


ATOZ REPORTS

EXTENDED ANALYSIS ON CURRENT TAX TOPICS - FEBRUARY 2023



Luxembourg Tribunal Classified an Interest-free Loan as a (Hidden) Capital Contribution: What Went Wrong?

By Oliver R. HOOR

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



OLIVER R. HOOR

Tax Partner
Head of Transfer Pricing &
the German Desk

ATOZ Tax Advisers (Taxand Luxembourg)

+352 26 940 646
+352 661 830 600
oliver.hoor@atoz.lu

With thanks to Samantha Schmitz for her assistance in relation to the review of this article.



SAMANTHA SCHMITZ

Of Counsel

CONTENTS

01. INTRODUCTION	5
02. FACT PATTERN OF THE CASE	5
03. DECISION OF THE TRIBUNAL	7
3.1. Opening comments	7
3.2. Features of the IFL that have been considered by the tribunal	7
3.3. Assessment by the tribunal	8
04. CLASSIFICATION OF FINANCING INSTRUMENTS	9
4.1. Opening comments	9
4.2. Step 1: Key features to be considered	9
<i>4.2.1. Civil law qualification and accounting treatment</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>4.2.2. Maturity</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>4.2.3. Remuneration of the financing instrument</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>4.2.4. Participation in liquidation proceeds and latent capital gains</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>4.2.5. Loss participation</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>4.2.6. Conversion feature</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>4.2.7. Label of the financing instrument</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>4.2.8. Political and voting rights</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>4.2.9. Modalities of the yield payment</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>4.2.10. Ability to accelerate (call) the instrument</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>4.2.11. Event of default clause</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>4.2.12. Ranking</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>4.2.13. Transfer rights</i>	<i>12</i>
4.3. Step 2: Assessment	12
4.4. Application to the case at hand	13
05. HIDDEN CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS	14
5.1. Opening comments	14
5.2. Characteristics of hidden capital contributions	14

CONTENTS

<i>5.2.1. General</i>	14
<i>5.2.2. The object of a hidden capital contribution</i>	14
<i>5.2.3. Motivation by the shareholding relationship</i>	15
<i>5.2.4. Absence of compensation</i>	15
5.3. Tax treatment of hidden capital contributions	15
5.4. Application to the case at hand	16
06. HIDDEN CAPITAL	16
6.1. Opening comments	16
6.2. The concept of hidden capital and related tax treatment	16
6.3. Application to the case at hand	17
07. TAX ADJUSTMENTS UNDER ARTICLE 56 OF THE LITL	17
7.1. Opening comments	17
7.2. Scope of article 56 of the LITL	17
7.3. Tax adjustments under article 56 of the LITL	18
7.4. Application to the case at hand	18
08. CONCLUSION	19

01 INTRODUCTION

On 23 September 2022, the Luxembourg Administrative Tribunal (*Tribunal Administratif*, the “Tribunal”, which is the first instance jurisdiction) held its decision (the “Decision”) in a case that concerns an interest-free loan (“IFL”) which has been granted by a Luxembourg company to its wholly owned Luxembourg subsidiary.¹

The IFL has been treated as a debt instrument by the borrower and the lender that, respectively, performed a downward adjustment (i.e. deemed interest expenses) and an upward adjustment (i.e. deemed interest income) in their corporate tax returns in order to reflect arm’s length conditions.

The Luxembourg tax authorities (“LTA”) challenged this approach and considered that the IFL represented a hidden capital contribution and declined the tax adjustment (notional interest deduction) performed by the Luxembourg subsidiary (the taxpayer in the case at hand). The Tribunal confirmed the position of the LTA and rejected the complaint of the taxpayer.

At the time this article is drafted, an appeal against the decision has been filed with the Luxembourg Administrative Court (*Cour Administrative, which is the second instance jurisdiction*). As IFLs are a wide-spread phenomenon in Luxembourg, this case is of paramount importance. However, were the LTA and the Tribunal right when concluding that the IFL was a (hidden) capital contribution? This question will be analysed in detail in this article.


02 FACT PATTERN OF THE CASE

The case involved a company resident in the Cayman Islands (“CayCo”) that invested, as from 2016, via a Luxembourg investment platform into (distressed) debt owed by third parties. Such debt instruments are commonly acquired at a price below nominal.

CayCo financed its Luxembourg subsidiary (“LuxParentCo”) by a mixture of equity and a profit-participating loan (“PPL”). LuxParentCo used the funds received to finance its Luxembourg subsidiary (“LuxSubsidiary”, the taxpayer) by a mixture of equity and (mainly) an IFL. In the Decision, it is stated that the IFL-to-Equity ratio was approximately 90:10 in 2016. LuxSubsidiary invested the funds received from LuxParentCo mainly into distressed debt instruments.

¹ Administrative Tribunal, Decision No. 44902 of 23 September 2022.

The following chart depicts the investment structure:



The IFL granted by LuxParentCo to LuxSubsidiary was formalised on 19 December 2016, whereas the funds had already been transferred on 29 April 2016. This belated formalisation of the IFL has been explained by the LuxSubsidiary with the speed and attention required to make the underlying investments. It has further been brought forward by LuxSubsidiary that the loan has been concluded between related parties so that there was no reason not to trust each other.

As from fiscal year 2017, LuxParentCo and LuxSubsidiary formed a fiscal unity (Article 164bis of the Luxembourg Income Tax Law, "LITL"). LuxParentCo and LuxSubsidiary filed a request for the application of the fiscal unity regime on 11 May 2017 which was confirmed by the LTA on 2 June 2017.

Apparently, LuxParentCo and LuxSubsidiary intended to apply the fiscal unity regime already as from fiscal year 2016 (i.e. the year in which both companies have been incorporated). This has been mentioned in the financial statements of LuxSubsidiary that expressly stated that the company was part of a fiscal unity with its sole shareholder. As such, it has been assumed by the Tribunal that the two companies omitted to file a request for the application of the fiscal unity regime in 2016.

