INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN - 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – https://ijlr.iledu.in/

Journal's Editorial Page - https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/

Volume 6 and Issue 1 of 2026 (Access Full Issue on - https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-6-and-issue-1-of-2026/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 73059 14348 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

DECODING THE GLOBAL TAX FRAMEWORK FOR DIGITAL ASSETS: A COMPARATIVE LEGAL ANALYSIS

AUTHOR - GAURAV ARORA, STUDENT AT CHRIST (DEEMED TO BE) UNIVERSITY, BANGALORE

BEST CITATION – GAURAV ARORA, DECODING THE GLOBAL TAX FRAMEWORK FOR DIGITAL ASSETS: A COMPARATIVE LEGAL ANALYSIS, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 6 (2) OF 2026, PG. 587-602, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344. DOI - https://doi.org/10.65393/LQES6922

Abstract

The growth of digital assets such as cryptocurrencies, non-fungible tokens (NFTs), stablecoins, and decentralized finance (DeFi) has changed the global financial system. These assets operate on blockchain technology and allow users to transfer value without traditional intermediaries such as banks. While this innovation has created new economic opportunities, it has also created challenges for existing tax laws. Traditional tax systems were designed for physical assets and transactions that occur within clear geographical boundaries. However, digital assets are decentralized, borderless, and often pseudonymous, which makes it difficult for governments to classify, track, and tax them effectively.

This paper studies how different countries tax digital assets through a comparative legal analysis of six jurisdictions: the United States, the United Kingdom, the European Union, India, Japan, and Singapore. It examines how each jurisdiction classifies digital assets and how taxes such as income tax, capital gains tax, and indirect taxes are applied to digital asset transactions. The analysis shows that countries follow different approaches. Some countries treat cryptocurrencies as property and apply capital gains tax, while others focus on the economic use of the asset. India has introduced a strict tax regime with a flat tax rate and transaction-level withholding requirements.

The study identifies key issues in the current global system, including inconsistent classification of digital assets, difficulties in valuation and record-keeping, regulatory arbitrage, and enforcement challenges. To address these issues, the paper suggests the need for international cooperation, clearer legal definitions, and technology-neutral tax policies. A coordinated global framework can improve compliance while supporting innovation in the digital economy.

Keywords: 1. Digital Assets 2. Crypto-Currency Taxation 3. Blockchain Regulation 4.Comparative-Tax Law 5. Global Tax Policy

1. Introduction

The emergence of digital assets—including cryptocurrencies, non-fungible tokens (NFTs), stablecoins, and decentralized finance (DeFi) instruments—has transformed the global financial and economic landscape. These assets operate on distributed ledger technologies (DLTs) that allow peer-to-peer transactions without intermediaries. While this technological innovation enhances efficiency and financial inclusion, it also poses significant challenges for existing regulatory and taxation frameworks, which were designed around physical presence, tangible goods, and centralized actors.

Traditional tax systems are rooted in the principle of **source-based or residence-based taxation**—concepts that rely on the location of the taxpayer, the situs of the asset, or the physical place where economic activity occurs.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

However, digital assets are inherently borderless, pseudonymous, and decentralized. These characteristics disrupt core concepts like "permanent establishment," "nexus," and even "income characterization." The result is a growing mismatch between economic reality and legal form, leading to uncertainty for taxpayers, enforcement difficulties for governments, and a fertile ground for regulatory arbitrage.

This legal vacuum is particularly troubling because the global digital asset market is no longer niche. As of 2024, the cryptocurrency market capitalization exceeds USD 2.3 trillion, with millions of users across jurisdictions participating in staking, trading, lending, and borrowing using blockchain-based protocols. NFT platforms and decentralized exchanges (DEXs) have attracted billions in volume, often without clear tax treatment in their home countries. The sheer scale of value creation and transfer within these ecosystems necessitates a consistent and effective tax framework to ensure revenue generation, fairness, and compliance.

Despite growing awareness, jurisdictions have taken markedly different approaches. The **United States** treats cryptocurrencies as property, applying capital gains or income tax depending on the transaction type[1468]. The **United Kingdom** follows a similar approach but imposes income tax on some crypto activities such as staking and mining.[1469]**India** introduced a high flat tax rate and transaction-level withholding without allowing deductions or loss set-offs.[1470]**Japan** subjects crypto income to progressive taxation, while **Singapore** exempts capital gains entirely.[1471] Meanwhile, the **European Union** lacks a harmonized approach, although recent directives like **DAC8** seek to bridge that gap through reporting obligations.[1472]

This divergence creates a fragmented global landscape that is inefficient, inequitable, and prone to exploitation. Moreover, inconsistencies in tax classification—for instance, whether a token is a utility, payment, or security—create compliance burdens and deter cross-border innovation. Jurisdictions with overly stringent regimes may stifle legitimate startups, while lax jurisdictions may become havens for tax evasion.

The central research problem thus arises: the lack of a cohesive and harmonized global tax framework for digital assets has led to regulatory uncertainty, enforcement challenges, and opportunities for tax arbitrage. This paper addresses that problem through comparative legal analysis, aiming to:

1. Examine the classification and taxation of digital assets in major jurisdictions.
2. Evaluate the effectiveness of income, capital gains, and indirect tax treatments.
3. Analyse reporting and compliance challenges across nations.
4. Propose actionable policy recommendations toward a harmonized global tax framework.

Through this study, the goal is not only to highlight the gaps but also to imagine a regulatory future that aligns tax law with the decentralized nature of digital assets while preserving revenue integrity and legal certainty.

