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

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2026

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR GAAR AND TREATIES

AUTHOR - LALIT RAJ, STUDENT AT AMITY UNIVERSITY NOIDA

BEST CITATION – LALIT RAJ, LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR GAAR AND TREATIES, INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR), 6 (5) OF 2026, PG. 90-99, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

ABSTRACT

This study discusses the relationship between GAAR and DTAAs in the field of international taxation. With globalization, the need for striking a balance between GAAR and treaties has become more important than ever. This research studies the GAAR system of India, international standards like the Principal Purpose Test and Multilateral Instrument, and three historic judgments by the Supreme Court in McDowell (1985), Azadi Bachao Andolan (2003), and Vodafone (2012), which have brought about an evolution in judicial interpretation from form over substance to substance over form.

INTRODUCTION

The increasing integration of global economies has significantly transformed the landscape of international taxation, making it more complex and dynamic than ever before. As businesses expand beyond domestic borders and engage in cross-border transactions, the challenge of determining the appropriate jurisdiction for taxation has become a critical issue for governments and taxpayers alike.[71] In this context, tax systems across the world have developed mechanisms to address both the risk of double taxation and the growing concern of tax avoidance. Two such important mechanisms are tax treaties, particularly Double Taxation Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs), and domestic anti-avoidance provisions such as the General Anti-Avoidance Rule (GAAR). While both serve distinct purposes, their interaction has become a focal point of debate in international tax law, especially with the rise of sophisticated tax planning strategies adopted by multinational enterprises.

Tax treaties are bilateral agreements entered into by countries with the objective of preventing the same income from being taxed in more than one jurisdiction.[72] These treaties play a vital role in facilitating international trade and investment by providing certainty, reducing tax burdens, and minimizing disputes between countries.[73] They typically allocate taxing rights between the source country, where income is generated, and the residence country, where the taxpayer resides. By doing so, they eliminate the barriers that double taxation could otherwise create for global economic activity.[74] In addition, tax treaties often include provisions for exchange of information, dispute resolution mechanisms, and safeguards against discriminatory taxation, thereby promoting transparency and cooperation among nations.[75]

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

However, while tax treaties are designed to encourage legitimate economic activity, they

[71]OECD, 'Addressing Base Erosion and Profit Shifting' (OECD Publishing, 2013) 7; Reuven S Avi-Yonah, 'Globalization, Tax Competition, and the Fiscal Crisis of the Welfare State' (2000) 113 Harvard Law Review 1573, 1575.

[72]OECD, 'Model Tax Convention on Income and on Capital' (OECD Publishing, 2017) Introduction, para 1; Philip Baker, Double Taxation Conventions (Sweet & Maxwell, looseleaf) para 1-01.

[73]Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), ss 90, 91; Klaus Vogel, Klaus Vogel on Double Taxation Conventions (3rd edn, Kluwer Law International 1997) 9–12.

[74]Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1969, Art 26; OECD Model Tax Convention (2017) Arts 23A, 23B (exemption and credit methods).

[75]OECD Model Tax Convention (2017), Arts 26 (exchange of information), 25 (mutual agreement procedure), 24 (non-discrimination); Roy Rohatgi, Basic International Taxation (2nd edn, BNA International 2005) vol 1, 3.

have also been susceptible to misuse through practices such as treaty shopping and other forms of tax avoidance. Treaty shopping refers to the practice of routing investments through an intermediary country solely to take advantage of favorable treaty provisions, even when there is little or no economic substance in that jurisdiction.[76] Such practices undermine the intent of tax treaties and result in significant revenue losses for countries.[77] In response to these challenges, governments have increasingly turned to anti-avoidance rules to ensure that tax benefits are granted only in cases where transactions have genuine commercial substance.[78]

The General Anti-Avoidance Rule (GAAR) represents a broad and principle-based approach to combating tax avoidance. Unlike specific anti-avoidance rules, which target particular types of transactions or schemes, GAAR provides tax authorities with the power to examine the substance of an arrangement and disregard or recharacterize it if it is found to be primarily motivated by the purpose of obtaining a tax benefit. GAAR is based on the principle that while taxpayers are entitled to arrange their affairs in a tax-efficient manner, they should not engage in artificial or abusive practices that exploit loopholes in the law. By focusing on the intent and economic reality of transactions, GAAR seeks to strike a balance between taxpayer autonomy and the need to protect the tax base.