LuxParentCo and LuxSubsidiary are Luxembourg companies that are subject to corporate income tax ("CIT") and municipal business tax ("MBT") at an aggregate rate of 24.94% (in Luxembourg City). In addition, both companies are subject to net wealth tax ("NWT") at an annual rate of 0.5% applied on the companies' unitary value (that is an adjusted net asset value). Given that the fiscal unity regime only applied as from 2017, both companies have been taxed on a standalone basis in 2016.

In 2016, LuxSubsidiary realised a gain in relation to its distressed debt portfolio which was subject to CIT and MBT. In its 2016 corporate tax return, LuxSubsidiary further performed a downward adjustment in relation to the IFL in order to account for deemed interest expenses that would have been due at arm's length. The downward adjustment has been made in accordance with Article 56 of the LITL.

The investments of LuxSubsidiary should be taxable assets for NWT purposes, whereas the IFL should be a deductible liability that reduces the company's unitary value if the IFL is classified as a debt instrument for tax purposes.

There are no indications that LuxParentCo realised any taxable income in 2016. However, LuxParentCo recognised deemed interest income in its corporate tax return (corresponding to the amount of the deemed interest expenses reflected in the 2016 corporate tax return of LuxSubsidiary). The upward adjustment was performed in accordance with Article 56 of the LITL.

As from 2017, LuxParentCo and LuxSubsidiary formed a fiscal unity. Accordingly, the taxable income of both companies was aggregated at the level of LuxParentCo that reported the consolidated taxable income in its corporate tax return. In 2017, no tax adjustments (upward or downward adjustment) have been made in respect of the IFL. The absence of tax adjustments in the 2017 corporate tax returns has been viewed by the LTA as an implicit acknowledgement that the IFL is not a debt instrument but a hidden capital contribution.

While the LTA may, for consistency purposes, require the same tax adjustments being made in the fiscal year 2017 (onwards), the deemed interest income and expenses would fully offset each other in the tax base of the fiscal unity. Thus, the recognition of deemed interest income and expenses would be merely a theoretical exercise without any practical implications in terms of tax liabilities. Therefore, the LTA should not attribute too much importance to the approach taken by the taxpayers as from 2017; it is no indication for the classification of the IFL by the taxpayers.

03 DECISION OF THE TRIBUNAL

3.1. Opening comments

The Tribunal had to decide whether the IFL granted by LuxParentCo to LuxSubsidiary should be classified as a debt instrument or as equity (the latter being the position of the LTA). Furthermore, should the IFL be classified as a debt instrument, the Tribunal would have to analyse whether the transfer pricing adjustment was consistent with the arm's length principle.

The Tribunal correctly proceeded on the assumption that the classification of a financing instrument must follow the economic approach ("*wirtschaftliche Betrachtungsweise*") which requires that for tax purposes the economic reality prevails over the legal form (also referred to as "substance over form" principle).

If the IFL is viewed as a debt instrument, transfer pricing adjustments might be required under Article 56 of the LITL. Conversely, the IFL might be reclassified into equity in accordance with the concept of hidden capital contribution ("*apport caché*", "*verdeckte Einlage*") or the concept of hidden capital ("*capital caché*", "*verdecktes Stammkapital*").

A hidden capital contribution refers to a contribution in cash or in kind made by a shareholder to a company without any change in the subscribed and paid-up share capital. The concept of hidden capital refers to a situation where a shareholder has directly or indirectly granted a loan to a company, whereas an independent creditor, acting in accordance with market practice, would not have granted such a loan.

3.2. Features of the IFL that have been considered by the Tribunal

For the classification of the IFL as either debt or equity, the Tribunal considered the following features of the IFL agreement:

- Limited recourse clause

The IFL agreement provides for a limited recourse clause according to which the borrower (here, LuxSubsidiary) would be required to repay the loan only to the extent that the investments held by (and/or the income received by the borrower with respect to those investments) are sufficient to enable the borrower to make the relevant payment.

A limited recourse clause was a common feature of debt instruments at that time (in the context of financing debt instruments) and an explicit requirement under the former transfer pricing regime applicable to Luxembourg finance companies until the end of 2016. While LuxSubsidiary did technically not fall within the scope of the Luxembourg transfer pricing circular (as the company acquired debt

instruments owed by third parties and not by related parties), the same remuneration model may be considered in case of third-party debt funding.²

As such, it would be wrong to attach too much importance to a feature that was common (and even required) at the time the IFL has been granted. Moreover, the IFL must be repaid if LuxSubsidiary's assets allow the company to do so. While the Tribunal emphasises that the IFL does not provide for additional guarantees, LuxSubsidiary is a private limited company that has a limited liability towards its creditors (as such, the limited recourse clause does not change much from an economic perspective).

- Contribution of the IFL

The IFL provides that the lender (here, LuxParentCo) may decide at any time that the IFL may be contributed, in full or in part, to the borrower against the issuance of shares in accordance with a ratio of one share of EUR 1 in exchange for any portion of the loan (which outstanding amount is equal to such a par value).

While the IFL provides for an explicit clause that allows for the contribution of the IFL in exchange for shares, the IFL could in any case be contributed to the (share) capital of LuxSubsidiary without any limitation.

- Interest

The IFL does not bear any interest.

- Transfer of funds and formalisation of the IFL

While the loan has been made available to the borrower as from 29 April 2016, the related contract was formalised only on 19 December 2016.

3.3. Assessment by the Tribunal

Considering the features of the IFL and the timing of its formalisation, the Tribunal concluded that the IFL can only represent capital (through the classification of the IFL as a hidden capital contribution) and is not a debt instrument.

The Tribunal presumed that the intention of LuxParentCo was to finance LuxSubsidiary with equity rather than to act as a lender (realising interest income and recovering the principal amount of the loan within a reasonable period of time).

