



Euro Tax Flash from KPMG's EU Tax Centre



[Background](#)

[The CJEU decision in the Parent-Subsidiary Directive cases](#)

[The CJEU decision in the Interest and Royalties Directive cases](#)

[EU Tax Centre comment](#)

CJEU decision on the Beneficial Owner concept under the Interest and Royalties Directive and the Parent-Subsidiary Directive

[Beneficial Owner – Interest and Royalties Directive – Parent-Subsidiary Directive - Denmark Anti-abuse Provision – Wholly Artificial Arrangements - OECD's Commentaries](#)

On February 26, 2019, the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) rendered two landmark decisions on the interpretation of the beneficial owner concept in cases where the Interest and Royalties Directive (joined cases N Luxembourg, X Denmark, C Denmark and Z Denmark) and the Parent-Subsidiary Directive (joined cases T Denmark and Y Denmark) apply. The CJEU concluded that it is for the referring courts to assess whether the arrangements under review constitute an abuse under EU law, taking into account in particular the existence of conduit companies.

Background

The four joined cases N Luxembourg 1 ([C-115/16](#)), X Denmark ([C-118/16](#)) and C Denmark 1 ([C-119/16](#)) and Z Denmark case ([C-299/16](#)) all involve back-to-back financing transactions, under which a Danish resident subsidiary is financed by its non-resident parent company via a series of loans granted to intermediary holding companies resident in another EU Member State. The two joined cases T Denmark ([C-116/16](#)) and Y Denmark ([C-117/16](#)) both concern dividend distributions made by a Danish resident company to an intermediate holding company resident in the EU.

In all cases, the Danish company requested an exemption from the Danish withholding tax levied on the payments made to the EU company, based respectively on the Interest and Royalties Directive (2003/49/EC) and on the Parent-Subsidiary Directive (90/435/EC). The Danish tax authorities denied the exemption, arguing that the company receiving the income was a conduit structure and could not be considered the beneficial owner of the payment.

The taxpayers appealed these refusals before the Danish courts. The Eastern and Western High Courts in turn asked the CJEU to clarify whether Denmark may deny the benefits of the EU Directives and impose withholding tax (1) on interest payments, based on the beneficial owner concept included in the Interest and Royalties Directive, and (2) on dividend distributions, based on the beneficial owner concept included in the Danish provisions implementing the Parent-Subsidiary Directive. The Courts also requested clarification of the applicability of the OECD's Commentaries on the Model Tax Convention in this respect, and on the requirements for a domestic or a Double Tax Treaty provision to qualify as anti-abuse provisions under the respective Directives.

The CJEU decision in the Parent-Subsidiary Directive cases

The CJEU first examined whether Denmark can rely on domestic or treaty-based anti-abuse provisions to combat an abuse under the Parent-Subsidiary Directive, if it has not transposed Article 1(2) of the latter. In this respect, the Court noted that EU law prohibits abusive practices as a general principle and concluded that under fraudulent circumstances Denmark has to deny the benefit of an EU Directive, even in the absence of domestic or other anti-abuse provisions. Contrary to the Advocate General's (AG) Opinion (see [ETF 357](#)), the Court concluded that in this case denying the benefit of an EU Directive merely results from the application of a general principle of EU law and therefore does not infringe the principle of legal certainty, which prohibits directives from being able by themselves to create obligations for individuals.

Noting that it is for the referring courts to assess whether the arrangements under review are in fact abusive, the Court nonetheless provided further guidance as to the constitutive elements of an abuse of rights under EU law. In accordance with settled case law, the Court concluded that an abusive situation can be evidenced in the combined presence of objective (the purpose of the EU Directives is circumvented, despite a formal observance of the conditions required for their application) and subjective elements (existence of a wholly artificial arrangement, as well as an intention to obtain a (tax) advantage). The existence of a conduit company without economic substance, which cannot use or enjoy the income received but has the obligation to pass it on to a third party, could also be considered a further indication of abuse. However, the fact that Denmark has concluded a tax treaty with the state of residence of the alleged ultimate beneficiary of the income cannot in itself rule out the existence of an abusive situation.