The introduction of GAAR in various jurisdictions, including India, has marked a significant shift in the approach to tax administration. In India, GAAR provisions were incorporated into the Income Tax Act with effect from April 1, 2017, following extensive deliberations and recommendations by expert committees.[79] The Indian GAAR framework includes several safeguards, such as thresholds for applicability, the requirement of approval from a high-level panel, and provisions to ensure that it is applied in a fair and consistent manner.[80] These safeguards are intended to prevent arbitrary use of GAAR and to provide clarity and confidence to taxpayers. Nevertheless, the implementation of GAAR has raised important questions regarding its interaction with existing tax treaties.[81]

The legal framework governing GAAR in India and at the international level represents a significant development in the effort to combat tax avoidance while maintaining fairness and certainty in taxation. GAAR is designed as a broad, principle-based provision that empowers tax authorities to deny tax benefits arising from arrangements that lack genuine commercial substance and are primarily intended to avoid taxes. Its legal foundation lies in the recognition that specific anti-avoidance rules alone are insufficient to address increasingly sophisticated tax planning strategies. As a result, GAAR has emerged as an essential component of modern tax systems, both domestically and globally.

In India, the legal framework for GAAR is embedded in the Income Tax Act, 1961, through provisions introduced to strengthen the country's ability to tackle aggressive tax avoidance. GAAR became effective from April 1, 2017, following extensive deliberation and consultation with stakeholders. The framework is structured around the concept of an 'impermissible avoidance arrangement,' which refers to any arrangement whose main purpose is to obtain a tax benefit and which satisfies certain specified conditions. These conditions

[76]OECD, 'Preventing the Granting of Treaty Benefits in Inappropriate Circumstances, Action 6 – 2015 Final Report' (OECD/G20 BEPS Project, 2015) 9; Phillip Postlewaite and David Warland, 'Treaty Shopping and the OECD Model Treaty' (1986) 36 American University Law Review 113.
[77]Union of India v Azadi Bachao Andolan (2003) 263 ITR 706 (SC); OECD, 'Double Taxation Conventions and the Use of Conduit Companies' (1986) R(6)-1.
[78]OECD, 'Action Plan on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting' (OECD Publishing, 2013) Action 6; OECD, Preventing the Granting of Treaty Benefits (n 6) 17.
[79]Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), ss 95–102 (Chapter X-A), inserted by Finance Act, 2012, effective 1 April 2017; Parthasarathi Shome (Chairman), Expert Committee on GAAR, 'Final Report on General Anti Avoidance Rules (GAAR) in Income Tax Act, 1961' (September 2012) 1.
[80]Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 144BA; CBDT, 'Guidelines for Implementation of GAAR in Income Tax Act, 1961', Circular No 7 of 2017 (27 January 2017) paras 4–6.
[81]Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 144BA(1) (threshold of INR 3 crore tax benefit); CBDT Circular No 7 of 2017 (n 10) para 3.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

include situations where the arrangement creates rights or obligations that are not ordinarily created between parties dealing at arm's length, lacks commercial substance, or results in misuse or abuse of tax provisions.[82]

A key feature of the Indian GAAR framework is the emphasis on safeguards to prevent arbitrary use. Recognizing the broad and discretionary nature of GAAR, the legislature incorporated procedural mechanisms to ensure fairness and transparency. The application of GAAR involves multiple stages of scrutiny, beginning with the assessing officer, who identifies a potentially impermissible arrangement. The matter is then reviewed by higher authorities, including the Principal Commissioner or Commissioner of Income Tax, before being referred to an approving panel. The approving panel, composed of experienced professionals and independent members, evaluates the case and determines whether GAAR should be invoked.[83]

Another important element of the Indian legal framework is the threshold requirement for invoking GAAR. The provisions apply only where the tax benefit exceeds a specified monetary limit, thereby excluding minor cases and focusing on significant instances of avoidance. Additionally, taxpayers are given an opportunity to present their case and provide explanations before GAAR is applied.[84] The framework also includes provisions for appellate review, allowing taxpayers to challenge GAAR decisions before higher judicial authorities.[85]

The interaction between GAAR and tax treaties is an integral part of the legal framework in India. The law provides that GAAR may be invoked even in cases involving treaty benefits, subject to certain conditions. This reflects the principle that treaty provisions should not be used to facilitate tax avoidance. At the same time, the framework acknowledges the importance of respecting international obligations and seeks to apply GAAR in a manner consistent with the object and purpose of tax treaties.[86]

At the international level, the legal framework for GAAR is shaped by a combination of domestic laws, bilateral tax treaties, and multilateral initiatives. Different countries have adopted GAAR provisions in varying forms, reflecting differences in legal traditions and policy priorities. Despite these differences, there is a growing convergence in the principles underlying GAAR, particularly the emphasis on substance over form and the prevention of abuse.[87]

