INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

ISSN: 2582-6433

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

ISSN: 2582-6433

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

ISSN: 2582-6433

EVOLVING DIMENSIONS OF TAXATION LAW IN INDIA: CHALLENGES OF DIGITAL ECONOMY AND REGULATORY REFORMS

AUTHORED BY - HARSHRAJ SHARMA

ABSTRACT

The rapid proliferation of digital commerce and the rise of platform-based economies have fundamentally disrupted conventional frameworks of taxation in India. This paper examines the evolving dimensions of Indian taxation law against the backdrop of digital transformation, tracing the legislative journey from classical direct and indirect tax regimes to the introduction of the Goods and Services Tax (GST) and the Equalization Levy. It critically analyses the doctrinal challenges that digital business models pose to established principles of nexus, permanent establishment, and source-based taxation. The paper further explores India's engagement with international tax reform frameworks, particularly the OECD/G20 BEPS project and the two-pillar solution, evaluating their implications for Indian fiscal policy. Through doctrinal analysis and comparative jurisprudence, this paper argues that India's tax architecture requires systemic recalibration—balancing revenue imperatives with investment-attracting regulatory certainty—to meet the demands of an increasingly digitized economy.

Keywords: *Digital Economy Taxation, Equalization Levy, BEPS, GST, Permanent Establishment, OECD Two-Pillar Solution, Indian Tax Law Reform.*

I. Introduction

The emergence of the digital economy has catalysed one of the most significant transformations in the history of taxation. Traditional tax systems, rooted in the physical presence and transactional logic of brick-and-mortar commerce, were not designed to accommodate the operational realities of multinational digital enterprises that generate vast revenues in jurisdictions where they have no tangible physical presence. In India—the world's third-largest startup ecosystem and a rapidly growing digital market—this challenge assumes particular urgency.

ISSN: 2582-6433

Indian taxation law has historically been shaped by the Income Tax Act, 1961, and the Customs Act, 1962, supplemented by a labyrinthine framework of central and state indirect taxes. The enactment of the Constitution (One Hundred and First Amendment) Act, 2016, and the consequent rollout of the Goods and Services Tax (GST) with effect from 1 July 2017, represented a watershed moment in Indian fiscal federalism. Yet, the GST architecture, while revolutionary in consolidating indirect taxation, remains ill-equipped to fully capture the value creation inherent in digital transactions, particularly those involving non-resident service providers.

The challenge is not merely administrative; it is deeply doctrinal. Classical attribution principles, such as the concept of permanent establishment (PE) derived from bilateral Double Taxation Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs) modelled on the OECD and UN Model Conventions, presuppose a physical or economic nexus that digital enterprises strategically circumvent. The consequent 'digital divide' in taxation—where profit is separated from the jurisdiction of value creation—has spurred both domestic legislative innovation and multilateral reform efforts.

This paper proceeds as follows: Section II provides a historical overview of the evolution of India's tax architecture. Section III analyses the doctrinal challenges that the digital economy poses to existing frameworks. Section IV examines specific legislative responses, including the Equalization Levy and amendments to the Income Tax Act. Section V situates India's position within the OECD/G20 multilateral reform process. Section VI identifies persistent gaps and proposes a reform agenda. Section VII concludes.

II. Historical Evolution of Indian Taxation Law

A. The Colonial Foundation and Early Independent Framework

The roots of India's income tax legislation lie in the Income Tax Act, 1886, enacted during the British colonial period, subsequently replaced by the Act of 1922. Following independence, the Law Commission of India, under the chairmanship of N.T. Vekataraman, recommended a comprehensive overhaul, culminating in the Income Tax Act, 1961 (hereinafter 'the Act'), which came into force on 1 April 1962. The Act established the fundamental architecture of direct taxation in India—chargeability based on residential status, heads of income, deductions, exemptions, and appellate structures—that persists, albeit in

ISSN: 2582-6433

significantly amended form, to the present day.

The central-state division of taxation powers, enshrined in the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution of India, 1950, assigned taxes on income (excluding agricultural income) to the Union List, while sales taxes and certain excise duties were assigned to the State List. This allocation, while administratively convenient in an era of predominantly territorial commerce, created significant complications as trade became increasingly interstate and, eventually, transnational.

