ACADEMY OF TAX LAW
learn • share • connect

INTERNATIONAL TAX
CASE SUMMARY

FRANCE VS SAS ROGER VIVIER

DECEMBER 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©, 2025 - Academy of Tax Law (Division of International Institute for Tax And Finance)

First Edition Published on 27 January 2025

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:	Cour Administrative d’Appel de Paris, 9th Chamber
Case No:	23PA01130
Applicant:	SAS Roger Vivier Paris
Defendant:	French Ministry for the Economy, Finance, and Industrial and Digital Sovereignty
Judgment Date:	13 December 2024
Full Judgment:	CLICK FOR FULL JUDGMENT
View Online:	CLICK TO VIEW SUMMARY ONLINE

JUDGMENT SUMMARY

The Cour Administrative d'Appel de Paris upheld significant portions of the tax adjustments imposed on SAS Roger Vivier Paris (RVP) for the years 2012–2014. The French tax authorities argued that RVP, as part of a group involving foreign parent entities and related companies, engaged in practices leading to profit transfers inconsistent with the arm's length principle as outlined in Article 57 of the French General Tax Code. The adjustments addressed insufficient re-invoicing for brand promotion expenses, failure to apply appropriate margins, and substantial discounts on unsold inventory returned to its supplier, Tod's.

The tax authorities applied the transactional net margin method (TNMM), referencing 43 comparable independent companies operating in the luxury distribution sector, and determined that RVP's profit margins were significantly below arm's length benchmarks. The authorities rejected RVP's arguments that its practices, such as a 65% discount on unsold goods and limited re-invoicing for promotional costs, reflected industry norms or market conditions. RVP's reliance on alternative tax provisions and interpretations from the French tax code was also dismissed.

Key findings included:

- The existence of indirect transfers of profits through pricing and operational decisions.
- Dependence relationships among RVP and its related entities in Portugal, Luxembourg, and Italy.
- Use of flawed methodologies by RVP, as no comparable data or adjustments were presented to counter the tax authorities' analysis.

Penalties of 40% were upheld for deliberate non-compliance, with the court noting that RVP's lack of transfer pricing documentation and repeated underreporting indicated intentional tax evasion.

The court also addressed procedural objections raised by RVP, including the handling of tax loss carryforwards and the choice of comparables, concluding that the authorities acted within the scope of the law.

This judgment has far-reaching implications for multinationals operating in France, particularly those in the luxury sector. It reinforces the importance of comprehensive transfer pricing documentation, adherence to the arm's length principle, and proactive engagement in risk management processes.

KEY POINTS

OF THE JUDGMENT

BACKGROUND

SAS Roger Vivier Paris (RVP) operates a luxury goods boutique in Paris, distributing Roger Vivier-branded footwear and accessories. The brand itself is owned by Gousson, a related entity, and the products are supplied exclusively by Tod's, another related company. These entities, along with their parent company, are part of a multinational group controlled by an Italian shareholder.

Between 2012 and 2014, the French tax authorities audited RVP and identified concerns related to transfer pricing. They asserted that RVP had indirectly transferred profits to its parent entities by inadequately re-invoicing promotional expenses, failing to apply profit margins on re-invoiced services, and providing excessive discounts on unsold inventory returned to Tod's. The authorities argued that these practices were not in line with the arm's length principle under Article 57 of the French General Tax Code.

RVP disputed the adjustments, claiming that its operations during the audited period were consistent with market norms. It contended that promotional expenses were justified, the discounts on unsold products were due to the rapid obsolescence of fashion items, and the transactional net margin method (TNMM) applied by the authorities was inappropriate.

The case progressed through administrative proceedings before arriving at the Cour Administrative d'Appel de Paris, where RVP sought relief from additional corporate tax, withholding tax, and value-added tax, along with the associated penalties.

KEY POINTS
OF THE JUDGMENT

CORE DISPUTE

The central dispute revolved around whether RVP's transfer pricing practices were consistent with the arm's length principle. The tax authorities alleged that RVP failed to meet this standard by:

1. **Insufficient Re-invoicing:** RVP charged only a portion of the promotional expenses incurred for the Roger Vivier brand to its parent companies, applying no margin on these costs. This practice resulted in the indirect transfer of profits to its related entities.
2. **Discounted Inventory Returns:** RVP applied a 65% discount on unsold inventory returned to Tod's, which the tax authorities deemed excessive and unjustified.
3. **Flawed Methodologies:** The authorities used TNMM with a set of 43 comparable companies to benchmark RVP's net margin. They concluded that RVP's margins fell significantly below arm's length levels.