2. Literature Review

The taxation of digital assets has become a focal point in both academic and policy discourse due to the disruptive nature of blockchain technology and the inadequacy of traditional tax frameworks. The literature

[1468] Internal Revenue Serv., Notice 2014-21, 2014-16 I.R.B. 938 (Apr. 14, 2014).
[1469]HM Revenue & Customs, Cryptoassets Manual (2023), https://www.gov.uk/hmrc-internal-manuals/cryptoassets-manual
[1470] Finance Act, 2022, § 115BBH, India.
[1471] Inland Revenue Auth. of Sing., *e-Tax Guide: Income Tax Treatment of Digital Tokens* (2020), https://www.iras.gov.sg/
[1472]Council Directive (EU) 2023/2226 of 17 October 2023 Amending Directive 2011/16/EU on Administrative Cooperation in the Field of Taxation (DAC8).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

surrounding digital asset taxation can be broadly classified into three domains:

(i) challenges in legal classification and income characterization,
(ii) the need for global harmonization, and
(iii) enforcement and compliance considerations in decentralized environments.

2.1. Tax Law's Struggle with Technological Innovation

Christopher J. Avery, in his article *Taxation in the Age of Blockchain*, underscores how traditional tax rules are structurally unsuited to address the complexities of blockchain-based ecosystems.[1473] Avery criticizes the continued reliance on property or currency analogies, noting that they obscure the novel economic realities of decentralized finance (DeFi), staking, yield farming, and NFTs. He calls for a new legal taxonomy grounded in the **economic substance** of transactions rather than their technological form. His work is particularly relevant in analyzing DeFi protocols, where tax events are often unclear, and self-custody wallets operate outside regulated exchanges.

2.2. The OECD's International Tax Policy Perspective

A foundational contribution in this domain is the OECD's 2020 report titled *Taxing Virtual Currencies: An Overview of Tax Treatments and Emerging Tax Policy Issues*.[1474]The report highlights the urgent need for tax administrators to update existing laws to address new forms of value transfer and asset ownership. It documents disparate approaches taken by various jurisdictions and emphasizes the importance of information reporting, consistent classification, and valuation rules. The OECD's work forms the backbone of emerging initiatives like the **Crypto-Asset Reporting Framework (CARF)** and **DAC8**, which aim to standardize disclosure requirements for crypto intermediaries and digital platforms.

2.3. Digital Economy Taxation and Multilateralism

Arthur Cockfield's *Designing Tax Policy for a Digital Economy* provides a broader conceptual framework for analyzing the taxation of intangible digital assets.[1475]Cockfield argues that unilateral taxation measures create distortions in global markets and calls for **multilateral cooperation** based on principles of economic allegiance and neutrality. He introduces the idea of **destination-based taxation**, where tax rights should follow the location of users and consumers of digital services. Although his work predates many developments in cryptocurrency regulation, it offers enduring insights into the need for shared jurisdictional standards.

2.4. Enforcement Through Taxation: A Regulatory Lens

Zohar Goshen and Gideon Parchomovsky, in their article *The Essential Role of Tax Law in Cryptocurrency Regulation*, present a compelling argument that **tax law may be the most effective tool for regulating digital assets** in the absence of comprehensive financial or securities regulation.[1476] They advocate for embedding tax compliance features directly into crypto protocols—through mechanisms such as real-time transaction reporting, automated withholding, and wallet-level KYC. The authors also stress the importance of **data sharing between jurisdictions**, akin to the OECD's Common Reporting Standard (CRS), to counteract tax evasion via unhosted wallets or foreign exchanges.

2.5. India's Experimental and Rigid Regime

Arpita Basu's recent article, *India's Evolving Crypto Taxation Regime: Global Inspiration or Overregulation?*, critically evaluates the Indian government's approach under the Finance Act,

[1473] Christopher J. Avery, *Taxation in the Age of Blockchain: Bridging the Legal Vacuum*, 48 J. Corp. L. 203 (2022).
[1474] OECD, *Taxing Virtual Currencies: An Overview of Tax Treatments and Emerging Tax Policy Issues* (2020), https://www.oecd.org/tax/taxing-virtual-currencies.htm.
[1475] Arthur J. Cockfield, *Designing Tax Policy for a Digital Economy*, 64 McGill L.J. 451 (2019).
[1476] Zohar Goshen & Gideon Parchomovsky, *The Essential Role of Tax Law in Cryptocurrency Regulation*, 37 Yale J. on Reg. 55 (2020).

2022.[1477] Basu notes that while India's flat 30% tax on Virtual Digital Assets (VDAs) brings legal clarity, it imposes a disproportionate burden on retail investors and startups. By disallowing deductions and loss set-offs, the regime fails to recognize the volatile and capital-intensive nature of digital asset markets. Her work reveals the tension between **fiscal objectives** and **market development**, serving as a cautionary example for emerging economies crafting similar legislation.

3. Methodology

This research adopts a **comparative doctrinal legal methodology**, supplemented by **qualitative content analysis** of primary legislation, regulatory guidelines, and scholarly literature from selected jurisdictions. The methodology is structured to critically assess the taxonomy, tax treatment, compliance requirements, and enforcement strategies surrounding digital assets across different legal systems.

3.1. Jurisdictional Scope and Selection Criteria

Six jurisdictions were selected based on their economic significance, diversity in legal systems, and distinct regulatory approaches to digital asset taxation:

- **United States** (common law; developed, enforcement-focused regime)
- **United Kingdom** (common law; early mover in DeFi tax guidance)
- **European Union** (civil law bloc; regional approach with decentralized application)
- **India** (common law; emerging economy with strict flat-tax regime)
- **Japan** (civil law; progressive and active in crypto oversight)
- **Singapore** (mixed legal system; functional and innovation-driven tax framework)

This diversity allows for a comparative evaluation of different models—ranging from rigid and punitive to permissive and technologically adaptive.

