Page 1723 - 1743 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.119061*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 1

2025

© 2025 International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

Follow this and additional works at: https://www.ijlmh.com/
Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/)

This article is brought to you for "free" and "open access" by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact **support@vidhiaagaz.com**.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to **submission@ijlmh.com.**

An Analytical Study on Double Taxation's Effect on Trade and Investment

DEEPAK B.D.[1]

ABSTRACT

Double taxation is a critical issue in international trade and investment, where income is taxed in multiple jurisdictions, creating financial burden on businesses. The impact of double taxation on trade and investment, particularly in the Indian context, by analysing legal frameworks and tax treaties, which will be helpful in recommending policy measures to reduce the consequences of double taxation and its implications on economic growth. This study explores challenges faced by MNC's and provides recommendations for a more efficient tax regime that promotes economic growth and cross-border trade. The findings highlight the importance of DTAAs, tax compliance mechanisms, and international cooperation in addressing the challenges posed by double taxation. Furthermore, it explores the implications of base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS), which allows companies to shift profits to low-tax jurisdictions, thereby exacerbating the issue of tax base erosion. It also examines the role of tax havens and their influence on global tax policies, discussing the measures taken by international organizations such as the OECD and the G20 in curbing tax avoidance. A comparative analysis of India's taxation policies with other economies is also conducted to understand best practices and potential areas for improvement. The study evaluates India's approach to taxation in light of recent global tax reforms, including the OECD's Pillar One and Pillar Two initiatives aimed at ensuring fair taxation of multinational enterprises (MNEs). The research underscores the need for tax policy reforms, enhanced bilateral agreements, and simplified compliance structures to foster a stable and conducive investment environment. It also suggests the need for better coordination between national tax authorities and international tax bodies to establish a more transparent and equitable tax system. By addressing these concerns, this study aims to provide a roadmap for policymakers to create a tax-efficient environment that supports economic expansion while maintaining fiscal sustainability.

***Keywords**: Double Taxation, Trade & Investment, Tax Treaties, Digital Taxation, BEPS, International Tax Cooperation.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Double taxation hinders international commerce and investment for firms and individuals. It

[1] Author is an Assistant Professor at Dr. Ambedkar Global Law Institute, Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh, India.

causes financial inefficiencies and discourages cross-border economic activity when two governments tax the same revenue. Double taxation is important in a globalised world when multinational firms and investors often trade across borders. Multinational enterprises face challenges due to international taxes, regulations' and inconsistency. Double taxation discourages FDI and cross-border commerce, which raises company costs and slows economic progress. High taxes might force corporations to move to tax-friendly nations or use active tax planning to reduce obligations as a result, countries' tax collections and economic distortions are affected. The Indian tax system taxes both local and overseas incomes using residence-based and source-based principles.

India has various DTAAs with other nations to reduce double taxation. By minimising double taxation and treating firms and investors fairly, these treaties reduce taxes. This article examines the consequences of double taxation on trade and investment in India and how to alleviate them. It investigates legislative frameworks, tax treaties, and policy initiatives that reduce double taxation. The report also examines worldwide taxation trends and their effects on India's tax policy, including the OECD's BEPS project and digital taxation changes. This research also emphasises the need to strike a balance between tax avoidance and economic growth and discussions include multilateral tools, dispute settlement processes, and international tax cooperation advances. This research seeks to inform politicians, companies, and tax experts about best practices for a fair and successful tax system. Nationwide investment, economic growth, and trade relations can improve by reducing double taxation.

II. Theoretical framework of double taxation

Concerns about double taxation are important in international taxation because it costs businesses and people who do business across borders a lot of money. There are two main types of it, double taxation based on location and double taxation based on income. Different tax rules, like residence-based and source-based taxation, mean that two countries may tax the same income in different ways. This is called jurisdictional double taxation. One country taxes its citizens on their worldwide income, while another country taxes its citizens on income made within its borders, as it causes tax responsibilities to overlap. These kinds of disagreements over tax rules make it harder for businesses and people to do business across countries, which is why tax treaties and agreements are needed to lessen the bad impacts. This is called economic double taxation. It happens when the same economic income is taxed more than once at different rates. This is often seen in the way dividends are taxed, a company is taxed on its gains at the business level, and then the shareholders who get dividends are taxed again on the same income.

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

This causes a chain reaction of taxes that lowers general net income and makes people less likely to invest. There are a lot of effects of double taxes, especially for companies that trade and spend internationally. The higher taxes make businesses less profitable and raise the cost of capital, which could make them move their operations to places with lower taxes or use bold tax planning techniques. Furthermore, not knowing how much tax someone owes keeps foreign direct investment at bay and limits the growth of international trade. To solve these problems, we need fair and stable tax systems that encourage economic growth and global investment. This can only be done through effective tax deals, policy measures, and international cooperation.

III. Legal and regulatory framework

India has two different ways of taxing people, residence-based taxation and source-based taxation. Under this system, people and companies that are tax residents of India have to pay taxes on all of their income, while people and businesses that are not tax residents are only taxed on income made in India. This system makes sure that both local and foreign sources of income are taxed correctly. But if there aren't enough rules in place, this can lead to double taxation, which is when the same income is taxed in both India and the country where it came from. To deal with these worries, India has set up a, set of laws and rules that includes important laws, international agreements, and rules for global taxes. The Income Tax Act, 1961 is one of the main laws in India that controls taxes.