RVP countered that its practices were industry-specific, justified by economic realities, and consistent with internal policies. It argued that the promotional expenses and discounts were standard for luxury retail, and TNMM was unsuitable given its operational structure and cost base. Furthermore, RVP challenged the comparability of the selected companies and the authorities' application of the average margin instead of the median.

The court needed to determine whether RVP's practices aligned with the arm's length principle and whether the tax adjustments and penalties imposed were justified.

KEY POINTS
OF THE JUDGMENT

COURT FINDINGS

The Cour Administrative d'Appel de Paris largely upheld the findings of the French tax authorities, concluding that SAS Roger Vivier Paris (RVP) had not adhered to the arm's length principle in its intercompany transactions. The court focused on three key areas:

1. **Dependence Relationships:** The court found that RVP was financially and operationally dependent on related entities within its group structure. Gousson, the brand owner, and Tod's, the sole supplier, exercised significant influence over RVP's operations. This relationship, coupled with the exclusive reliance on Tod's for product supply, indicated that RVP lacked autonomy in key commercial decisions, a factor that supported the tax authorities' claims of non-arm's length practices.
2. **Transfer Pricing Adjustments:** The court agreed with the application of the transactional net margin method (TNMM) to benchmark RVP's net margins. It deemed the selected panel of 43 comparable companies appropriate, as they operated in similar high-end retail markets under competitive conditions. RVP's margins, significantly below the median and average of the comparables, were found to reflect insufficient remuneration for its functions, risks, and assets. The court dismissed RVP's challenge to the methodology and data selection, noting the company's failure to provide alternative comparables or a robust methodological critique.
3. **Promotional Expenses and Discounts:** The court determined that RVP's insufficient re-invoicing of promotional expenses and failure to apply margins on these recharges constituted an indirect transfer of profits to its related parties. Similarly, the 65% discount on unsold inventory was deemed excessive, as RVP did not substantiate its claim that the discount aligned with industry norms.

Overall, the court ruled that the tax authorities' adjustments and the 40% penalty for deliberate non-compliance were justified, highlighting RVP's lack of transfer pricing documentation and consistent underreporting of taxable income.

KEY POINTS

OF THE JUDGMENT

OUTCOME

The Cour Administrative d'Appel de Paris dismissed the majority of RVP appeal, affirming the tax authorities' adjustments and the penalties imposed. The judgment highlighted several critical outcomes:

1. **Validation of Adjustments:** The court upheld the adjustments made by the tax authorities concerning RVP's insufficient re-invoicing of promotional expenses, failure to apply margins on these charges, and excessive discounts on unsold inventory returned to Tod's. It confirmed that these practices constituted indirect profit transfers under Article 57 of the French General Tax Code.
2. **Application of TNMM:** The court validated the use of the transactional net margin method (TNMM) as the appropriate transfer pricing method to benchmark RVP's operations. The selection of 43 comparable companies operating in the luxury retail sector was deemed reasonable and representative. RVP's consistent failure to meet the arm's length benchmark highlighted underperformance in its reported margins.
3. **Penalty Confirmation:** The court upheld the 40% penalties for deliberate non-compliance. It concluded that RVP's lack of transfer pricing documentation, repetitive underreporting of taxable income, and failure to address structurally inadequate results demonstrated an intentional disregard for tax obligations.
4. **Rejected Defences:** RVP's claims, including those related to the comparability of selected companies, the appropriateness of the TNMM, and reliance on tax code provisions, were rejected. The court noted the absence of sufficient evidence or credible alternative methodologies provided by RVP to refute the tax authorities' findings.
5. **Implications for Future Operations:** The judgment underscored the importance of comprehensive transfer pricing documentation and adherence to the arm's length principle. It served as a warning to multinationals about the risks of inadequate internal controls and tax planning.

This decision reinforced the tax authorities' position and imposed significant financial and procedural lessons for RVP and other multinational entities operating in similar sectors.

