



ANDERSEN®

JUDGMENT ISSUED BY THE SUPREME
COURT OF MAURITIUS
2024 SCJ 191

Mauritius Revenue Authority

Appellant

v/s

1. Hilmi Mohammad Ehsan Dilloo
2. The Assessment Review Committee

Respondents

In the matter of:

Hilmi Mohammad Ehsan Dilloo

Appellant

v/s

1. The Assessment Review Committee
2. Mauritius Revenue Authority

Respondents

Executive Summary

The Supreme Court (“SC”) has heard the appeals of both the Mauritius Revenue Authority (“MRA”) and Mr Dilloo (together referred to as “the Appellants”), by way of case stated against a decision of the Assessment Review Committee (“ARC”). The case concerned the taxability of foreign sourced income derived by Mr Dilloo which he remitted to Mauritius. Both appeals revolve fundamentally on the interpretation of section 5 of the Income Tax Act 1995 (“ITA”).

The SC concluded that section 5(3) of the ITA is intricately linked with section 5(1)(b) of the ITA and when read together, it enunciates foreign sourced income is deemed to be derived by a resident individual when it is remitted to Mauritius. The SC also pointed out the applicability of section 73 of the ITA, when interpreting the definition of “residence”. It held that the ARC erred in its ruling that section 5(3) of the ITA is not subject to any other provision of the law and does not provide for the residence requirement of the individual to be satisfied.

The case further established that employment income retains its character despite being retained for a long time period and cannot be treated as savings or of capital nature.

Analysis of the Judgment

The facts established before the ARC are as follows –

- Mr Dilloo, a Mauritian national, was employed by a company based in Saudi Arabia. He did not submit his returns of income for the years of assessment 2016/2017 to 2018/2019 to the MRA.
- Mr Dilloo remitted income into Mauritius through bank transfers from his Saudi Arabian bank account into his Mauritian bank account and acquired an immovable property in Mauritius.
- The MRA was of the opinion that Mr Dilloo is a resident of Mauritius and hence, is taxable on his worldwide income when the income is received in Mauritius, as provided by section 5(3) of the ITA.
- Mr Dilloo had paid Expatriate tax under the Saudi law. The MRA did not entertain the documentation relating to the Expatriate tax as it was not compliant with Regulation 8 of the Income Tax (Foreign Tax Credit) Regulations 1996.
- The MRA issued a notice of assessment to Mr Dilloo, against which Mr Dilloo lodged an objection.
- However, the MRA reaffirmed the assessment raised and issued a notice of determination of objection as Mr Dilloo failed to prove his foreign tax residency following a request from the MRA.
- Being aggrieved, Mr Dilloo lodged representations before the ARC. However, these were set aside and the determination of the MRA was maintained.

Appeals made by the Appellants against the ARC

Mr Dilloo lodged an appeal to the SC against ARC’s ruling on the following Grounds:

A.	Whether the ARC did not err in law in its interpretation and application of section 5(3) of the ITA by construing it as an independent charging provision, which is repugnant to its plain and literal meaning and by failing to take into account the amending provisions of Finance Act 2007 that enacted section 5(3) of the ITA.
B.	Whether the Committee has not erred in law in concluding that the money transferred from Saudi Arabia to the Appellant's local bank account was purportedly “income” on its interpretation of sections 4(1)(a) and 10 of the ITA.
C.	Whether the ARC has not erred in law in its conclusion that the Appellant was a resident of Mauritius for the years of assessment 2016/2017 to 2018/2019 pursuant to its interpretations of section 73(1)(a)(i) of the ITA.

The MRA also appealed against the same ruling of the ARC on the following Grounds:

(i)	Whether the Committee erred in holding that section 5(3) of the ITA: (a) is not subject to any other provision of law; and (b) does not provide for any requirement to establish that the individual "was resident in Mauritius".
(ii)	Whether the Committee erred in holding that "a plain and literal interpretation of section 5(3) of the ITA leads to the conclusion that the remittance basis is set out as a stand-alone provision".

(iii) Whether the Committee erred in holding that the "residence requirement under section 73 of the ITA is inapplicable when the deeming provision under section 5(3) of the ITA applies".

The analysis of each of the Grounds of appeal is as follows:

Grounds A, (i) and (ii) – Derivation of income

The Appellants challenged ARC's interpretation of section 5(3) of the ITA.

Learned Counsel for the MRA submitted that:

- The taxability of Mr Dilloo in Mauritius should be considered. Where he is tax resident of Mauritius, the time when the foreign sourced income became taxable in Mauritius should be considered;
- To hold that section 5(3) of the ITA is a standalone provision and that any income from abroad once remitted to Mauritius becomes taxable, would negate the effect of section 5(1)(b) of the ITA which provides that income derived from abroad is taxable where the person is resident in Mauritius. It was further argued that the provisions of section 5 of the ITA are clear and unambiguous and accordingly, a literal interpretation must be favored; and
- Sections 5(1) and 5(3) of the ITA are interconnected and that once a person is found to be resident in Mauritius, income derived by him from abroad is taxable when it is received in Mauritius by him or on his behalf, or it is dealt with in Mauritius in his interest or on his behalf.

