

### ### Title

**\*\*CBK Power Company Limited vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue\*\***

### ### Facts

CBK Power Company Limited (CBK Power) is a Philippine limited partnership that develops and operates hydroelectric power plants. To finance its projects, CBK Power secured a syndicated loan from foreign banks, including BNP Paribas, Dai-ichi Kangyo Bank, Industrial Bank of Japan, Ltd., and Societe Generale. These banks were later involved in mergers and had parts of their loans assigned to others.

Between 2001 and 2003, CBK Power made interest payments on these loans and withheld taxes, applying regular withholding tax rates rather than preferential rates specified in applicable tax treaties. CBK Power later sought refunds for overpaid taxes on the grounds that the interest should have been taxed at the preferential rates stated in treaties between the Philippines and the respective countries of the loaning banks.

Despite filing claims for refunds with the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR) covering the years 2001 through 2003, no action was taken by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Consequently, CBK Power brought the matter to the Court of Tax Appeals (CTA), which consolidated its cases:

1. CTA Case No. 6699: Filed on June 6, 2003, for the refund of P6,393,267.20 for 2001 interest payments.
2. CTA Case No. 6884: Filed on March 5, 2004, for the refund of P8,136,174.31 for 2002 interest payments.
3. CTA Case No. 7166: Filed on March 9, 2005, for the refund of P1,143,517.21 for 2003 interest payments.

### ### Issues

1. **\*\*Applicability of Preferential Tax Rates:\*\*** Whether the preferential tax rates under the various tax treaties should apply to CBK Power's interest payments.
2. **\*\*Necessity of ITAD Ruling:\*\*** Whether obtaining a ruling from the International Tax Affairs Division (ITAD) is a precondition for availing tax treaty benefits.
3. **\*\*Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies:\*\*** Whether CBK Power erred by seeking judicial intervention before the Commissioner resolved its administrative claims.
4. **\*\*Compliance with the Two-Year Prescriptive Period:\*\*** Whether CBK Power filed its judicial claims within the statutory two-year period.

### ### Court's Decision

#### \*\*Issue 1: Applicability of Preferential Tax Rates\*\*

The Court affirmed that the interest payments made by CBK Power should be taxed at the preferential rates specified by the tax treaties. These treaties have the force of law, and compliance with their terms takes precedence over the internal revenue orders issued by the BIR.

#### \*\*Issue 2: Necessity of ITAD Ruling\*\*

The Supreme Court agreed with the CTA En Banc that while Revenue Memorandum Order (RMO) No. 1-2000 requires a prior application for treaty relief, the failure to comply strictly with this requirement should not deprive a taxpayer of treaty benefits. The Deutsche Bank case highlighted that administrative processes should not override the obligations and benefits provided under international agreements.

#### \*\*Issue 3: Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies\*\*

The Court held that CBK Power was justified in seeking judicial relief without waiting for the BIR's decision, given the imminent expiry of the two-year prescriptive period. The law intended the claim filed with the BIR as a notice, not a prerequisite requiring the Commissioner's action before court intervention.

#### \*\*Issue 4: Compliance with the Two-Year Prescriptive Period\*\*

CBK Power's claims, both administrative and judicial, were timely filed within the two-year prescriptive period as stipulated in the National Internal Revenue Code. The Court affirmed that CBK Power preserved its right to judicial recourse by acting within the legal timeframe, even if the administrative claim was still pending.

### ### Doctrine

1. **\*\*Tax Treaties vs. Internal Revenue Orders:\*\*** Treaties must be complied with in good faith, and administrative orders should not negate treaty benefits. Requirements in RMOs should not be imposed if they conflict with treaty provisions.
2. **\*\*Filing Prescriptive Periods:\*\*** Taxpayers must file both administrative and judicial claims within the statutory two-year period to preserve their right to refunds.

### ### Class Notes

- **\*\*Tax Treaty Benefits:\*\*** Taxpayer's right to benefits under tax treaties should take precedence over additional administrative requirements not found in treaties (Refer to Deutsche Bank AG Manila Branch v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue).

- **Administrative and Judicial Claims:** Must be filed within two years from the date of tax payment (Section 229, NIRC).
- **Good Faith Compliance:** Governments must return erroneously collected taxes in good faith, ensuring taxpayers' rightful claims are honored.

### ### Historical Background

This case occurred in the context of global financial transactions influenced by tax treaties aimed at avoiding double taxation. The Philippine government aimed to attract foreign investment by signing favorable tax treaties. The specific treaties involved prioritized lower tax rates for interest income, underpinning international fiscal cooperation and investment climate. The decision solidifies the legal precedent that treaties hold supremacy over domestic administrative orders regarding tax matters.