TP METHOD

HIGHLIGHTED (IF ANY)

The French tax authorities employed the **Transactional Net Margin Method (TNMM)** to evaluate the transfer pricing practices of SAS Roger Vivier Paris (RVP). This method compares the net profit margin relative to a specific base (e.g., sales, costs, or assets) of the tested party with the net profit margins of comparable independent companies engaged in similar activities.

Application of TNMM

Benchmarking Process:

- A panel of 43 independent companies operating in the luxury retail sector was selected for comparison. These companies performed similar distribution functions under competitive market conditions.
- The authorities calculated the net margin rate for each company in the panel over an 11-year period, covering financial years 2005 to 2014.

Comparability Adjustments:

- The panel's average net margin rate was used as the benchmark. The first quartile, median, and third quartile net margins were also considered but not applied directly.
- RVP's net margins were significantly below the average benchmark (6.76%) during the audited period, indicating inadequate profitability.

Key Findings:

- RVP consistently reported negative net margins for the financial years 2004–2012.
- The tax authorities applied the average benchmark rate (6.76%) to RVP's sales revenue to determine its arm's length profitability.
- The discrepancies identified included insufficient remuneration for brand promotion activities, excessive discounts on unsold goods, and inadequate gross margins.

RVP's Challenge:

- RVP argued that TNMM was inappropriate due to its unique cost structure and reliance on related entities. It advocated for the Resale Price Method (RPM) as a more suitable alternative. However, the court dismissed this, citing the absence of detailed evidence to support the claim.

The court concluded that TNMM was appropriately applied, aligning with the OECD Guidelines and adequately capturing RVP's operational inefficiencies and profit distortions.

PART 2

SIGNIFICANCE

MAJOR ISSUES

AREAS OF CONTENTION

The case of RVP highlighted several contentious issues, reflecting the complexities of transfer pricing in multinational groups. These areas of contention included:

Arm's Length Principle Compliance:
The central dispute revolved around whether RVP's transactions adhered to the arm's length principle under Article 57 of the French General Tax Code. The tax authorities asserted that RVP failed to adequately remunerate itself for brand promotion and development services and applied excessive discounts on unsold inventory, indirectly transferring profits to related entities.

Selection and Application of TNMM:
The authorities used the TNMM to assess RVP's profitability. The application of an 11-year period for comparison and reliance on the average margin rate of 43 comparables was challenged by RVP, which argued that this approach ignored economic fluctuations and industry-specific challenges.

RVP also contended that the resale price method (RPM) would have been more appropriate given its cost structure and focus on distribution rather than brand development. However, the court rejected this argument due to a lack of substantiating evidence.

Justification of Promotional Expenses and Discounts:
RVP's partial re-invoicing of brand promotion expenses to its parent companies without applying a margin was deemed insufficient by the authorities. Similarly, the company's claim that a 65% discount on unsold inventory reflected industry norms was rejected, as no evidence was provided to substantiate the assertion.

Penalties for Non-Compliance:
The imposition of 40% penalties for deliberate non-compliance was highly contentious. RVP argued that its practices were consistent with industry standards and did not demonstrate intentional tax evasion. The court upheld the penalties, citing the absence of transfer pricing documentation and a pattern of underreporting taxable income.

These disputes underscore the critical need for robust transfer pricing strategies and comprehensive documentation in defending multinational tax practices.

EXPECTED

OR CONTROVERSIAL?

The decision by the Cour Administrative d'Appel de Paris in the case of SAS Roger Vivier Paris (RVP) was both expected and controversial, depending on the perspective of the stakeholders involved.

Why It Was Expected:

Adherence to Established Legal Framework:

- The judgment followed well-established principles of French tax law, particularly Article 57 of the French General Tax Code, which presumes indirect profit transfers in controlled transactions unless rebutted with sufficient evidence.
- The use of the transactional net margin method (TNMM) and reliance on the OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines aligned with standard international practices.
- RVP's failure to provide robust transfer pricing documentation and alternative comparables made it challenging to contest the tax authorities' methodology and conclusions.

Consistent Jurisprudence:

- French courts have historically upheld stringent enforcement of the arm's length principle, particularly where intercompany transactions involve insufficient remuneration or excessive cost allocation to French subsidiaries.