International efforts to combat tax avoidance have played a significant role in shaping the legal framework for GAAR. Initiatives aimed at addressing base erosion and profit shifting have led to the development of common standards and guidelines that influence domestic legislation. One of the key outcomes of these efforts is the inclusion of anti-abuse provisions in tax treaties, such as the Principal Purpose Test (PPT). The PPT denies treaty benefits where obtaining such benefits is one of the principal purposes of an arrangement, unless granting the benefit is consistent with the treaty's objectives.[88]

The introduction of the Multilateral Instrument (MLI) represents another significant development in the international legal framework. The MLI allows countries to modify their existing tax treaties to incorporate anti-abuse measures and other provisions without renegotiating each treaty individually. This has

[82]Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 96 (definition of 'impermissible avoidance arrangement'); CBDT Circular No 7 of 2017 (n 10) para 2; Shome Report (n 9) 20–22.
[83]Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 144BA(1)–(6) (procedural mechanism including reference to approving panel); CBDT Circular No 7 of 2017 (n 10) paras 4–6.
[84]Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 144BA(1) (INR 3 crore threshold); Shome Report (n 9) 34–38; CBDT Circular No 7 of 2017 (n 10) para 3.
[85]Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 144BA(12) (appellate review); Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), ss 246A, 253 (appeals to CIT(A) and ITAT).
[86]Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 90(2A); CBDT Circular No 7 of 2017 (n 10) para 7; P Radhakrishnan, 'GAAR and Tax Treaties: The Indian Perspective' (2017) 9 National Law School of India Review 45, 52.
[87]OECD, 'Harmful Tax Competition: An Emerging Global Issue' (OECD Publishing, 1998); Brian Arnold and Michael McIntyre, International Tax Primer (3rd edn, Kluwer Law International 2014) 147.
[88]OECD BEPS Action 6 Final Report (n 6); OECD Model Tax Convention (2017), Art 29 (Entitlement to Benefits) and Commentary.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

accelerated the implementation of global standards and enhanced the effectiveness of treaty networks in addressing avoidance.[89] By integrating anti-abuse provisions into treaties, the MLI strengthens the overall framework for combating tax avoidance at the international level.[90]

The legal framework for GAAR also involves the interaction between domestic laws and international obligations. Countries must ensure that their anti-avoidance provisions are consistent with treaty commitments and international principles. This requires careful drafting and interpretation of laws to avoid conflicts and ensure that GAAR is applied in a manner that respects both domestic sovereignty and international cooperation. Judicial interpretation plays a crucial role in resolving such conflicts and providing clarity on the application of GAAR in cross-border contexts.[91]

Another important aspect of the legal framework is the role of administrative guidance and regulatory practice. Tax authorities often issue guidelines, circulars, and explanatory notes to clarify the application of GAAR and provide practical guidance to taxpayers. In India, for example, detailed guidelines have been issued to explain the scope, applicability, and procedural aspects of GAAR. Such guidance is essential for ensuring that the law is applied in a predictable and transparent manner.[92]

The legal framework must also address the challenges posed by the digital economy and evolving business models. Traditional tax rules, including those related to permanent establishment and source of income, may not adequately capture the economic activities of digital businesses. This has led to discussions on new approaches to taxation, including the reallocation of taxing rights and the introduction of global minimum tax standards.[93]

Despite the progress made in developing a comprehensive legal framework, challenges remain in the implementation of GAAR both in India and internationally. One of the key challenges is the potential for uncertainty arising from the broad and principle-based nature of GAAR. Taxpayers may find it difficult to predict how the rules will be applied, leading to increased compliance costs and the risk of disputes.[94]

Another challenge is the need to balance the objectives of preventing tax avoidance and promoting economic growth. While GAAR is essential for protecting the tax base, its application should not create an environment of excessive uncertainty or discourage legitimate business activity. Policymakers must therefore design and implement GAAR in a manner that achieves its objectives without imposing undue burdens on taxpayers.[95]

The legal framework for GAAR also raises questions about fairness and equity in taxation. By targeting arrangements that exploit legal loopholes, GAAR contributes to a more equitable distribution of tax burdens. However, it is important to ensure that the rules are applied consistently and without bias, so that all taxpayers are treated fairly. This underscores the importance of transparency, accountability, and oversight in the administration of GAAR.[96]

The legal framework for tax treaties forms a fundamental component of international

