



NTRC Tax Research Journal

An Official Publication of the National Tax Research Center

Volume XXXVI.4

Philippines

July – August 2024

**Harmonization of the Data Privacy Act
and the Power of the Commissioner
to Obtain Information: Effect of the
Ruling in Philippine Stock Exchange, Inc.,
et al. vs. Secretary of Finance, et al.**



**Digest of Select Supreme Court Decisions
on Taxation for the Calendar Year 2022**



Republic of the Philippines
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
NATIONAL TAX RESEARCH CENTER
8th Floor, EDPC Building, BSP Complex,
Roxas Boulevard cor. P. Ocampo St., Malate, Manila, 1004 Philippines

Editorial Board

Atty. Mark Lester L. Aure
Atty. Jocet Consisa P. Dita
Monica G. Rempillo

Editors

Ma. Rhea L. Caro
Florida J. Jurado

Publication Staff

Angelica R. Porciuncula
Jozreel Martin A. Romanillos
Johann Louise D. Ramos
Apple T. Jusayan

Phone Number: (02) 5322-4401
E-mail Address: info@ntrc.gov.ph
Web Address: <http://www.ntrc.gov.ph>



Management
System
ISO 9001:2015

www.tuv.com
ID 9108644368

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Harmonization of the Data Privacy Act and the Power of the Commissioner to Obtain Information: Effect of the Ruling in Philippine Stock Exchange, Inc., et al. vs. Secretary of Finance, et al. 1

This paper presents the harmonized interplay of the provisions of the Tax Code and the Data Privacy Act (DPA) vis-à-vis the mandate of the Commission of Internal Revenue (CIR) to obtain information from taxpayers, in light of the pronouncement of the Supreme Court in the Philippine Stock Exchange Inc. (PSEI) case. This study delves into whether the CIR can validly require the submission of the Taxpayer's Information Number of all the active members of a cooperative for purposes of securing a certificate of tax exemption, applying the principles established in the PSEI case. This paper also explores the potential impact, if any, of the provisions of the DPA on the power of the CIR to obtain taxpayers' information under the National Internal Revenue Code of 1997, as amended.

Digest of Select Supreme Court Decisions on Taxation for the Calendar Year 2022 13

The paper provides a digest of taxation-related cases decided by the Supreme Court for the calendar year 2022.

Legislation and Issuances with Revenue or Tax Implications: July-August 2024 38

Harmonization of the Data Privacy Act and the Power of the Commissioner to Obtain Information: Effect of the Ruling in Philippine Stock Exchange, Inc., et al. vs. Secretary of Finance, et al.*

I. Introduction

Section 5(B) of the National Internal Revenue Code (NIRC) of 1997,¹ as amended, has vested with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (CIR) a multitude of powers, among which is the power to obtain information, on a regular basis, from any person other than the taxpayer subject of the audit or investigation.

With the enactment of Republic Act (RA) No. 10173,² the act of collecting, processing, and storing personal data and information has been subject to rigorous regulation. The Data Privacy Act (DPA) applies to the processing of all types of personal information and natural and juridical person involved in personal information processing, except to government agencies with respect to the processing of information or personal data necessary in performing their statutorily mandated functions, among others.

Notwithstanding this exception, the Supreme Court in G.R. No. 213860,³ struck down as unconstitutional certain issuances of the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR) for violation of the privacy rights and the provisions of the DPA. The Supreme Court discussed extensively the extent of the power of the CIR to obtain information vis-à-vis the constitutional right to privacy and the relevant provisions of the DPA.

In view of these statutory and jurisprudential developments, this paper aims to harmonize the interplay of the provisions of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, and the DPA vis-à-vis the mandate of the CIR to obtain information from taxpayers, in light of the pronouncement of the

** Prepared by Nicole Bernadette F. Occeño, Legal Assistant II. Reviewed and approved by Atty. Jocet Consisa P. Dita, Attorney V, Legal Research and Communication Division.*

The NTRC Tax Research Journal is the official publication of the National Tax Research Center. The views and opinions expressed are those of the NTRC and do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the Department of Finance, its bureaus and government corporations under its supervision.