Why It Was Controversial:

Rigidity in Methodology:

- The reliance on TNMM and the use of an 11-year period for comparables were contested as overly rigid and dismissive of RVP's unique business model and market conditions. Critics argue that more tailored approaches, such as the resale price method (RPM), could have provided a more accurate analysis.

Severity of Penalties:

- The 40% penalty for deliberate non-compliance sparked debate. While the court justified this based on RVP's lack of documentation and repeated underreporting, the company maintained that it operated in good faith within industry norms. For multinationals, such penalties highlight the heightened risks associated with transfer pricing disputes.

Impact on Luxury Industry:

- The judgment's emphasis on arm's length remuneration for brand promotion and inventory management may set a precedent that disproportionately affects luxury retailers, where high obsolescence and significant promotional costs are common.

In sum, while the outcome was grounded in established law, its implications for methodology, documentation, and penalties raised concerns, particularly for multinationals in complex industries.

SIGNIFICANCE

FOR MULTINATIONALS

The judgment in the RVP case carries significant implications for multinational enterprises, particularly those operating in complex industries such as luxury retail. It underscores the increasing scrutiny by tax authorities and courts on transfer pricing practices, documentation, and compliance with the arm's length principle.

1. Transfer Pricing Documentation:

The ruling highlights the necessity for comprehensive and robust transfer pricing documentation. RVP's inability to present adequate documentation or alternative comparables to support its pricing decisions significantly weakened its defense. For MNEs, this case reinforces the importance of maintaining detailed and contemporaneous documentation that aligns with OECD Guidelines and local regulations.

2. Application of TNMM:

The validation of the transactional net margin method (TNMM) and the use of a broad panel of comparables signal a preference for standard methodologies in determining arm's length pricing. MNEs must ensure that their profitability metrics align with industry benchmarks and that alternative methods are substantiated with strong evidence if used.

3. Intercompany Agreements and Policies:

The court's focus on insufficient remuneration for brand promotion and excessive discounts on unsold goods highlights the need for clear intercompany agreements that detail remuneration for services and the rationale for pricing strategies. MNEs must ensure that intercompany transactions are carefully documented and supported by market evidence.

4. Heightened Penalties:

The imposition of a 40% penalty for deliberate non-compliance signals a strong deterrent against lax transfer pricing practices. This serves as a warning to MNEs about the financial and reputational risks associated with non-compliance.

5. Sector-Specific Considerations:

For industries with unique operational models, such as luxury retail, this judgment underscores the need to justify practices like discounts and promotional expenses with robust market data.

Overall, the case serves as a cautionary tale for MNEs to invest in proactive tax risk management strategies and engage transfer pricing experts to navigate complex compliance landscapes.

SIGNIFICANCE

FOR REVENUE SERVICES

The RVP judgment is a critical precedent for revenue authorities, emphasizing their role in enforcing transfer pricing compliance and the arm's length principle. It provides valuable insights into how tax authorities can strengthen their audits and litigations against MNEs.

1. Validation of Methodology:

The court's endorsement of the TNMM affirms its utility as a reliable transfer pricing tool, especially when applied to distribution companies. Revenue authorities are encouraged to adopt well-documented methodologies, supported by comprehensive comparability analyses, to defend their adjustments.

2. Focus on Intercompany Transactions:

The case highlights the importance of scrutinizing intercompany transactions that involve insufficient remuneration, disproportionate cost allocations, or questionable discounts. The tax authorities' ability to demonstrate that such practices constituted profit shifting under Article 57 of the French General Tax Code underscores the effectiveness of focusing on such vulnerabilities during audits.

3. Penalties as a Deterrent:

The imposition of 40% penalties for deliberate non-compliance sends a strong signal to taxpayers about the consequences of inadequate documentation and non-arm's length pricing. This serves as a powerful tool for revenue services to encourage proactive compliance among MNEs.

4. Comprehensive Comparability Analysis:

The reliance on an 11-year comparability period and 43 comparable companies demonstrates the importance of detailed and statistically sound benchmarking. It reinforces the need for revenue authorities to invest in robust data collection and analysis to support their assessments.

