

---

# THE TAX DISPUTES AND LITIGATION REVIEW

---

FIFTH EDITION

EDITOR  
SIMON WHITEHEAD

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH

THE TAX  
DISPUTES AND  
LITIGATION  
REVIEW

---

Fifth Edition

Editor  
SIMON WHITEHEAD

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH LTD

PUBLISHER  
Gideon Robertson

SENIOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER  
Nick Barette

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGERS  
Thomas Lee, Felicity Bown

SENIOR ACCOUNT MANAGERS  
Joel Woods

ACCOUNT MANAGERS  
Pere Aspinall, Jack Bagnall, Sophie Emberson, Sian Jones, Laura Lynas

MARKETING AND READERSHIP COORDINATOR  
Rebecca Mogridge

EDITORIAL COORDINATOR  
Gavin Jordan

HEAD OF PRODUCTION  
Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR  
Anne Borthwick

SUBEDITOR  
Claire Ancell

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER  
Paul Howarth

Published in the United Kingdom  
by Law Business Research Ltd, London  
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK  
© 2017 Law Business Research Ltd  
[www.TheLawReviews.co.uk](http://www.TheLawReviews.co.uk)

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of February 2017, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above. Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed to the Publisher – [gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com](mailto:gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com)

ISBN 978-1-910813-54-6

Printed in Great Britain by  
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire  
Tel: 0844 2480 112

# THE LAW REVIEWS

THE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS REVIEW

THE RESTRUCTURING REVIEW

THE PRIVATE COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

THE EMPLOYMENT LAW REVIEW

THE PUBLIC COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE BANKING REGULATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION REVIEW

THE MERGER CONTROL REVIEW

THE TECHNOLOGY, MEDIA AND  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS REVIEW

THE INWARD INVESTMENT AND  
INTERNATIONAL TAXATION REVIEW

THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW

THE CORPORATE IMMIGRATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS REVIEW

THE PROJECTS AND CONSTRUCTION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL MARKETS REVIEW

THE REAL ESTATE LAW REVIEW

THE PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW

THE ENERGY REGULATION AND MARKETS REVIEW

THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW

THE ASSET MANAGEMENT REVIEW

THE PRIVATE WEALTH AND PRIVATE CLIENT REVIEW

THE MINING LAW REVIEW

THE EXECUTIVE REMUNERATION REVIEW

THE ANTI-BRIBERY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION REVIEW

THE CARTELS AND LENIENCY REVIEW  
THE TAX DISPUTES AND LITIGATION REVIEW  
THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW  
THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE LAW REVIEW  
THE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW  
THE DOMINANCE AND MONOPOLIES REVIEW  
THE AVIATION LAW REVIEW  
THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT REGULATION REVIEW  
THE ASSET TRACING AND RECOVERY REVIEW  
THE INSOLVENCY REVIEW  
THE OIL AND GAS LAW REVIEW  
THE FRANCHISE LAW REVIEW  
THE PRODUCT REGULATION AND LIABILITY REVIEW  
THE SHIPPING LAW REVIEW  
THE ACQUISITION AND LEVERAGED FINANCE REVIEW  
THE PRIVACY, DATA PROTECTION AND CYBERSECURITY LAW REVIEW  
THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP LAW REVIEW  
THE TRANSPORT FINANCE LAW REVIEW  
THE SECURITIES LITIGATION REVIEW  
THE LENDING AND SECURED FINANCE REVIEW  
THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW REVIEW  
THE SPORTS LAW REVIEW  
THE INVESTMENT TREATY ARBITRATION REVIEW  
THE GAMBLING LAW REVIEW  
THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND ANTITRUST REVIEW  
THE REAL ESTATE, M&A AND PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW  
THE SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS AND ACTIVISM REVIEW  
THE ISLAMIC FINANCE AND MARKETS LAW REVIEW

[www.TheLawReviews.co.uk](http://www.TheLawReviews.co.uk)

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following law firms for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