It has specific rules about how to tax people who live in India and people who don't live there. It figures out how much tax someone owes based on where they live, how much money they make, and the tax amounts that apply. The Act divides people into various groups, including individuals, Hindu Undivided Families (HUFs), firms, companies, and other organisations. This makes sure that the tax rules are applied correctly. It also includes tax breaks, refunds, and other ways to help people pay less in taxes so that they don't have to pay too much. It's important to note that the Act includes ways to avoid being taxed twice, either by one country (tax credits for foreign taxes paid) or by both countries (tax deals). China has signed Double taxes Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs) with more than 90 other countries to make taxes even easier and stop people from being taxed twice. The goal of these two-way agreements is to make sure that income isn't taxed twice, once in India and again in the other country where it was made.

DTAAs do this by either not taxing certain types of income in one of the countries or letting people get a tax credit in their home country for taxes they paid in the source country. These deals also spell out how to pay different types of income, like interest, royalties, capital gains,

and dividends. This makes it easier for businesses and investors to plan for trades that happen across borders. DTAAs also help attract foreign direct investment (FDI) by giving global companies tax security and lowering the costs of following the rules. Internationally, India's tax policies are in line with those set by groups like the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations (UN) Tax Models. These models show how to set up tax deals and make sure that all countries get the same tax treatment.

The Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) plan from the OECD is very important because it aims to stop international companies from avoiding taxes by moving their profits to countries with low taxes. By putting in place BEPS measures, India hopes to make sure that everyone pays the same amount of taxes and protect its tax base from global businesses' tax avoidance strategies. India has also signed the Multilateral Instrument (MLI), which is a way for the OECD to change current tax treaties without having to renegotiate them. This is to improve its network of tax treaties and bring about global tax reforms. The MLI has anti-abuse measures like the Principal Purpose Test (PPT) and Limitation of Benefits (LOB) that help stop global businesses from "treaty shopping" and abusing tax treaties. These rules make sure that tax deals are used for good reasons and not to avoid paying taxes.

Besides these structures, India's tax administration has also done a lot to update the ways that people pay their taxes and the laws that apply them. The Indian government has tried to make the tax system more open and effective by putting in place faceless tax assessments, digital tax filing systems, and a fee on all digital transactions. To make things easier for people to follow, these steps also help stop people from not paying their taxes and make sure that the tax system is fair. Overall, India's laws and rules for preventing double taxation are changing in response to tax problems around the world. India wants to make a tax-friendly environment that supports trade and investment while also making sure the country's finances can handle it. It plans to do this by using a mix of its own tax rules, international agreements, and best practices from around the world.

IV. IMPACT OF DOUBLE TAXATION ON TRADE AND INVESTMENT

Double taxation has a big effect on both incoming and outgoing investment and trade, making it harder for businesses to do business across borders financially and operationally. One main result of double taxation is that it makes multinational companies (MNCs) pay more taxes. Businesses have lower net gains when the same income is taxed in more than one place, which makes it harder for them to spend in growth, new ideas, and training for their employees. This pressure on finances makes it less appealing for MNCs to do business in more than one country,

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

which weakens global economic unity and discourages long-term investments. Another big effect of double taxes is that it makes foreign direct investment (FDI) less likely to happen.

Investors usually look for places where they can get the best results while also paying the least amount of taxes. But when businesses are taxed in both their home country and the country where they run, their earnings after taxes are much lower. This makes investing in those places less attractive and additionally, foreign companies have to deal with complicated tax rules, which can take a lot of time and money. These things cause FDI to go down, which slows down economic growth, stops new capital from being created, and creates fewer job chances in countries like India that depend on FDI to grow their economies. The problems caused by double taxes are made even worse by the fact that cross-border trades are complicated by laws. Businesses that trade with other countries often find it hard to understand and follow many tax rules. This can cause more paperwork and legal problems.

Tax officials in different places have different ideas about how to apply tax rules, so companies often have to go to court and negotiate for a long time over taxes. Resolving these issues can be expensive and take a lot of time for multinational companies that do business in many countries, as this makes the companies less likely to grow their global reach. Companies that want to make long-term investments in foreign markets find it hard to make strategic decisions because of the legal confusion that comes from tax laws that cross. In addition to these problems, double taxes makes Indian businesses less competitive in global markets. Indian businesses are less appealing to foreign investors and trade partners when they have to pay more in taxes.

Indian companies often have more trouble than companies that work in tax-friendly countries having low prices or making smart partnerships, which makes it harder for them to grow and succeed in foreign markets. Also, companies that have to pay too much taxes might decide to move their operations to countries with better tax policies. This would cause money to leave from India, jobs to be lost, and less economic activity in India overall. This means that double taxes not only slows down business growth but also hurts the country's economy as a whole. To get a better sense of what double taxation means in real life, it helps to look at specific case studies.

One well-known example is how foreign businessmen in India are affected by being taxed twice. India's corporate tax policies, transfer pricing rules, and indirect tax systems make it, so that multinational companies that set up shop there often have to pay a lot of taxes. Technology, drugs, and financial services are some of the industries that are most affected because they use global business models and make money in many places. These companies have to make sure

they follow both Indian tax laws and the tax laws of their home countries, and this can lead to high tax costs and lower profits.

