

Tax Controversy / Tax Reform Proposal Newsletter

November 2025

Successful Case of a Legal Opinion Regarding the CFC Regime

Key Takeaways

- As a means to avoid receiving a tax assessment, we recommend preparing a detailed written statement outlining the reasons why the taxpayer's position should be accepted and submitting it to the tax examiners together with supporting evidence.
- It is also effective to submit documents that are, as much as possible, of the same quality and quantity as briefs prepared for tax litigation.
- In this newsletter, we will introduce a recent successful case of a legal opinion regarding the CFC regime.

A case in which the argument that interest on time deposits does not constitute passive income was accepted

The taxpayer's transaction

The taxpayer, a Japanese shipping company, indirectly owned all shares of its Singapore subsidiary, which operated an international shipping business. The subsidiary needed substantial cash reserves to procure vessels. Therefore, it deposited funds derived from its business revenue into time deposits with maturities of not more than one year, both to prepare the necessary cash on hand and to earn interest on these time deposits. The taxpayer filed its corporate tax return without including the interest earned on these time deposits as passive income subject to consolidation under the CFC regime.

The tax authorities' position

Since the subsidiary met all the economic activity requirements under the CFC regime, the taxpayer was not required to consolidate all of the subsidiary's income. However, passive income must be consolidated. The interest on the time deposits did not fall under "interest on deposits arising in the ordinary course of business" (Article 66-6(6)(ii) of the Special Taxation Measures Law) and therefore constituted passive income. Accordingly, the taxpayer should have included this interest as consolidated income and reported it in the corporate tax return.

Summary of the legal opinion

The reason for excluding "interest on deposits arising in the ordinary course of business" from passive income is that tax avoidance through the use of interest on deposits or savings arising in the ordinary course of business is considered unlikely. The subsidiary, in the course of its business, needed to maintain substantial cash reserves for the purchase of vessels, which were deemed as business assets. Therefore, depositing funds derived from its business revenue into a bank was a reasonable and common business practice that inevitably occured in the course of carrying out the subsidiary's business operations.

Furthermore, as time deposits offered more favorable terms than ordinary deposits and could be cancelled before maturity, it was rational for a profit-oriented company to place funds whose usage timing was not yet determined into time deposits. The action was entirely unrelated to tax avoidance schemes that transfer investment income to a foreign subsidiary. Accordingly, the interest on these time deposits constituted "interest on deposits arising in the ordinary course of business" and did not fall under passive income.

Shield to protect taxpayers

In recent tax audits relating to the CFC regime, there has been an increasing number of cases where tax authorities point out that interest earned on time deposits by foreign subsidiaries should be included as passive income. Whether such interest constitutes passive income depends on whether it falls under "interest on deposits arising in the ordinary course of business." However, the meaning of this phrase is not necessarily clear, making it a frequent point of contention.

In this case, by submitting a legal opinion, the taxpayer's position was accepted at the time of tax auditing and the tax return was approved. Taxpayers generally wish to avoid receiving a tax assessment if at all possible. If this is the case, we recommend that taxpayers prepare a detailed written explanation of the reasons why their position should be accepted and submit it to the tax examiners together with supporting evidence.

It is most effective to submit documents that are, as much as possible, of the same quality and quantity as briefs prepared for tax litigation. The key is to proactively address the issues at the time of tax auditing. Such proactive measures serve as an important shield to protect taxpayers.

Tax controversy is a means of defending taxpayers against tax assessments.

Guide to tax controversy services

Deloitte Tohmatsu defends taxpayers against tax assessments through tax controversy.

Deloitte Tohmatsu has a proven track record of resolving tax issues by providing comprehensive services, ranging from submitting rebuttal letters and legal opinions to representing taxpayers in tax appeals and tax litigation, thereby defending taxpayers against tax assessments.

Phase 1
Rebuttal Letter

Phase 2 Legal Opinion Phase 3
Tax Appeal

Phase 4
Tax Litigation

The first step

When a taxpayer faces differences in opinion with the tax authorities during a tax audit, the first step is to submit a rebuttal letter that outlines the taxpayer's viewpoint and the reasons behind it.

Cases where a rebuttal letter is effective

For example, submitting a rebuttal letter is effective in the cases where it is necessary to counter the tax examiner's points by considering case law, or to argue that the tax examiner's interpretation of contracts or factual findings is incorrect.

Rebuttal letter service

We quickly submit an initial rebuttal letter under the taxpayer's name based on the facts discernible from the documents provided at the time of the order. We do this for a fixed fee, and we can handle all types of Japanese taxes.
We also offer services for further consultations with tax examiners and the submission of additional

rebuttal letters, billed on an

hourly basis.