ASC LEGAL SOLICITORS & ADVOCATES

BAKER & MCKENZIE AMSTERDAM NV

BECH-BRUUN

CHEVEZ RUIZ ZAMARRIPA Y CIA, SC

CUATRECASAS, GONÇALVES PEREIRA

DDTC CONSULTING

DLA PIPER

FLICK GOCKE SCHAUMBURG

GARRIGUES PORTUGAL, SLP

GUZMÁN ARIZA, ATTORNEYS AT LAW

HERGÜNER BILGEN ÖZEKE ATTORNEY PARTNERSHIP

HWUASON LAW FIRM

JOSEPH HAGE AARONSON LLP

KROGERUS ATTORNEYS LTD

LENZ & STAEHELIN

LOYENS & LOEFF

MACHADO, MEYER, SENDACZ E OPICE ADVOGADOS

MAISTO E ASSOCIATI

MASON HAYES & CURRAN

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT CANADA LLP

PÉREZ BUSTAMANTE & PONCE, ABOGADOS

PHILIPPE DEROUIN

PHILIPPI PRIETOCARRIZOSA FERRERO DU & URÍA

PWC LEGAL

SELE FROMMELT & PARTNER ATTORNEYS AT LAW LTD

SOŁTYSIŃSKI KAWECKI & SZŁĘZAK

STAVROPOULOS & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE

SYCIP SALAZAR HERNANDEZ & GATMAITAN

WITHERS KHATTARWONG

# CONTENTS

---

<b>Editor's Preface</b>	.....vii
	<i>Simon Whitehead</i>
<b>Chapter 1</b>	TAX APPEALS TO THE EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE... 1
	<i>Paul Farmer</i>
<b>Chapter 2</b>	AUSTRIA..... 13
	<i>Franz Althuber and Stefan Holzer</i>
<b>Chapter 3</b>	BELGIUM ..... 24
	<i>Caroline P Docclo</i>
<b>Chapter 4</b>	BRAZIL ..... 39
	<i>Daniella Zagari and Maria Eugênia Doin Vieira</i>
<b>Chapter 5</b>	CANADA ..... 48
	<i>Dominic C Belley</i>
<b>Chapter 6</b>	CHILE..... 61
	<i>Patricio Silva-Riesco Ojeda and Arturo Selman Nahum</i>
<b>Chapter 7</b>	CHINA..... 72
	<i>Liu Tianyong</i>
<b>Chapter 8</b>	DENMARK ..... 86
	<i>Kaspar Bastian</i>
<b>Chapter 9</b>	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC ..... 97
	<i>Christoph Sieger and Fabio J Guzmán-Ariza</i>
<b>Chapter 10</b>	ECUADOR..... 103
	<i>Juan Gabriel Reyes-Varea and Alejandro Pérez-Vallejo</i>



<b>Chapter 11</b>	FINLAND .....	114
	<i>Jouni Weckström</i>	
<b>Chapter 12</b>	FRANCE .....	125
	<i>Philippe Derouin</i>	
<b>Chapter 13</b>	GERMANY.....	135
	<i>Michael Hendricks</i>	
<b>Chapter 14</b>	GREECE.....	149
	<i>Ioannis Stavropoulos and Elina Stavropoulou</i>	
<b>Chapter 15</b>	INDIA .....	160
	<i>Aseem Chawla</i>	
<b>Chapter 16</b>	INDONESIA .....	174
	<i>David Hamzah Damian</i>	
<b>Chapter 17</b>	IRELAND.....	186
	<i>John Gulliver and Robert Henson</i>	
<b>Chapter 18</b>	ITALY .....	199
	<i>Guiglielmo Maisto</i>	
<b>Chapter 19</b>	LIECHTENSTEIN .....	213
	<i>Heinz Frommelt and Angelo Trebo</i>	
<b>Chapter 20</b>	MEXICO .....	226
	<i>Manuel Sáinz Orantes and Claudio F Cárdenas Salomon</i>	
<b>Chapter 21</b>	NETHERLANDS .....	236
	<i>Paul Halprin and Megan Ruigrok</i>	
<b>Chapter 22</b>	PHILIPPINES.....	244
	<i>Carina C Laforteza and Mark Xavier D Oyales</i>	
<b>Chapter 23</b>	POLAND.....	256
	<i>Stawomir Łuczak and Karolina Gotfryd</i>	

<b>Chapter 24</b>	PORTUGAL.....	271
	<i>Pedro Miguel Braz</i>	
<b>Chapter 25</b>	RUSSIA.....	282
	<i>Yana Proskurina and Maria Mikhaylova</i>	
<b>Chapter 26</b>	SINGAPORE.....	300
	<i>Joanna Yap</i>	
<b>Chapter 27</b>	SPAIN.....	313
	<i>Miró Ayats Vergés and Jaume Bonet León</i>	
<b>Chapter 28</b>	SWITZERLAND .....	329
	<i>Jean-Blaise Eckert</i>	
<b>Chapter 29</b>	TURKEY .....	339
	<i>Ayşe Hergüner Bilgen and Ahmet Karahan</i>	
<b>Chapter 30</b>	UNITED KINGDOM.....	352
	<i>Simon Whitehead</i>	
<b>Chapter 31</b>	UNITED STATES .....	383
	<i>Edward L Froelich</i>	
<b>Appendix 1</b>	ABOUT THE AUTHORS.....	413
<b>Appendix 2</b>	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS.....	429

# EDITOR'S PREFACE

---

The objective of this book is to provide tax professionals involved in disputes with revenue authorities in multiple jurisdictions with an outline of the principal issues arising in those jurisdictions. In this, the fifth edition, we have continued to add to the key jurisdictions where disputes are likely to occur for multinational businesses.