[89]OECD, 'Multilateral Convention to Implement Tax Treaty Related Measures to Prevent BEPS' (2016) (MLI), Art 7 (Principal Purpose Test); OECD, 'Explanatory Statement to the Multilateral Convention' (2016) para 10.
[90]MLI (n 20), Arts 1–39; OECD, 'Explanatory Statement' (n 20) paras 1–15; as of 2024, over 100 jurisdictions have signed the MLI.
[91]Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1969, Art 31 (general rule of interpretation); OECD Model Tax Convention (2017), Art 3(2) (undefined terms); Vogel (n 3) 41.
[92]CBDT Circular No 7 of 2017 (n 10); OECD, 'Guidance on the Application of the Exclusions from the Definition of Permanent Establishment' (2019).
[93]OECD, 'Tax Challenges Arising from Digitalisation – Report on Pillar One Blueprint' (2020); OECD, 'Statement on a Two-Pillar Solution to Address the Tax Challenges Arising from the Digitalisation of the Economy' (October 2021).
[94]Shome Report (n 9) 50; Michael Devereux and John Vella, 'Are We Heading Towards a Corporate Tax System Fit for the 21st Century?' (2014) 35(4) Fiscal Studies 449, 463.
[95]OECD, 'Pillar Two – Global Anti-Base Erosion Model Rules' (2021); OECD, Statement on a Two-Pillar Solution (n 25).
[96]Judith Freedman, 'Improving (Not Perfecting) Tax Legislation: Rules and Principles Revisited' (2010) British Tax Review 717, 720; Shome Report (n 9) 55.

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

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2026

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

taxation, providing the structure through which countries coordinate their taxing rights and prevent conflicts arising from cross-border economic activities. Tax treaties, commonly known as Double Taxation Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs), are bilateral or multilateral agreements entered into by sovereign states to allocate taxing jurisdiction, eliminate double taxation, and promote international trade and investment.[97]

At the core of the legal framework for tax treaties lies the principle of mutual agreement between sovereign states. Countries negotiate and enter into treaties based on their economic interests, fiscal policies, and diplomatic considerations. Once concluded, these treaties become binding obligations under international law and must be implemented in good faith. In many jurisdictions, including India, tax treaties are given legal recognition through specific provisions in domestic legislation, allowing them to be applied directly in determining tax liabilities.[98]

A key objective of tax treaties is the elimination of double taxation, which occurs when the same income is taxed in more than one jurisdiction. To achieve this, treaties establish rules for allocating taxing rights between the source country, where the income is generated, and the residence country, where the taxpayer resides. These rules vary depending on the nature of the income, such as business profits, dividends, interest, royalties, and capital gains.[99] Treaties also provide mechanisms for relief, including the exemption method, where income is taxed in only one country, and the credit method, where taxes paid in one jurisdiction are credited against the liability in another.[100]

The structure and content of tax treaties are largely influenced by internationally accepted models, particularly the OECD Model Tax Convention and the UN Model Double Taxation Convention. These models provide standardized provisions and commentary that guide countries in drafting and interpreting treaties. While the OECD Model is often favored by developed countries, the UN Model places greater emphasis on the rights of source countries, reflecting the interests of developing nations.[101]

Another important element of the legal framework is the concept of permanent establishment (PE), which determines the threshold for taxing business profits in the source country. A PE typically refers to a fixed place of business through which an enterprise conducts its operations, such as an office, branch, or factory. The existence of a PE establishes a sufficient connection between the enterprise and the source country. This concept is central to the allocation of taxing rights and has been the subject of significant debate and reform, particularly in the context of the digital economy.[102]

Tax treaties also include provisions to prevent discrimination and ensure equal treatment of taxpayers. Non-discrimination clauses prohibit countries from imposing more burdensome taxation on foreign entities compared to domestic ones in similar circumstances. Additionally, treaties often contain provisions for the exchange of information between tax authorities, which enhances transparency and facilitates the enforcement of tax laws.[103]

A significant aspect of the legal framework for treaties is the incorporation of anti-abuse measures to prevent misuse of treaty benefits. Modern treaties include provisions such as the Limitation of Benefits (LOB) clause and the Principal Purpose Test (PPT). The LOB clause sets

[97]Baker (n 2) para 1-01; OECD Model Tax Convention (2017) Introduction, para 2; Rohatgi (n 5) vol 1, 1.

[98]Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1969, Arts 11–16 (treaty formation), 26 (pacta sunt servanda); Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 90.

[99]OECD Model Tax Convention (2017) Arts 6–21 (allocation of taxing rights); UN Model Double Taxation Convention (2021) Arts 6–21.

[100]OECD Model Tax Convention (2017), Arts 23A (exemption method), 23B (credit method); Vogel (n 3) 1131–1140.

[101]OECD Model Tax Convention (2017) Introduction, paras 5–7; UN Model Double Taxation Convention between Developed and Developing Countries (2021) Introduction, para 1.

[102]OECD Model Tax Convention (2017), Art 5 (permanent establishment); OECD, 'Preventing the Artificial Avoidance of Permanent Establishment Status, Action 7 – 2015 Final Report' (OECD/G20 BEPS Project, 2015).