¹ Entitled, “National Internal Revenue Code of 1997, as amended by Republic Act (RA) No. 10963 (TRAIN), RA 11256, RA 11346, RA 11467, and RA 11534 (CREATE)”, 26 March 2021.

² Entitled, “Data Privacy Act of 2012”, 15 August 2012.

³ Philippine Stock Exchange, Inc., Bankers Association of the Philippines, Philippine Association of Securities Brokers, Inc., Fund Managers Association of the Philippines, Trust Officers Association of the Philippines, and Marmon Holdings, Inc, Petitioners v. Secretary of Finance, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and Chairperson of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Respondents., 05 July 2022.

Supreme Court in the Philippine Stock Exchange Inc. (PSEI) case. Specifically, the study delves into whether the CIR can validly require the submission of the Taxpayer's Information Number (TIN) of all the active members of a cooperative for purposes of securing a certificate of tax exemption (CTE), applying the principles established in the PSEI case. Additionally, the paper explores the potential impact, if any, of the provisions of the DPA on the power of the CIR to obtain taxpayers' information under the NIRC of 1997, as amended.

II. Background Information

Under Sections 60 and 61 of RA 9520,⁴ otherwise known as the "Philippine Cooperative Code of 2008", cooperatives are entitled to certain tax exemptions depending on their classification and transaction. Accordingly, duly registered cooperatives dealing or transacting exclusively with members are exempt from any taxes and fees imposed under the internal revenue laws and other tax laws. Moreover, duly registered cooperatives that transact business with both members and non-members shall be subject to applicable taxes for transactions with non-members, if the accumulated reserves and undivided net savings of such cooperatives are more than P10 million. If, however, the accumulated reserves and undivided net savings are P10 million and below, such cooperative shall continue to be exempt from all national, city, provincial, municipal, or barangay taxes of whatever nature.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Joint Rules and Regulations of RA 9520⁵ provide that all income of cooperatives not related to the main or principal business/es under its Articles of Cooperation shall be subject to all the appropriate taxes under the NIRC of 1997, as amended. This applies to all types of cooperatives, whether dealing purely with members or both members and non-members.

To avail of the tax exemption provided by law, a registered cooperative must secure a CTE from the BIR. A CTE is a ruling issued by the BIR granting exemption to a cooperative, which shall be valid for five years from the date of issue. It is a mandatory requirement before a qualified cooperative can avail of tax exemptions provided under the Cooperative Code.

Revenue Memorandum Order (RMO) No. 76-2010⁶ provides simplified procedures for processing and confirmation of tax exemptions of cooperatives. Under the said RMO, a cooperative shall submit a duly accomplished application for CTE for cooperatives or BIR Form No. 1945, together with the complete documentary requirements, including Articles of Cooperation and By-laws, certificate of Cooperative Development Authority (CDA) registration, certificate of good standing issued by the CDA, and certificate of BIR registration. In addition to the aforementioned requirements, the cooperative shall submit a certification under oath of the list of cooperative members with their respective TINs and their capital

⁴ Entitled, "Philippine Cooperative Act of 2008", 17 February 2009.

⁵ Entitled, "Joint Rules and Regulations Implementing Articles 60, 61 and 144 of Republic Act No. 9520, Otherwise Known as the Philippine Cooperative Code of 2008 in Relation to RA No. 8424 or the National Internal Revenue Code, as Amended", 05 February 2010.

⁶ Entitled, "Prescribing the Policies and Guidelines in the Issuance of Certificate of Tax Exemption of Cooperatives and the Monitoring Thereof", 27 September 2010.

contributions. For the renewal of the CTE, the cooperative must also complete and submit their active members' TINs.

In 2022, or 12 years following the issuance of RMO 76-2010, the Supreme Court promulgated the PSEI case, which nullified three issuances of the BIR and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) requiring the submission of TIN, among others, for being violative of the right to privacy. The Supreme Court ruled that TINs of investors are, without a doubt, sensitive personal information, and processing thereof requires that the regulatory enactments must guarantee the protection of the sensitive personal information, and that consent is not required by law or regulation pursuant to Section 13 of the DPA.