3.2. Primary Sources

Legal analysis was based on primary legal documents, including:

- Statutory tax codes (e.g., U.S. Internal Revenue Code, Indian Income Tax Act)
- Official guidance from tax authorities (e.g., IRS Notices, HMRC Cryptoassets Manual, IRAS e-Tax Guide)
- Regional directives (e.g., EU DAC8 Directive)
- Case law (notably, CJEU's *Hedqvist* judgment on VAT treatment of crypto)

These primary materials were used to map the formal legal treatment of digital assets within each jurisdiction.

3.3. Secondary Sources and Literature Integration

To enrich the legal analysis, peer-reviewed articles, institutional reports (OECD, IMF), and legal commentaries were analysed thematically. This supported the interpretation of legal texts, especially where national policies are in flux or enforcement practices are opaque.

The **literature review in Section 2** was synthesized into the doctrinal analysis to:

- Identify scholarly consensus or divergence on best practices
- Trace the evolution of legal debates
- Evaluate policy outcomes in real-world contexts

3.4. Analytical Framework

A three-part framework guided the comparative analysis:

1. **Classification**: How digital assets (cryptocurrencies, NFTs, tokens, DeFi instruments) are legally defined—

[1477] Arpita Basu, *India's Evolving Crypto Taxation Regime: Global Inspiration or Overregulation?*, 12 NUJS L. Rev. 145 (2023).

property, currency, security, or a separate class.

2. **Tax Treatment**: How jurisdictions apply income tax, capital gains tax, and indirect taxes (e.g., VAT or GST) to digital asset transactions.
3. **Reporting and Enforcement**: What compliance obligations exist for individuals and intermediaries, and how governments detect and deter non-compliance.

This structured framework allows meaningful comparison and supports coherent policy recommendations in later sections.

3.5. Limitations

Several methodological limitations are acknowledged:

- Rapid policy shifts mean that guidance may become outdated quickly.
- Variations in terminology across jurisdictions may lead to interpretive differences.
- The absence of comprehensive enforcement data limits empirical verification of the effectiveness of legal frameworks.

Despite these constraints, the legal-comparative approach offers valuable insights into patterns, gaps, and potential areas of convergence in digital asset taxation.

4. Comparative Tax Analysis: Six Jurisdictions

This section examines the legal classification and tax treatment of digital assets in six jurisdictions, using the three-fold analytical framework established earlier: classification, tax treatment (income, capital gains, indirect taxes), and reporting/enforcement mechanisms. The comparison reveals significant regulatory divergences and highlights both innovative and problematic practices.

4.1 United States

Legal Classification

The **Internal Revenue Service (IRS)** treats virtual currencies as **property**, not currency, under **Notice 2014-21**. This means that general tax principles applicable to property transactions govern cryptocurrencies.[1478]

Tax Treatment

- **Capital Gains Tax (CGT)**: Sale or exchange of crypto triggers CGT. Holding period determines whether gains are short-term or long-term.
- **Ordinary Income Tax**: Crypto received as payment for goods or services, mined coins, or staking rewards are taxed as ordinary income.
- **NFTs**: Treated as property, but the IRS may classify them as **collectibles**, potentially subjecting gains to a 28% tax rate under § 408(m)(2).[1479]

Reporting and Enforcement

Taxpayers must report gains/losses using **Form 8949 and Schedule D**. Exchanges must report using **Form 1099-K or 1099-MISC**. As of 2023, broker-dealers handling digital assets are subject to **expanded information reporting rules** under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.[1480]

4.2 United Kingdom

Legal Classification

HMRC does not recognize crypto as legal tender but treats it as **property**. It divides tokens into four categories: exchange tokens, utility tokens, security tokens, and e-money tokens.[1481]

Tax Treatment

- **Capital Gains Tax**: Applied upon disposal (e.g., selling, exchanging, gifting, or using crypto). Specific rules apply for **pooling assets** under the share identification rules.

[1478] IRS, Notice 2014-21, 2014-16 I.R.B. 938 (Apr. 14, 2014).
[1479] I.R.C. § 408(m)(2).
[1480] Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, Pub. L. No. 117–58, § 80603, 135 Stat. 429 (2021).
[1481] HM Revenue & Customs, *Cryptoassets Manual* (2023).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

- **Income Tax**: Applies to mining, airdrops, and staking if these are not capital in nature.
- **NFTs**: Taxed based on transaction nature. Disposals attract CGT.

Reporting and Enforcement

HMRC requires self-assessment reporting. In 2023, it issued guidance on **DeFi lending and staking**, stating that transferring tokens to a smart contract may be considered a **disposal** for tax purposes.[1482]

4.3 European Union

Legal Classification

The EU lacks uniform classification. Individual Member States follow their own tax rules. However, the **Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)**, in the landmark **Hedqvist** case, recognized Bitcoin as a means of payment and exempted it from VAT.[1483]

Tax Treatment

- **Capital Gains Tax**: Varies. In Germany, crypto held for more than a year is CGT-exempt. France imposes a flat 30% tax on gains from digital assets.
- **Income Tax**: In some jurisdictions, income from mining or professional trading is taxed progressively.
- **VAT**: Most Member States follow the **Hedqvist** ruling, treating crypto-to-crypto or crypto-to-fiat exchanges as VAT-exempt.

Reporting and Enforcement

The **DAC8 Directive** (2023) introduces standardized cross-border reporting obligations for crypto-asset service providers (CASPs). It mandates reporting of transactions and account balances to national tax authorities, starting 2026.[1484]

4.4 India

Legal Classification

India introduced the legal category of **Virtual Digital Assets (VDAs)** in the **Finance Act, 2022**. VDAs include cryptocurrencies, NFTs, and other digital assets notified by the Central Government.[1485]

Tax Treatment

- **Flat Income Tax**: A 30% tax applies on income from VDAs under § 115BBH of the Income-tax Act.
- **TDS (Withholding)**: 1% tax deducted at source (TDS) on transfer of VDAs if the value exceeds ₹10,000 (approx. USD 120).
- **Loss Treatment**: No deduction allowed except cost of acquisition. Losses from VDAs cannot be set off against other income or carried forward.

