ACADEMY OF TAX LAW
learn • share • connect

INTERNATIONAL TAX CASE SUMMARY

PORTUGAL vs A MINING S.A.

FEBRUARY 2024

ACADEMY OF TAX LAW

PUBLISHING SERVICES

This Publication is copyrighted under the Berne Convention.

No reproduction or use of this material is allowed without prior permission

Copyright©, 2024 - Academy of Tax Law (Division of International Institute for Tax And Finance)

First Edition Published on 18 November 2024

Published by Academy Of Tax Law

CONTACT US
www.academyoftaxlaw.com | info@academyoftaxlaw.com

HEAD OF ACADEMICS

Welcome to the Academy of Tax Law's case and judgment summaries. These documents have been carefully curated to support professionals, students, and researchers navigating the complex landscape of international tax and transfer pricing. At the Academy, we understand that tax law is ever-evolving, with key rulings continuously shaping its practice.

Each summary you'll find here is designed to provide not just the facts, but the context and implications of pivotal legal decisions. These case summaries are created to serve as a valuable resource for legal teams, multinationals, revenue authorities, and academics, offering insights that go beyond the surface. Our goal is to ensure you remain informed and prepared, whether you are dealing with tax planning, dispute resolution, or risk management.

We believe that knowledge is the foundation of sound decision-making, and with these resources, we hope to empower you in your professional journey. As you delve into the analysis, remember that staying ahead in tax law requires not just understanding the rules but how to apply them in a dynamic, global environment.

Thank you for choosing the Academy of Tax Law as your partner in this ongoing learning experience.

Sincerely,
Dr. Daniel N Erasmus

PART 1

SUMMARY

JUDGEMENT SUMMARY

CASE OVERVIEW

Court: Supreme Administrative Court, Portugal

Case No: 0120/12.9BEBJA 01224/16

Applicant: A…, S.A.

Defendant: AT - Tax and Customs Authority

Judgment Date: 10 February 2024

Full Judgment: CLICK FOR FULL JUDGMENT

View Online: CLICK TO VIEW SUMMARY ONLINE

JUDGMENT SUMMARY

The case concerns a tax dispute between A…, S.A., a Portuguese mining company, and AT - Tax and Customs Authority. At the heart of the issue was the sale of an industrial wash plant by A… to B…, S.A., at a symbolic price of €1. AT contended that the sale breached transfer pricing principles under Article 58 of the IRC Code. It argued that a special relationship existed between the parties at the time of negotiating the transaction, which enabled a non-arm's length price to be set, resulting in an under-reported tax liability.

The Tax Authority's position hinged on a valuation of €16.9 million for the wash plant, derived from a related-party agreement prior to the sale. It claimed this figure represented the arm's length price. However, A… argued that at the time of the transaction (31 December 2008), the parties were no longer related. It further contended that the transaction occurred under unique circumstances tied to a broader business restructuring involving independent entities, making transfer pricing rules inapplicable.

The Supreme Administrative Court examined two key issues: whether a special relationship existed at the time of the transaction and whether the comparable market price was valid. The court found that no special relationship existed on the transaction date and rejected AT's use of the earlier valuation, as it originated from a related-party scenario and did not reflect independent market conditions.

KEY POINTS

OF THE JUDGMENT

BACKGROUND

A…, S.A. is a mining company that, in 2008, sold an industrial wash plant to B…, S.A. for a nominal price of €1. This sale was part of a broader restructuring involving multiple entities, including unrelated parties. The transaction was critical to the sale of shares in B… to an independent buyer, D… SGPS, which insisted that the wash plant be included in the deal.

At issue was whether the transaction adhered to Portugal's transfer pricing regulations, which require transactions between related entities to be conducted at arm's length. The Tax Authority alleged that a special relationship existed during the negotiation phase between A… and B…, as they were both under the umbrella of the C… Group at the time. It further asserted that the €1 sale price was artificially low, referencing a valuation of €16.9 million from 2007 when both parties were related entities.

A… contested these claims, arguing that by the transaction date (31 December 2008), B… was no longer part of the C… Group. It also emphasised that the wash plant's inclusion in the broader deal was necessitated by operational constraints and unrelated business interests, not by any special relationship. The case thus centred on the applicability of transfer pricing rules in this unique fact pattern.

KEY POINTS
OF THE JUDGMENT

CORE DISPUTE

The core dispute revolved around two questions:

1. **Special Relationship:** Did a special relationship between A… and B… exist at the time of the transaction, justifying the application of Article 58 of the IRC Code? The Tax Authority argued that the special relationship persisted during the negotiation phase, even if it had formally ceased before the transaction.

2. **Comparable Market Price:** Was the €16.9 million valuation from 2007 a valid comparable for determining the arm's length price? The Tax Authority asserted that this valuation represented a market price, despite originating from a related-party agreement.