Following this pronouncement by the Supreme Court, this study will evaluate whether the BIR may continue requiring the submission of cooperative members' TIN for purposes of securing CTE under RMO 76-2010.

III. Comments and Observations

A. "Philippine Stock Exchange, Inc. (PSEI), et. al. v. Secretary of Finance, et. al."

This case arose when the petitioners assailed the constitutionality of Revenue Regulation (RR) No. 1-2014,⁷ Revenue Memorandum Circular (RMC) No. 5-2014,⁸ and SEC Memorandum Circular (MC) No. 10-2014⁹ (collectively, the "questioned regulations") for allegedly violating the petitioner's right to privacy.

The questioned regulations in this case are as follows:

- a. BIR RR 1-2014 and RMC 5-2014, which required all withholding agents to submit to the BIR an alphabetical list (alphalist) of employees and payees with their respective TINs, among others.
- b. SEC MC 10-2014 directs the Philippine Depository and Trust Corporation and broker-dealers to provide the listed companies or their transfer agents an alphalist of all depository account holders with their TINs, among others.

Petitioners questioned the above issuances on the grounds that their right to privacy over their personal information, protected by the DPA, is violated. They argued that by requiring broker-dealers to divulge their clients' personal information, such as TIN, the questioned regulations would expose them to criminal penalties under the

⁷ Entitled, "Amending the Provisions of Revenue Regulations (RR) No. 2-98, as Further Amended by RR No. 10-2008, Specifically on the Submission of Alphabetical List of Employees/Payees of Income Payments", 17 December 2013.

⁸ Entitled, "Clarifying Provisions of Revenue Regulations No. 1-2014 Pertaining to the Submission of Alphabetical List of Employees/Payees of Income Payments", 29 January 2014.

⁹ Entitled, "Guidelines and Directives to Assist Issuers of Securities Listed and Traded in the Philippine Stock Exchange in Complying with the Requirements of BIR Revenue Regulation No. 1-2014", 22 May 2014.

DPA. Respondents, however, insisted that there is no violation of the right to privacy and the DPA because the collection and forwarding of the information required under the questioned regulations are allowed. Respondents argued that Section 4 of the DPA clearly states that the information needed in the performance of regulatory agencies of their constitutionally and statutorily mandated functions is excluded from the scope of that law.

The Court ruled that the questioned regulations violated the right to privacy of the petitioners, for the following reasons:

- a. The questioned regulations failed the second requirement under the “strict scrutiny test”. There are two requirements under the strict scrutiny test, i.e., (a) the State must show that the regulation serves a compelling interest; and (b) is narrowly drawn to prevent abuses.

Citing *Ople v. Torres*,¹⁰ the Court ratiocinated that it is mandatory to apply the strict scrutiny test in approaching government actions that are alleged to be violative of a fundamental right, including the right to privacy. Government bears the burden to show and prove that its action serves a compelling state interest and is narrowly drawn to prevent abuses. The *Ople* case states that:

And we now hold that when the integrity of a fundamental right is at stake, this [C]ourt will give the challenged law, administrative order, rule or regulation a stricter scrutiny. It will not do for the authorities to invoke the presumption of regularity in the performance of official duties. Nor is it enough for the authorities to prove that their act is not irrational for a basic right can be diminished, if not defeated, even when the government does not act irrationally. They must satisfactorily show the presence of compelling state interests and that the law, rule, or regulation is narrowly drawn to preclude abuses. This approach is demanded by the 1987

¹⁰ Blas F. Ople, Petitioner, vs. Ruben D. Torres, Alexander Aguirre, Hector Villanueva, Cielito Habito, Robert Barbers, Carmencita Reodica, Cesar Sarino, Renato Valencia, Tomas P. Africa, Head of the National Computer Center and Chairman of the Commission of Audit, Respondents., 23 July 1998.