On this basis, the Tribunal assessed that the IFL constitutes a disguised shareholding in the form of a loan and that the normal method of financing, dictated by genuine economic or legal considerations, would have been a capital increase.

It follows from the reclassification of the IFL into capital that the Tribunal rejected the recognition and deduction of deemed interest expenses (at the level of LuxSubsidiary) and deemed interest income (at the level of LuxParentCo).

While the decision also includes some information on the transfer pricing approach that has been adopted regarding the determination of an arm's length remuneration on the IFL (which was detailed in the transfer pricing documentation filed by the taxpayer together with its tax return), the Tribunal did not take a decision in this respect as this was considered superfluous given the equity classification of the IFL.

According to the Tribunal, a loan granted by a shareholder to a corporation is to be recharacterized as a hidden capital contribution if the normal way of financing, dictated by serious economic or legal considerations, would have been an increase in capital and it is clear from the circumstances that the form of the loan may have been chosen only for tax reasons.

However, taxpayers are free to structure their affairs in the way that is most tax efficient unless a specific anti-abuse rule applies, or an arrangement represents an abuse of law that can be tackled under the general anti-abuse rule³ (GAAR).

² The scope of Circular °164/2 of 26 January 2011 (the "Circular") encompassed debt funding of related parties that is funded by debt, be it intra-group or third-party debt. As LuxSubsidiary invested into third-party distressed debt instruments, LuxSubsidiary did not perform financing activities within the meaning of the Circular.

³ Section 6 of the Steueranpassungsgesetz.

04 CLASSIFICATION OF FINANCING INSTRUMENTS

4.1. Opening comments

Luxembourg tax law does not provide for any specific rules for the classification of financing instruments as either equity or debt. Therefore, this determination must be based on general Luxembourg tax principles.

The preparatory note of the LITL of 4 December 1967 related to Article 114 (now Article 97 of the LITL) on income from capital states that the “substance over form” principle and the economic approach (i.e. “*wirtschaftliche Betrachtungsweise*”) applies when characterising a financial instrument and the nature of income derived therefrom.

On this basis, it is necessary to analyse all relevant features of a financing instrument to determine the overall character of the instrument as either debt or equity.

4.2. Step 1: Key features to be considered

The following features should be considered when analysing financing instruments:

4.2.1. Civil law qualification and accounting treatment

The analysis of financing instruments should generally begin with a classification under Luxembourg Civil Law.⁴ This classification should generally be followed under Luxembourg General Accepted Accounting Principles (“GAAP”).

Moreover, the tax treatment generally follows the accounting treatment⁵, unless there are specific rules or concepts that require a different treatment for tax purposes (here, this could be the economic approach and the substance over form principle).

A loan is defined as a contract whereby one party delivers to the other party either an asset which the recipient can use with the obligation to return it after use⁶ or a certain amount of fungible goods with the obligation to return the same amount or number of goods of an equal type and quality.⁷

A company contract is defined as a contract by virtue of which two or more persons (except for a “single shareholder private company”) agree to contribute funds or assets with a view to sharing the profits (and losses) that may arise therefrom.

The main (cumulative) criteria to decide whether an instrument should be classified as debt or equity from a legal perspective include:

Debt obligation

- The holder is entitled to the return of its investment after a predetermined period;
- The loan carries a predetermined fixed return, which is not linked to the company’s result;
- In the event of the debtor’s liquidation or bankruptcy, the investor ranks above the shareholders, i.e. he has the right to be repaid before any funds are made available to them.

Equity

- Equity fully exposes the investor to the risk of the business (no assurance with respect to reimbursement of the original investment or with respect to the return);
- Vests in its holder the right to receive part of the liquidation surplus;
- Provides shareholder rights to the investor (e.g. voting rights, right of supervision, etc).

⁴ Article 1 Commercial Law; Art. 1832 f. Civil Code (“*Contrat de société*”), Articles 1874 and foll. Civil Code (“*Contrat de prêt*”).

⁵ Grundsatz der Maßgeblichkeit, Art. 40 (1) LITL.

⁶ Article 1875 Civil Code – in this definition, the lender remains the owner of the asset.

⁷ Article 1892 Civil Code – in this definition, legal title to the goods is transferred to the borrower – the contract can be interest-bearing.

The legal classification should be analysed based on the essential features of the contract considering the real intention of the parties as opposed to the form or label given by the parties.

4.2.2. Maturity

The maturity of a financing instrument is an important feature. While a right of repayment after a specified period of time is a characteristic of a debt obligation, a permanent commitment of funds is an equity feature.

However, even when a financing instrument has a fixed maturity, the long-term nature of the maturity might, in accordance with the parliamentary documents⁸, point to the classification as an equity instrument.

Based on German case law, a maturity of up to 29 years (i.e. less than 30 years) should be considered as a debt feature, whereas a long-term maturity of 30 years and longer is an indication of an equity instrument.⁹

4.2.3. Remuneration of the financing instrument

The remuneration of the financing instrument is another important characteristic. While a (unlimited) participation in a company's profit would be an equity feature, the mere remuneration with a fixed interest rate would be a clear-cut debt feature.

However, in practice a variety of remuneration models might be agreed upon. For example, the remuneration of a financing instrument may be linked to the income generated by the borrower in relation to a specific asset that is financed by the instrument (asset-linked or income participating instruments). Parties may also agree on a participation in the borrower's profits (which may be capped in one way or another). While income or profit participation tends to be an equity feature, the debt character of the instrument may be reinforced through the inclusion of a (small) fixed interest rate.

When the payment of a fixed interest is limited by the amount of (accounting) profit or income derived from a certain asset, or subject to the condition that the borrower has sufficient cash for the payment of the interest, the remuneration model is still rather a debt feature.