Each chapter provides an overview of the procedural rules that govern tax appeals and highlights the pitfalls of which taxpayers need to be most aware. Aspects that are particularly relevant to multinationals, such as transfer pricing, are also considered. In particular, we have asked the authors to address an area where we have always found worrying and subtle variations in approach between courts in different jurisdictions, namely the differing ways in which double tax conventions can be interpreted and applied.

The idea behind this book commenced in 2013 with the general increase in litigation as tax authorities in a number of jurisdictions took a more aggressive approach to the collection of tax – in response, no doubt, to political pressure to address tax avoidance. In the UK alone we have seen the tax authority vested with broad new powers not only of disclosure but even to require tax to be paid in advance of any determination by a court that it is due. The provisions empower the revenue authority, an administrative body, to compel payment of a sum, the subject of a genuine dispute, without any form of judicial control or appeal.

Over the past year the focus on perceived cross-border abuses has continued with action by the European Commission on past tax rulings in Ireland, Luxembourg and Belgium, and the BEPS reaching a crescendo in the announcement of a 'diverted profits tax' to impose an additional tax in the UK when it is felt that a multinational is subject to too little corporation tax even in an EU context. The general targeting of cross-border tax avoidance now has European legislation in the Anti-Tax Avoidance Directive, which came into force in June 2016 with promises of more to follow. The absence of much European legislation in direct tax has always been put down to the need for unanimity and the way in which Member States closely guard their taxing rights. The relatively speedy passage of this legislation (the Parent–Subsidiary Directive before it took some 10 years to pass) and its restriction of attractive tax regimes indicates the general political disrepute with which such practices are now viewed.

These are, perhaps, extreme examples, reflective of the parliamentary cycle, yet a general toughening of stance seems to be being felt. In that light, this book provides an overview of each jurisdiction's anti-avoidance rules and any alternative mechanisms for resolving tax disputes, such as mediation, arbitration or restitution claims.

We have attempted to give readers a flavour of the tax litigation landscape in each jurisdiction. The authors have looked to the future, and have summarised the policies and approaches of the revenue authorities regarding contentious matters, addressing important questions such as how long cases take and situations in which some form of settlement might be available.

We have been lucky to obtain contributions from the leading tax litigation practitioners in their jurisdictions. Many of the authors are members of the EU Tax Group, a collection of independent law firms, of which we are a member, involved particularly in challenges to the compatibility of national tax laws with EU and EEA rights. We hope that you will find this book informative and useful.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the hard work of my colleague Ramsey Chagoury in the editing and compilation of this book.

**Simon Whitehead**

Joseph Hage Aaronson LLP

London

February 2017

## Chapter 12

---

# FRANCE

*Philippe Derouin*<sup>1</sup>

### I INTRODUCTION

The French system for assessing, auditing and challenging taxes has been extremely constant over the past few decades. The major changes essentially reflect progress in technology (use of digital data and equipment in tax audits, tax filings, tax payments and dispute procedures), the growing influence of international instruments of human rights and European Union law, and a tendency of both the tax authorities and taxpayers to be more aggressive than they used to be. Alternative dispute resolution methods have not developed, and a very effective method came to an end in 2010.

The French tax system is largely based upon self-assessment, with taxpayers filing their tax returns, and often assessing their own tax, on the basis of their assessment of the facts and interpretation of the law. In recent years, the filing and reporting obligations of taxpayers have been increased substantially, especially with respect to their cross-border assets and activities. Likewise, the French tax authorities have been granted easier access to widened means of information by the legislator in domestic situations and by international instruments in matters containing a foreign element.

Statutes of limitation had been remarkably constant in the past. They have been successively amended to reduce limitation periods for certain taxpayers' claims, and to extend the periods available to the tax authorities for making reassessments or initiating criminal procedures. Currently, the legislator is endeavouring to double the criminal periods of limitation, and no such limitation effectively applies to money laundering of the proceeds of tax fraud.