B. The Era of Indirect Tax Fragmentation (1962–2017)

For over five decades following independence, India's indirect tax regime was characterised by multiplicity and fragmentation. The Central Excise and Salt Act, 1944 governed manufacturing duties; the Customs Act, 1962 regulated import-export levies; Central Sales Tax, 1956 applied to interstate commerce; and each state maintained its own sales tax legislation, later partially reformed into Value Added Tax (VAT) frameworks from 2003 onwards. Service tax, introduced in 1994 under the Finance Act, was progressively expanded to cover an ever-widening array of services.

The result was a cascading, inefficient, and regressive system characterised by tax-on-tax incidence, compliance fragmentation across jurisdictions, and pervasive classification disputes. The Task Force on Indirect Taxes (Kelkar Committee, 2002) and subsequent reform committees consistently recommended the consolidation of indirect taxation into a unified national framework—a recommendation that eventually materialised in the GST.

C. The GST Revolution (2017–Present)

The implementation of the GST regime, structured as a dual levy of Central GST (CGST), State GST (SGST), and Integrated GST (IGST) on inter-state supplies, represented a constitutionally and administratively complex reform of historic proportions. The GST subsumed seventeen central and state levies, replacing the fragmented indirect tax landscape with a destination-based, consumption-tax framework governed by the GST Council—a constitutional body under Article 279A.

GST's foundational principle of destination-based taxation proved particularly relevant to digital services. The levy of IGST on the import of services under the reverse charge mechanism (RCM) under Section 5(3) of the IGST Act, 2017, extended India's indirect tax jurisdiction to offshore digital service providers supplying to Indian consumers. Subsequently, the introduction of the Online Information and Database Access or Retrieval (OIDAR) service

ISSN: 2582-6433

category brought a significant tranche of digital services—streaming, cloud computing, e-learning—within the direct GST net.

III. Doctrinal Challenges of the Digital Economy

A. The Nexus Problem and the Declining Relevance of Permanent Establishment

The most fundamental challenge that the digital economy poses to tax law is the disruption of the nexus concept. Traditional income tax treaties, following the OECD Model Tax Convention, permit source-country taxation of business income only where the non-resident enterprise has a Permanent Establishment (PE) in the source state. Article 5 of the OECD Model defines PE as a fixed place of business through which the business of an enterprise is wholly or partly carried on.

Digital enterprises, by design, operate without fixed physical presence. A global technology platform generating hundreds of millions of dollars in advertising or subscription revenue from Indian users may do so through servers located in Ireland, management functions concentrated in the United States, and intellectual property parked in low-tax jurisdictions such as Luxembourg or the Netherlands. Under classical PE doctrine, India—despite being the locus of value creation through user data, content, and consumption—would have no taxing rights over the resulting profits.

India's tax administration has attempted to stretch the PE concept through the 'Dependent Agent PE' (DAPE) doctrine and the concept of 'Service PE,' as seen in cases such as Morgan Stanley & Co. v. Commissioner of Income Tax (2007) 7 SCC 1, where the Supreme Court recognised that seconded employees performing core functions could create a PE. However, as the Karnataka High Court observed in Google India Private Limited v. Union of India (2017), digital advertising revenues structurally resist attribution under traditional PE frameworks, exposing the inadequacy of case-by-case litigation as a systemic solution.

B. Transfer Pricing and Base Erosion

The interaction between digital business models and transfer pricing regulations under Chapter X of the Income Tax Act, 1961, presents a second layer of doctrinal complexity. Multinational digital enterprises routinely employ profit-shifting strategies—including cost contribution arrangements (CCAs), intra-group intellectual property (IP) licensing, and strategic location of marketing intangibles—to allocate disproportionate profits to low-tax jurisdictions.

ISSN: 2582-6433

The arm's length principle (ALP), codified in Section 92C of the Act and elaborated through the Income Tax (Eleventh Amendment) Rules, 2001, requires that related-party transactions be priced as if conducted between independent parties. However, the highly unique nature of digital assets—algorithms, user data, proprietary platforms—renders comparable uncontrolled price (CUP) analysis methodologically precarious. The Central Board of Direct Taxes (CBDT) has issued guidance on profit split methods and the treatment of intangibles, but fundamental valuation uncertainty persists.

The Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications India (P.) Ltd. v. CIT (2015) 374 ITR 118 (Del.) decision, though not strictly a digital economy case, illustrated the judiciary's willingness to examine the economic substance of intra-group arrangements—a doctrinal approach increasingly relevant to digital transfer pricing disputes.