When a financing instrument provides for a zero interest rate, the transaction is not an arm's length transaction and might require tax adjustments.¹⁰ A zero-interest rate is an equity feature.

4.2.4. Participation in liquidation proceeds and latent capital gains

Financing instruments may provide for a participation in the liquidation proceeds of the borrower or latent capital gains inherent in (certain) assets owned by the borrower. The existence of such a clause is a strong equity feature. However, as long as the instrument does not, in addition, provide for a participation in losses incurred by the borrower, the instrument may still qualify as a debt instrument.

4.2.5. Loss participation

Participation in the borrower's (accounting) losses or losses incurred in relation to a specific investment (or activity) is an indication of an equity instrument. Debt instruments generally do not provide for a participation of the lender in the losses incurred by the borrower. However, this is not an absolute criterion and in specific cases, parties may agree on loss participation without jeopardizing the debt classification of the financing instrument.

4.2.6. Conversion feature

Financing instruments may also include a conversion feature that provides for the possibility to convert the instrument into shares of the borrower. When the conversion can be requested by the borrower (instead of a repayment of the principal amount), this is a strong equity feature.

⁸ Projet de loi concernant l'impôt sur le revenu, doc. parl. 571⁴,

⁹ Some practitioners consider a 50-year (or longer) maturity as being the dividing line for a long-term financing instrument, whereas a maturity of maximum 49 years would be a debt feature.

¹⁰ Tax adjustments may be required in accordance with the concept of hidden dividend distributions (Article 164 (3) of the LITL) or Article 56 of the LITL.

Likewise, a mandatory conversion clause according to which the instrument is automatically converted at a predefined date and rate is an indication of an equity instrument. If the company is liquidated before the conversion date, the instrument may either be repaid at face value or automatically be converted into shares of the borrower. In this regard, an automatic conversion clause would be a much stronger equity feature than a provision that (at least optionally) provides for a repayment at face value.

When the financing instrument may be converted upon request of the investor, this would be rather a debt feature, in particular when the instrument provides for an alternative redemption at market value.

4.2.7. Label of the financing instrument

The label of the financing instrument generally provides a first indication as to whether a financing instrument should be classified as equity or debt.

However, as the label of the financing instrument is not necessarily consistent with the other characteristics of the instrument, this feature is ancillary to other features that are more significant in the analysis.

4.2.8. Political and voting rights

A shareholder may generally participate in the life of the company and may vote in the general meetings as well as all extraordinary shareholder' meetings. The shareholder further has voting rights and the right to be kept informed of major developments that may have an impact on the company's situation.

However, as companies may also issue non-voting shares, voting rights are not a strong equity feature. Rather, this feature is an equity indication that together with other criteria may result in an equity classification.

4.2.9. Modalities of the yield payment

When the payment of the remuneration due under a financing instrument is at the discretion of the board of directors under a procedure similar to dividend distributions, this is an indication of an equity instrument. Another equity feature would be if the payment of yield depends on the borrower having sufficient reserves or retained earnings available.

In contrast, when the payment is not subject to any procedure or condition, this would be a characteristic of a debt feature.

4.2.10. Ability to accelerate (call) the instrument

Where early repayment or redemption is possible, this would be a debt feature. Conversely, the absence of an early repayment or redemption clause is an equity indication.

The party that may request early repayment or redemption will also be an indicator. In case the repayment or redemption can be requested by the investor, this would be an indication of a debt instrument. In contrast, if early repayment or redemption can be requested by the borrower, this would be an equity indication.

4.2.11. Event of default clause

A debt instrument generally includes an "event of default" clause that may provide for an accelerated maturity or increased yield payments if the borrower fails to comply with its obligations under the instrument. In contrast, equity instruments do not include such a clause.

4.2.12. Ranking

One of the factors commonly used to distinguish debt from equity instruments is their relative ranking in the company's capital structure. In case of default, the holder of a debt obligation has the right to be repaid before any funds are made available to shareholders.

However, there may be only a very small gap between the most subordinated debt obligation and equity instruments. As a principle, subordination is an equity feature, whereas the absence of subordination is a strong debt feature.

4.2.13. Transfer rights

Shareholders and bondholders generally have the right to freely transfer their shares or bonds to another party. Hence, a transfer right is neither a clear indication of an equity or a debt instrument.

However, should the instrument provide for a stapling clause according to which the instrument is only assignable together (on a pro-rata basis) with shares of the borrower, this is an indication of an equity instrument.


4.3. Step 2: Assessment

The classification of a financing instrument as either debt or equity follows an in-depth analysis of all relevant characteristics of the financing instrument. There is no single criterion that would be decisive for the assessment. Rather, the assessment is based on the overall character of the financing instrument.

However, not all the characteristics are equally important. Some characteristics are of major importance as they provide clear-cut debt and equity indications, whereas other characteristics may be less relevant as they are less binary. These characteristics may, nonetheless, be useful to inform the analysis.

While in most cases the assessment is straight forward, in some cases, the presence of equity and debt features may make the classification of financing instruments a more intricate exercise. In the latter case, it might be considered by the parties to align some of the features with the desired classification for Luxembourg tax purposes.

The following checklist depicts the features that need to be considered when analysing financing instruments.



4.4. Application to the case at hand

The tax treatment should generally follow the accounting treatment unless a provision of the Luxembourg tax law or a specific tax concept requires a different treatment for tax purposes ("*Massgeblichkeitsprinzip*").¹¹ The classification of the IFL as either debt or equity is no exception to this principle.

Thus, while the classification of the IFL as debt for accounting purposes is the starting point of the tax analysis, the economic approach and the substance over form principle may require a different classification for tax purposes if the overall assessment of all relevant features points to a classification as an equity instrument.