Statistics published by the French tax authorities in their annual report show that the overall number of tax reviews by the French tax authorities remains stable. A vast majority consists of unilateral reviews by a tax auditor of documents available to the authorities both for individuals (close to 1 million of them in total) and businesses (close to 300,000 of them

---

<sup>1</sup> Philippe Derouin owns his own law firm, Philippe Derouin.

in total). Taxpayers must be informed of the outcome of such reviews and may comment before the tax is assessed. More formal audit procedures are more inquisitive, and involve both a discussion with the taxpayer and counsel and access to an internal review. Their numbers are tending to slowly decline: in 2015, 46,266 audits with accounting checks were carried out with businesses, and 3,902 thorough audits of personal situations took place with individuals.

The amounts of reassessments and penalties increased by almost 11 per cent to €22 billion in 2015, largely but not only because of the voluntary disclosure programme for individuals holding assets abroad. Corporation tax reassessments also went up by 27 per cent to €4.8 billion. The total amount of taxes and penalties assessed in serious frauds (defined as triggering 40 per cent penalties or more after a tax audit) also jumped by 46 per cent to €7.8 billion, although this represents the same 31 per cent proportion of tax and penalties assessed in formal tax audit procedures over preceding years.

The amount and proportion of tax and penalties effectively collected over a period remain at approximately 55 per cent of the assessed amounts. This relatively stable proportion slightly increased in 2015 as a result of the voluntary disclosure programme. A 55 per cent proportion tends to confirm that a substantial amount of the taxes and penalties, of approximately €8 billion in total, assessed after a tax audit are effectively reduced as a result of internal reviews by, or negotiations with, the French tax authorities resulting in pre-litigation settlements; and also in pursuance of court decisions upon disputes.

## II COMMENCING DISPUTES

Although there can be many steps, or administrative decisions, before a tax is assessed, taxpayers are generally barred from initiating any action until a tax is assessed. Only few exceptions enable an actual or potential taxpayer to start an action before a tax deed has been issued.

Taxpayers, and certain taxpayers associations, may file petitions for a judicial review of administrative guidelines that may be declared illegal on any point where they give an interpretation of the tax law that differs from the decision of an administrative judge on the relevant point. Such procedures have been used, successfully at times, to shortcut the lengthy administrative and judicial process of a tax controversy. Some of these petitions may be the basis for the administrative court to refer a preliminary question either to the Constitutional Council on certain matters where a legislative provision is challenged against any fundamental human rights enshrined in the French Constitution, or the European Court of Justice (ECJ) where a question of EU law is involved.

The recent challenge to the 3 per cent corporation tax surcharge on distributed amounts provides such an example where petitions were filed by certain taxpayers and AFEP, the French association of large businesses, before the Council of State in 2016. Both petitioners claimed the administrative guidelines were illegal because they commented upon a piece of legislation that was against the principle of equal rights on certain points and contrary to the EU Parent–Subsidiary Directive on other points. The Council of State decided in June 2016 to refer the equal treatment point to the French Constitutional Council, and the Directive points to the ECJ. The Constitutional Council found the law to be discriminatory and unconstitutional in a ruling of 30 September. The law was amended accordingly by the Finance Act of 29 December 2016, which extended the benefit of an exemption for intragroup dividends to domestic, European and most third-country corporate relationships.

The EU case is pending before the ECJ, which decided that there would be no hearing or advocate general's opinion, presumably because the French case is similar on both points to an earlier Belgian case on the 'fairness tax'.

Other parallel procedures are less radical, and have both narrower scope and lower chances of success.

Petitions for judicial review could also be introduced with respect to individual decisions, such as an unsatisfactory ruling, notified to a taxpayer. Until recently, the French tax courts were excessively restrictive upon the admission of such petitions on the ground that, except in very special circumstances, the decision was not separable from the taxation procedure. A limited progress on the point should come from a December 2016 Council of State decision in the *Export Press* case.

Prior to a tax audit, the tax authorities may apply to a civil judge for a warrant to search premises and attach documents that could be used as evidence that a business is carried out in France and should be taxable in France. Many undisclosed permanent establishments of foreign entities were the purpose of such warrants. As a result of an European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) ruling in *Ravon*, French law was amended to the effect of allowing the potential taxpayer and the tenant of the searched premises to immediately appeal from the warrant to the president of the court of appeals and challenge the basis for the authorities' suspicions. They may also challenge the validity of the search on grounds of breach of confidentiality. Such appeals and challenges are commonly introduced shortly after the searches have been made and before the tax assessments are established. However, such appeals are seldom successful.

More commonly, tax disputes commence when a tax is assessed or paid and the taxpayer either challenges the administrative reassessment or claims for a tax refund.

