

Tax Hotline

February 13, 2009

TAXATION OF MAURITIUS CELL COMPANIES EXAMINED


BACKGROUND

Over the years, different entities have been used by fund managers as investment vehicles. To suit the preferences of investors, commonly used jurisdictions had developed innovative models of these entities. One such instance is the use of a company with different share classes where each class represents a separate fund with distinct investment objectives. This "multi-class umbrella fund" is particularly useful where a fund manager desires to manage the assets of multiple funds and, at the same time, market the multiple funds as a single opportunity. Although the "multi-class umbrella fund" has its commercial benefits, it does not provide for segregation of liabilities between the share classes / sub-funds, which is a major concern among investors. To address this issue of cross-class liability, several investor friendly jurisdictions, including Mauritius, introduced the concept of a Protected Cell Company ("PCC"). A PCC is statutorily authorized to segregate its assets into cells and a creditor of one cell can only proceed against the assets of that cell, a concept known as "ring-fencing". Over the last decade, PCCs have evolved as the most popular entity for use as collective investment vehicles across jurisdictions particularly Europe.

TAX TREATMENT OF PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES: THE NICHOLAS APPEGATE RULING

Although in law the cells of a PCC are separate from each other, the same principle is usually not applied in the case of taxation. Most jurisdictions which have cell company legislation regard the PCC as a single taxable person and each cell is not liable to tax separately, a position that also arises from the fact that the cells of a PCC are not separate legal entities. However, with regard to jurisdictions that do not have cell company legislation such as India, it is somewhat unclear as to whether the same principle will be followed or if each cell will constitute a separate taxable entity. Recently¹, a fund incorporated under the *Mauritius Protected Cell Company Act* was faced with the same puzzling question in respect of the taxation of its investments in India.

- Nicholas Applegate South East Asia Fund ("Fund"), a Mauritius PCC, had four cells where each cell represented a separate fund ("Sub-fund"). The Fund and each Sub-fund had separate Permanent Account Numbers² and each Sub-fund had a separate sub-account registration under the Securities and Exchanges Board of India (Foreign Institutional Investor Regulations), 1995. The Sub-funds had incurred short term capital losses in respect of its Indian investments and intended to carry forward these losses to the following year as per the provisions of section 74 of the Indian Income Tax Act, 1961 ("ITA").



- On account of the uncertainty regarding the tax treatment under the ITA of cell companies, a separate tax return ("Initial Return") for each Sub-fund was filed assuming that this was the requirement under the ITA. However, realizing that a single consolidated return may be what is actually required under the ITA, the same was later filed by the Fund ("Revised Return").
- In order to be eligible to set off losses incurred during the year against future profits, the Fund was required under the ITA to furnish the return before a certain period. The Initial Return was filed within the prescribed time and the Revised Return was filed sometime later. The Assessing Officer ("AO") held that the Initial Return was "invalid" since the cells of the PCC were not liable to tax separately and accordingly considered the Revised Return as the Initial Return. Since the Revised Return had been filed after the due date, the Fund was not allowed to carry forward the loss. The first appellate authority rejected the Fund's appeal and the second appeal was made to the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal ("Tribunal").
- The Tribunal held that the Initial Return was valid in so far as it fell within the ambit of section 292B. As per section 292B, a return which suffers from a defect, mistake or omission is not invalid if it is otherwise, in substance and

Research Papers

FAQs on Setting Up of Offices in India

December 13, 2024

FAQs on Downstream Investment

December 13, 2024

Gaming Law 2024

December 12, 2024

Research Articles

The Revolution Realized: Bitcoin's Triumph

December 05, 2024

The Bitcoin Effect

November 14, 2024

Acquirers Beware: Indian Merger Control Regime Revamped!

September 15, 2024

Audio

Securities Market Regulator's Continued Quest Against "Unfiltered" Financial Advice

December 18, 2024

Digital Lending - Part 1 - What's New with NBFC P2Ps

November 19, 2024

Renewable Roadmap: Budget 2024 and Beyond - Part I

August 26, 2024

NDA Connect

Connect with us at events, conferences and seminars.

NDA Hotline

Click here to view Hotline archives.

Video

"Investment return is not enough" Nishith Desai with Nikunj Dalmia (ET Now) at FIIB event in Riyadh

October 31, 2024

Analysing SEBI's Consultation Paper on Simplification of registration for FPIs

effect, in conformity with the purpose of the Act. Thus, according to the Tribunal, the filing of separate returns in respect of each Sub-fund was a technical mistake which stood removed on the filing of the consolidated return and the Initial Return being valid and within the prescribed time, the Fund was permitted to set off losses incurred during the year against future profits.

REMARKS

We believe that although the Tribunal did not directly address the issue of whether each cell of the PCC is a separate taxable entity, the very fact that it regarded the Initial Return as defective seems to indicate that individual cells of a PCC will not constitute a separate taxable entity. The position is further strengthened by a plain reading of section 2 (31) of the ITA which identifies only the company and does not refer to the cells of a company as a (taxable) person for the purposes of the ITA.

Thus we may infer that a PCC, regardless of its jurisdiction of incorporation, will be liable to tax in India as a single taxable person, as opposed to each cell being liable to tax separately. An apparent benefit of this treatment is that losses of a cell will offset the profits of another, thereby reducing taxable income, which would not have been the case if the cells were treated as separate taxable entities. In light of the view taken by the Tribunal, it would be interesting to evaluate the tax treatment in India of an Incorporated Cell Company, which is a further enhancement of the PCC. In an Incorporated Cell Company each cell is a separate legal entity and taxed separately in its home jurisdiction. In such a case would the Indian tax authorities regard each cell as a separate “person” liable to tax? It is a question which remains to be answered.

- Mihir Shedde & Bijal Ajinkya

You can direct your queries or comments to the authors

1 Nicholas Applegate South East Asia Fund Ltd. v. ADIT [2009-TIOL-74-ITAT-MUM-TM]
2 Permanent Account Number or PAN is the tax identification number issued by the tax authorities

DISCLAIMER

The contents of this hotline should not be construed as legal opinion. View detailed disclaimer.

This Hotline provides general information existing at the time of preparation. The Hotline is intended as a news update and Nishith Desai Associates neither assumes nor accepts any responsibility for any loss arising to any person acting or refraining from acting as a result of any material contained in this Hotline. It is recommended that professional advice be taken based on the specific facts and circumstances. This Hotline does not substitute the need to refer to the original pronouncements.

This is not a Spam mail. You have received this mail because you have either requested for it or someone must have suggested your name. Since India has no anti-spamming law, we refer to the US directive, which states that a mail cannot be considered Spam if it contains the sender's contact information, which this mail does. In case this mail doesn't concern you, please unsubscribe from mailing list.