Constitution whose entire matrix is designed to protect human rights and to prevent authoritarianism. In case of doubt, the least we can do is to lean towards the stance that will not put in danger the rights protected by the Constitution.

It can be argued that the questioned regulations serve a compelling state interest: the effective and proper collection of taxes. RR 1-2014's stated purpose of ensuring information on all income payments made by payors are monitored and captured in the taxpayer database for "establishing simulation model, formulating analytical framework for policy analysis, and institutionalizing appropriate enforcement activities" may well be considered to be within the BIR's mandate of assessment and collection of national taxes.

However, the Court found that the second requirement was not met. Accordingly, the questioned regulations were not narrowly drawn to prevent abuses. Respondents failed to present any evidence to show and prove that the challenged regulations were narrowly drawn as the "least restrictive means for effecting the invoked interest." There may be abuses, as a result of the enforcement of the questioned regulations: there is no assurance that the information gathered and submitted to the listed companies pursuant to the questioned regulations will be protected and will not be used for any other purpose outside its stated purpose. The investors provided their information to the brokers, presumably without the intention of sharing such with any other entity, including the investee companies and the BIR.

- b. The questioned regulations also failed to sufficiently meet the requirement of "necessity" under the DPA to describe the information to be used for the performance of functions of public authority for the processing to be outside the purview of the law.

Section 4 of the DPA exempts from its coverage any information necessary to carry out public functions. However, the same Section explicitly uses the word "necessary" to describe the information to be used for the performance of functions of public authority for the processing to be outside the purview of the law.

The Court holds that collecting information pursuant to the questioned regulations is unnecessary for the BIR to carry out its functions. There was no showing that there was a problem or inefficacy with the system prior to the issuance of the questioned regulations. Respondents failed to show the aspects of operations under the prior rule that will be improved by collecting the information. As it stands, the prior rule is effective and does not require additional information to collect the taxes properly. Accordingly, the state

cannot just use the exception of the performance of mandated functions under the DPA to carry out actions that abridge the right to privacy, there must be a showing of necessity.

- c. Finally, respondents failed to consider Section 13(b) of the DPA in processing sensitive personal information, such as the TIN. In processing the TINs of investors, Section 13(b) should be observed, which requires that the regulatory enactments guarantee the protection of sensitive personal information and privileged information, and the law or regulation does not require the consent of the data subject. The questioned regulations also failed to provide safeguards for collecting sensitive information. Respondents cannot simply rely on other laws and regulations, such as the NIRC of 1997, as amended, the Securities Regulation Code, and other issuances regarding the said requirement. The DPA is clear that it must be the subject issuance itself—not the other laws or regulations—that should provide the safeguard.

B. Implications of the PSEI ruling on the requirement for the submission of TIN of members for purposes of securing a CTE

In view of the doctrine enunciated under the PSEI case, will a requirement for the submission of the cooperative members' TINs to BIR to secure a CTE infringe the members' right to privacy and violate the provisions of the DPA?

In a nutshell, the subject case provides for three parameters to determine whether there is a violation of privacy rights under RMO 76-2010, when it required the submission of the cooperative members' TINs to BIR, to wit:

- a. Will it pass the strict scrutiny test?
- b. Will it pass the necessity requirement under the DPA?
- c. Are there safeguards for the protection of sensitive personal information, i.e., members' TIN, in the regulatory enactment?

Let's discuss the parameters *in seriatim*.

Firstly, RMO 76-2010 has to pass the two-fold requirements under the strict scrutiny test, i.e., the BIR must show that the regulation not only serves a compelling interest, but is also narrowly drawn to prevent abuses. To pass the requirement of strict scrutiny, the BIR must show that the RMO 76-2010 serves compelling state interest, and that the issuance must be the least restrictive or intrusive means for effecting the invoked interest. If these requirements are successfully met, the risk of RMO 76-2010 being declared unconstitutional for violating privacy rights can be effectively avoided.