5. Precedent for Luxury Retail:

This ruling sets a precedent for addressing transfer pricing in industries with unique dynamics, such as luxury retail. It equips revenue authorities with a framework to challenge profit allocations in similar sectors where promotional activities, inventory obsolescence, and intercompany agreements are prevalent.

In conclusion, the judgment reinforces revenue services' ability to enforce transfer pricing laws effectively while encouraging them to adopt methodical, data-driven approaches during audits and disputes.

RELEVANT CASES

APPLE VS EU

The European Commission ruled that Apple had received unlawful state aid in Ireland through selective tax rulings that allowed the company to allocate profits to a "head office" exempt from tax. This arrangement reduced Apple's effective tax rate significantly.

Like the RVP case, this dispute emphasized the need for MNEs to justify profit allocation practices and highlighted the scrutiny faced by arrangements involving minimal tax liability in high-profit jurisdictions.

Click here to read our summary of this case

COCA-COLA VS USA

The IRS challenged Coca-Cola's transfer pricing for concentrate sales to foreign affiliates, alleging that the pricing mechanism undervalued U.S.-based intangibles. The IRS proposed a $3.3 billion adjustment using a profit split method.

This case parallels RVP's reliance on group structures and inadequate remuneration for critical functions. It reinforces the importance of aligning transfer pricing policies with actual business operations.

Click here to read our summary of this case

NESLE INDIA VS INDIA

The Indian tax authorities challenged Nestlé's pricing for services provided by the parent company, arguing that the payments exceeded arm's length amounts. The authorities applied TNMM to benchmark the costs.

Similar to RVP, this case highlights the importance of detailed documentation and defensible methodologies to substantiate intercompany charges.

PART 3

PREVENTION

ENGAGING EXPERTS

The RVP case highlights the critical importance for MNEs to engage experienced transfer pricing experts to navigate the complexities of intercompany transactions and tax compliance.

1. Strategic Expertise:

Transfer pricing experts bring a deep understanding of the OECD Guidelines, local tax regulations, and international best practices. In cases like RVP, where discrepancies in pricing, margins, and intercompany agreements are scrutinized, expert guidance ensures alignment with the arm's length principle.

2. Documentation and Compliance:

One of the primary weaknesses in RVP's defense was the lack of robust transfer pricing documentation. Experts help develop and maintain detailed records, including benchmarking analyses, functional analyses, and intercompany agreements, which are critical during audits or disputes.

3. Tailored Methodology:

RVP's failure to propose alternative comparables or justify the use of a different method (e.g., Resale Price Method) underscores the value of experts who can tailor transfer pricing methodologies to specific business models and industry contexts.

4. Dispute Resolution:

Transfer pricing disputes often involve significant financial and reputational risks. Experts provide the technical and strategic support needed to counter tax authority challenges effectively, minimizing penalties and adjustments.

5. Proactive Risk Management:

Engaging experts enables MNEs to proactively identify and address potential transfer pricing risks. This reduces the likelihood of disputes, ensures compliance, and enhances relationships with tax authorities.

Ultimately, transfer pricing experts play a pivotal role in safeguarding MNEs from financial penalties, reputational damage, and operational disruptions in an increasingly complex regulatory environment.

PREVENTATIVE

MEASURES TO AVOID SIMILAR CASES

The RVP case underscores the importance of proactive measures to avoid transfer pricing disputes and ensure compliance with the arm's length principle. MNEs can minimize tax risks through robust preventative strategies, including the implementation of a tax risk management framework and a tax steering committee.

Tax Risk Management Framework:

- Establish policies to ensure compliance with domestic and international tax laws.
- Conduct regular audits to identify and address potential vulnerabilities, such as treaty reliance without adequate substance.

Tax Steering Committee:

- Comprising tax professionals, legal advisors, and business leaders, the committee oversees tax strategy and risk management.
- Ensures alignment of business objectives with tax planning, preventing artificial arrangements that may invite scrutiny.

Regular Audits and Training:

- Conducting periodic internal audits of transfer pricing arrangements ensures that pricing practices remain defensible and compliant.
- Educate key stakeholders on evolving global tax laws, including the Multilateral Instrument (MLI) and anti-abuse provisions.
- Regular updates on compliance best practices minimise unintentional breaches.

These preventative measures, alongside strategic input from tax professionals, can significantly reduce the risk of litigation.

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.

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 this 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.

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.