The features of the IFL are summarised in the following table:

Criteria of major importance	Features of the IFL	Indication
Civil law qualification and accounting treatment	The loan has been qualified as debt from a civil law perspective and for accounting purposes	debt
Maturity	The loan has to be repaid, in cash or in kind, after 8 years	debt
Remuneration	The loan was "interest-free"	equity
Participation in liquidation proceeds and latent capital gains	The lender was not entitled to receive any liquidation bonus	debt
Loss participation	The loan provides for a limited recourse clause that may entail a participation in the company's losses	equity
Conversion feature	The loan may be converted into shares upon the option of the lender. The borrower has no option to convert the loan into capital by unilateral decision	rather equity
Label of the financing instrument	The loan has been labelled "interest free loan agreement"	debt
Political and voting rights	The loan does not provide for any voting rights	debt
Modalities of interest payments	n/a	-
Ability to accelerate (call) the instrument	The borrower has a right to make an early repayment.	debt
Event of default	In case of an event of default upon maturity, the interest-free loan would become interest bearing	debt
Ranking	The loan is unsecured but ranks higher than share capital, share premium or other equity contributions	debt
Transfer rights	The loan did not include any "stapling clause" preventing the transfer of the loan independently from the shareholding in LuxSubsidiary	no clear indication

In the present case, there are only three features that are (rather) equity features. On the contrary, the terms and conditions of the IFL provide for several strong debt features such as (i) the (debt) classification from a legal and accounting perspective, (ii) a relatively short maturity, (iii) the absence of a participation in liquidation proceeds and latent capital gains, (iv) the absence of political and voting rights, and (v) the ranking of the IFL above the equity.

While the IFL contains few equity features, an overall assessment of all the relevant features clearly points to a classification as a debt instrument. For the IFL to be classified as an equity instrument, the IFL would need to include additional equity features.

Despite the belated formalisation of the IFL, at the time the funds have been transferred by LuxParentCo to LuxSubsidiary, both companies should recognize, respectively, a receivable (LuxParentCo) and a liability (LuxSubsidiary) in their balance sheets – absent a waiver or an explicit contribution of the receivable by LuxParentCo. Given that the parties did not agree on a remuneration for the granting of funds, the loan was interest-free as from the beginning.

The formalisation of the IFL before the end of the year is the legal manifestation of the intention of the parties. While it would have been better to properly document the IFL alongside the implementation of the investments, it can be assumed that this was a mistake that has only been realised after several months. This is consistent with the statement of the plaintiff that the attention was focused on investing.

¹¹ See Article 40 of the LITL.

05 HIDDEN CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS ("VERDECKTE EINLAGE")

5.1. Opening comments

Contributions to Luxembourg companies may be made either in the form of a regular contribution as provided for in Luxembourg commercial law or in the form of a hidden capital contribution.

While the IFL granted by LuxParentCo to LuxSubsidiary should be classified as a debt instrument, the question arises whether (i) the IFL itself or (ii) the advantage granted through the IFL (i.e. the arm's length interest expenses) might be the object of a hidden capital contribution.

5.2. Characteristics of hidden capital contributions

5.2.1. General

In accordance with relevant case law, hidden capital contributions bear the following characteristics:

- a shareholder or a related party of the shareholder grants an advantage to a company that may be reflected in the balance sheet, i.e. either an increase in assets or a decrease in liabilities (insofar as the shareholder does not receive an arm's length compensation)¹²;
- the advantage is motivated by the shareholding relationship; and
- the contribution is not a regular contribution (pursuant to Luxembourg commercial law).¹³

5.2.2. The object of a hidden capital contribution

5.2.2.1. Liabilities

As a principle, contributions increase the net equity of a company which is reflected in the receiving company's (tax) balance sheet. The object of a hidden capital contribution must, therefore, directly relate to balance sheet items, i.e. an increase in assets or a reduction in liabilities. Accordingly, only advantages that may be contributed within the framework of regular contributions may be classified as hidden capital contributions.¹⁴

An example of a hidden capital contribution that result in a reduction of a company's liabilities is the waiver of a shareholder loan.¹⁵ The waiver of a shareholder receivable generally increases a company's net equity by way of a reduction in liabilities and an increase in accounting profit. Here, the hidden capital contribution should correspond to the valuable part of the receivable which should be excluded from the company's taxable income.¹⁶

¹² BFH, Decision of 9.3.1962, I 203/61 S, BStBl III 1962, p. 338; BFH, Decision of 3.2.1971, I R 51/66, BStBl II 1971, p. 408; BFH, Decision of 29.1.1975, BStBl II 1975, p. 553; BFH, Decision of 24.5.1984, I R 166/78, BStBl II 1984, p. 747; BFH, Decision of 26.10.1987, GrS 2/86, BStBl II 1988, 348; BFH, Decision of 22.11.1983, VIII R 133/82, GmbHR 1984, p. 110; BFH, Decision of 14.3.1989, I R 8/85, BStBl II 1989, p. 633.