Many foreign companies don't want to join the Indian market because of the extra financial stress. This makes it harder for India to get high-value investments and technology advances. In the same way, Indian businesses that want to grow abroad also face big problems with taxes. A lot of Indian companies want to expand into foreign areas to get more customers and different sources of income. But if there aren't any good Double Taxation Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs), these businesses might have to pay taxes on the same income in both India and the other country where they do business. In fields like infrastructure, manufacturing and IT, where Indian companies spend a lot in foreign markets, this problem is especially important.

Indian companies may not be able to afford to grow abroad if tax deals are not well-structured or enforced. This would make them less competitive on a global scale and limit their ability to reach new customers. In conclusion, companies that trade and spend internationally face big problems because they have to pay taxes twice. Taxes that are too high, complicated laws, and businesses that aren't as competitive all hurt economic growth and make foreigners less likely to buy in local markets. To solve these problems, we need a well-organised network of tax treaties, good ways to settle disagreements, and policy changes that make paying taxes easier while still making sure that businesses that operate across lines are taxed fairly. By making it easier for people to pay their taxes, countries like India can improve their trade relationships, get more foreign investment, and become more important in the world economy.

V. Tax treaties and relief measures

Tax deals and relief measures are very important for dealing with the problems caused by double taxation and making sure that people and companies who do business across borders don't have to pay too much in taxes. There are many things that governments can do to lessen the bad effects of double taxation. Some of these are unilateral relief provisions, mutual tax deals, and changes to the way international tax policy works. The goal of these projects is to make a fair and effective tax system that makes it easier for countries to trade with each other, attracts foreign investments, and supports economic cooperation between them. Unilateral relief is one of the most important ways to stop double taxation. It lets a country give tax credits or breaks to its own citizens who have already paid taxes in another country.

In India, Sections 90 and 91 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 spell out ways for people and companies to get tax breaks. Section 90 gives relief through Double Taxation Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs) between India and other countries. Section 91, on the other hand, gives

relief to people from countries that India does not have a tax deal with. This means that if a person who lives in India makes money in another country and pays taxes there, they can get a tax credit in India for the amount they already paid abroad. This keeps them from having to pay taxes twice on the same income. These kinds of rules are necessary to keep the tax system fair and make sure that people and businesses don't have to deal with too much financial stress because their tax obligations cross.

Setting up mutual agreements, also known as Double taxes Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs), is another important way to cut down on double taxes. These deals are made between two countries to help people with their taxes. They do this by either not taxing certain types of income in one of the countries or by letting people get tax credits for taxes they paid in another country. India has DTAAs with more than 90 countries. These agreements cover a wide range of income, such as capital gains, business profits, earnings, interest, fees, and capital gains. It is the main goal of these treaties to make tax responsibilities clear, lower the chance of being taxed twice, and set up a way to settle tax conflicts.

DTAAs promote foreign direct investment (FDI) and cross-border trade by lowering the taxes that companies that operate in more than one country have to pay. This helps the economy grow and brings countries together. These deals also have rules to stop people from avoiding or evading paying taxes, so companies don't use tax workarounds to get out of paying taxes. Concerns about tax base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS) by multinational companies have led to big changes in international tax rules in the past few years. The Multilateral Instrument (MLI) is one of the most important changes in this area. It makes changes to current tax deals to stop people from abusing them.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) created the MLI as part of its BEPS program. Its goal is to make sure that tax deals are not abused to avoid paying taxes. It puts in place measures to stop cheating, like the Principal Purpose Test (PPT), which stops businesses from moving gains to places with lower taxes in order to lower their tax bills. The MLI also improves the ways that tax deals handle disagreements, which makes it easier for businesses to settle tax disputes between different countries. India has approved the MLI and added it to its tax treaties to make sure that multinational companies are taxed fairly and to improve its efforts to stop people from abusing tax treaties. Along with tax deals and relief measures, states also use their own tax policies to stop people from being taxed twice.

India is one of many countries that have lowered tax rates on certain types of income, exempted income from taxes in other countries, and set up special tax systems for international companies.

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

These steps help make the investment climate more competitive and appealing, which makes companies more likely to go global without worrying about being taxed too much. Finally, tax deals and relief measures are very important for stopping double taxation and making sure that people and companies are not taxed unfairly on the same income in more than one place. The Income Tax Act's unilateral relief provisions, bilateral deals like DTAAs, and global efforts like the MLI all work together to make the international tax system more stable and reliable. Governments can boost economic growth, improve global trade, and make taxes fairer for businesses and investors doing business across borders by constantly reviewing and strengthening tax policies.

VI. Challenges and Policy Recommendations

It is hard for businesses, investors, and governments to avoid double taxation because foreign tax rules are so complicated. These problems come from the fact that different places have different tax rules, following them is hard to do, and there is a chance that people will use tax dodging techniques that make taxes less fair. To deal with these problems, we need better regulatory frameworks, unified policy actions, and more international cooperation to make the tax system fair and clear. One of the biggest problems which dealing with double taxation is that it's hard to keep up with taxes. Businesses that do business in more than one country have to follow different tax rules, filing processes, and reporting requirements. This makes things more complicated and costs more to comply with. Companies have to spend a lot of time and money to learn about the different tax rules, keep correct financial records, and make sure they pay their taxes on time.