Reporting and Enforcement

All VDA transactions must be reported. The 1% TDS mechanism creates an audit trail. However, critics argue that high tax rates and non-deductibility discourage compliance and innovation.[1486]

4.5 Japan

Legal Classification

Japan's **Payment Services Act** regulates crypto-assets, defined as property-like value electronically recorded on electronic devices.[1487]

Tax Treatment

- **Miscellaneous Income**: Crypto profits (e.g., from trading, staking) are taxed as miscellaneous income, subject to progressive rates up to 55%.
- **Corporate Tax**: For corporations, digital assets may be treated as inventory.
- **Consumption Tax**: Abolished for crypto in 2017.

Reporting and Enforcement

[1482] HMRC, *DeFi Lending and Staking Guidance* (Mar. 2023).
[1483] Case C-264/14, Skatteverket v. Hedqvist, ECLI:EU:C:2015:718.
[1484] Council Directive (EU) 2023/2226 (DAC8).
[1485] Finance Act, 2022, § 115BBH, India.
[1486] Arpita Basu, *India's Evolving Crypto Taxation Regime*, 12 NUJS L. Rev. 145 (2023).
[1487] Japan Financial Services Agency, *Payment Services Act* (Amended 2020).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

Japan has strong KYC/AML obligations. Taxpayers must calculate gains using market value at the time of transaction. Exchanges are required to report user activity. Ongoing discussions are exploring more favourable tax treatments to promote crypto innovation.[1488]

4.6 Singapore

Legal Classification

The **Inland Revenue Authority of Singapore (IRAS)** classifies tokens based on their **function**, not form. It distinguishes between payment tokens, utility tokens, and security tokens.[1489]

Tax Treatment

- **Capital Gains**: Singapore does not impose capital gains tax.
- **Income Tax**: Crypto income (e.g., business trading, mining rewards) is taxed only if it arises in the course of business or is habitual.
- **NFTs and DeFi**: Tax treatment is determined by substance—e.g., whether NFTs are used for profit-making or personal enjoyment.

Reporting and Enforcement

While enforcement is relatively light-touch, IRAS provides clear guidelines on how to report crypto-related business income. Singapore's clarity and innovation-friendly stance make it a preferred jurisdiction for Web3 startups.

Comparative Table Snapshot

Jurisdiction	Legal Classification	Income Tax	CGT	Indirect Tax	Reporting Regime
US	Property	Yes	Yes	No VAT	Extensive (Forms 8949, 1099)
UK	Property	Yes	Yes	No VAT	DeFi guidance (2023)
EU	Varies	Yes	Yes	Hedqvist VAT exemption	DAC8
India	VDA (statutory)	30% flat	Included	No GST on exchange	TDS + Audit trail
Japan	Miscellaneous Income	Yes	Yes	No consumption tax	Mandatory exchange reporting
Singapore	Function-based	Yes (business only)	No	No GST on crypto	IRAS guidelines

5. Key Issues and Challenges

The comparative analysis in Section 4 illustrates that while many jurisdictions have made progress in regulating the taxation of digital assets, the global framework remains disjointed, inconsistent, and often reactive. These deficiencies create legal uncertainty, compliance burdens, and enforcement vulnerabilities. This section identifies and examines five critical challenges faced by policymakers, taxpayers, and regulators in taxing digital assets.

5.1 Fragmented Legal Classifications

One of the most pressing issues is the lack of a uniform classification system for digital assets. Most jurisdictions classify cryptocurrencies as **property**, yet there is no consensus on the treatment of emerging categories like **non-**

[1488] Nat'l Tax Agency of Japan, *Crypto Asset Guidelines* (2023).

[1489] Inland Revenue Auth. of Sing., *e-Tax Guide: Income Tax Treatment of Digital Tokens* (2020).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

fungible tokens (NFTs), **security tokens**, and **governance tokens**. For instance, while the IRS treats NFTs as property, it may subject them to **collectibles tax rates**, potentially increasing tax liability to 28%—a stance not clearly mirrored in other jurisdictions.[1490]

Similarly, DeFi protocols complicate classification, as the nature of staking, yield farming, or liquidity provision often blurs the line between **capital gains**, **interest income**, and **business income**. The absence of internationally accepted taxonomy leads to inconsistent taxation outcomes and hampers cross-border investment. As observed in the OECD's 2020 report, tax administrators often struggle to apply legacy concepts such as "asset," "ownership," and "income" to blockchain transactions that are dynamic, smart contract-based, and decentralized.[1491]

5.2 Valuation and Record-Keeping Difficulties

Valuation of digital assets is another complex area. Unlike traditional assets that have clear, regulated markets, digital assets may trade on multiple exchanges, often at different prices. Real-time fluctuations, slippage, and illiquidity in NFT and DeFi token markets make it difficult to determine fair market value.

Taxpayers must maintain detailed records of:

- Date and time of transactions
- Value in fiat currency
- Wallet addresses and transaction hashes
- Type and quantity of digital asset transferred

Such record-keeping is cumbersome, especially when transactions are executed across multiple decentralized platforms with no central reporting entity. For example, DeFi platforms like Uniswap or Compound do not issue tax reports, placing the full burden of documentation on users.

Some jurisdictions like Japan and the U.S. require taxpayers to use **specific identification** or **first-in-first-out (FIFO)** accounting methods. However, inconsistencies in guidance lead to confusion, especially in cases involving token swaps, wrapped tokens, or bridging across chains.