The trump card

When submitting a rebuttal letter does not resolve the differences in opinion with the tax authorities, a legal opinion becomes the taxpayer's trump card.

Cases where a legal opinion is effective

In the case where the issue at hand is critical due to the amount of additional tax, it is necessary to submit a legal opinion, negotiate with the tax examiner and, if needed, submit additional legal opinions to ensure the taxpayer's viewpoint is accepted.

Legal opinion service

We offer comprehensive representation, not only in submitting a legal opinion under the name of a lawyer but also in negotiations with tax examiners and the submission of additional legal opinions, based on a success fee or hourly fee. Before providing these services, we will review the relevant materials in advance to assess the likelihood of the taxpayer's viewpoint being accepted.

Speaking up in tax matters

When the tax authorities issue a tax assessment, taxpayers can file an appeal with the tribunal to seek a final administrative decision. Filing an appeal can be considered a means of speaking up in tax matters. The tribunal listens to the viewpoints of both the taxpayer and the tax authorities and makes a decision based on the evidence presented.

Tax appeal process

An appeal must be filed with the tribunal within three months of receiving the notice of assessment.

Typically, there are about three to four exchanges of briefs during the appeal process. The entire process usually takes about one year until a decision is reached.

Tax appeal service

We provide comprehensive representation for taxpayers' appeals, based on a success fee or hourly fee. We handle all aspects of the appeal process, including the preparation of documents and negotiations with the tribunal judges.

Further means of speaking up

If the tribunal issues a decision that denies the taxpayer's viewpoint, the taxpayer can file a tax litigation in court to seek a judicial decision. A tax litigation represents a further means of speaking up in tax matters. While it may be difficult to correct erroneous interpretations of tax law at the tribunal level, it is possible to do so in court.

Tax litigation process

A tax lawsuit must be filed within six months of becoming aware of the tribunal's decision. First Instance: The period until a judgment is usually around one and a half years. Appeal: The period until a judgment is usually within one year. Final Appeal: It may take more than a year to reach a judgment.

Tax litigation service

We provide comprehensive representation for taxpayers in tax litigation, from the first instance to the appeal and final appeal, based on a success fee or hourly fee. We handle all aspects of the process, including the preparation of documents and attendance at oral arguments.

Tax reform proposal is a means of changing the tax rules themselves.

Guide to tax reform proposal service

Deloitte Tohmatsu supports efforts to change the tax rules themselves through tax reform proposals.

Deloitte Tohmatsu has a proven track record of resolving tax issues by advising taxpayers on tax reform proposals and changing the tax rules themselves.

Cases where a tax reform proposal is effective

Even if there are issues with the current tax rules, once the tax authorities issue a tax assessment based on those rules, judicial resolution of tax issues becomes difficult. However, by amending laws, regulations, or administrative circulars, it is possible to change the problematic tax rules themselves, thereby resolving tax issues legislatively or administratively. In cases where it is necessary to change the tax rules themselves, a tax reform proposal proves to be effective.

Tax reform proposal service

We provide advice to taxpayers on tax reform proposals based on a success fee or hourly fee, supporting efforts to change the tax rules themselves. We carefully examine the issues with the current tax rules, propose feasible amendments to laws, regulations, or administrative circulars, prepare the rationale for why such amendments should be implemented, and strongly back up the realization of tax reform proposals.



Our strong credentials in resolving tax issues make us a top choice.

Track record of tax controversy / tax reform proposal services

Deloitte Tohmatsu has a proven track record of resolving tax issues through tax controversy / tax reform proposal.

We strive to resolve tax issues as swiftly as possible. In numerous cases that we have undertaken and been involved in, we have resolved tax issues through tax controversy / tax reform proposal. Some recent examples where tax issues were resolved are as follows.

2025	Rebuttal letter	Director's remuneration		
	Tax reform proposal	Earnings stripping rules	Rebuttal letter	Stamp tax
	Legal opinion	Accrual basis principle	Rebuttal letter	Inheritance tax
	Rebuttal letter	Requirements for re-examination	Rebuttal letter	Taxable sales ratio
	Tax appeal	Entertainment expenses	Legal opinion	CFC regime
2024	Rebuttal letter	Donations	Legal opinion	Heavy penalty tax
	Tax litigation	Article 132-2 of Corporation Tax Act	Tax appeal	Revocation of blue form tax return approval
	Legal opinion	CFC regime	Tax appeal	Property tax
2023	Legal opinion	Bad debt losses and losses on sale of receivables	Legal opinion	Entertainment expenses
	Legal opinion	Article 132-2 of Corporation Tax Act	Legal opinion	Advantageous placement of shares
	Tax litigation	CFC regime		
2022	Legal opinion	Property tax	Tax appeal	Deemed capital gains
	Tax appeal	Corporate gains on donations	Legal opinion	Deemed capital gains
2021	Tax appeal	Reorganization tax regime		
2020	Legal opinion	Stamp tax		