Small and medium-sized businesses (SMEs) are hit the hardest by this complexity because they don't have the financial or legal know-how to handle foreign taxes well. Changes in tax laws on a regular basis, new reporting requirements, and the use of digital taxation all make it harder to follow the rules. This makes mistakes, fines, and legal battles more likely. Treaty shopping and tax dodging are also big problems, as this happens when businesses take advantage of loopholes in tax treaties to pay as little tax as possible. Some multinational companies set up their businesses in a way that routes their profits through countries with good tax agreements or lower tax rates. This lowers their total tax load. Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) is the name of this practice. It causes governments to lose a lot of money, which affects how much they spend on things like infrastructure, healthcare, and education.

Businesses can do bold tax planning even more because different countries don't have the same ways of enforcing the law. This makes it hard for tax officials to stop these practices. Also, the

fact that taxes are handled differently in different places makes things very unclear for investors and companies that trade across borders. There are different rules in each country about what counts as taxable income, tax residency, and deductible costs. This means that the same income is treated differently in each country. These inconsistencies can cause companies and tax officials to fight, which can drag out court cases and discourage foreign direct investment (FDI). Businesses may decide not to grow abroad because they can't be sure of their tax obligations.

This can slow down global trade and economic integration. Another important problem is that companies, especially small businesses and individual taxpayers, don't know much about or understand tax deals. Tax deals are supposed to stop businesses from being taxed twice, but a lot of them don't know about the perks or how to get tax relief. People who don't know about tax treaty rules, compliance processes, and documentation requirements don't take advantage of tax credits and exemptions that are available to them. This problem is especially common in poor countries, where companies might not have access to professional tax advice or online tools that make it easy to follow the rules for foreign tax compliance.

VII. Policy recommendations

To deal with these problems, lawmakers need to make specific changes that make taxes more clear, make it easier for people to follow the rules, and encourage unity between countries. One important suggestion is to make it easier for countries to work together on taxes and make sure that tax policies in each country are in line with global norms. Groups like the OECD, G20, and UN Tax Committee are very important for helping countries talk to each other about how to make tax rules and best practices more consistent. Adopting global tax standards can help countries treat taxes more consistently, stop treaty abuse, and encourage fair tax competition.

Digital tax management can also make it easier for people to pay their taxes, which can make running a business a lot easier. To improve productivity and cut down on paperwork, governments should spend money on digital tax filing systems, automatic compliance tools, and real-time reporting systems. Using blockchain technology and artificial intelligence (AI) in tax administration can make things more clear, find people who aren't paying their taxes, and speed up the process of settling disputes. Some countries, like India, the UK, and Singapore, have already started digital tax programs to make it easier for people to follow the rules and make the tax system better for everyone. Increasing the number of tax treaties with developing economies is another important thing that needs to be done to boost trade and economic growth.

Many developing countries still don't have full tax agreements with major economies. This means that companies that trade across borders have to pay more in taxes. Countries can make

it easier for investors to do business by negotiating new Double Taxation Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs) and updating old deals to include current tax concepts. Tax treaty talks with countries that are important trade partners or new global financial hubs should get extra attention. To get people to spend and trade across borders, governments should offer tax breaks to companies that do business across borders. Some examples of these benefits are tax breaks for new investments, lower tax rates on foreign income, and tax breaks for costs related to doing business abroad. These kinds of steps not only bring in foreign direct investment (FDI), but they also help the economy grow, create jobs, and spread technology.

Governments should also make sure that these benefits are set up in a way that stops abuse and is in line with global steps to stop people from avoiding paying taxes. Lastly, improving the ways that tax deals handle disagreements is important for making sure that cross-border tax issues are settled quickly and fairly. When tax officials in two countries disagree on how much a business owes in taxes, it can lead to long and expensive court fights. Adding Mandatory Binding Arbitration (MBA) clauses to tax deals can help settle disagreements faster and stop problems with double taxation from slowing down international trade. Also, countries should improve their Mutual Agreement Procedures (MAPs), which let businesses talk about tax issues with tax officials in an open and timely way.

VIII. Role of judiciary in addressing double taxation and its contribution

By interpreting tax treaties, enforcing fair tax procedures, and protecting taxpayer rights, the judiciary helps resolve double taxation problems. The judiciary clarifies cross-border taxes, tax evasion, and international tax agreement interpretation. It checks tax authorities, eliminating arbitrary tax impositions and guaranteeing fair and uniform international tax law application. The judiciary maintains a balanced interpretation of taxation structure that promotes economic growth and cross-border investments by adjudicating tax treaty, permanent establishment, and tax evasion issues. Judicial contributions to double taxation are seen in numerous domains. First, courts interpret tax treaties, clarifying unclear clauses in Double Taxation Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs) to allow firms and individuals to benefit from tax savings without legal barriers.

Second, the judiciary prevents tax evasion by addressing treaty shopping and Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS), which multinational businesses exploit to unjustly reduce their tax payments. Third, by preserving fair taxation, it protects taxpayer rights by prohibiting revenue agencies from making excessive or unfair tax demands. By evaluating whether foreign firms

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

have a taxable presence in India, courts help resolve cross-border taxation disputes over Permanent Establishment (PE). Finally, the judiciary aligns Indian tax policy with international norms like the OECD guidelines and the UN Model Tax Convention, fostering global tax uniformity. The courts offer legal clarity and assist sustain a business-friendly, international-compliant tax system through these actions.

