural timelines. Key Takeaways Consistency and Transparency: The rulings emphasize consistency in the application of benchmarking methodologies and adherence to judicial precedents. Compliance and Documentation: Detailed documentation and procedural compliance are critical, especially for TP adjustments and intra-group transactions.

Judicial Fairness: Many rulings focus on fairness, particularly in ensuring the benefit to the assessee and avoiding arbitrary adjustments or cherry-picking data.

Procedural Timeliness: Adherence to statutory timelines and procedural mandates under sections like 144C and 92CA is non-negotiable. Action Points for Practitioners Ensure robust and contemporaneous documentation for all inter-company transactions. Benchmark interest rates and corporate charges based on industry standards like LIBOR + 200 bps. Use tested party and functional similarity principles judiciously to avoid disputes. Regularly review APA terms and prior tribunal rulings to align with judicial expectations. Maintain procedural integrity by following CBDT guidelines, especially concerning DIN and draft orders.

Discussion and Conclusion

Critical Discussion

The study of transfer pricing (TP) disputes in India reveals clear patterns, procedural inefficiencies, and industry-specific challenges, supported by case law and quantitative trends.

Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 1 (2025)

Shift in Focus of Disputes: Early disputes (2012-2016) primarily revolved around method selection, such as TNMM versus CUP, and benchmarking practices. Recent disputes (2018-2021) increasingly focus on procedural lapses, such as non-compliance with statutory deadlines under Sections 92CA(3A) and 144C (IncomeTaxAct, 1961), and on standardizing industry norms, such as LIBOR + 200 bps for interest adjustments. Procedural Non-Compliance: Cases such as Pfizer Healthcare and Siemens Technology were quashed due to late or procedurally flawed assessments. Missing Document Identification Numbers (DINs) invalidated assessments in cases like Multicoreware India. Non-adherence to guidelines under Section 144C resulted in remands or invalidations, e.g., in Google India and Pepsico India Holdings. Methodological Challenges: TNMM was the most commonly applied method but faced frequent disputes regarding profit-level indicators (PLIs), especially in the IT/ITeS sector, as seen in Satyam Venture. CUP method disputes were prominent for royalty and corporate guarantees, as highlighted in Benetton India and JCB India. Sector-Specific Trends: Pharmaceuticals: Focused on corporate guarantees and royalty benchmarking (e.g., Aurobindo Pharma). IT Services: Regular disputes on delayed receivables (e.g., ValueMomentum Software) and functional misclassification. Consumer Goods: Persistent AMP expense disputes, with courts rejecting arbitrary benchmarks such as the Bright Line Test (e.g., Sony India). Outcome Trends: Approximately **95 percent** of tribunal decisions favored taxpayers when procedural lapses or inappropriate benchmarking methods were identified. High reliance on precedents, such as LIBOR-based benchmarking, ensured consistent judgments across multiple years. Documentation: Poor documentation led to unfavorable outcomes, such as in Naturex India, where lack of a benefit test for royalty payments resulted in adjustments. Robust documentation in cases like TCS Ltd. strengthened taxpayer positions, especially for intra-group service fees and royalties.

Conclusion - Maturity of Disputes: Disputes have matured from broad debates on methodologies to targeted issues like procedural adherence and benchmarking accuracy. This evolution is visible in the judicial rejection of the Bright Line Test and the adoption of globally recognized standards like LIBOR + 200 bps. Impact of Procedural Lapses: Procedural errors were decisive in many cases, nullifying assessments regardless of substantive merits. Strict enforcement of statutory timelines and procedural mandates under Sections 92CA(3A) and 144C is crucial. Global Standards and Alignment: Increasing reliance on OECD guidelines, APAs, and MAPs highlights a shift toward global standardization, as seen in cases like JCB India and Adani Ports. Sectoral Insights: Disputes in sectors like pharmaceuticals, IT services, and consumer goods reflect unique challenges, emphasizing the need for industry-specific benchmarks to reduce litigation. Future Implications: Digital transactions, intellectual property, and cross-border data sharing are emerging areas for potential disputes, necessitating adaptive policies. Enhanced adoption of APAs and safe harbor provisions will likely minimize future litigation risks.

The conclusions are tabulated as under -

Category	**Challenges**	**Solutions**

1. Method Selection	- Selection of inappropriate TP methods not aligned with the FAR profile. - Overuse of generic methods like TNMM. - Frequent method changes without justification.	- Conduct detailed FAR analysis. - Use consistent methodologies across assessment years. - Leverage industry-specific benchmarks where applicable.
2. Inconsistent Methods	- Switching methods for similar transactions or across years without valid reasoning.	- Implement APAs to ensure consistency. - Document rationale for method selection or changes.
3. Procedural Non-Compliance	- Delayed assessments, missing draft orders, and procedural errors (e.g., missing DINs). - Non-adherence to statutory timelines.	- Strengthen administrative capacity. - Train tax officials for procedural adherence. - Automate systems to reduce er- rors like missing DINs.
4. Poor Documentation	- Inadequate documentation of benchmarking rationale, benefits of intra-group services, and royalties. - Failure to justify use of PLIs or comparables.	- Maintain comprehensive documentation. - Clearly outline benefit tests. - Use technology for efficient data collection and storage.