5.3 Regulatory Arbitrage and Capital Flight

A major concern is the phenomenon of **regulatory arbitrage**, where individuals and companies relocate assets or operations to jurisdictions with lower tax burdens or more favourable regulation. This undermines domestic tax collection and creates an uneven global playing field.

For instance, Singapore's exemption from capital gains tax and its clarity on crypto taxation have made it a hub for Web3 firms. In contrast, India's punitive 30% tax rate and 1% TDS have reportedly driven startups and exchanges to relocate operations to **Dubai** or **Singapore.**[1492] This creates a dual loss: domestic talent migrates abroad, and capital formation is redirected outside the taxing country.

The OECD has acknowledged the risk of "jurisdiction shopping" and calls for **minimum standards** and **automated exchange of information** mechanisms to prevent such outcomes.[1493] However, enforcement of such frameworks requires both political will and technological capacity.

5.4 Enforcement and Compliance Gaps

Enforcement remains a major hurdle. The **pseudonymous** nature of blockchain transactions makes it difficult for tax authorities to identify taxable events or actors. While some countries require crypto exchanges to perform **Know Your Customer (KYC)** checks and report transactions (e.g., U.S. Forms 1099), these rules

[1490] I.R.C. § 408(m)(2); see also IRS, *Frequently Asked Questions on Virtual Currency Transactions*, https://www.irs.gov.

[1491] OECD, *Taxing Virtual Currencies* (2020), https://www.oecd.org/tax/taxing-virtual-currencies.htm.

[1492] Basu, supra note 19, at 148.

[1493] OECD, *Crypto-Asset Reporting Framework* (2022), https://www.oecd.org/tax/exchange-of-information/crypto-asset-reporting-framework.htm.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

often do not cover **self-custody wallets**, **peer-to-peer transfers**, or **DeFi platforms**, which are outside regulatory perimeters.

Moreover, in emerging economies, tax authorities may lack the tools or blockchain analytics expertise to trace transactions. Even in developed jurisdictions, enforcement actions are resource-intensive and often delayed. For example, the **IRS's "Operation Hidden Treasure"**—launched to trace crypto tax evaders—has had limited reach given the volume and complexity of DeFi activity.[1494]

DAC8 in the EU and CARF at the OECD level propose reporting obligations for **Crypto Asset Service Providers (CASPs)**, including exchanges, wallet providers, and brokers. However, enforcing such standards globally remains challenging when CASPs are registered in regulatory havens.

5.5 Overregulation and Market Stifling

While under-regulation poses risks of tax evasion, **overregulation** can be equally problematic. India's regime exemplifies this issue. By disallowing deduction of losses and enforcing a blanket 30% tax on gains from VDAs, the law imposes a harsh burden on legitimate traders and developers.[1495] Such rigid tax frameworks deter startups, create disincentives for retail adoption, and shift transactions to unregulated platforms or overseas jurisdictions.

Additionally, taxing each crypto transfer—including token swaps or gas fees—as a separate taxable event imposes an unsustainable compliance burden. Some scholars, including Arpita Basu, advocate for **de minimis exemptions** and safe harbours for small retail investors, similar to provisions used in the U.S. for foreign currency transactions.[1496]

Summary of Challenges

Challenge	Impact
Legal Classification Gaps	Inconsistent tax outcomes; investor confusion
Valuation & Record-Keeping	High compliance burden; audit difficulties
Regulatory Arbitrage	Capital flight; jurisdiction shopping
Enforcement Gaps	Tax evasion; under-reporting; technological incapacity
Overregulation	Stifled innovation; migration of startups and users

6. Enforcement Strategies and Technological Innovations

In light of the challenges outlined in Section 5, particularly the pseudonymous nature of digital assets and the lack of centralized intermediaries in decentralized finance (DeFi), conventional enforcement mechanisms are increasingly inadequate. However, several jurisdictions and international bodies are leveraging emerging technologies, data-sharing frameworks, and cross-border collaborations to enhance tax enforcement in the crypto ecosystem.

This section evaluates key enforcement tools and technological innovations that are reshaping how tax authorities monitor, audit, and ensure compliance in the digital asset space.

6.1 Blockchain Analytics and Forensic Tools

Blockchain's immutability and transparency—paradoxically—make it both a privacy concern and an enforcement opportunity. Modern **blockchain forensic tools**, such as those developed by Chainalysis, CipherTrace, and Elliptic, allow authorities to trace wallet addresses, follow token flows across protocols, and deanonymize users through metadata and clustering techniques.

- The **U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS)** and the **Financial Crimes Enforcement**

[1494] IRS, *Operation Hidden Treasure* (2021), https://www.irs.gov/newsroom/irs-criminal-investigation-combats-emerging-threats-involving-cryptocurrency.
[1495] Finance Act, 2022, § 115BBH, India.
[1496] Arpita Basu, supra note 19, at 152.

Network (FinCEN) have collaborated with private analytics firms to monitor suspicious wallet activity and enforce reporting requirements.

- The **United Kingdom's HMRC** has similarly procured blockchain tracing tools to track potential tax evasion and identify underreported crypto income.[1497]

Such tools have proven effective in identifying large-scale non-compliance, such as in the case of darknet marketplaces, illicit NFT trading, or staking pools where tax reporting is absent. However, privacy advocates raise concerns about the extent and legality of such surveillance.

6.2 Real-Time Transaction Reporting

Some experts advocate for embedding **real-time tax compliance mechanisms** into crypto protocols. This includes:

- **Smart contracts** programmed to withhold taxes on certain transactions (e.g., interest, staking rewards).
- Automated alerts to tax authorities when tokens are swapped or cashed out into fiat.
- Wallet-level integration of tax identity (Tax ID) or reporting modules.