A… maintained that no special relationship existed at the time of the transaction, as B… had been sold to an independent group (D… SGPS). It further argued that the €1 price was driven by commercial realities, including the need to transfer the wash plant to align with operational requirements in the broader restructuring deal. The applicant also pointed out that the €16.9 million valuation was outdated and did not reflect market conditions at the time of sale.

The Supreme Administrative Court was tasked with assessing whether the Tax Authority's reliance on the comparable market price method, using a related-party valuation, and its interpretation of the timing of special relationships aligned with the principles of transfer pricing law.

KEY POINTS
OF THE JUDGMENT

COURT FINDINGS

The court's findings centred on two key areas:

1. **Special Relationship:** The court determined that a special relationship must exist at the time of the transaction to invoke transfer pricing rules under Article 58 of the IRC Code. It found that by 31 December 2008, A… and B… were no longer related entities, as B… had been sold to an independent group. The court emphasised that the mere existence of special relationships during the negotiation phase was insufficient to trigger transfer pricing adjustments.

2. **Comparable Market Price:** The court ruled that the €16.9 million valuation used by AT was not a valid comparable. This valuation was established in 2007 when A… and B… were related entities and did not reflect independent market conditions. The court criticised AT for failing to provide evidence of an arm's length price derived from transactions between unrelated parties.

The court highlighted the need for the Tax Authority to substantiate transfer pricing adjustments with clear and independent evidence. It concluded that AT's reliance on the related-party valuation was inconsistent with the arm's length principle, rendering the adjustment unlawful.

KEY POINTS

OF THE JUDGMENT

OUTCOME

The Supreme Administrative Court annulled the tax adjustment against A…, S.A., ruling in its favour. It concluded that:

- No special relationship existed between A… and B… at the time of the transaction, disqualifying the application of Article 58 of the IRC Code.
- The €16.9 million valuation used as a comparable was invalid, as it originated from a related-party scenario and failed to reflect market conditions.

The court ordered the reversal of the contested tax assessment, along with the associated penalties and interest. This outcome reinforced the principle that transfer pricing rules require robust evidence linking the alleged transfer pricing violation to special relationships and non-arm's length conditions at the time of the transaction.

The judgment has significant implications for similar cases, setting a precedent for how special relationships and comparables should be assessed in unique transactions involving large-scale restructuring.

TP METHOD

HIGHLIGHTED (IF ANY)

The Tax Authority applied the Comparable Market Price Method (CMPM) to assess whether the sale of the industrial wash plant adhered to the arm's length principle, as required under Article 58 of the Portuguese IRC Code. This method involves comparing the price of a controlled transaction with the price of similar transactions between independent entities under comparable circumstances.

In this case, the Tax Authority used a 2007 valuation of the wash plant (€16.9 million), performed by an independent appraiser, as the comparable market price. However, the valuation itself originated from a related-party agreement, as A… and B… were part of the same corporate group at the time. The valuation reflected a context where the wash plant's utility and economic circumstances were aligned with group synergies, not independent market forces.

Additionally, the valuation failed to account for significant changes in the market and business conditions by the time of the 2008 transaction. The wash plant's value was influenced by the broader restructuring, the financial losses of the concession, and the operational realities of the buyer, making the €1 sale price commercially reasonable in context.

The Supreme Administrative Court criticised the Tax Authority's reliance on this valuation for two main reasons:

1. **Lack of Independence:** The 2007 valuation was conducted under related-party conditions and did not represent a genuine market transaction. The court highlighted that the CMPM requires comparables to reflect arm's length transactions between unrelated parties.

2. **Inapplicability to Transaction Context:** The valuation did not consider the specific economic circumstances at the time of the sale, such as the buyer's precarious financial position and the operational necessity of including the wash plant in the broader share sale agreement.

Ultimately, the court deemed the CMPM as misapplied, noting that transfer pricing adjustments must be grounded in valid, independent comparables and must reflect the specific realities of the transaction under review.

PART 2

SIGNIFICANCE

MAJOR ISSUES

AREAS OF CONTENTION

The primary contentions were as follows:

1. **Existence of Special Relationships**
   The primary dispute was whether the special relationship between A… and B… justified applying transfer pricing adjustments. The Tax Authority contended that the existence of a special relationship during the negotiation phase (prior to the transaction) warranted scrutiny under Article 58 of the Portuguese IRC Code. It argued that the terms of the transaction were influenced by the earlier related-party relationship. However, A… countered that the relationship ceased on 23 December 2008, with the sale of B… to an independent entity, D… SGPS. The court determined that transfer pricing adjustments must be based on the existence of special relationships at the time the transaction legally occurs, not during earlier negotiations. This distinction limited the Tax Authority's scope of applying transfer pricing rules retrospectively.