[103]OECD Model Tax Convention (2017), Art 24 (non-discrimination); Art 26 (exchange of information); Art 27 (assistance in collection of taxes).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

objective criteria that must be met to qualify for treaty benefits, while the PPT denies benefits where obtaining them is one of the principal purposes of an arrangement.[104]

The interaction between tax treaties and domestic law is a critical component of the legal framework. In many jurisdictions, treaties may override domestic tax laws to the extent that they provide more favorable treatment to taxpayers. In India, for example, the Income Tax Act allows taxpayers to choose between domestic law and treaty provisions, whichever is more beneficial. However, this interaction can become complex when domestic anti-avoidance rules, such as GAAR, are applied to deny treaty benefits.[105]

Dispute resolution mechanisms are an essential feature of tax treaties. The Mutual Agreement Procedure (MAP) allows competent authorities of the contracting states to negotiate and resolve disputes arising from the interpretation or application of the treaty. In recent years, there has been a growing emphasis on improving the effectiveness of dispute resolution, including the introduction of arbitration mechanisms in some treaties.[106]

The legal framework for treaties has also been influenced by global initiatives aimed at addressing tax avoidance and ensuring fair taxation. The introduction of the Multilateral Instrument (MLI) has been a major development in this regard, allowing countries to modify their existing treaties to include anti-abuse provisions and other measures without renegotiating each agreement individually.[107]

Administrative aspects also play a crucial role in the effective functioning of the treaty framework. Tax authorities must ensure that treaty provisions are implemented correctly and that taxpayers comply with the requirements for claiming benefits. The increasing use of digital systems and data analytics has enhanced the ability of tax authorities to administer treaties effectively and detect potential misuse.[108]

The legal framework for treaties must also adapt to the challenges posed by the digital economy and evolving business models. Traditional rules based on physical presence and source of income may not adequately capture the economic activities of digital enterprises, leading to gaps in taxation. This has prompted discussions on new approaches, including the reallocation of taxing rights and the introduction of global minimum tax standards.[109]

In addition, the framework must address the needs and concerns of developing countries, which often face challenges in negotiating and enforcing tax treaties. International cooperation, capacity building, and technical assistance are essential in addressing these challenges and ensuring that the benefits of tax treaties are distributed equitably.[110]

Despite its many strengths, the legal framework for treaties is not without limitations. Issues such as ambiguity in treaty language, differences in interpretation, and conflicts with domestic laws can create uncertainty and lead to disputes. To address these issues, there is a need for continuous refinement of treaty provisions, improved guidance, and enhanced cooperation between countries.[111]

[104]OECD BEPS Action 6 Final Report (n 6); OECD Model Tax Convention (2017), Art 29 (LOB and PPT); MLI (n 20), Arts 7, 10.
[105]Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 90(2); CIT v Hindustan Coca Cola Beverages Pvt Ltd (2007) 293 ITR 226 (SC); Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 90(2A) (GAAR override).
[106]OECD Model Tax Convention (2017), Art 25 (mutual agreement procedure); MLI (n 20), Art 16 (MAP); OECD, 'Making Dispute Resolution Mechanisms More Effective, Action 14 – 2015 Final Report' (OECD/G20 BEPS Project, 2015).
[107]MLI (n 20), Arts 1–39; OECD Explanatory Statement (n 20); OECD, 'Tax Treaty-Related Measures to Prevent BEPS' (2016) paras 1–20.
[108]OECD, 'Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Account Information in Tax Matters' (2nd edn, OECD Publishing, 2017); OECD, Common Reporting Standard (CRS).
[109]OECD, Tax Challenges Arising from Digitalisation (n 25); OECD, Statement on a Two-Pillar Solution (n 25); Pillar Two Model Rules (n 27).
[110]UN, 'Handbook on Selected Issues for Taxation of the Extractive Industries by Developing Countries' (UN 2017); OECD, 'Capacity Building' in BEPS Inclusive Framework.
[111]OECD Model Tax Convention (2017), Art 3(2) (interpretation gaps); Vienna Convention (n 30), Art 31(3)(c); Vogel (n 3) 38.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

CASE LAWS

Union of India v. Azadi Bachao Andolan (2003)

The case of **Union of India v. Azadi Bachao Andolan** (2003) is one of the most significant judgments in the field of international taxation in India, particularly concerning the interpretation of tax treaties and the permissibility of treaty shopping. The decision of the Supreme Court provided clarity on the relationship between domestic tax law and international treaty obligations and laid down important principles that influenced the later development of anti-avoidance rules, including the introduction of GAAR.[112]

Background of the Case

The dispute arose in the context of the Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement (DTAA) between India and Mauritius. Under this treaty, capital gains arising from the sale of shares of Indian companies by a resident of Mauritius were taxable only in Mauritius and not in India.[113] Since Mauritius did not levy capital gains tax at that time, this effectively allowed investors to avoid tax on such gains altogether. As a result, many foreign investors began routing their investments into India through Mauritius-based entities in order to benefit from the treaty provisions.