While these innovations are not yet mainstream, regulators in technologically advanced economies are exploring pilot projects. Such solutions may be especially relevant for **institutional DeFi** platforms, which operate in semi-permissioned environments and could be subject to contractual compliance mechanisms.[1498]

6.3 International Cooperation and Information Exchange

Recognizing the global and borderless nature of digital assets, multilateral bodies have pushed for cooperative enforcement via **automatic information exchange agreements**. Key developments include:

6.3.1 Crypto-Asset Reporting Framework (CARF)

Introduced by the OECD in 2022, the **CARF** mandates reporting by **crypto-asset service providers (CASPs)**, including exchanges, brokers, and wallet providers. Covered information includes:

- Wallet addresses
- Crypto transactions (buy, sell, transfer)
- Customer identity and jurisdiction of tax residence

The CARF is designed to work alongside the **Common Reporting Standard (CRS)** and expands its scope to cover virtual assets.[1499]

6.3.2 EU DAC8 Directive

Adopted in October 2023, the **DAC8 Directive** enhances the EU's administrative cooperation by obligating all CASPs operating in the EU to report customer transactions and balances to tax authorities.[1500] This applies regardless of whether the CASP is physically based within the EU, extending extraterritorial reach. Penalties for non-compliance are steep and harmonized across Member States.

These frameworks are essential to closing loopholes exploited through **regulatory arbitrage**, where users shift assets to non-reporting jurisdictions. However, uniform global adoption and enforcement remain aspirational.

6.4 Self-Declaration and TDS Mechanisms

Several countries have adopted **self-reporting and withholding mechanisms** to enhance compliance in lieu of real-time enforcement:

- **India's 1% Tax Deducted at Source (TDS)** on digital asset transfers creates a transactional audit trail and forces exchanges to record trades. Though

[1497] HM Revenue & Customs, *Procurement of Blockchain Analytics Tools*, UK Gov't Digital Marketplace, 2022.
[1498] Zohar Goshen & Gideon Parchomovsky, *The Essential Role of Tax Law in Cryptocurrency Regulation*, 37 Yale J. on Reg. 55 (2020).
[1499] OECD, *Crypto-Asset Reporting Framework* (2022), https://www.oecd.org/tax/exchange-of-information/crypto-asset-reporting-framework.htm.
[1500] Council Directive (EU) 2023/2226 (DAC8).

criticized for affecting liquidity, it offers a model for low-cost, scalable compliance in high-volume retail markets.[1501]

- In **Japan**, users are required to declare crypto income under "miscellaneous income," and exchanges are legally mandated to report trading data. Non-compliance attracts substantial penalties.

Such mechanisms reduce enforcement cost but depend on institutional trust, administrative efficiency, and high taxpayer awareness.

6.5 Legal Presumptions and Reverse Burden of Proof

To address enforcement asymmetries, some jurisdictions are considering or have implemented legal presumptions such as:

- Treating unexplained increases in crypto holdings as **unreported income** unless proven otherwise.
- Assigning **reverse burden of proof** on taxpayers to explain sources of digital wealth—especially where offshore wallets are involved.

While controversial, such measures may be justified in jurisdictions with low voluntary compliance and high levels of crypto anonymity.

6.6 Public-Private Collaborations and Industry Guidelines

Enforcement has also benefited from collaborations with industry:

- In the **U.S.**, crypto exchanges like Coinbase and Kraken have voluntarily issued **1099 forms** to users, supporting tax compliance.
- The **Joint Chiefs of Global Tax Enforcement (J5)**, a coalition of tax authorities from Australia, Canada, Netherlands, the U.K., and the U.S., share intelligence on high-risk crypto actors and trends.[1502]

Such collaborations ensure that enforcement keeps pace with innovation while building an ecosystem of co-regulation rather than adversarial oversight.

Summary Table: Enforcement Tools

Tool/Mechanism	Jurisdictions/Institutions Using It	Effectiveness & Challenges
Blockchain Analytics	US, UK, Japan, OECD	Effective in tracing but raises privacy concerns
Real-Time Tax Integration	Proposed (US, EU); Pilot (Singapore)	Technically feasible, not yet deployed widely
Information Exchange (CARF, DAC8)	OECD, EU	Promising but needs global harmonization
TDS / Withholding	India	Increases audit trail; liquidity cost
Legal Presumptions	India, UK (limited)	Risk of overreach; suits high-risk contexts
Public-Private Collaborations	J5 nations, exchanges like Coinbase	Enhances voluntary compliance

[1501] Finance Act, 2022, § 194S, India.

[1502] Joint Chiefs of Global Tax Enforcement (J5), *Annual Report 2023*, https://www.j5.gov.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

7. Policy Recommendations for a Global Framework

Given the fragmented and inconsistent global treatment of digital assets, the need for a harmonized, technology-neutral, and enforceable tax framework has never been more urgent. A sound tax policy must strike a balance between innovation, equity, administrative feasibility, and revenue assurance. Based on the comparative analysis and challenges discussed in earlier sections, this part proposes a set of normative and institutional recommendations to guide national and international tax reform for digital assets.

7.1 Adopt a Uniform Digital Asset Taxonomy

A central impediment to regulatory convergence is the absence of a shared **taxonomy** of digital assets. Countries diverge significantly in classifying tokens as **property, currency, securities, or commodities**. This leads to inconsistencies in applicable tax rules and valuation standards.

Recommendation:

- International organizations such as the **OECD**, **IMF**, and **Financial Stability Board (FSB)** should collaboratively publish a globally accepted classification framework.
- This taxonomy should distinguish clearly between:
    - **Payment Tokens** (e.g., Bitcoin)
    - **Utility Tokens** (e.g., Filecoin)
    - **Security Tokens** (tokenized shares)
    - **Governance Tokens**
    - **Non-Fungible Tokens (NFTs)**
    - **Stablecoins** (algorithmic or asset-backed)

Such clarity will guide consistent tax characterization—whether income, capital gains, or business revenue.