¹³ RFH, Decision of 28.7.1936, I A 83/36, I A 83/36, RFHE 39, 303; RFH, Decision of 8.6.1937, I A 378/36, RFHE 41, 274; RFH, Decision of 22.6.1943, I 204/42, RStBl 1943, p. 587; BFH, Decision of 28.2.1956, I 92/54 U, BStBl III 1956, p. 154; BFH, Decision of 3.5.1967, I 263/63, BFHE 88, 425, BStBl III 1967, p. 421; BFH, Decision of 19.2.1970, I R 24/67, BStBl II 1970, 442; BFH, Decision of 3.2.1971, I R 51/66, BStBl II 1971, p. 408; BFH, Decision of 14.8.1974, I R 168/72, BStBl II 1975, p. 123; BFH, Decision of 26.11.1980, I R 52/77, BStBl II 1981, p. 181; BFH, Decision of 9.3.1983, I R 182/78, BFHE 139, 139, BStBl II 1983, p. 744; BFH, Decision of 22.11.1983, GmbHR 1984, p. 110; BFH, Decision of 11.4.1984, I R 175/79, BStBl II 1984, p. 535; BFH, Decision of 14.11.1984, I R 50/80, BStBl II 1985, 227; BFH, Decision of 24.3.1987, I R 202/83, BStBl II 1987, p. 705; BFH, Decision of 26.10.1987, GrS 2/86, BStBl II 1988, p. 348; BFH, Decision of 27.7.1988, I R 147/83, BStBl II 1989, p. 271; BFH, Decision of 21.9.1989, IV R 115/88, BStBl II 1990, 86; BFH, Decision of 28.2.1990, I R 43/86, BStBl II, p. 615; BFH, Decision of 18.12.1990, VIII R 17/85, BStBl II 1991, p. 512; BFH, Decision of 8.5.1991, I B 30/90, BFH/NV 1992, p. 414; see GUY HEINTZ, "L'impôt sur le revenu des collectivités", Etudes Fiscale, Saint-Paul, Luxembourg 1999, p. 30; see JEAN OLINGER, "Le droit fiscal – Introduction à l'étude du droit fiscal luxembourgeois", Etudes Fiscale, Saint-Paul, Luxembourg 1994, p. 20; see JEAN-PIERRE WINANDY, "Fiscalité et comptes annuels des entreprises", Portalis éditions, 2005, p. 215.

¹⁴ See JEAN-PIERRE WINANDY, "Fiscalité et comptes annuels des entreprises", Portalis éditions, 2005, p. 215.

¹⁵ RFH, Decision of 28.7.1936, I A 83/36, RFHE 39, 303; RFH 22.6.1943, I 204/42, RStBl 1943, p. 587; BFH, Decision of 29.5.1968, I 187/65, BFHE 93, 62, BStBl II 1968, p. 722.

¹⁶ BFH, Decision of 29.5.1968, I 187/65, BStBl II 1968, p. 722; BFH, Decision of 9.6.1997, GrS 1/94, BStBl II 1998, p. 307.

It should be highlighted that the mere subordination of a shareholder loan to other liabilities of the company cannot be classified as hidden capital contributions.¹⁷ In this scenario, the company's liabilities remain in the balance sheet and the net equity remains unchanged.

Similarly, the granting of shareholder guarantees relating to the company's liabilities should not be classified as hidden capital contributions.¹⁸ Even when the guarantee is exercised, a hidden capital contribution should not be considered as the shareholder should have a claim towards the company (following the payment). A hidden capital contribution would need to be considered, however, when the shareholder waives its right to receive a refund. In this case, the amount of the company's liabilities is effectively reduced.

5.2.2.2. Services granted without valuable consideration

It is not uncommon for shareholders to grant services to a company for partial or no consideration (*Nutzungseinlagen*).¹⁹ Examples of free services include interest-free loans and royalty-free licenses (here, the advantage corresponds to the arm's length remuneration).

However, such advantages do not qualify as assets and may, therefore, not be reflected in the company's balance sheet. Consequently, only assets – and not their use – may be the object of a contribution although the company's net equity should be “indirectly” increased as a result of reduced business expenses.²⁰

5.2.3. Motivation by the shareholding relationship

The increase of a company's net equity must be “motivated by the shareholding relationship” in order to be considered as a hidden capital contribution.

Thus, a causal link must be established between the shareholding relationship and the increase in the company's net equity with reference to the concept of the prudent business manager (*ein ordentlicher und gewissenhafter Geschäftsleiter*). In essence, if an unrelated party would not have granted the same advantage, the advantage is deemed to be motivated by the shareholder relationship as opposed to the business relationship (this should be determined based on the arm's length standard).²¹

5.2.4. Absence of compensation

A hidden capital contribution only exists to the extent that an advantage is granted by the shareholder to the company without valuable consideration; in particular, no shares must be issued to the shareholder.²² The hidden capital contribution should correspond to the fair market value of the advantage shifted by the shareholder to the company.²³

5.3. Tax treatment of hidden capital contributions

Hidden capital contributions may require complex tax adjustments at the level of the company and the shareholder that need to be analysed on a case-by-case basis.

At the level of the company, hidden capital contributions are often treated as income in the company's accounting profit and loss account (Luxembourg GAAP). An increase in the accounting profit that is related to hidden capital contributions must, however, be excluded from

¹⁷ BFH, Decision of 30.3.1993, BStBl II 1993, p. 502; see MARX (Verdeckte Einlagen 1995), p. 457.

¹⁸ BFH, Decision of 2.10.1984, VIII R 36/83, BStBl II 1985, p. 320; BFH, Decision of 16.4.1991, VIII R 100/87, BStBl II 1992, p. 234; BFH, Decision of 9.6.1997, GrS 1/94, BFHE 183, 187, BStBl II 1998, p. 307; BFH, Decision of 12.12.2000, VIII R 36/97 (NV).

¹⁹ Typical examples include the granting of interest-free loans and letting of real estate without charging an arm's length rent.

²⁰ BFH, Decision of 9.3.1962, I 203/61 S, BStBl III 1962, p. 338; BFH, Decision of 16.5.1963, IV 379/60 U, BStBl III 1963, p. 400; BFH, Decision of 3.2.1971, I R 51/66, BStBl II 1971, p. 408; BFH, Decision of 29.1.1975, I R 135/70, BStBl II 1975, p. 553; BFH, Decision of 28.1.1981, I R 10/77, BStBl II 1981, p. 612; BFH, Decision of 19.5.1982, I R 102/79, BStBl II 1982, p. 631; BFH, Decision of 22.11.1983, VIII R 133/82, GmbHR 1984, p. 110; BFH, Decision of 24.5.1984, I R 166/78, BStBl II 1984, p. 747; BFH, Decision of 26.10.1987, GrS 2/86, BStBl II 1988, p. 348; BFH, Decision of 14.3.1989, I R 8/85, BStBl II 1989, p. 633.