2. **Validity of Comparable**
   The Tax Authority relied on a €16.9 million valuation conducted in 2007 under related-party conditions to argue that the sale price of €1 did not reflect the arm's length principle. A… challenged this valuation as invalid, noting that it was derived from a related-party context and did not account for the significant economic and operational changes leading up to the 2008 transaction. The court agreed, emphasising that the Comparable Market Price Method requires independent market data, not figures influenced by intra-group arrangements. The invalid comparable highlighted the difficulty of applying standard methods to unique assets and transactions.

3. **Broader Context of Transaction**
   A… argued that the transaction was part of a broader restructuring deal driven by commercial imperatives involving independent entities. The inclusion of the wash plant at a nominal price was a condition for finalising the share sale of B… to D… SGPS. The court recognised that the restructuring's context and the arm's length terms governing the broader transaction supported A…'s position. This broader perspective limited the relevance of transfer pricing rules in isolated transaction components.

EXPECTED
OR CONTROVERSIAL?

The court's decision to rule in favour of A… was significant but not entirely unexpected. It reinforced the principle that transfer pricing adjustments must adhere to clear evidence and internationally recognised standards. By clarifying that special relationships must exist at the transaction date and that comparables must reflect genuinely independent market data, the judgment aligned with OECD guidelines and broader transfer pricing jurisprudence.

For tax professionals, this ruling offered clarity on critical aspects of transfer pricing disputes, particularly regarding timing and the validity of comparables. However, for tax authorities, the decision was controversial. It restricted their ability to rely on related-party valuations as comparables and to apply transfer pricing adjustments retrospectively. The court's rejection of the €16.9 million valuation signalled that tax authorities must demonstrate a clear, independent rationale for any adjustments.

The controversy lies in the potential broader implications. Revenue authorities may face increased challenges in adjusting prices for unique transactions where independent comparables are scarce. For taxpayers, the decision provides a robust precedent for challenging arbitrary or poorly substantiated transfer pricing adjustments, especially in cases of business restructuring.

SIGNIFICANCE
FOR MULTINATIONALS

This case highlights the critical importance of robust documentation and well-thought-out transfer pricing strategies for multinationals. In particular, it underscores the risks of relying on related-party valuations in intercompany transactions. Multinationals engaging in complex restructurings must carefully assess whether their transfer pricing aligns with the arm's length principle and document every stage of the transaction to demonstrate compliance.

The ruling also emphasises the importance of considering the broader commercial context when defending against transfer pricing adjustments. Here, A… successfully argued that the wash plant's sale price was part of a larger deal involving unrelated parties, diminishing the relevance of isolated transfer pricing scrutiny. This perspective offers valuable insights for multinationals engaged in restructuring, particularly when intercompany transactions are components of larger cross-border arrangements.

Finally, the case reinforces the need for independent benchmarks in pricing arrangements. Multinationals should ensure their transfer pricing analyses are supported by external, market-based comparables wherever possible. This approach reduces the risk of disputes and provides a strong defence against revenue authority challenges.

SIGNIFICANCE

FOR REVENUE SERVICES

This judgment reinforces the need for revenue authorities to apply transfer pricing rules judiciously and based on clear, independent evidence. The Supreme Administrative Court's emphasis on the timing of special relationships creates a new benchmark for assessing transfer pricing disputes. It makes clear that adjustments cannot be justified retroactively based solely on historical relationships or earlier negotiations.

The decision also sets limits on using related-party data as comparables. Revenue authorities must ensure that their pricing adjustments are supported by independent, market-based benchmarks that reflect arm's length conditions. This requirement is particularly relevant for transactions involving unique assets, such as the industrial wash plant in this case.

Moreover, the ruling highlights the importance of considering the broader context of transactions. Revenue authorities must be cautious in isolating individual components of larger deals for scrutiny, as doing so may overlook the commercial realities influencing pricing decisions. This case underscores the need for a holistic approach when applying transfer pricing adjustments, particularly in complex restructuring scenarios.

For tax administrations, the ruling is a reminder to invest in robust methodologies and training to handle intricate cases. It also signals the need to engage with multinationals early in the process, using advance pricing agreements (APAs) or mutual agreement

RELEVANT CASES

CADBURY SCHWEPPES VS UK

This case addressed whether transfer pricing rules could apply to transactions where the parties ceased to have a special relationship at the time of execution. The court ruled that such adjustments must consider the transaction date's actual circumstances. It emphasised the need to align adjustments with existing relationships and market realities. This aligns with the A... case's focus on the timing of special relationships.