C. Characterisation of Income: Royalty versus Business Profits

A recurring and commercially significant dispute concerns whether payments made by Indian entities to non-resident technology companies—for software licenses, API access, data subscriptions, and cloud services—constitute 'royalties' taxable at source under Section 9(1)(vi) of the Act or business income taxable only through a PE. The distinction carries profound implications for withholding tax obligations under Section 195.

The Supreme Court, in Engineering Analysis Centre of Excellence Private Limited v. CIT (2021) 432 ITR 471 (SC), held that payments for the use of standardised, off-the-shelf software do not constitute royalties under the applicable DTAAs, as the end-user does not acquire any copyright but merely a licence to use the product. While this decision provided doctrinal clarity in the software context, it simultaneously highlighted the insufficiency of existing treaty definitions to capture the economic reality of cloud services, SaaS arrangements, and platform access fees, where the boundary between use of IP and provision of a service is increasingly blurred.

IV. India's Legislative Responses to Digital Taxation

A. The Equalization Levy: A Unilateral Measure

Faced with the inadequacy of existing frameworks, India enacted the Finance Act, 2016, introducing the Equalization Levy (EL)—a withholding levy of 6% on payments made to non-resident digital advertising service providers where the aggregate annual payment exceeded Rs. 1 lakh. This measure, inspired by OECD BEPS Action 1 discussion drafts and

ISSN: 2582-6433

the French 'digital tax' proposals, was innovative in applying a gross-revenue-based levy outside the income tax framework, thereby sidestepping DTAA constraints.

The Finance Act, 2020 substantially expanded the EL's ambit, introducing a new 2% levy on the consideration received by non-resident e-commerce operators from online supply of goods or services to Indian customers. This expansion—effective from 1 April 2020—brought entities such as global e-commerce platforms, digital marketplace operators, and online travel agencies within its scope. The EL was intended to function as a stopgap measure pending global consensus on digital taxation, but its unilateral application generated significant bilateral friction, particularly with the United States, which initiated a Section 301 investigation under US trade law in January 2021, characterising the EL as unreasonable and discriminatory.

India ultimately agreed to withdraw the expanded EL effective 1 August 2024, as part of the political commitment to implement the OECD Pillar One Amount A framework—a decision reflecting the inherent tension between national revenue autonomy and multilateral fiscal cooperation.

B. Significant Economic Presence

Simultaneously, India amended Section 9(1)(i) of the Income Tax Act through the Finance Act, 2018, to introduce the concept of 'Significant Economic Presence' (SEP) as a basis for source-country taxation of business income. The SEP provisions—effective from Assessment Year 2022-23—deem a non-resident to have a business connection in India if the aggregate payments from India exceed a prescribed threshold or if the non-resident systematically interacts with a specified number of Indian users through digital means.

The SEP represents a legislative departure from the physical presence paradigm, recognising that sustained economic engagement with Indian markets—even without any physical footprint—justifies source taxation. However, the practical utility of SEP is significantly constrained by DTAA override: where an applicable treaty does not incorporate a corresponding nexus rule, the SEP provisions cannot override the treaty's PE threshold, by virtue of the non-obstante clause in Section 90(2) of the Act. As most of India's DTAAs predate the SEP concept, its operational impact remains limited pending treaty renegotiation.

C. GST on Digital Services and OIDAR Provisions

Under the IGST Act, 2017, OIDAR services supplied by offshore providers to non-registered Indian recipients (essentially, Business-to-Consumer or B2C supplies) are taxable in India, with the obligation to register and remit GST falling on the foreign supplier. While

ISSN: 2582-6433

structurally sound, enforcement of this obligation against unregistered foreign digital entities has proved administratively challenging. The GST Council has periodically reviewed simplification of compliance procedures for foreign OIDAR suppliers, including the introduction of a simplified registration mechanism analogous to the EU's VAT MOSS scheme.

V. India and the International Tax Reform Architecture

A. BEPS and India's Position

India was an active participant in the OECD/G20 Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) project (2013–2015), which produced fifteen action plans addressing treaty abuse, transfer pricing, hybrid mismatches, and digital economy challenges. As a member of the Inclusive Framework on BEPS, India committed to implementing the four minimum standards: Action 5 (harmful tax practices), Action 6 (treaty abuse), Action 13 (transfer pricing documentation and Country-by-Country Reporting), and Action 14 (dispute resolution).