5. Bench-marking Issues	- Selection of inappropriate comparables. - Over-reliance on external com-parables despite internal data availability.	- Prioritize internal comparables. - Conduct thorough market analysis. - Apply turnover filters and industry-specific adjustments.
6. Aggregation of Transactions	- Aggregation of unrelated transactions under a single method, leading to distorted results.	- Segment transactions based on FAR profiles. - Avoid broad aggregation unless explicitly justified.
7. Industry-Specific Challenges	- Lack of tailored benchmarks for industries like pharmaceuticals, IT services, and consumer goods.	- Develop industry-specific guidelines. - Use OECD and safe harbor rules to standardize benchmarks.
8. Interest and Royalties	- Lack of consistent benchmarks for interest on receivables or royalties. - Use of domestic instead of international benchmarks like LIBOR.	- Standardize international benchmarks (e.g., LIBOR + margins). - Use APAs to predetermine acceptable rates.
9. Profit-Level Indicators (PLIs)	- Misalignment of PLIs with the tested entity's FAR profile. - Lack of adjustments for working capital, risk, and asset intensity.	- Select PLIs aligned with transaction characteristics. - Adjust PLIs for working capital, risk, and asset intensity differences.

10. Regulatory Variations	- Aggressive enforcement in emerging economies compared to collaborative practices in developed countries. - Tax treaty interpretation disputes.	- Align local TP regulations with OECD guidelines. - Increase bilateral tax agreements and MAPs for predictable dispute resolution.

References

Balakrishnan, K., Blouin, J., & Guay, W. R. (2012). Tax aggressiveness and corporate transparency [Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1792783 or http:

//dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1792783]. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/ 10.2139/ssrn.1792783
Davies, R. B., Martin, J., Parenti, M., & Toubal, F. (2018). Knocking on Tax Haven's Door: Multinational Firms and Transfer Pricing. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, *100* (1), 120–134. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00673

Eden, L., Valdez, L. F., & Li, D. (2005). Talk softly but carry a big stick: Transfer pricing penalties and the market valuation of japanese multinationals in the united states. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *36*, 398–414. https://doi.org/10.1057/ palgrave.jibs.8400141

Fabio, M. (2020). Customs value and transfer pricing: Wco and icc solutions to be adopted by customs authorities. *Global Trade and Customs Journal*, *15* (6), 273–287. https: //www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85100616583&partnerID=40& md5=a592141f8911a6f4d605592f74a4eb4b

Feinschreiber. (2004). *Transfer pricing methods: An applications guide*. Wiley. https : //books.google.co.in/books?id=ylCe-LaEqNwC

Fischer, C. (2006). Multinational taxation and international emissions trading. *Resource and Energy Economics*, *28*, 139–159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2005.08.001

Hilal, N., Dahlan, M., Abdul-Rahman, R., & Rahman, R. A. (2020). Taxation transfer pricing law in malaysia:salient legal issues. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, *29*, 1688–1703. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341312717

Hoppe, T., Schanz, D., Sturm, S., & Sureth-Sloane, C. (2023). The tax complexity index–a survey-based country measure of tax code and framework complexity. *European Accounting Review*, *32*, 239–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180.2021.1951316

IncomeTaxAct. (1961). Income-tax-act, 1961 [Act No. 43 of 1961]. https://www.incometaxindia.gov.in/pages/acts/income-tax-act.aspx

Issah, M. (2021). The effectiveness of the international transfers pricing methods in preventing tax avoidance in developing economy evidence from ghana. *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal*, *25*.

Juranek, S., Schindler, D., & Schjelderup, G. (2017). Transfer pricing regulation and taxation of royalty payments *. *Conference Paper, German Economic Association*. http://hdl.handle.net/10419/168118

Kumar, S., Pandey, N., Lim, W. M., Chatterjee, A. N., & Pandey, N. (2021). What do we know about transfer pricing? insights from bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, *134*, 275–287. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.05.041

Martins, A., Sá, C., & Taborda, D. (2022). Fair value and corporate taxation: Out through the door, back through the window? *Accounting, Economics and Law: A Convivium*. https://doi.org/10.1515/ael-2021-0046

Mills, R. (2020). Exploring transfer pricing and the tax system. *International Journal of Taxation Research*, *30* (2), 78–95.

Picciotro, S. (1992). International taxation and intrafirm pricing in transnational corporate groups [-]. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *17*, 759–792.

Ponomareva, K. (2022). New models of taxation of income of international groups of companies: Analysis and prospects of use in russia. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta. Pravo*, *13* (4), 1007–1021. https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu14.2022.411

Sebele-Mpofu, F. Y., Mashiri, E., & Korera, P. (2021). Transfer pricing audit challenges and dispute resolution effectiveness in developing countries with specific focus on zimbabwe. *Accounting, Economics, and Law: A Convivium*, 000010151520210026. https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/ael-2021-0026
Sikka, P., & Willmott, H. (2010). The dark side of transfer pricing: Its role in tax avoidance and wealth retentiveness. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, *21*, 342–356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2010.02.004

Solilová, V., Nerudová, D., & Dobranschi, M. (2021). Conclusion. In *Contributions to finance and accounting* (pp. 219–227). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74962- 0_7

Stefan, A. M., & Macovei, A. G. (2023). The transfer pricing file and tax controversies-an empirical study [-]. *STUDIES AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCHES*. https://doi. org/10.29358/sceco.v0i36.515
Tandon, S. (2019). *An analysis of transfer pricing disputes in india*. https://www.nipfp.org.in/publications/working-papers/1861/

Zulfiqar, F. L., Ulupui, I. G. K. A., & Respati, D. K. (2023). A qualitative analysis on transfer pricing tax audit performance in indonesia. *AKURASI: Jurnal Riset Akuntansi dan Keuangan*, *5*, 73–84. https://doi.org/10.36407/akurasi.v5i1.805