To provide administrative clarity, the Central Board of Direct Taxes (CBDT) issued Circular No. 789 in 2000, stating that a certificate of residence issued by the Mauritian authorities would be sufficient proof of residence and entitlement to treaty benefits.[114] However, the circular was challenged by Azadi Bachao Andolan, a public interest group, on the grounds that it enabled tax avoidance and was contrary to public policy. The Delhi High Court initially ruled in favor of the petitioner, holding that the circular was ultra vires and that treaty benefits should not be granted in cases of abuse.[115]

Nature of the Agreement and Dispute

The central issue in the dispute revolved around the interpretation and application of the India–Mauritius DTAA. The agreement allocated taxing rights on capital gains to the country of residence of the investor. The petitioner argued that arrangements whereby investors established residence in Mauritius primarily to exploit this provision, without having substantial economic activity there, were artificial and constituted an abuse of the treaty.[116]

Legal Issues Raised

The case raised several important legal issues, including whether treaty shopping could be considered illegal or abusive in the absence of specific anti-avoidance provisions, the validity of the CBDT circular, whether treaty provisions should prevail over domestic tax laws, and the role of judicial interpretation in matters of tax policy.[117]

Supreme Court's Verdict

The Supreme Court reversed the decision of the Delhi High Court and upheld the validity of the CBDT circular. The Court held that tax planning within the framework of law is legitimate and that taxpayers are entitled to arrange their affairs in a manner that minimizes tax liability, distinguishing between permissible tax avoidance and illegal tax evasion.[118]

In addressing the issue of treaty shopping, the Court held that there was no prohibition against such practices in the India–Mauritius DTAA. It observed that if the government intended to prevent treaty shopping, it could have included specific anti-abuse provisions in the treaty. In the absence of such provisions, it was not for

[112]Union of India v Azadi Bachao Andolan (2003) 263 ITR 706 (SC); Azadi Bachao Andolan v Union of India (2001) 252 ITR 471 (Del HC).
[113]Convention between the Government of the Republic of India and the Government of Mauritius for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and Prevention of Fiscal Evasion (India–Mauritius DTAA), signed 24 August 1982, Art 13(4).
[114]CBDT Circular No 789 of 2000 (13 April 2000); Azadi Bachao Andolan (SC) (n 44) 720–721.
[115]Azadi Bachao Andolan (Del HC) (n 44); Union of India (SC) (n 44) 706–710.
[116]Azadi Bachao Andolan (SC) (n 44) 730–732; Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 90(2).
[117]Azadi Bachao Andolan (SC) (n 44) 733; IRC v Duke of Westminster [1936] AC 1 (HL) 19 (principle that taxpayer may arrange affairs to minimise tax).

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

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2026

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

the judiciary to impose restrictions not contemplated by the parties.[119]

The Court upheld the binding nature of the CBDT circular on the tax department, emphasized that tax treaties have a special status and must be interpreted in accordance with international principles, and rejected the application of the 'substance over form' doctrine in the absence of a statutory provision such as GAAR.[120][121][122]

The Supreme Court further highlighted that the responsibility for renegotiating treaties or introducing anti-avoidance measures lies with the executive branch. The judgment established that treaty benefits cannot be denied merely on the grounds of tax avoidance in the absence of explicit anti-abuse provisions, and played a significant role in shaping subsequent developments, including the introduction of GAAR.[123]

Vodafone International Holdings BV v. Union of India (2012)

The case of **Vodafone International Holdings BV v. Union of India** (2012) is one of the most influential judgments in Indian tax jurisprudence, particularly in the context of cross-border taxation, indirect transfer of assets, and the limits of tax authority jurisdiction. This case not only clarified the legal position at the time but also triggered significant legislative changes and contributed to the eventual introduction of GAAR in India.[124]

Background of the Case

The dispute arose from a transaction in 2007 where Vodafone International Holdings BV, incorporated in the Netherlands, acquired the entire share capital of CGP Investments (Holdings) Ltd., incorporated in the Cayman Islands, from Hutchison Telecommunications International Ltd. The value of the transaction was approximately USD 11 billion. Through this acquisition, Vodafone indirectly gained control over Hutchison Essar Ltd., an Indian telecommunications company.[125]

The Indian tax authorities contended that although the transaction took place between two foreign entities outside India, it effectively resulted in the transfer of a capital asset situated in India. On this basis, they sought to impose capital gains tax on Vodafone and argued that the company had an obligation to withhold tax under Indian law.[126]