²¹ RFH, Decision of 27.3.1928, I A 470, StW 1928, No. 417; RFH, Decision of 28.7.1936, I A 83/36, I A 83/36, RFHE 39, 303; RFH, Decision of 8.6.1937, I A 378/36, RFHE 41, 274; RFH, Decision of 22.6.1943, I 204/42, RStBl 1943, p. 587; BFH, Decision of 29.5.1968, I 187/65, BStBl III 1968, p. 722; BFH, Decision of 19.2.1970, I R 24/67, BStBl II 1970, 442; BFH, Decision of 14.8.1974, I R 168/72, BStBl II 1975, p. 123; BFH, Decision of 9.3.1983, I R 182/78, BFHE 139, 139, BStBl II 1983, p. 744; BFH, Decision of 14.11.1984, I R 50/80, BStBl II 1985, p. 227; BFH, Decision of 21.9.1989, IV R 115/88, BStBl II 1990, 86; BFH, Decision of 8.5.1991, I B 30/90 BFH/NV 1992, p. 414.

²² BFH, Decision of 28.2.1956, I 92/54 U, BStBl III 1956, p. 154; BFH, Decision of 27.7.1988, I R 147/83, BStBl II 1989, p. 271; BFH, Decision of 25.10.1995, I R 104/94, BB 1996, p. 841.

²³ BFH, Decision of 24.3.1987, I R 202/83, BStBl II 1987, p. 705; BFH, Decision of 27.7.1988, I R 147/83, BStBl II 1989, p. 271; BFH, Decision of 1.8.1990, II R 17/87, BStBl II 1990, p. 879; BFH, Decision of 18.12.1990, VIII R 17/85, BStBl II 1991, p. 512; BFH, Decision of 23.2.2005, I R 44/04, DStRE 2005, p. 706.

the tax base as such income is not a component of a company's taxable income.²⁴

At the level of the shareholder, the book value of the participation in the company should be increased in the tax balance sheet by the fair market value of the contribution. In addition, deemed income corresponding to the amount of the hidden capital contribution will often need to be included in the shareholder's taxable income.

5.4. Application to the case at hand

The decision of the Tribunal does not mention a waiver of the IFL by LuxParentCo. As such, LuxSubsidiary's liabilities were not reduced, and the net equity remained unchanged. From an accounting perspective, the transfer of funds must be recorded, respectively, as a receivable (LuxParentCo) and a liability (LuxSubsidiary).

The granting of the IFL itself cannot be classified as a hidden capital contribution. The late formalisation of the IFL on 19 December 2016 (while the funds have been transferred on 29 April 2016) can also not be construed as a waiver declaration. Given that the granting of an IFL was market practice in these circumstances, it is further fair to assume that the intention of the parties was to implement an IFL as from the beginning.

The question arises whether the absence of an arm's length remuneration could give rise to the classification as a hidden capital contribution. However, given that the advantage granted through the IFL neither results in an increase of assets nor a decrease of liabilities, the advantage shifted to LuxSubsidiary cannot be classified as a hidden capital contribution.

06 HIDDEN CAPITAL (“*VERDECKTES STAMMKAPITAL*”)

6.1. Opening comments

The IFL is a debt instrument that, absent a waiver by LuxParentCo, should not be classified as a hidden capital contribution.

However, the question arises whether the IFL could be reclassified for tax purposes into equity based on the concept of hidden capital (“*verdecktes Stammkapital*”).

6.2. The concept of hidden capital and related tax treatment

The freedom of shareholders in the financing of companies is limited by the concept of hidden capital under which shareholder loans may be reclassified into equity based on their economic substance. The hidden capital concept has been shaped by German case law and is based on the principles laid down in § 5 Steueranpassungsgesetz (sham transactions) and § 6 Steueranpassungsgesetz (abuse of law).

However, the scope of the concept has been limited by German jurisprudence to exceptional cases in which additional equity financing was imperative considering the legal and economic circumstances of the case. This could, for example, be the case if the company does not comply with minimum equity requirements from a legal or a regulatory perspective and the company has been financed by debt anyway. The Luxembourg tax authorities should not lightly conclude that the concept of hidden capital applies though.

²⁴ The tax adjustment is made in the company's corporate tax return. The legal basis for the exclusion of income relating to hidden capital contributions is Art. 18 (1) of the LITL providing that contributions should be deducted from the taxable basis; BFH, Decision of 3.2.1971, I R 51/66, BStBl II 1971, p. 408; BFH, Decision of 14.8.1974, I R 168/72, BStBl II 1975, p. 123; BFH, Decision of 9.3.1983, I R 182/78, BStBl II 1983, p. 744; BFH, Decision of 9.6.1997, GrS 1/94, BStBl II 1998, p. 307.

When the concept of hidden capital applies, interest on the shareholder loans is reclassified into hidden dividend distributions that are not deductible for tax purposes and, in principle, subject to Luxembourg dividend withholding tax. Moreover, the concept of hidden capital would result in a requalification of debt into equity. This may, for example, affect the NWT position of the company.²⁵

The burden of proof that a debt instrument is to be classified as equity in accordance with the concept of hidden capital lies with the LTA.²⁶

6.3. Application to the case at hand

The IFL might be reclassified into hidden capital if it was necessary for LuxParentCo to finance LuxSubsidiary with additional equity rather than by means of a debt instrument.

However, Luxembourg companies investing into debt instruments do not have to respect any specific debt-to-equity ratio and the financing of debt instruments generally does not require a significant amount of equity funding at arm's length. Under the former transfer pricing regime, Luxembourg finance companies had to be financed by an amount of equity corresponding to the lower of 1% of the financing volume or EUR 2 million. However, the equity did not have to be used to finance the debt instruments but could be invested into other assets (for example, participations qualifying for the Luxembourg participation exemption regime).²⁷

The Decision mentions that LuxSubsidiary has been financed by circa 10% of equity and circa 90% of IFL. Based on experience, this percentage of equity financing is very high even for investments into distressed debt that are at the riskier end of the spectrum.