India's implementation of Country-by-Country Reporting (CbCR) through Section 286 of the Income Tax Act, read with the Income Tax (Country-by-Country Report) Rules, 2017, represented a significant enhancement of tax transparency. Similarly, the adoption of the Multilateral Instrument (MLI)—signed by India in June 2017 and ratified in June 2019—modified a substantial number of India's bilateral DTAAs to incorporate anti-abuse provisions, including the Principal Purpose Test (PPT) and treaty-shopping limitations.

B. The Two-Pillar Solution: Implications for India

The OECD/G20 Two-Pillar Solution, agreed upon in October 2021 by 137 jurisdictions of the Inclusive Framework, represents the most ambitious restructuring of the international tax order in a century. Pillar One proposes a reallocation of taxing rights—through 'Amount A'—attributing a portion of the excess profits of the largest and most profitable multinational enterprises (MNEs) to market jurisdictions, regardless of physical presence. Pillar Two introduces a Global Minimum Tax (GMT) of 15% on the income of large MNEs, implemented through the Qualified Domestic Minimum Top-up Tax (QDMTT) and Income Inclusion Rule (IIR).

For India, Pillar One's Amount A offers the prospect of enhanced taxing rights over digital MNEs that currently escape Indian corporate tax. However, the beneficiary market jurisdictions are likely to receive reallocated profits representing a fraction of what India's existing domestic measures—including the EL and SEP—may have captured. The obligation

ISSN: 2582-6433

to withdraw unilateral measures as a condition of Amount A implementation has accordingly been received with measured scepticism by Indian policymakers.

Pillar Two's GMT is of considerable structural interest to India. The Indian corporate tax rate for domestic companies stands at 22% (25.17% with surcharge and cess) under Section 115BAA, and at 15% for new manufacturing companies under Section 115BAB. Existing rates for foreign companies stand at 40%. The GMT would establish a floor that limits the competitive attractiveness of jurisdictions offering rates below 15%, potentially reducing the aggressive tax competition that has historically enabled profit-shifting by digital MNEs. India introduced QDMTT provisions through the Finance (No.2) Act, 2024, to ensure that the top-up tax on Indian operations of large MNEs is collected by India rather than by a foreign parent jurisdiction.

VI. Persistent Gaps and a Reform Agenda

A. Treaty Renegotiation Imperative

India's existing DTAA network—comprising over 90 bilateral agreements—was negotiated predominantly in the pre-digital era and reflects physical-presence-based nexus principles incompatible with contemporary digital business realities. Systematic renegotiation of key treaties—particularly those with Ireland, Singapore, Netherlands, Luxembourg, and the United States—to incorporate SEP provisions, updated PE definitions, and digital service permanent establishment concepts is urgently required. The MLI provides a partial mechanism, but its optional provisions and reservation rights of treaty partners significantly limit its transformative scope.

B. Strengthening Domestic Anti-Avoidance Provisions

India's General Anti-Avoidance Rules (GAAR), incorporated in Chapter X-A of the Income Tax Act and operative from Assessment Year 2018-19, represent an important instrument against abusive arrangements lacking commercial substance. However, GAAR's interaction with specific anti-avoidance rules (SAARs)—including transfer pricing provisions, deemed dividend rules, and treaty-abuse provisions—remains doctrinally unsettled. Clarificatory guidance on GAAR's applicability to digital business structures, including aggressive IP-holding arrangements and commissionaire models, would enhance legal certainty.

ISSN: 2582-6433

C. Capacity Building and Technology-Driven Compliance

The effective taxation of digital transactions depends critically on administrative capacity. India's income tax and GST administrations have made significant strides in leveraging technology—including mandatory e-invoicing under GST for businesses above prescribed turnover thresholds and the deployment of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and machine learning for risk-based scrutiny selection. However, the detection and assessment of income from digital platforms, crypto-asset transactions, and the gig economy demands further investment in digital forensics capacity and inter-agency data sharing.

The taxation of Virtual Digital Assets (VDAs)—introduced by the Finance Act, 2022, through Section 115BBH at a flat rate of 30% with a 1% TDS under Section 194S—represents a legislative acknowledgment of new digital asset classes. However, the regime's design—disallowing set-off of losses and excluding deductions other than cost of acquisition—has been criticised as commercially punitive and may impede the development of India's nascent crypto-asset market.

D. Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

Digital economy transfer pricing disputes have generated substantial litigation in India, creating regulatory uncertainty that deters foreign investment. The Advance Pricing Agreement (APA) programme, introduced in 2012, and the expanded dispute resolution processes under the Mutual Agreement Procedure (MAP) provisions of DTAAs, offer mechanisms for binding prospective resolution. Strengthening the APA programme's capacity for digital economy cases—including those involving platform commissions, algorithmic pricing, and data monetisation—would significantly reduce litigation overhang.

VII. Conclusion

The digital economy has not merely posed administrative challenges to Indian taxation law—it has exposed fundamental doctrinal inadequacies in legal frameworks designed for a different era of commerce. The principle that taxation follows physical presence, adequate for the industrial economy, is demonstrably insufficient for an economy in which value is created through data, algorithms, network effects, and intellectual property that transcend territorial boundaries.

India's legislative responses—the Equalization Levy, Significant Economic Presence,

ISSN: 2582-6433

OIDAR GST provisions, and the VDA taxation regime—represent commendable, if imperfect, attempts to extend the fiscal reach of the state in the digital domain. Yet these measures are inherently transitional. Their long-term sustainability depends on the successful conclusion and implementation of the OECD Two-Pillar framework, which would provide a principled, multilaterally legitimate basis for the reallocation of taxing rights to market jurisdictions.

In the interim, India's reform priorities must include systematic DTAA renegotiation, doctrinal clarification of GAAR's application to digital structures, and administrative modernisation to match the compliance demands of the digital age. The ultimate objective must be a tax architecture that is simultaneously revenue-productive, administratively efficient, investment-compatible, and capable of reflecting, rather than lagging behind, the relentless pace of digital transformation.

As Justice Holmes observed in Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas v. Collector (1927), 'Taxes are what we pay for civilised society.' In the digital age, ensuring that the architects of the digital civilisation contribute fairly to its sustenance is not merely a fiscal imperative—it is a question of legal equity and constitutional obligation.

References

Statutes and Regulations

- The Income Tax Act, 1961 (India)
- The Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017
- The Integrated Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017
- Finance Act, 2016 (Chapter VIII – Equalization Levy)
- Finance Act, 2020 (Equalization Levy on E-commerce Operators)
- Finance Act, 2022 (Sections 115BBH and 194S – VDA Taxation)
- Finance (No.2) Act, 2024 (Qualified Domestic Minimum Top-up Tax)
- Constitution (One Hundred and First Amendment) Act, 2016

Case Law

- Morgan Stanley & Co. v. Commissioner of Income Tax (2007) 7 SCC 1 (Supreme Court of India)
- Engineering Analysis Centre of Excellence Pvt. Ltd. v. CIT (2021) 432 ITR 471 (SC)

ISSN: 2582-6433

- Google India Private Limited v. Union of India (2017) (Karnataka High Court)
- Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications India (P.) Ltd. v. CIT (2015) 374 ITR 118 (Del.)
- Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas v. Collector of Internal Revenue, 275 U.S. 87 (1927)

OECD/International Documents

- OECD, Addressing the Tax Challenges of the Digital Economy, Action 1 – 2015 Final Report, OECD/G20 BEPS Project (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2015)
- OECD, Statement on a Two-Pillar Solution to Address the Tax Challenges Arising from the Digitalisation of the Economy (October 2021)
- OECD, Model Tax Convention on Income and on Capital: Condensed Version (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2017)
- OECD, Transfer Pricing Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and Tax Administrations (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2022)
- UN, Model Double Taxation Convention between Developed and Developing Countries (New York: United Nations, 2021)

Books and Secondary Sources

- Arvid Skaar, Permanent Establishment: Erosion of a Tax Treaty Principle (Kluwer Law International, 1991)
- Kanga, Palkhivala & Vyas, The Law and Practice of Income Tax (LexisNexis, 12th ed., 2020)
- Parthasarathi Shome (ed.), India's Fiscal Policy: Prescriptions, Pragmatics and Practice (Cambridge University Press, 2017)
- Reuven Avi-Yonah, Advanced Introduction to International Tax Law (Edward Elgar, 2nd ed., 2019)
- Central Board of Direct Taxes, Report of the Task Force on Direct Tax Code (CBDT, Ministry of Finance, 2019)