#### **i Tax claim**

Under French tax procedure, the first step for challenging a tax assessment or for claiming a tax refund is a petition to the head of the relevant tax department whatever tax is involved and even where the tax was assessed according to the taxpayer's return. More than three million are filed each year, mainly with respect to income taxes assessed by the authorities on individuals or local taxes. Businesses file approximately 50,000 such petitions on corporation tax and a few thousand more on VAT.

The petition must be filed, before any referral to any court, to the head of the tax office that has jurisdiction over the relevant tax. It must:

- a* specify the tax that is being challenged;
- b* provide a summary of the facts, pleas and arguments;
- c* be signed by the taxpayer or an authorised agent; and
- d* be accompanied by a copy of the Treasury claim concerned (assessment notice, collection notice or withholding document, in the case of withholding taxes).

Generally, the claim must be filed by 31 December of the second year following that of the assessment, collection notice or payment. An extension applies after a tax audit.

Submitting a claim does not exempt the taxpayer from the obligation to pay the taxes and penalties imposed. However, the taxpayer may request that payment be suspended. Suspension of payment is granted in exchange for the provision of guarantees (e.g., mortgage or pledge up to the amount of the principal taxes; penalties need not to be secured). The suspension remains until a lower court decision on the dispute is issued.

If the lower court rules in favour of the tax authorities, the suspended tax and penalties become payable, and the taxpayer would be liable to pay a 5 or 10 per cent surcharge plus interest on the arrears at a rate of 0.4 per cent per month. Conversely, if the court finds for the taxpayer who has already paid the taxes claimed, the taxpayer is entitled to interest on arrears of 0.4 per cent per month or 4.8 per cent per annum. Considering the prevailing market rates, it is financially advantageous for taxpayers to pay and not to apply for suspension.

The authorities must reply to a claim within six months. Failing a reply within this time, the authorities are deemed to have implicitly rejected it.

If the claim is totally or partially rejected, in writing or implicitly, the taxpayer is entitled to bring an action before the administrative or civil courts, depending on the case.

### III THE COURTS AND TRIBUNALS

Where the taxpayer is not satisfied by a decision, the dispute may be brought before the courts. There are no special tax courts in France, and tax cases are heard by the common administrative, civil or criminal courts, depending upon the tax that is challenged or the penalty applied.

#### i Types of court

Administrative courts have jurisdiction over income tax, corporation tax, VAT and local taxes, and over the related tax penalties. Each year, approximately 18,000 tax cases are introduced in the lower administrative courts. In 2015, 3915 appeals were recorded with administrative courts of appeals, and 354 further appeals were lodged with the Council of State, the supreme administrative court. Overall, the administrative courts decided partly or totally in favour of the taxpayers in approximately 12.4 per cent of the cases (13.6 per cent on VAT matters, and 14.8 per cent on income and corporation tax matters) in 2015.

Civil courts have jurisdiction over stamp duties, gift and inheritance taxes, annual wealth taxes and some excise duties, together with the related tax penalties. In 2015, 751 cases were filed with the lower civil courts, 256 with the courts of appeals and 53 with the Court of Cassation, the supreme court of the judiciary. Civil courts decided in favour of the taxpayers in approximately 33 per cent of the cases.

Criminal prosecutions may be initiated at the request of the tax authorities on any matter of tax fraud, which is widely defined, whatever the tax involved. Approximately 1,000 such procedures are held each year. The criminal procedure for money laundering of the proceeds of tax fraud or for tax swindles (in VAT and other tax credit cases) may be initiated by the public prosecutor without request from the tax authorities. Criminal sanctions such as fines and imprisonment may be applied on top of the tax penalties.

Each type of court comprises three levels: the first level consists of the administrative courts and the courts of first instance; the second level consists of the courts of appeal and the administrative appeal courts; and the highest level consists of the Court of Cassation and the Council of State, which generally rule only on points of law and not fact.

Each court may, and in certain situations must, refer certain questions either to the Constitutional Council or the ECJ. The Constitutional Council has exclusive jurisdiction to decide upon the conformity of French legislative provisions with the human rights protected by the Constitution, including the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 1789. Several dozens of tax provisions have been reviewed accordingly upon the request of taxpayers. Referrals to the ECJ are commonly ordered by the Council of State or the Court



of Cassation, including for tax matters. Lower courts are much more restrictive or reluctant to do so, and some, like the administrative courts of Paris, have never referred a tax case to the ECJ.

## ii Proceedings

Before French courts, and particularly in relation to tax matters, the procedure is conducted primarily in writing, and results in an exchange of briefs and pieces of evidence between the taxpayer and the authorities.