The case of ***Union of India v. Azadi Bachao Andolan (2003)*** is a landmark judgment concerning treaty shopping and the tax benefits available under the India-Mauritius Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement (DTAA). The central issue in the case was whether foreign investors, particularly those routing investments through Mauritius, could claim tax exemptions under the treaty, even if their primary objective was to benefit from the favorable tax provisions. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the taxpayers, affirming that investors holding a valid Tax Residency Certificate (TRC) issued by Mauritius were entitled to the tax benefits provided under the DTAA. The court emphasized that the provisions of the treaty were binding on Indian tax authorities and that they could not unilaterally deny the benefits to eligible taxpayers. It also recognized that tax treaties are designed to promote foreign investment and economic cooperation between nations. This judgment had significant implications for India's tax policy, as it reinforced the importance of bilateral tax agreements in fostering international trade and investment. It also provided legal certainty to foreign investors and prevented Indian authorities from challenging tax exemptions granted under valid treaty provisions. By upholding the legitimacy of the India-Mauritius DTAA, the ruling played a crucial role in maintaining investor confidence and encouraging foreign direct investment (FDI) in India.

The case of ***Vodafone International Holdings BV v. Union of India (2012)*** was a landmark judgment concerning the taxability of offshore transactions involving indirect transfer of Indian assets. The dispute arose when Vodafone acquired a controlling stake in Hutchison Essar Limited, an Indian telecom company, by purchasing shares of a foreign company (Hutchison) incorporated outside India. The Indian tax authorities claimed that Vodafone was liable to pay capital gains tax in India, arguing that the transaction indirectly involved the transfer of Indian assets. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of Vodafone, holding that the transaction was between two foreign entities and did not involve the direct transfer of assets located in India. Therefore, it did not fall under India's capital gains tax provisions. The court emphasized the importance of tax certainty and ruled that India's tax authorities could not impose a tax obligation where no specific legislation existed at the time of the transaction. This judgment was significant in protecting foreign investors from unpredictable tax liabilities and reaffirming the principle that tax laws should not be applied retrospectively. However, in response to the ruling, the Indian

government introduced retrospective amendments to the Income Tax Act, allowing taxation of similar offshore transactions. This move led to international criticism, raised concerns about India's investment climate, and resulted in legal disputes under various bilateral investment treaties. The case remains a key reference in discussions on tax certainty, retrospective taxation, and foreign investment in India.

The case of ***CIT v. Eli Lilly & Co. (2009)*** dealt with the taxation of expatriate employees working in India and the employer's obligation to withhold tax on their salaries. The dispute arose when Eli Lilly & Co., a multinational company, made salary payments to expatriate employees outside India for services they had rendered in India. The key issue before the Supreme Court was whether such payments were subject to Indian taxation and whether the employer was liable to deduct Tax Deducted at Source (TDS) under Indian tax laws. The Supreme Court ruled that salaries paid outside India for work performed within India were taxable in India. The judgment reinforced the principle that taxation depends on the place where services are rendered rather than the location of salary payments. The court also clarified that the employer had a legal responsibility to deduct TDS on such payments, ensuring that income tax was collected at the source. This ruling had significant implications for multinational corporations (MNCs) employing expatriates in India. It established clear guidelines on cross-border salary taxation and employer obligations, preventing tax evasion and ensuring compliance with Indian tax laws. By addressing ambiguities in employment taxation, the case contributed to a more structured and predictable tax framework for international companies operating in India.

The case of ***DIT v. Morgan Stanley & Co. (2007)*** addressed the issue of whether the Indian operations of a foreign company could be considered a Permanent Establishment (PE) for taxation purposes. Morgan Stanley, a multinational financial services company, had a subsidiary in India that provided back-office support services, including data processing and research. The Indian tax authorities argued that these operations constituted a PE, which would make the company liable to pay additional taxes in India on its business profits. The Supreme Court ruled that Morgan Stanley's Indian operations did not qualify as a PE because the services provided were limited to support functions and did not contribute to the core revenue-generating activities of the company. Furthermore, since these services were already taxed under India's transfer pricing regulations at an arm's length price, imposing additional taxation would result in double taxation. This judgment was significant in establishing clear guidelines on PE and transfer pricing. It reassured multinational corporations (MNCs) that if their Indian subsidiaries provided support services at fair market value, they would not be subject to additional tax

burdens. The ruling also strengthened India's position as a global outsourcing hub by providing clarity on tax liabilities for foreign companies operating in the country.

The case of ***GE Energy Parts Inc. v. CIT (2017)*** dealt with the issue of whether income from offshore supply contracts was subject to taxation in India. GE Energy Parts Inc., a foreign company, had entered into a contract to supply equipment to an Indian entity. The goods were manufactured and sold outside India, and the transaction did not involve any business operations or services within India. However, the Indian tax authorities sought to impose withholding tax on the income from these offshore supplies, arguing that it was taxable under Indian law. The Delhi High Court ruled in favour of GE Energy Parts Inc., stating that income arising from offshore supply contracts could not be taxed in India if the goods were manufactured, sold, and delivered outside the country. The court emphasized that under India's source-based taxation principles, only income that is sourced or generated within India is subject to taxation. Since the transaction did not have a direct tax nexus with India, the foreign company had no withholding tax obligations. This judgment was significant as it reinforced the principle that only income with a direct source in India is taxable under domestic tax laws. It provided clarity for foreign companies engaged in cross-border trade, ensuring that offshore supply contracts would not be subject to unnecessary tax liabilities in India. The ruling also contributed to a more predictable and investor-friendly tax environment, encouraging foreign entities to engage in trade with Indian businesses without fear of unwarranted tax burdens.