It can be argued that RMO 76-2010 serves a compelling state interest, i.e., judicious confirmation of the tax incentives granted to qualified cooperatives under RA 9520. It is incumbent upon the BIR to ensure that the tax exemptions and incentives extended to cooperatives are administered effectively through the

submission of relevant documentation and information by the cooperatives, such as the TIN of the cooperative as its members.

It is settled that tax exemption and preferential treatment are not favored and are never presumed, so that if granted, they must be construed against the taxpayer. This means that the BIR is obligated to thoroughly exercise due diligence before confirming a cooperative's entitlement to any tax exemptions, ensuring that such confirmation is substantiated with corroborative documents.

However, to hurdle the second requirement of the strict scrutiny test, the BIR has to present evidence to show and prove that RMO 76-2010 was narrowly drawn as the “least restrictive means for effecting the invoked interest”. Simply put, the BIR has to prove that the requirement of submission of TIN both at the cooperative and members’ level is the least intrusive means to judiciously perform its mandate of collecting the applicable taxes and/or implementing the fiscal provisions of the Cooperative Code, in relation to the provisions of the NIRC of 1997, as amended. The BIR has to prove and provide assurance that the TIN gathered and submitted pursuant to RMO 76-2010 will be protected and shall not be used for any other purpose outside its stated purpose.

Secondly, the BIR has to sufficiently establish that the submission of TIN is necessary to carry out its functions. If there is a showing of necessity, the processing of TIN under RMO 76-2010 will not be subject to the provisions of the DPA; hence, RMO 76-2010 may not contain a guarantee for the protection of sensitive personal information or provide safeguards for its collection.

The submission of an original copy of the “Certification under Oath of the List of Cooperative Members” with their respective TINs and capital contributions is necessary for the BIR to efficiently and effectively monitor the taxability of the transactions of the cooperative and/or their members. A perusal of RMO 76-2010 shows that the objectives of the issuance include: (a) to prescribe simplified procedures in the availment of tax exemption and incentives in the Cooperative Code; (b) sustain an efficient and effective administration of tax exemptions under RA 9520; and (c) increase coordination between revenue regions and national office for purposes of monitoring the revenue impact of the exemptions granted to cooperatives. RMO 76-2010’s stated purpose of providing uniform and simplified procedures in the processing and confirmation of cooperative tax exemption may be considered to be within the BIR’s mandate of assessment, collection of national taxes, and supervisory powers conferred to it by the NIRC of 1997, as amended, or other laws.

However, to discuss the necessity, it is imperative to highlight that RMO 76-2010 deals with two types of TIN: (1) TIN of cooperatives; and (2) TIN of individual members of the cooperatives. Accordingly, the processing of this information is governed by distinct rules as outlined under the DPA.

There are no privacy issues in requiring the TIN of the cooperative whose entitlement to incentive is in question for the issuance of appropriate CTE. The

DPA does not apply when the data subject is a juridical entity, like a cooperative. The National Privacy Commission (NPC), through Privacy Policy Office Advisory Opinion No. 2023-002¹¹, reiterated that:

We note that while a tax declaration, in itself, is not automatically considered sensitive personal information, the Tax Identification Number (TIN) issued to an individual is classified as sensitive personal information. Thus, the processing of tax declaration of properties belonging to natural persons falls within the ambit of the DPA and may only be processed under the circumstances provided under Section 13 of the DPA. On the other hand, a TIN issued to a juridical entity such as the TRC or DOST is not considered sensitive personal information under the DPA. The scope of the DPA only extends to natural persons, considered as data subjects, whose personal data are sought to be protected.

However, privacy issues may ensue when it comes to requiring the submission, processing, and collection of cooperative members' TIN since, under the DPA, the sensitive personal information of an individual must be protected unless the requirement of necessity is established. Thus, the BIR has to provide the rationale for requiring the submission of TIN at a cooperative members' level and how it relates to the performance of its mandated function to efficiently and effectively administer the tax exemptions and incentives of its affiliate cooperative. If necessity is sufficiently established vis-à-vis processing of cooperative members' TIN, RMO 76-2010 may be exempt from the operation of the DPA. Otherwise, RMO 76-2010 has to comply with the provision of the DPA, particularly in guaranteeing the protection of sensitive personal information or providing safeguards for its collection.