The taxpayer must petition the court within a prescribed time following the formal rejection of its claim by the tax director. The time limit is generally two months. The petition must be reasoned and attach the tax deed, plus any piece of evidence the taxpayer would rely on, even where previously submitted to the tax authorities, since these are not expected to forward any of these to the court.

The assistance of a registered attorney is not legally required in the first instance. Before the appellate courts, representation by a registered lawyer is mandatory. Before the Council of State and Court of Cassation, the taxpayer must be represented by one of the 60 barristers admitted to represent clients before these supreme courts. This restriction does not apply before the Constitutional Council or the ECJ, where any registered lawyer may assist the parties, and the government is generally represented by its own agents.

No more than two briefs are commonly exchanged by each party, but this is not a hard rule. Following these exchanges, the court may, and often does, pronounce the closure of the period for submissions (also named ‘instruction’) and schedules a date for the hearing.

Administrative and civil courts conduct hearings differently and have different views of their own missions. Civil courts recognise taxpayers’ right to a fair trial before them, in line with Article 6 of the European Convention of Human Rights.<sup>2</sup> Administrative courts have taken the opposite view on the grounds that Article 6 applies only to civil obligations and criminal charges, and would not apply to tax matters except where the tax penalties are equivalent to a criminal sanction. This position was not altered after the European Charter of Fundamental Rights, which does not distinguish between these positions, obtained treaty force in December 2009.

In practical terms, these differing views entail certain consequences, the most important of which are that the administrative courts consider that it is part of their mission to challenge the petition of the taxpayer, including on points of law and points of fact that are not discussed by the French tax authorities; and that in doing so, they are not raising a plea of their own motion, and accordingly can forgo from informing the parties (i.e., the taxpayer) and inviting them to submit their comments.<sup>3</sup>

Before both types of courts, a reporting judge summarises the case at a hearing. Witnesses and experts are not heard. Both parties are entitled to present oral arguments and plead their case (however briefly).

Before the administrative courts, a public reporter, who is a member of the court that does not participate in the decision-making, delivers an opinion that is based upon a draft judgment, and may raise issues that were not addressed by the parties. At this point, the parties are informed of such issues. They may then make very brief observations and,

---

2 C cass; Ass plén 14 June 1996 *Kloeckner*, bull civ AP No. 5.

3 Council of State 2 June 2010 No. 318014 *Fondation de France*.

where appropriate, file a 'post-hearing brief' to clarify any points that have been raised, or overlooked, by the public reporter. The court must consider this post-hearing brief and decide whether it reopens the case before reaching a decision.

### iii Effectiveness of the system

The costs of such procedures are fairly limited and are not an obstacle for taxpayers to put their case. However, the length of the proceedings is a weakness that may dissuade taxpayers from initiating them. One reason is that the tax authorities often take a long time to reply to briefs filed by taxpayers, and taxpayers do not really have any way to compel the administration to issue a response.

It is not uncommon for the administrative courts of first instance to take up to three years to rule on a matter brought before them. Regarding appeals, it can take up to 10 years to resolve a tax dispute, which penalises the taxpayer more than the tax administration.

A taxpayer who has been unsuccessful before the national courts may apply to the ECHR where fundamental rights are at stake. However, this is extremely rare, even though, in certain cases, the judgments delivered by the ECHR have had a real impact on French tax procedures.<sup>4</sup>

## IV PENALTIES AND REMEDIES

### i Tax penalties

#### *Default interest*

Tax increases set by the tax offices are systematically increased through default interest of 0.4 per cent each month (4.8 per cent per annum). This default interest is not considered a penalty as such, but rather as fair compensation for the damage incurred by the Treasury owing to late payment of taxes by the taxpayer.

Since the default interest is not considered a penalty, it is applied automatically and does not have to be justified.

In practice, and for the same reason, it has become very difficult to obtain a total or partial exemption from default interest even when taxpayers act in good faith.

#### *Surcharges*

Assessments for back taxes are often accompanied by surcharges, the rate of which varies depending on the circumstances of the case and on whether the taxpayer is deemed to have acted in good faith.