What to do if there's a dispute over tax? Let's learn from the latest tribunal case where a taxpayer won and think together! DT Legal Japan



Contact

Yutaka Kitamura

Tax Controversy Leader at Tax & Legal of Deloitte Tohmatsu Group Partner at DT Legal Japan

email yutaka.Kitamura@tohmatsu.co.jp

Ryosuke Kono

Partner at DT Legal Japan

email <u>rykono@tohmatsu.co.jp</u>

Toshitomo Imai

Managing Director at Deloitte Tohmatsu Tax Co.

email tosimai@tohmatsu.co.jp

Tsutomu Yamatoya

Counsel at DT Legal Japan

email <u>tsutomu.yamatoya@tohmatsu.co.jp</u>

DT Legal Japan

Tokyo Office Shin-Tokyo Building, 3-3-1 Marunouchi

Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo, 100-0005, Japan

Tel +81 3 6870 3300

email <u>dtlegal@tohmatsu.co.jp</u>

Corporate Info www.deloitte.com/jp/en/dtlegal
Dai-Ichi Tokyo Bar Association (Tokyo Office)

Osaka Office Yodoyabashi Mitsui Building, 4-1-1 Imabashi,

Chuo-Ku, Osaka-shi, Osaka, 541-0042, Japan

Tel +81 6 7711 2540

Deloitte. Legal

Deloitte Tohmatsu Group (Deloitte Japan) is a collective term that refers to Deloitte Tohmatsu LLC, which is the Member of Deloitte Asia Pacific Limited and of the Deloitte Network in Japan, and firms affiliated with Deloitte Tohmatsu LLC that include Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu LLC, Deloitte Tohmatsu Risk Advisory LLC, Deloitte Tohmatsu Consulting LLC, Deloitte Tohmatsu Financial Advisory LLC, Deloitte Tohmatsu Tax Co., DT Legal Japan, and Deloitte Tohmatsu Group LLC. Deloitte Tohmatsu Group is known as one of the largest professional services groups in Japan. Through the firms in the Group, Deloitte Tohmatsu Group provides professional services in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. With more than 20,000 people in about 30 cities throughout Japan, Deloitte Tohmatsu Group serves a number of clients including multinational enterprises and major Japanese businesses. For more information, please visit the Group's website at www.deloitte.com/jp.

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited ("DTTL"), its global network of member firms, and their related entities (collectively, the "Deloitte organization"). DTTL (also referred to as "Deloitte Global") and each of its member firms and related entities are legally separate and independent entities, which cannot obligate or bind each other in respect of third parties. DTTL and each DTTL member firm and related entity is liable only for its own acts and omissions, and not those of each other. DTTL does not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more.

Deloitte Asia Pacific Limited is a company limited by guarantee and a member firm of DTTL. Members of Deloitte Asia Pacific Limited and their related entities, each of which is a separate and independent legal entity, provide services from more than 100 cities across the region, including Auckland, Bangkok, Beijing, Bengaluru, Hanoi, Hong Kong, Jakarta, Kuala Lumpur, Manila, Melbourne, Mumbai, New Delhi, Osaka, Seoul, Shanghai, Singapore, Sydney, Taipei and Tokyo.

Deloitte provides leading professional services to nearly 90% of the Fortune Global 500° and thousands of private companies. Our people deliver measurable and lasting results that help reinforce public trust in capital markets, and enable clients to transform and thrive. Building on its 180 year history, Deloitte spans more than 150 countries and territories. Learn how Deloitte's approximately 460,000 people worldwide make an impact that matters at www.deloitte.com.

This communication contains general information only, and none of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited (DTTL), its global network of member firms, or their related entities(collectively, the "Deloitte organization") is, by means of this communication, rendering professional advice or services. Before making any decision or taking any action that may affect your finances or your business, you should consult a qualified professional adviser. No representations, warranties or undertakings (express or implied) are given as to the accuracy or completeness of the information in this communication, and none of DTTL, its member firms, related entities, employees or agents shall be liable or responsible for any loss or damage whatsoever arising directly or indirectly in connection with any person relying on this communication. DTTL and each of its member firms, and their related entities, are legally separate and independent entities.

Member of





IS 669126 / ISO 27001



BCMS 764479 / ISO 22301

IS/BCMSそれぞれの認証範囲はこちらをご覧ください http://www.bsigroup.com/clientDirectory