Lastly, similar to the questioned regulations in the PSEI case, RMO 76-2010 has no guarantees for protecting the cooperative members' TINs, which is sensitive personal information under the DPA. Considering that RMO 76-2010 was issued

¹¹ Entitled, "Disclosure of Tax Declarations of Real Properties and Other Related Documents", 18 January 2023.

prior to the enactment of the DPA in the country, there is a need for its amendment to be compliant with the provisions of the DPA.

C. Harmonization of the DPA and its Implementing Rules and Regulations and Power of the CIR under the NIRC of 1997, as amended

The NPC has repeatedly reiterated in its Advisory Opinions (see Table 1) that the scope of the DPA is not all-encompassing. Section 5(d) of its Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) provides that the DPA does not apply to information necessary to fulfill the mandates of government agencies or institutions.

Table 1

NPC Advisory Opinions in Relation to the Processing of Personal/Sensitive Information

NPC advisory opinion no.	Date	Title
2018-083	26 November 2018	Re: Collection of health information by the Department of Health
2020-083	06 February 2020	Re: Publication of the full content of Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR) rulings in the BIR website
2020-015	24 February 2020	Re: Collection of personal data by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for tax compliance purposes
2020-055	29 December 2020	Re: Applicability of the criteria for lawful processing of personal and sensitive personal information
2021-028	16 July 2021	Re: Disclosure of tenants' personal information by a condominium corporation to the Bureau of Internal Revenue
2023-002	18 January 2023	Re: Disclosure of tax declarations of real properties and other related documents

Note. Sections 12 and 13 of RA 10173; Sections 21 and 22 of Rule V of its IRR.

The DPA does not operate to hinder the BIR from adopting measures that it may deem necessary and crucial to promote transparency in its transactions; however, the collection and processing of personal and/or sensitive data, concomitantly impose on the BIR the responsibility of complying with the requirements of the DPA, its IRR, and other issuances of the NPC. It must be underscored that the DPA is a mechanism to uphold the fundamental human right to privacy while ensuring the free flow of information and growth. Therefore, the provisions of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, and the DPA must be harmonized and reconciled to give effect, if possible, to every clause and word of the statutes.

Under Section 3(j) of the DPA, processing is defined as any operation or any set of operations performed upon personal information, including but not limited to, the collection, recording, organization, storage, updating or modification, retrieval, consultation, use, consolidation, blocking, erasure, or destruction of data.

Thus, the yearly submission of cooperatives to their appropriate Revenue District Office of information, particularly the cooperative's List of Members and their respective TINs, as a pre-requisite for the issuance of CTE falls within the purview of the said definition.

Sections 12 and 13 of the DPA provide for the instances wherein the processing of personal and sensitive personal information, respectively, may be permitted, to wit:

Sec. 12. Criteria for Lawful Processing of Personal Information.

– the processing of personal information shall be permitted only if not otherwise prohibited by law, and when at least one of the following conditions exists:

X X X

(e) The processing is necessary in order to respond to national emergency, to comply with the requirements of public order and safety, or to fulfill functions of public authority which necessarily includes the processing of personal data for the fulfillment of its mandate;

X X X

The DPA also allows the processing of sensitive personal information, to wit:

Sec. 13. Sensitive Personal Information and Privileged Information. – the processing of sensitive personal information and privileged information shall be prohibited, except in the following cases:

X X X

(b) The processing of the same is provided for by existing laws and regulations: Provided, That such regulatory enactments

guarantee the protection of the sensitive personal information and the privileged information: Provided, further, That the consent of the data subjects are not required by law or regulation permitting the processing of the sensitive personal information or the privileged information;

X X X

The processing of the personal data of the BIR finds support in the DPA. Section 2 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, provides that as a public authority performing supervisory functions, the BIR is permitted, to a certain extent, to process personal and sensitive data to perform its mandate. Notwithstanding the lawful basis, Section 11 of the DPA states that the exercise of this right is subject to the rights of a data subject and must adhere to the general data privacy principles, specifically the principle of proportionality. This principle dictates that information processing shall be adequate, relevant, suitable, necessary, and not excessive in relation to a declared and specified purpose. It must be emphasized that the qualifier “necessary” is the ultimate test to determine whether the processing is justified in relation to the declared purpose.