CLICK HERE TO READ THE CASE SUMMARY

FIAT CHRYSLER VS EU

The European Commission challenged Fiat Chrysler's intercompany financing arrangements, alleging non-arm's length pricing and selective tax advantages under state aid rules. The case emphasised the importance of using independent, market-based comparables to validate pricing. Like the A... case, it highlighted the complexities of transfer pricing for unique financial arrangements. Both cases stressed the need for robust methodologies and evidence.

CLICK HERE TO READ THE CASE SUMMARY

COCA COLA VS USA

The IRS disputed Coca-Cola's transfer pricing of intercompany royalties and intangible assets, alleging that the applied methods deviated from arm's length standards. The court analysed the appropriateness of Coca-Cola's pricing methodologies and comparables. Similar to the A... case, it underlined the importance of using valid benchmarks and the challenges of defending pricing practices for complex multinational transactions.

CLICK HERE TO READ THE CASE SUMMARY

PART 3

PREVENTION

ENGAGING EXPERTS

Engaging with tax lawyers is crucial for multinational enterprises (MNEs) to navigate the complex landscape of international tax compliance and minimize exposure to risks. Tax laws and regulations vary significantly across jurisdictions, and tax authorities are increasingly collaborating globally to enforce compliance. Tax lawyers provide MNEs with strategic guidance tailored to specific jurisdictions, ensuring that transactions and tax structures align with both local and international tax laws.

One of the primary advantages of consulting tax lawyers is their expertise in safeguarding sensitive information under legal professional privilege, especially in cross-border contexts. This confidentiality is essential for MNEs, as it allows open communication with legal counsel, protecting strategic tax planning discussions from disclosure to tax authorities. Tax lawyers are also well-versed in complex anti-avoidance laws, transfer pricing regulations, and disclosure obligations, which vary across jurisdictions but significantly impact MNEs.

Moreover, tax lawyers play a vital role in risk management, advising MNEs on compliance strategies and helping establish robust tax governance frameworks. With proactive legal advice, MNEs can adopt preventative measures—such as setting up a tax steering committee or implementing a tax risk management process—that help in identifying, managing, and mitigating tax risks before they escalate into costly disputes or reputational issues.

In an environment where global tax regulations are continually evolving, engaging tax lawyers allows MNEs to stay compliant and responsive to regulatory changes, reducing potential risks while upholding best practices in tax transparency and governance.

PREVENTATIVE

MEASURES TO AVOID SIMILAR CASES

TAX RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Implementing a comprehensive tax risk management process is essential to identify, assess, and mitigate tax risks associated with cross-border transactions. This process should involve:

- Regular reviews of intra-group transactions to ensure they have genuine economic substance.
- Proactive engagement with tax authorities to seek clarity on the application of anti-abuse rules.
- Thorough documentation of the business rationale for each transaction to support

DOWNLOAD FREE BOOK

TAX INTELLIGENCE: THE 7 HABITUAL TAX MISTAKES MADE BY COMPANIES

Tax Intelligence: The 7 Habitual Tax Mistakes Made by Companies" by Dr. Daniel N. Erasmus is a must-read for businesses seeking to navigate the intricate world of tax compliance and risk management. By highlighting common pitfalls and offering strategic solutions, Erasmus equips companies with the knowledge to improve their tax practices and secure financial stability.

https://support.academyoftaxlaw.com/product/tax-intelligence-by-prof-dr-daniel-n-erasmus/

PREVENTATIVE

MEASURES TO AVOID SIMILAR CASES

TAX STEERING COMMITTEE

Establishing a tax steering committee can help ensure that tax policies are aligned with the broader business strategy and that transactions are vetted for both commercial and tax implications. A tax steering committee can:

- Review all significant cross-border transactions before they are executed.
- Ensure that tax decisions are made in the context of overall business objectives, not solely for tax savings.
- Monitor changes in international tax laws to ensure ongoing compliance and avoid disputes like the X BV case.

DOWNLOAD FREE E-BOOK

DRIVING TAX COMPLIANCE: THE ESSENTIAL ROLE OF THE TAX STEERING COMMITTEE

The eBook "Driving Tax Compliance: The Essential Role of a Tax Steering Committee" by Prof. Dr. Daniel N. Erasmus, Renier van Rensburg, and Gilbert Ferreira, emphasizes the critical importance of establishing a Tax Steering Committee (TSC) within multinational corporations to ensure tax compliance and manage tax-related risks effectively.

https://support.academyoftaxlaw.com/product/essential-role-of-the-tax-steering-committee/

INTERNATIONAL TAX

CASE SUMMARY

ACADEMY OF TAX LAW

Copyright © 2024/2025
International Institute for Tax and Finance Ltd (I/I/T/F) Academy of Tax Law

This publication was accurate at time of publishing.
It may be necessary for reasons beyond the control of the organisers to alter the content.