A 10 per cent surcharge applies in cases of delay by the taxpayer in satisfying his or her declaratory obligations, plus default interest. A 40 per cent surcharge applies to unpaid taxes where the authorities consider that the taxpayer's failure to pay was deliberate. This surcharge is raised to 80 per cent in the event of fraud and 'abuse of the law'. The deliberate nature of offences (*mens rea*) must be demonstrated by the tax authorities, who apply the above

---

<sup>4</sup> See in particular ECHR, 21 February 2008 No. 18497/03 (*Ravon*) in connection with house searches, and ECHR 30 June 2011 No. 8916/05 (*Jehovah's Witnesses*) in connection with the retroactivity of tax measures.

penalties in approximately 30 per cent of reassessments following full audits, and who bear the onus of proof in the case of a challenge before the tax courts. Tax penalties may be, and often are, mitigated by the tax authorities to reach out-of-court settlements.

## ii Criminal penalties

On top of tax surcharges, criminal penalties may apply in a wide range of situations.

Legal and natural persons may be found guilty of tax evasion where they fraudulently evaded or tried to fraudulently evade the assessment or collection of tax.

Criminal penalties for 'ordinary' tax evasion include a fine of €500,000 and a prison sentence of up to five years. The fine is increased to €750,000 if the evasion was carried out or facilitated by means of purchases or sales without invoices, or where invoices do not relate to real transactions.

'Aggravated' tax evasion may be subject to a €2 million fine or seven years' imprisonment in situations where it was carried out or facilitated by using foreign bank accounts or entities such as trusts located in third countries, false identities or any false documents, fictional or artificial acts or entities, or abusive tax residence in another state. The same penalties would be applicable in cases of tax fraud carried out in organised groups. Any accessory to such offences may be charged with the same penalties.

The Constitutional Court found the French system to be compatible with the '*non bis in idem*' principle on the basis that criminal prosecutions are dedicated to the most serious offences, which may be selected by the tax authorities upon a favourable opinion from the Tax Offence Commission. As previously mentioned, the tax authorities file around 1,000 tax evasion complaints each year.

The statute of limitations applicable to the offence of tax evasion has been extended from three to six years by the Tax Fraud Act, which also introduced a 'repentance provision' according to which the offender may benefit from a reduction of a prison term on the condition that he or she helps the tax authorities to identify his or her accomplices.

## V TAX CLAIMS

### i Recovering overpaid tax

Taxpayers who believe they have paid too much tax and wish to claim it back must follow a procedure similar to that for challenging a tax reassessment. The procedure applies to a taxpayer residing abroad who has incurred French withholding tax at the statutory rate, and who wishes to invoke a bilateral tax treaty to benefit from a reduced rate of withholding tax and to claim back the excess tax paid. Both the non-resident taxpayer and the paying agent may lodge a claim with the relevant office (in this example, the tax office for non-residents) within the legal time limit. If the claim is implicitly or explicitly rejected, the taxpayer or the withholding agent may bring the case to the competent courts.

In the particular case where it is claimed the tax in question breaches EU law, taxpayers are entitled to demand an exemption from or a reduction of the taxes and the repayment of

any excess based on the fact that the texts applied are contrary to EU law; and compensation for the damage incurred. The amount of tax repayment, plus interest, is assessed each year in the Finance Bill. Currently it stands at approximately €21 billion.<sup>5</sup>

The remedy follows the tax claim procedure described above, particularly as regards the time in which to file an action.

## ii Challenging administrative decisions

Taxpayers and certain other persons may ask an administrative judge to review certain administrative decisions that they deem illegal within the framework of an abuse of power contest.

When examining an abuse of power contest against an administrative act upon which a tax is based, the administrative judge who finds the act to be illegal may declare it null, but may not decide upon the corresponding tax charges.

## iii Claimants

Tax claims may be brought only by the taxpayer, or the withholding agent in the case of withholding taxes. Group actions are not allowed in tax disputes.

## VI COSTS

Costs are limited to counsel and other fees, as the French administration of justice is free of charge.

Within the framework of court action, the losing party may be ordered to pay the successful party a sum intended to cover 'irrecoverable' costs.

A taxpayer whose action was unsuccessful may be ordered to compensate the Treasury for its legal costs.

Regardless of which party brings the action, incurred costs are almost never refunded in full. Compensation seldom exceeds a few thousand euros.

## VII ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Strictly speaking, in France there are no alternatives to the dispute resolution procedures described in this chapter.

However, at any time during the procedure, and even when the dispute is before the courts, the taxpayer can reach a settlement with the tax authorities to end the dispute.

In the context of such settlements, the parties generally agree on a tax base. Quite often, the authorities grant a partial or total exemption from penalties. No settlement may be found when the Revenue contemplates filing a criminal complaint or when the taxpayer has tried to delay the procedure in bad faith.

In this respect, it was recently observed that the tax authorities tended to 'inflate' the amount of the penalties in the adjustment notices sent to taxpayers to retain some room for negotiation in the event of a settlement.