On this basis, it seems to be quite a stretch to conclude that it was imperative for LuxParentCo to finance LuxSubsidiary with equity rather than an IFL. On the contrary, the investment structure was consistent with market practice and all applicable tax rules.

07 TAX ADJUSTMENTS UNDER ARTICLE 56 OF THE LITL

7.1. Opening comments

The IFL granted by LuxParentCo to LuxSubsidiary should be classified as a debt instrument and not be reclassified into equity based on the concept of hidden capital contribution or the concept of hidden capital.

However, the question arises whether the advantage shifted by LuxParentCo to LuxSubsidiary through the IFL (i.e. the arm's length interest) may result in tax adjustments under Article 56 of the LITL.

7.2. Scope of Article 56 of the LITL

The scope of Article 56 of the LITL is limited to transactions between associated enterprises and does not apply to transactions between individual shareholders and a Luxembourg company.

²⁵ See Winandy, Jean-Pierre: "Fiscalité et comptes annuels des entreprises", Portalis Editions 2005, p. 535; BFH, Decision of 15.5.1953, III 103/52 S, BStBl III 1953, p. 208; Döllerer, Georg: "Verdeckte Gewinnausschüttungen und verdeckte Einlagen bei Kapitalgesellschaften", 2nd Edition, Verlag Recht und Wirtschaft GmbH, Heidelberg 1990.

²⁶ RFH, Decision of 19.9.1933, I A 272/31, RStBl 1933, p. 1220; RFH, Decision of 30.8.1938, I 271/38, RStBl 1938, p. 901; RFH, Decision of 30.8.1938, I 272/38, RStBl 1938, p. 902; RFH, Decision of 29.9.1942, I 129/42, RStBl 1942, p. 1075; BFH, Decision of 7.11.1950, I 20/50 U, BStBl III 1951, p. 12; BFH, Decision of 20.8.1954, I 130/53 U, BStBl III 1954, p. 336; BFH, Decision of 11.10.1955, I 117/54 U, BStBl III 1956, p. 11; BFH, Decision of 20.3.1956, I 178/55 U, BStBl III 1956, p. 179; BFH, Decision of 13.1.1959, I 44/57 U, BStBl III 1959, p. 197; BFH, Decision of 28.10.1964, I 198/62 U, BStBl III 1965, p. 119; BFH, Decision of 10.12.1975, I R 135/74, BStBl II 1976, p. 226.

²⁷ The equity funding merely had to be available in case the risk in relation to the financing activities materializes.

Notably, Article 56 of the LITL applies to cross-border transactions and transactions between Luxembourg companies alike.

In a tax treaty context, tax adjustments made under Article 56 of the LITL are generally permitted under a provision that replicates Article 9 (1) of the OECD Model Convention.

7.3. Tax adjustments under Article 56 of the LITL


Article 56 of the LITL serves as a legal basis for performing upward and downward adjustments in accordance with the arm's length principle.

In other words, when a Luxembourg company shifts an advantage to another group company, the LTA may increase the company's taxable income (that is an upward adjustment).

Conversely, when a Luxembourg company receives an advantage from an associated enterprise, the taxable income of the Luxembourg company should be reduced by a downward adjustment so as to reflect arm's length conditions.

7.4. Application to the case at hand

The terms and conditions of the IFL do not adhere to the arm's length standard. Therefore, tax adjustments should generally be performed at the level of LuxParentCo (upward adjustment) and LuxSubsidiary (downward adjustment). The arm's length remuneration of the IFL should be documented in a transfer pricing study (as it has been done by the taxpayer).



In the fiscal year 2016, both companies have been taxed separately. Therefore, the tax adjustments have a direct impact on the companies' taxable income.

As from fiscal year 2017, both companies formed a fiscal unity. Thus, the downward adjustment and the upward adjustment offset each other in the tax base to be reported for the fiscal unity. While the LTA may perform tax adjustments for consistency purposes, overall, these tax adjustments would not change the tax base of the fiscal unity and merely be a theoretical exercise.

08 CONCLUSION

The Tribunal held that the IFL represented a hidden capital contribution as the normal way of financing, dictated by serious economic or legal considerations, would have been an increase in capital, and it was clear from the circumstances that the form of the loan may have been chosen only for tax reasons.

In its reasoning, the Tribunal focused on few characteristics of the IFL and seemed to have mixed the classification of the IFL (as an equity or a debt instrument) and the application of the concept of hidden capital contribution.

However, in a first step, the analysis of all relevant features of the IFL clearly points to a classification as a debt instrument. In a second step, the IFL may not be classified as a hidden capital contribution absent a waiver by LuxParentCo. In a third step, the concept of hidden capital should not apply since investments into debt may be largely financed by debt instruments (i.e. it was not imperative to finance these investments with additional equity). Thus, the IFL should be treated as a debt instrument for tax purposes.

Given that the interest-free feature of the loan does not adhere to the arm's length standard, tax adjustments were necessary at the level of both Luxembourg companies (in accordance with Article 56 of the LITL). The upward adjustment at the level of LuxParentCo and the downward adjustment at the level of LuxSubsidiary should have an impact on the companies' tax position in 2016 (when both companies were taxed on a standalone basis). As from 2017, these tax adjustments would offset each other when determining the tax base of the fiscal unity.

Ultimately, it remains to be seen how the Administrative Court will decide in this case. Considering the wide-spread use of IFLs to finance Luxembourg companies, the importance of this decision cannot be overstated.



ATOZ

TAX ADVISERS LUXEMBOURG

Aerogolf Center 1B, Heienhaff | L-1736 Senningerberg
Phone (+352) 26 940-1

www.atoz.lu



@ATOZLuxembourg



ATOZ Tax Advisers Luxembourg