If abuse is identified, the Court further ruled, contrary to the AG's Opinion, that a Member State cannot be required to identify the person it deems to be the beneficial owner of the income, as it may be impossible for the national authorities to provide this information.

Lastly, the Court briefly addressed the potential infringement of the fundamental freedoms and concluded that the latter cannot be relied upon in abusive situations.

The CJEU decision in the Interest and Royalties Directive cases

The Court first noted that the exemption of interest payments from any taxes as provided for by the Interest and Royalties Directive is restricted solely to the beneficial owners of such interest and further emphasized that such beneficial owner is the entity that economically benefits and has the freedom to use and enjoy the interest. In this respect, the Court underlined that the OECD Model Tax Convention and the pertinent commentaries are relevant for interpreting the

concept of beneficial owner under the Interest and Royalties Directive, as the original directive's proposal is based on the OECD work in this matter.

Following a similar reasoning to that in the Parent-Subsidiary Directive cases, the Court further noted that the existence of an abuse under EU law should be assessed by the referring courts and provided additional guidance in that respect. The Court also briefly addressed the potential infringement of the fundamental freedoms in an abusive situation, reaching the same conclusions as in the Parent-Subsidiary Directive cases.

Lastly, the Court addressed several questions on the general interpretation of the Interest and Royalties Directive that do not directly relate to abusive situations. Examining the case of the Luxembourg SICAR investment fund in the X Denmark case, the Court concluded that even if the SICAR is formally subject to corporate income tax in Luxembourg, it cannot benefit from the Directive if the interest income is in fact tax-exempt. Following settled case law as regards the Danish legislation possibly infringing the free movement of capital in non-abusive cases, the Court further noted that the Danish withholding tax on interest paid to non-residents infringed EU law insofar as resident taxpayers receiving Danish sourced interest (1) benefit from a tax payment deferral, (2) enjoy lower late payment interest rates and (3) may take any business expenses directly related to the interest income received into account when assessing their taxable income.

EU Tax Centre comment

It is interesting to note that the CJEU's decision substantially differs from the AG's Opinion on various aspects of the case, including whether the OECD work could be relevant in interpreting provisions of the Interest and Royalties Directive or whether national tax authorities should be required to identify the person they deem to be the beneficial owner of the income in cases of abuse. The CJEU nonetheless provides much needed guidance on the interpretation of the concept of abuse under EU law and on the beneficial owner concept under the Interest and Royalties Directive in particular. In many respects, it would appear that the concept of abuse under EU law continues to evolve.

Should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact [KPMG's EU Tax Centre](#), or, as appropriate, your local KPMG tax advisor.



Robert van der Jagt

Chairman, KPMG's EU Tax Centre and
Partner,
Meijburg & Co

kpmg.com/socialmedia



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

You have received this message from KPMG's EU Tax Centre. If you wish to unsubscribe, please send an Email to eutax@kpmg.com.

If you have any questions, please send an email to eutax@kpmg.com

You have received this message from KPMG International Cooperative in collaboration with the EU Tax Centre. Its content should be viewed only as a general guide and should not be relied on without consulting your local KPMG tax adviser for the specific application of a country's tax rules to your own situation. The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavor to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

To unsubscribe from the Euro Tax Flash mailing list, please e-mail KPMG's EU Tax Centre mailbox (eutax@kpmg.com) with "Unsubscribe Euro Tax Flash" as the subject line. For non-KPMG parties – please indicate in the message field your name, company and country, as well as the name of your local KPMG contact.

KPMG's EU Tax Centre, Laan van Langerhuize 9, 1186 DS Amstelveen, Netherlands

© 2019 KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. Member firms of the KPMG network of independent firms are affiliated with KPMG International. KPMG International provides no client services. No member firm has any authority to obligate or bind KPMG International or any other member firm vis-à-vis third parties, nor does KPMG International have any such authority to obligate or bind any member firm. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are registered trademarks or trademarks of KPMG International.