Nature of the Agreement and Dispute

The transaction was structured as a share purchase agreement involving the transfer of shares of a Cayman Islands company, though the underlying value derived primarily from the Indian telecommunications business. The core issue was whether such an indirect transfer could be taxed in India. The tax authorities argued for a 'bundle of rights' approach based on substance, while Vodafone contended that the principle of territorial nexus must be strictly applied.[127]

Legal Issues Raised

The case raised complex issues including whether India had jurisdiction to tax a transfer of shares of a foreign company when underlying assets were in India (requiring interpretation of Section 9 of the Income Tax Act), whether 'substance over form' could recharacterize the transaction, and the scope of

[119]Azadi Bachao Andolan (SC) (n 44) 734–736; India–Mauritius DTAA (n 45), Art 13.
[120]Azadi Bachao Andolan (SC) (n 44) 737–738; Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 119 (binding nature of CBDT circulars); UCO Bank v CIT (1999) 237 ITR 889 (SC).
[121]Azadi Bachao Andolan (SC) (n 44) 738–740; Vienna Convention (n 30), Arts 31–32 (treaty interpretation); Vogel (n 3) 37.
[122]Azadi Bachao Andolan (SC) (n 44) 741; McDowell & Co Ltd v Commercial Tax Officer (1985) 154 ITR 148 (SC) 160 (Chinnappa Reddy J, concurring).
[123]Azadi Bachao Andolan (SC) (n 44) 742; Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 95 (subsequently enacted GAAR provisions).
[124]Vodafone International Holdings BV v Union of India (2012) 341 ITR 1 (SC); Vodafone International Holdings BV v Union of India (2010) 329 ITR 126 (Bom HC).
[125]Vodafone (SC) (n 55) 5–10; CGP Investments (Holdings) Ltd was incorporated in the Cayman Islands; Hutchison Telecommunications International Ltd was a Hong Kong-listed entity.
[126]Vodafone (SC) (n 55) 10–12; Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 195 (obligation to withhold tax on payments to non-residents).
[127]Vodafone (SC) (n 55) 14–16; Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 9(1)(i) (income deemed to accrue or arise in India).

the withholding tax obligation under Section 195.[128][129]

Supreme Court's Verdict

The Supreme Court ruled in favor of Vodafone, holding that the transaction was not taxable in India under the existing legal framework. The Court held that Section 9 of the Income Tax Act, as it stood at the time, did not extend to indirect transfers of Indian assets through offshore share transactions, emphasizing that any extension of the statute's scope must be explicitly provided by the legislature.[130]

The Court rejected the 'substance over form' doctrine, finding the transaction to be a bona fide commercial arrangement and not a colorable device to evade tax. It held that the use of holding company structures is a common and legitimate practice in international business, and that the 'bundle of rights' argument could not justify taxing rights independent of share ownership.[131]

The Supreme Court held that Vodafone was not liable to deduct tax at source, as the payment made to Hutchison was not chargeable to tax in India. It emphasized the importance of maintaining a stable and predictable tax regime to attract foreign investment and reinforced the principle that tax policy decisions should be made by the legislature.[132]

The judgment exposed gaps in the existing legal framework, leading to the retrospective amendment of the Income Tax Act through the Finance Act, 2012, to include provisions for taxing indirect transfers of Indian assets. The case played a crucial role in shaping the discourse on tax avoidance and contributed to the introduction of GAAR.[133]

McDowell & Co. Ltd. v. Commercial Tax Officer (1985)

The case of **McDowell & Co. Ltd. v. Commercial Tax Officer** (1985) is a landmark judgment in Indian tax jurisprudence that significantly influenced the development of anti-avoidance principles. It is widely regarded as a turning point marking a shift from a strictly legalistic interpretation of tax laws to a more purposive and substance-oriented approach, laying the foundation for modern anti-avoidance doctrines including GAAR.[134]

Background of the Case

McDowell & Company Limited was engaged in the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages. The company devised a method to reduce its tax liability by arranging for buyers or intermediaries to make payments towards excise duty separately from the sale price, thereby attempting to exclude the excise duty component from its taxable turnover. The tax authorities contended that the arrangement was merely a device to avoid tax, as excise duty formed an integral part of the sale price.[135]

Nature of the Agreement and Dispute

The dispute centered around whether the structure adopted by McDowell to separate the excise duty component from the sale price was a legitimate business arrangement or a colorable device designed to reduce sales tax liability. The tax authorities argued that the arrangement was artificial and did not reflect the true nature of the transaction.[136]

Legal Issues Raised

The case raised fundamental questions about the distinction between permissible tax