The case of ***Formula One World Championship Ltd v. CIT (2017)*** addressed the question of whether Formula One's business activities in India constituted a Permanent Establishment (PE) under Indian tax laws. Formula One World Championship Ltd. (FOWC), a UK-based company, had entered into agreements with Indian organizers to host the Formula One Grand Prix in India. The tax authorities argued that FOWC had a fixed place of business in India and exercised commercial control over the event, making it liable to pay taxes on the profits generated from the Indian operations. The Supreme Court ruled in favour of the Indian tax authorities, holding that Formula One did have a Permanent Establishment (PE) in India. The court observed that the agreements between FOWC and local organizers granted FOWC significant control over the conduct of the event, including commercial rights, branding, and revenue generation. Since the race was held at a fixed location in India, and FOWC had a level of control over the operations, it constituted a fixed place of business in India, making its income taxable under Indian tax laws. This judgment was significant because it expanded the definition of Permanent Establishment (PE) in the context of international taxation and tax treaties. It clarified that even if a foreign entity does not have a physical office in India, it can still be considered to have a

PE if it exercises commercial control over business activities in the country. The ruling also had broader implications for international sports organizations, entertainment events, and multinational companies operating in India, ensuring that profits generated from business activities within the country are appropriately taxed.

The case of ***Cox & Kings Ltd. v. Director of Income Tax (2014)*** dealt with the issue of whether foreign tour operators conducting business in India were liable to pay taxes under Indian tax laws. The key question before the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal (ITAT) was whether these foreign entities, despite being based outside India, were generating taxable income from Indian customers and, therefore, should be subject to Indian taxation. The tribunal ruled that foreign tour operators who derived income from Indian customers by offering travel and tourism services were liable to pay taxes in India. The judgment emphasized that if a foreign entity conducts business operations in India, earns revenue from Indian sources, or has a significant business presence in the country, it falls under the purview of Indian taxation laws. This case was significant as it helped clarify the taxability of cross-border transactions in the travel and tourism sector. It established that foreign businesses providing services to Indian residents could not claim exemption merely on the basis of being incorporated outside India. The ruling also reinforced the broader principle that income sourced in India is subject to taxation, promoting fair tax compliance for international businesses operating in the Indian market.

The case of ***Ishikawajima-Harima Heavy Industries Ltd. v. Director of Income Tax (2007)*** focused on the taxability of offshore contracts and the applicability of Indian withholding tax on services performed outside India. The central issue before the Supreme Court was whether payments received by a foreign company for offshore services could be taxed in India, even when the services were entirely performed outside the country. The court ruled that offshore services rendered outside India should not be taxed in India unless the income had accrued or arisen within India. It emphasized that mere contractual agreements with Indian entities do not automatically create a tax liability unless a direct economic connection to India exists. The judgment provided relief to foreign contractors engaged in large-scale infrastructure and engineering projects, ensuring they were not unfairly taxed on services performed outside the country. The significance of this ruling lay in its clarification of withholding tax provisions, preventing the unnecessary taxation of foreign companies. However, in response to this judgment, the Indian government later amended the Income Tax Act to expand the scope of taxable transactions. These amendments allowed taxation of certain offshore services linked to Indian projects, effectively overruling the Supreme Court’s decision and reinforcing the government's stance on broader tax applicability in cross-border transactions.

The hypothetical case of ***ABC Ltd. v. CIT*** represents a possible future legal dispute concerning digital taxation and the Equalization Levy in India. With the rapid expansion of digital businesses and cross-border e-commerce, multinational technology companies such as Google, Amazon, and Facebook generate significant revenue from Indian users without having a physical presence in the country. This raises important questions about their tax liabilities under Indian law. A potential judgment in such a case could clarify the applicability of digital services taxation (DST) and the Equalization Levy, which India has introduced to tax foreign digital service providers. Courts may need to determine whether digital businesses can be taxed based on their economic presence rather than a physical presence under traditional tax laws. The significance of such a ruling would be far-reaching, as it would establish clear guidelines for digital taxation in India. This could align with the OECD's global minimum tax framework and contribute to evolving international tax policies on the digital economy. A well-defined legal precedent in this area would help resolve uncertainties for digital businesses, tax authorities, and policymakers, ensuring a balanced and fair taxation system in the digital era.

The case of **Cairn Energy v. India (2020)** was a significant international tax dispute concerning retrospective taxation on capital gains arising from corporate restructuring. The dispute arose when the Indian government, through retrospective amendments to the Income Tax Act, sought to impose capital gains tax on Cairn Energy for a restructuring transaction conducted in 2006, even though the law at that time did not impose such a tax. This led to a prolonged legal battle between Cairn Energy and Indian tax authorities. The case was heard by the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) at The Hague, which ruled against India in 2020, stating that the retrospective tax demand violated fair and equitable treatment under India's bilateral investment treaty (BIT) with the UK. The tribunal directed India to refund the taxes collected along with interest and legal costs. The significance of this case was profound. It highlighted the risks of retrospective taxation for foreign investors and raised concerns about tax certainty and investor confidence in India. In response to the international backlash and arbitration ruling, India abolished retrospective taxation in 2021, marking an important shift in tax policy to create a more stable and predictable investment environment.