7.2 Embrace Technological Neutrality

Taxation should be based on the **economic substance** of a transaction, not the digital form or platform used. For example, staking rewards should be treated similarly to interest income regardless of whether they are generated via centralized platforms or smart contracts.

Recommendation:

- National tax codes should be updated to ensure **function-based taxation**, similar to Singapore's approach.
- Regulations should accommodate **technological evolution** without constant amendment—by embedding broad definitional clauses that cover future token types.

7.3 Implement De Minimis Exemptions for Retail Users

Retail participants often engage in low-volume, high-frequency transactions that create disproportionate compliance burdens relative to revenue. Taxing each token swap or NFT trade creates inefficiency and inhibits participation.

Recommendation:

- Adopt **de minimis thresholds** for capital gains from crypto (e.g., $200 per transaction in the U.S. as proposed under the Virtual Currency Tax Fairness Act).
- Simplified presumptive schemes (e.g., flat tax rate on crypto trades below a threshold) can be introduced for micro-traders.

Such exemptions will focus enforcement on high-value actors while reducing friction for retail users.

7.4 Institutionalize the Crypto-Asset Reporting Framework (CARF)

CARF and EU's DAC8 offer robust models for **automatic exchange of tax information**. However, their success depends on wide global adoption, particularly by offshore jurisdictions that serve as crypto hubs.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

Recommendation:

- Countries should sign **multilateral competent authority agreements** to operationalize CARF.
- CASPs, including DeFi interfaces, should be mandated to:
    - Perform KYC and tax residency checks.
    - Report customer transactions and balances.
    - Retain data for audit trails.

Where enforcement is difficult, **incentives or penalties** can be used to secure compliance.

7.5 Encourage Safe-Harbour and Amnesty Provisions

Many early adopters of digital assets may not have complied with tax laws due to lack of guidance or evolving legal positions. To bring such users into the formal net, **one-time disclosure schemes** can help.

Recommendation:

- Introduce **voluntary compliance windows** where taxpayers can disclose past crypto income in exchange for reduced penalties.
- Provide **safe-harbour accounting methods** (e.g., FIFO or average cost) to calculate crypto gains, as adopted in Australia and Canada.

This will increase revenue collection and foster long-term compliance culture.

7.6 Foster International Legal Cooperation

As with the Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) project, global coordination on crypto taxation requires **legal harmonization** and **political consensus**.

Recommendation:

- Launch an **inclusive framework for digital asset taxation** under the OECD's Inclusive Framework on BEPS.
- Regional blocs (e.g., EU, ASEAN, AU) should align crypto tax policies to minimize regulatory arbitrage.
- Encourage adoption of **model laws or treaties** that establish minimum standards for taxing cross-border digital asset transactions.

7.7 Integrate Smart Reporting Technologies

To address enforcement asymmetries in DeFi, smart contract standards can be leveraged to embed compliance mechanisms within protocols themselves.

Recommendation:

- Encourage the development of **"tax-compliant" smart contracts**, with features such as:
    - Automatic withholding of tax on interest/staking rewards.
    - Real-time reporting to authorities via APIs.
- Develop partnerships with Web3 developers to design **privacy-preserving compliance tools** that balance transparency with data protection.

Summary of Recommendations

Policy Area	Recommendation
Classification	Adopt global taxonomy for tokens
Tax Principle	Function-based (not form-based) classification
Retail User Relief	De minimis thresholds and presumptive taxation
Information Exchange	Global CARF implementation and KYC for CASPs
Compliance Regularization	Safe-harbours and voluntary disclosure schemes
International Cooperation	Multilateral treaties and regional harmonization

Tech Integration	Smart contract-based tax withholding and automated reporting

8. Case Study: The Impact of India's Crypto Taxation Regime on Startups

India's digital asset market witnessed a meteoric rise between 2017 and 2021, becoming one of the top ten countries in cryptocurrency adoption globally. However, the regulatory environment shifted dramatically in 2022 with the introduction of a **flat 30% income tax** on earnings from virtual digital assets (VDAs) under **Section 115BBH of the Income-tax Act**, along with a **1% Tax Deducted at Source (TDS)** on all transactions above a nominal threshold.[1503] This case study examines how the implementation of India's VDA tax regime has influenced the country's startup ecosystem in the Web3 and blockchain domain.

8.1 Policy Overview: India's VDA Tax Framework

Key provisions introduced under the **Finance Act, 2022** include:

- **30% tax on VDA gains**, without allowing any deduction for expenses (except acquisition cost).
- **No set-off of losses** from VDAs against other income or future crypto income.
- **1% TDS** on all crypto transactions exceeding ₹10,000 per financial year.
- Introduction of **Section 194S** making exchanges and brokers responsible for TDS deduction and compliance reporting.

While the stated objective was to formalize the sector and plug tax leakages, the regime has had unintended consequences.

8.2 Decline in Onshore Exchange Volumes

According to data from **CREBACO**, a blockchain analytics firm, the transaction volumes on Indian crypto exchanges like WazirX, CoinDCX, and ZebPay fell by over **70% within six months** of the tax provisions taking effect in July 2022.[1504] The primary reasons cited were:

- Capital lock-in due to non-adjustable losses.
- Reduced liquidity from TDS friction.
- Retail investor exit from regulated platforms to avoid surveillance.

The decline in onshore activity was paralleled by a surge in usage of **peer-to-peer (P2P)** and **offshore exchanges** such as Binance and KuCoin, which are not subject to Indian tax enforcement.