Learned Counsel for Mr Dilloo submitted that the interpretation of section 5(3) of the ITA by the ARC is incongruous, as explained by the below points:

- Section 4(1)(a) of the ITA requires tax to be paid to the MRA by every person on all income (other than exempt income) derived by him during the preceding year.
- Section 5(1)(a) provides that where a person is a non-resident, he is deemed to have derived income where the income has a Mauritian source.
- Under section 5(1)(b), income is deemed to be derived by a person where he is a resident of Mauritius irrespective of where the income is sourced.
 - Section 5(2) deems income to be derived when it is earned or accrued or is dealt with in a taxpayer's interest or on his behalf, whether or not it has become due or receivable.
 - In the case of foreign sourced income, section 5(3) deems income to be derived when it is received by the individual in Mauritius or on his behalf or dealt with in Mauritius in his interest or on his behalf. Section 5(3) thus identifies the **timing** of the derivation of the income where it is derived from abroad by an individual.

It is obvious from reading section 5 of the ITA as a whole that foreign sourced income is subject to tax in Mauritius where it is derived by a Mauritian tax resident and when the income is remitted to Mauritius.

In light of the above, the SC held that the ARC failed to grasp that pursuant to section 5(1)(b) of the ITA, only a resident of Mauritius is liable to tax on income derived from outside Mauritius. The ARC further erred when it stated that section 5(3) is not subject to any other provisions of the law and does not provide for any requirement to establish the residence status of the individual.

Ground (iii) - Residence

At this juncture, in order to determine the point raised under Ground (iii), reference was made to section 73 of the ITA. It was gleaned from the said section that it provides for the definition of residence "for the purposes of this Act", that is, for the whole of the ITA.

Therefore, the SC affirmed that the ARC was wrong to hold that the residence requirement under section 73 of the ITA is inapplicable when the deeming provision under section 5(3) of the ITA applies.

Ground B – Nature of income

Under Ground B, learned Counsel for Mr Dilloo contended that the money transferred from Saudi Arabia to the Appellant's local bank account was a transaction of capital nature as the money had remained in his Saudi Arabian bank account before being remitted to his MCB account.

Learned Counsel for the MRA argued that Mr Dilloo had failed to provide documentary evidence in support that the money transferred from Saudi Arabia to Mauritius was 'savings' and not 'income'.

The ARC referred to the UK HMRC Internal Manual concerning the remittance basis of taxation and contended that whether the employment remuneration of Mr Dilloo is received directly in Mauritius or transits through a Saudi Arabian bank account and only part of it is credited into a Mauritian Bank account, does not alter its “income nature”.

The SC could not find any flaw in the above finding of the ARC. Hence, Ground B was accordingly dismissed.

Ground C – An Appeal lies on a point of law

Under Ground C, Mr Dilloo challenged the ARC's finding that he was a resident of Mauritius for the period under review.

Learned Counsel for the MRA objected that Ground C cannot be entertained as it falls foul of section 21(1)(a) of the Mauritius Revenue Authority Act 2004 which provides that an appeal from a decision of the ARC lies to the SC on a point in law. She further submitted that the residence status of Mr Dilloo entails an appreciation of facts/evidence adduced by the parties in reaching the conclusion and cannot be challenged unless it is averred that the findings are perverse.

If there was any contrary evidence in Mr Dilloo's favour and which the ARC had failed to consider, learned Counsel for Mr Dilloo should have directed the Court's attention thereto but he failed to do so. Considering the above, the SC agreed with the finding of the ARC, and it accordingly set aside Ground C.

For all the reasons mentioned above, the SC allowed the appeal of the MRA on all the Grounds and the appeal of Mr Dilloo on Ground A. In the circumstances, it made no order as to costs.

Our observation

It is remarkable that despite the ARC had ruled in favour of the MRA in determining the objection lodged by Mr Dilloo, the MRA did not vacillate to appeal against ARC's decision in order to establish the correct interpretation of section 5 of the ITA, which essentially led to the conclusion that foreign sourced income remitted to Mauritius is not taxable for non-residents.

Two other important aspects to be highlighted from the above case are:

- an appeal from a decision of the ARC to the SC may only be made on a point in law unless it is attested that the ARC's finding is perverse or unreasonable on the facts found proved or that it is unsustainable in view of evidence adduced; and
- employment income retains its character despite being retained for a long time period and as such, cannot be treated as savings or of capital nature.

Author:

Kusumita D. Bisnauthsing

Tax Associate

CONTACT US

Andersen in Mauritius

Level 4, Alexander House, 35 Cybercity Ebene 72201, Mauritius

Phone: +(230) 403 0850 | **Fax:** +(230) 403 0851

Email: info@mu.Andersen.com | **Website:** mu.Andersen.com

DISCLAIMER

The information in this e-newsletter was prepared by Andersen (Mauritius) Limited to provide potential clients with a broad overview of the opportunities available in Mauritius. While all reasonable care has been taken in the preparation of this e-newsletter, Andersen (Mauritius) Limited accepts no responsibility for any errors it may contain, whether caused by negligence or otherwise, or for any loss, however caused, sustained by any person that relies on it. Readers are advised to consult with appropriate, qualified professional advisors before taking action. Andersen (Mauritius) Limited will be pleased to discuss any specific issues.