[128] Vodafone (SC) (n 55) 18–20; Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 9(1)(i); Vodafone (Bom HC) (n 55) 130–132.
[129] Vodafone (SC) (n 55) 22–24; Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 195; Commissioner of Income Tax v Eli Lilly & Co (India) Pvt Ltd (2009) 312 ITR 225 (SC).
[130] Vodafone (SC) (n 55) 26–30; Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 9(1)(i) as interpreted before Finance Act, 2012 retrospective amendment.
[131] Vodafone (SC) (n 55) 31–34; Azadi Bachao Andolan (SC) (n 44) 741; Matheson Ormsby Prentice, 'Offshore Holding Structures in Cross-Border M&A' (2010) 15 International Tax Review 22.
[132] Vodafone (SC) (n 55) 35; Income Tax Act, 1961 (India), s 195; Eli Lilly (n 60).
[133] Vodafone (SC) (n 55) 40–42; Finance Act, 2012 (retrospective amendment to s 9(1)(i) of Income Tax Act, 1961 to tax indirect transfers).
[134] McDowell & Co Ltd v Commercial Tax Officer (1985) 154 ITR 148 (SC); AIR 1985 SC 1747.
[135] McDowell (n 65) 150–152; Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944; Andhra Pradesh General Sales Tax Act, 1957.
[136] McDowell (n 65) 153–154; CIT v A Raman & Co (1968) 67 ITR 11 (SC) (earlier view permitting tax planning).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

planning and impermissible tax avoidance, the applicability of the 'substance over form' principle in determining tax liability, and the role of the judiciary in addressing arrangements that, while technically compliant with the law, undermine its purpose.[137]

Supreme Court's Analysis

The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the tax authorities and delivered a strong judgment condemning the use of artificial arrangements to avoid tax. The Court acknowledged that taxpayers have the right to arrange their affairs in a manner that minimizes tax liability, but emphasized that this right does not extend to the use of colorable devices or artificial schemes designed to evade tax.[138]

The Court held that excise duty was an integral part of the sale price and could not be artificially separated from it. A key contribution of the judgment was its endorsement of the 'substance over form' doctrine, marking a departure from earlier decisions that placed greater emphasis on the literal interpretation of statutes.[139][140]

The judgment introduced a strong moral dimension to tax compliance, emphasizing that tax avoidance undermines the integrity of the tax system and places an unfair burden on honest taxpayers. The Court's criticism of earlier judicial attitudes that appeared to tolerate tax avoidance redefined the boundaries of acceptable tax planning.[141]

The Court further highlighted the need for legislative and judicial cooperation in addressing tax avoidance, recognizing that while the legislature is responsible for enacting laws, the judiciary plays a crucial role in interpreting those laws in a manner that prevents misuse. Subsequent decisions, including Azadi Bachao Andolan and Vodafone, refined and limited the broader propositions of McDowell to bona fide commercial transactions.[142]

CONCLUSION

The relationship between GAAR and tax treaties presents one of the most challenging areas of international taxation. With the advent of more elaborate tax avoidance plans adopted by multinationals, the need for robust anti-avoidance legislation has become evident, without compromising the spirit of the treaties involved. India's journey, illustrated in the landmark cases of McDowell, Azadi Bachao Andolan, and Vodafone, clearly shows how Indian taxation laws have evolved into adopting a substance-based approach.

The enactment of GAAR coupled with the international trend of incorporating the Principal Purpose Test as well as the development of the Multilateral Instrument presents a concerted global move towards addressing treaty abuse and base erosion. Nevertheless, the appropriate balance needs to be struck, as too rigorous an application of anti-avoidance legislation may adversely affect the investment climate. It is therefore critical that adequate attention be given to the implementation of GAAR in ensuring compliance with international best practice standards.

[137]McDowell (n 65) 155–156; IRC v Duke of Westminster (n 49); CIT v A Raman & Co (n 67).
[138]McDowell (n 65) 157–158; W T Ramsay Ltd v IRC [1982] AC 300 (HL) (UK approach to substance over form in tax).
[139]McDowell (n 65) 159–160 (Ranganath Misra J, majority); Chinnappa Reddy J (concurring) 160–163 (stronger condemnation of tax avoidance).
[140]McDowell (n 65) 158; Ramsay (n 69); Furniss v Dawson [1984] AC 474 (HL) (UK composite transaction doctrine).
[141]McDowell (n 65) 160–162 (Chinnappa Reddy J); Azadi Bachao Andolan (SC) (n 44) 741 (subsequent limiting of McDowell's broader propositions).
[142]McDowell (n 65) 162–163; Vodafone (SC) (n 55) 30 (Supreme Court in Vodafone distinguished McDowell from bona fide commercial transactions).