8.3 Startup Exodus and Brain Drain

Several Indian blockchain startups relocated to crypto-friendly jurisdictions including:

- **Singapore** (no capital gains tax, technology-neutral regulation),
- **Dubai** (zero income tax, Virtual Assets Regulatory Authority),
- **Portugal** (until recently, no crypto taxes for individuals).

Notable cases include:

- **Polygon (Matic)**: A globally successful Layer-2 Ethereum scaling solution, with its founders and operations primarily based in the UAE.
- **Mudrex**: A Y-Combinator-backed crypto investing platform that moved key operations abroad.

This **regulatory flight** reflects a broader phenomenon of "**tax-driven jurisdictional arbitrage**," where economic activity migrates to more favourable legal environments.[1505]While India remains a hub for blockchain talent, the country has lost substantial value creation, investment, and tax potential due to restrictive policies.

[1503] Finance Act, 2022, § 115BBH & § 194S, India.

[1504] CREBACO, *Post-Tax Crypto Market Analysis – India*, Dec. 2022.

[1505] OECD, *Addressing the Tax Challenges of the Digital Economy*, Action 1: 2015 Final Report.

8.4 Entrepreneur and Investor Sentiment

Industry stakeholders have expressed concern that the current regime treats crypto income more harshly than traditional speculative assets like equity derivatives or gambling winnings, despite the high-risk and high-innovation nature of the sector. Venture capital investment in Indian Web3 startups declined sharply post-2022, with investors citing:

- Lack of clarity on token issuance and fundraising.
- Prohibitive tax implications on liquidity events.
- Uncertain enforcement practices and delayed guidance.

A **survey conducted by IndiaTech.org** in 2023 found that over **70% of crypto entrepreneurs** were actively considering relocating their business overseas due to tax and policy unpredictability.[1506]

8.5 Missed Opportunities and Policy Suggestions

India has immense potential to be a global leader in blockchain adoption, given its:

- Large tech-savvy population,
- Mature digital payments infrastructure (e.g., UPI),
- Strong developer base.

However, the current tax regime undermines these advantages. Stakeholders have proposed the following reforms:

- **Tiered taxation** distinguishing between speculative and long-term crypto activity.
- **Allowance for loss set-off** and cost deductions, akin to securities.
- **De minimis exemptions** for low-value trades and retail investors.
- Clearer **classification** and **definitions** for NFTs, stablecoins, and DeFi instruments.

So far, the Indian government has signalled reluctance to amend the tax law significantly, instead awaiting the development of global norms via the **G20 and OECD**.

8.6 Lessons for Other Jurisdictions

India's case offers a cautionary tale for countries seeking to regulate digital assets:

- Excessive rigidity, without stakeholder consultation, may backfire.
- Blanket taxation, without considering transaction diversity, can distort behaviour.
- Policy unpredictability harms startup formation and capital inflows.

In contrast, countries that have balanced taxation with **regulatory clarity** (e.g., Singapore, Germany) have attracted investment while maintaining legal compliance.

9. Conclusion

The rise of digital assets—cryptocurrencies, non-fungible tokens (NFTs), decentralized finance (DeFi), and stablecoins—has fundamentally challenged the traditional architecture of tax law. Jurisdictions around the world have responded with varying degrees of enthusiasm, caution, and coherence. While some have opted for innovation-friendly, substance-over-form approaches (e.g., Singapore and parts of the EU), others, like India and Japan, have adopted stricter and more revenue-centric regimes.

The comparative legal analysis across six key jurisdictions—United States, United Kingdom, European Union, India, Japan, and Singapore—demonstrates that although progress has been made, the global tax framework for digital assets remains fragmented, inconsistent, and often poorly suited to the decentralized and borderless nature of the technology. This disjunction results in legal uncertainty for taxpayers, compliance burdens, increased enforcement costs, and missed economic opportunities.

[1506] IndiaTech.org, *Crypto Startup Sentiment Survey Report*, 2023.

Key challenges identified include:

- The lack of a globally harmonized **legal taxonomy** for digital assets.
- Inconsistent **income and capital gains treatment** of similar crypto activities.
- Regulatory **arbitrage**, where firms relocate to jurisdictions with lower tax or compliance requirements.
- Inadequate **reporting obligations** in decentralized or self-custodial environments.
- **Overregulation** that stifles innovation and pushes legitimate actors underground or offshore.

Yet, as this paper also demonstrates, there is cause for cautious optimism. Initiatives like the **OECD's Crypto-Asset Reporting Framework (CARF)** and the **EU's DAC8 Directive** are beginning to lay the groundwork for multilateral cooperation and cross-border enforcement. Innovations in blockchain analytics, smart contract integration, and voluntary compliance measures offer promising tools for bridging the gap between enforcement and technological evolution.

To move forward, jurisdictions must adopt a policy posture grounded in **technological neutrality**, **economic substance**, and **international coordination**. Specific recommendations include:

- Establishing a shared **global taxonomy** of digital asset types.
- Embracing **function-based tax principles** that reflect transaction realities.
- Creating **de minimis thresholds** and safe harbours for retail users.
- Institutionalizing information exchange under **CARF** and expanding public-private collaborations.
- Enabling **voluntary disclosure schemes** and amnesty programs to transition non-compliant actors into the formal tax net.

As India's case study illustrates, excessive rigidity or premature regulation, without stakeholder engagement or transitional reliefs, may drive away innovation and capital. Conversely, thoughtful, adaptable regulation can strengthen compliance, attract responsible actors, and generate sustainable revenue.

The way forward must not be through unilateral overreach or reactive legislation, but through collaborative international policymaking that recognizes the unique characteristics of digital assets. A **globally harmonized, principle-based, and enforceable tax framework** will not only address the challenges of today's digital economy but also build resilience for the financial architectures of the future.