---

5 National Assembly, Report on Finance Bill 2017, No. 4125, annex 41, by Dominique Lefevre.

## VIII ANTI-AVOIDANCE

French law contains both general anti-avoidance rules, namely ‘*abus de droit*’ (or abuse of the law) and ‘act of mismanagement’ theories, and specific anti-avoidance rules.

Special administrative procedural rules apply to ‘*abus de droit*’. Article L64 of the tax procedure code (LPF) provides that the tax authorities are entitled to reject as inapplicable to them acts that constitute fraud, and to restore the true character thereof where those acts either are shams that are fictitious (‘fictitiousness’ theory) or that comply with the letter of the law but are contrary to the purpose of its authors and inspired by no other reason than to elude or reduce the tax burden (‘fraudulent evasion’ theory). A special 80 per cent surcharge applies to abuse of law where the taxpayer was the principal instigator or principal beneficiary of such a scheme. A surcharge of 40 per cent will be applied otherwise.

Where the tax authorities consider that there is an abuse of law, the taxpayer may refer the matter to the Abuse of Law Committee and present its observations in a written statement. It is then summoned to a Committee session to present its oral observations and answer the questions of Committee members. Prior to the meeting, and in the absence of the taxpayer or its counsel, the Committee members hear a reporter, generally appointed from the French tax authorities.

## IX DOUBLE TAXATION TREATIES

France has one of the largest networks of international tax treaties. Currently, it has concluded 126 treaties for the avoidance of double taxation.<sup>6</sup>

Most of these treaties conform to the OECD or UN models, and when interpreting them the courts pay close attention to the OECD Comments. Recent controversial decisions have held that tax-exempt parties are not regarded as residents of the other contracting state and must be denied treaty benefits. This applies to both offshore activities<sup>7</sup> and pension funds.<sup>8</sup>

France recently concluded 25 treaties in conformity with Article 26 of the OECD Model Convention, the purpose of which is limited to the exchange of information.

On the other hand, certain foreign states or territories have not concluded any agreement with France for the exchange of fiscal information. Under French domestic law, they are regarded as ‘non-cooperative’ and are the subject of specific tax provisions (e.g., an increase in the withholding tax on income paid to companies that are established in such states). The short list of these states and territories is updated annually.<sup>9</sup> Pursuant to Constitutional Council decisions, the presumption of tax avoidance attached to transactions with such territories may be rebutted.

6 bofip.impots.gouv.fr, BOI-ANX-000306.

7 Council of State, 20 May 2016, No. 389994 *Easy Vista*; and Administrative Court of Appeal of Versailles, 29 November 2016, No. 16VE01537.

8 Council of State, 9 November 2015, No. 371132 *Santander pensiones*; and Administrative Court of Appeal of Versailles, 29 November 2016, No. 14VE01266.

9 Currently, an order of 8 April 2016.

## **X AREAS OF FOCUS**

To defend their rights, taxpayers can of course rely on the law, as voted by Parliament, as well as regulatory measures taken by the government that are codified in the General Tax Code and the LPF. Moreover, the administration's own doctrine, consisting of its guidelines, instructions, ministerial replies to questions from members of Parliament or the administrative decisions on questions put to it by taxpayers (rulings), may be invoked by taxpayers in the same situation, and are binding both for the tax authorities and the tax courts.<sup>10</sup>

## **XI OUTLOOK AND CONCLUSIONS**

French authorities regularly emphasise the need to combat fraud and tax avoidance, especially in cross-border contexts.

Proposals regularly submitted to Parliament aim at reinforcing the means available to the authorities and increase the obligations placed on taxpayers, as well as impose tougher penalties for breaches. More often than not, these specific measures need to be, and effectively are, checked by the fundamental rights protected by the Constitution and international instruments.

---

10 Article L80A of the LPF.

## Appendix 1

---

# ABOUT THE AUTHORS

### **PHILIPPE DEROUIN**

*Philippe Derouin*

Philippe Derouin is a member of the Paris Bar and the current chair of the French branch of the International Fiscal Association. Before running his own firm, he had been a partner with major international law firms, namely Gide Loyrette Nouel, Linklaters LLP and Skadden Arps Slate Meagher and Flom LLP.

### **PHILIPPE DEROUIN**

140, rue du Faubourg Saint Honoré

75008 Paris

France

Tel: +33 1 42 25 88 91

Fax: +33 1 42 25 88 44

[philippe.derouin@cabinet-derouin.com](mailto:philippe.derouin@cabinet-derouin.com)

[www.philippe-derouin.com](http://www.philippe-derouin.com)