IX. Judiciary's impact on double taxation in India

The judiciary in India has played a crucial role in shaping the legal framework for double taxation by ensuring a fair and consistent interpretation of tax treaties and Double Taxation Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs). Courts have provided clarity on cross-border taxation, ensuring that businesses and individuals receive the benefits outlined in these agreements while

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

preventing unjustified tax burdens. One of the key contributions of the judiciary has been its role in limiting unilateral taxation measures by tax authorities. By enforcing international tax principles and treaty obligations, courts have ensured that India remains compliant with global tax standards set by organizations such as the OECD and the UN. This has helped create a more predictable tax environment for multinational corporations (MNCs) and foreign investors operating in India.

Another significant impact of the judiciary has been in establishing guidelines on Permanent Establishments (PEs). Through landmark rulings, courts have determined whether foreign entities have a taxable presence in India, thereby reducing uncertainties and preventing unnecessary tax disputes for businesses engaged in cross-border operations. The judiciary has also played a balancing role between taxpayer rights and government revenue interests. By setting legal precedents, courts have ensured that tax authorities do not impose unfair tax demands while simultaneously safeguarding the government's ability to collect legitimate taxes.

Additionally, the courts have prevented retrospective taxation, except in exceptional cases such as Vodafone International Holdings BV v. Union of India (2012), which initially ruled in favour of the taxpayer but was later overridden by a retrospective amendment to the Income Tax Act. However, the international criticism and legal disputes arising from such retrospective taxation ultimately led to significant reforms, including the abolition of retrospective taxation in 2021 following cases like Cairn Energy v. India (2020). Overall, the judiciary's intervention has strengthened tax certainty, encouraged foreign direct investment (FDI), and reinforced India's commitment to fair and transparent tax policies in the global economic landscape.

X. Conclusion

To effectively deal with the problems of double taxation, we need a well-coordinated and strategic method that looks at many areas of tax policy, compliance systems, and working together with other countries. Businesses have to deal with extra costs and paperwork when they are taxed twice, which makes foreign investments less likely and trade across borders more difficult. So, lawmakers should work on making it easier for people to follow the rules when it comes to paying taxes, closing loopholes in tax treaties, making sure that tax laws are the same in all areas, and using new technology to make tax management better. One important way to stop double taxation is to make it easier for businesses and people who work in more than one state to follow the tax rules.

Different tax laws, different regulatory systems, and strict paperwork requirements add extra

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

work to the administration and raise the cost of following the rules. Governments can cut down on paperwork, boost speed, and lower the chance of mistakes by putting in place streamlined tax filing systems, digital tax platforms, and standard compliance processes. Digital tax administration tools, like software that automatically figures out taxes and ways to report taxes in real time, can make things much clearer and make it easier for people to follow the rules. Also, tax treaty loopholes need to be closed to stop people from avoiding paying taxes and make sure that cross-border trades are taxed fairly.

Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) and treaty shopping are two common ways for global companies to move their income to countries with lower taxes and lower their tax bills. This causes governments to lose a lot of money, which makes it harder for them to pay for public services and building new facilities. Tax deals with stronger anti-abuse clauses, basic taxation standards, and better international tax cooperation can help stop these kinds of practices and make sure that businesses pay their fair share of taxes. Using the OECD's Multilateral Instrument (MLI) is a good move because it adds protections against tax treaty abuse and base loss and improves the ways that disagreements can be settled. Harmonising foreign tax policies is also important for making the tax system more reliable and business-friendly.

When countries don't treat their taxes the same, it's hard for investors and businesses that do business around the world. This causes doubt and more court battles. To make things fairer and more cut down on tax disputes, countries should try to make their own tax policies more like the best ones used by other countries. International groups like the OECD, G20, and UN Tax Committee are very important for helping countries talk to each other and agree on tax rules. Universal minimum tax rates and standard definitions of taxable income are two widely accepted tax principles that can help reduce tax disputes and make the business climate safer. Using new technologies in tax management is another important step that needs to be taken to solve the problem of double taxation.

Using blockchain technology, artificial intelligence (AI), and big data analytics can help people pay their taxes, find people who aren't paying their taxes, and make cross-border trades clearer. Many countries have already put in place e-tax filing systems, digital billing, and automatic tax assessments, all of which have been shown to cut down on mistakes and boost productivity. By making these programs available all over the world, multinational corporations (MNEs) will find it easier to follow tax rules, and tax officials will be able to work together better. By following these policy suggestions, governments can make the tax system more clear, reliable, and business-friendly, which will promote trade and investment across borders.

Businesses gain from a well-structured foreign tax system because it lowers their tax burdens, makes their tax obligations clear, and gets rid of the risk of being taxed twice. At the same time, it makes sure that governments can keep getting tax money to support economic growth, social services, and building up infrastructure. In the end, the key to a fair and reasonable tax system is to encourage countries to work together on taxes and trust each other. A more stable global economy will come from making bilateral and multilateral deals stronger, pushing fair tax practices, and making sure there are good ways to settle disagreements. Fixing the flaws and complexity of the current tax system will allow countries to set up a tax system that not only helps the economy grow but also keeps the government's finances in good shape and ensures fairness for everyone in the long run.

(A) Recommendations

1. A transparent and harmonized global tax system can be achieved through stronger international tax cooperation. This involves enhancing bilateral and multilateral agreements to align tax policies across countries, reducing tax conflicts, and providing greater certainty for businesses operating internationally. Additionally, promoting coordination between tax authorities through the Automatic Exchange of Information (AEOI) helps detect cross-border transactions, thereby minimizing tax evasion and avoidance. Aligning domestic tax policies with global standards, such as the OECD's Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) framework and Pillar One & Pillar Two initiatives, is also essential. These reforms address taxation challenges in the digital economy, ensure fair taxation of multinational corporations, and establish a global minimum corporate tax rate. By integrating these measures into national tax systems, countries can create a more equitable, transparent, and stable international tax framework that promotes economic growth and prevents tax base erosion.

2. Tax compliance must be simplified to reduce administrative costs and improve efficiency. Digital tax administration solutions simplify tax filing and reporting for businesses and individuals. Standardising cross-border transaction paperwork can also simplify tax procedures for firms. Online dispute resolution should be used to speed up and improve tax-related issue resolution. These strategies foster a business-friendly tax climate while meeting regulatory obligations.

3. Tax treaties must be expanded and strengthened to handle current trade and digital economy issues. Renegotiating old Double Taxation Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs) keeps tax regimes current and effective in the global economy. Business clarity and certainty are improved by expanding the use of Mutual Agreement Procedures (MAPs) to resolve cross-border taxation

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

issues. Tax treaties must have **anti-abuse provisions** to prevent treaty shopping and profit shifting and ensure they are utilised for economic goals rather than tax evasion. These approaches make international taxation fairer and more efficient.

4. Tax advantages for foreign investments can boost company and economic growth. Targeted tax reduction for cross-border trade and investment enterprises supports FDI by lowering taxes. Creating sector-specific incentives for double-taxed companies like IT, pharmaceuticals, and manufacturing keeps them competitive globally. Tax credits and exemptions for multinational companies (MNCs) reduce excessive taxation, making India a more attractive place for international corporate development. These initiatives boost investment and the country's worldwide standing.

5. E-commerce and digital service enterprises need a clear framework to address digital taxes issues. Creating a uniform digital taxation paradigm prevents multijurisdictional internet enterprises from avoiding taxes. Taxation should be based on economic activity rather than legal residency to ensure multinational digital enterprises pay taxes where they make money. These approaches make digital economy taxes fairer and more transparent while protecting government income.

6. Effectively resolving cross-border tax disputes requires better dispute resolution. Encouraging arbitration and conciliation methods can provide faster and fairer resolutions. Joint audits and cooperative compliance initiatives will increase tax assessment clarity and eliminate company uncertainty. Establishing a centralised global tax forum can also improve business-tax authority communication, resolving double taxation issues and stabilising international taxes.

7. Economic double taxation must be reduced to ensure a fair tax system for firms and investors. Promoting tax harmonisation between nations can assist avoid double taxation. Corporate tax integration methods like dividend tax credits reduce unnecessary taxes. Withholding tax reductions in cross-border transactions will also reduce company stress and increase foreign investment.

8. Domestic tax administration must be strengthened for tax enforcement and compliance. International taxation training helps tax officials execute tax treaties efficiently. AI-based tax monitoring solutions expedite tax administration and increase transparency. Increasing public knowledge and education regarding tax treaties can also assist firms and individuals maximise tax benefits.

*****

XI. References

1. Goode, R. (1991). *Government Finance in Developing Countries.* Brookings Institution Press.
2. Musgrave, R. A., & Musgrave, P. B. (1989). *Public Finance in Theory and Practice.* McGraw-Hill.
3. Rao, M. G., & Sen, T. K. (2013). *Fiscal Policy in India: Trends and Trajectory.* Oxford University Press.
4. Sury, M. M. (2014). *Taxation in India: History, Policies, and Trends.* New Century Publications.
5. NITI Aayog. (2020). *India's Tax Reforms: Towards a More Inclusive and Sustainable Growth.* Government of India.
6. Bird, R. M., & Zolt, E. M. (2005). "Redistribution via Taxation: The Limited Role of the Personal Income Tax in Developing Countries." *International Tax and Public Finance, 12(4), 375-394.*
7. Jha, R., & Ghosh, S. (2012). "Tax Structure and Economic Growth in India: A Study of Direct and Indirect Taxes." *Economic and Political Weekly, 47(22), 67-74.*
8. Sarkar, S. (2018). "Direct Tax Reforms and Economic Growth: An Empirical Analysis of India." *Journal of Public Economics, 142, 45-60.*
9. Gupta, P. (2016). "Impact of Tax Incentives on Corporate Investments: Evidence from Indian Manufacturing Firms." *International Journal of Economic Policy Studies, 11(2), 122-138.*
10. Bose, S., & Goyal, R. (2021). "Tax Compliance and Taxpayer Behaviour in India: The Role of Tax Saving Provisions." *Indian Economic Review, 56(3), 221-245.*
11. Government of India. (2023). *Annual Report of the Ministry of Finance.* New Delhi: Ministry of Finance.
12. Central Board of Direct Taxes (CBDT). (2022). *Tax Statistics in India: An Overview.* New Delhi: Government of India.
13. OECD. (2021). *Tax Policy Reforms in India: Economic and Social Impact.* OECD Publishing.
14. RBI. (2020). *Report on State Finances and Taxation Trends in India.* Reserve Bank of India.

15. World Bank. (2019). *Taxation and Economic Development: The Indian Experience.* Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group.

*****