Further, the BIR should also observe the following NPC issuances with regard to the processing of personal information: (a) NPC Advisory No. 2017-03¹² on the Guidelines on Privacy Impact Assessment to ensure that the processing and collection of data is appropriate and in accordance with the organizational, physical, and technical safeguard for data protection; and (b) NPC Circular No. 16-01¹³ on the Security of Personal Data in Government Agencies.

Given the foregoing, there is no actual conflict between the DPA and the power of the Commissioner to collect and process the personal information of the members of the cooperatives in relation to the issuance of CTE. In fact, they complement each other.

IV. Conclusion and Recommendation

In view of the foregoing, we opine that the BIR may continue to require the submission of cooperative members’ TINs in the application for CTE provided that RMO 76-2010 will be amended to comply with the provisions of the DPA, its IRR, and other relative issuances of the NPC.

¹² Entitled, “Guidelines on Privacy Impact Assessments”, 31 July 2017.

¹³ Entitled, “Security of Personal Data in Government Agencies”, 10 October 2016.

Moreover, it is recommended that the BIR and the NPC release a joint issuance that will address the issues surrounding the application of the DPA and its IRR, in relation to the exercise of the CIR of its powers enumerated under the NIRC of 1997, as amended.

Also, Section 5 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, recognizes the fundamental human right of privacy when it requires the CIR and revenue officers to comply with and observe the requirements of the law, with the BIR's own rules, and with regard to the taxpayer's constitutional rights in obtaining personal and sensitive information from any person. Thus, while the CIR is authorized by law to obtain information in evaluating any person's tax compliance, such authority should be exercised securely and with strict adherence to all existing laws, rules, and regulations.

Digest of Select Supreme Court Decisions on Taxation for the Calendar Year 2022*

I. National Internal Revenue Code of 1997, as Amended

A. Organization and Function of the Bureau of Internal Revenue

Republic of the Philippines, Petitioner, vs. Robiegie Corporation, Respondent.
Third Division | G.R. No. 260261 | 03 October 2022

Doctrine: *The power of a Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR) revenue officer to conduct taxpayer investigations flows from a validly issued Letter of Authority (LOA), which is the statutorily defined modality for the delegation of the investigatory powers vested in the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (CIR) by law. Thus, the reassignment of a taxpayer investigation to a different revenue officer must also be made pursuant to a LOA.*

Facts: The BIR issued a LOA that authorized Revenue Officer (RO) David to examine Robiegie's books of accounts and other accounting records for the Taxable Year (TY) 2008. A Memorandum Referral was issued, reassigning the LOA to RO Dy with notice to Robiegie. The Regional Director of BIR-Manila issued a Preliminary Assessment Notice (PAN) to Robiegie, informing the latter of the findings of the investigation conducted by RO Dy. Thereafter, BIR-Manila issued a Formal Letter of Demand (FLD) and Final Assessment Notices (FANs). After failing to find any leviable or garnishable property of Robiegie, the Republic, through the BIR, filed a complaint before the Court of Tax Appeals (CTA) to collect the claimed deficiency taxes.

The CTA Second Division dismissed the complaint on the ground that the assessments are null and void for lack of authority of RO Dy to investigate Robiegie's accounts. The Republic filed a motion for reconsideration, which the CTA Second Division denied, stating that the reassignment of an RO is not prohibited. However, it must also be made by a BIR official who is authorized to issue and sign a LOA—Regional Directors, Deputy Commissioners, and Commissioner, in compliance with the general principles on LOAs under Section 6(A) of the National Internal Revenue Code (NIRC) of 1997 in relation to Revenue Memorandum Order (RMO) No. 43-90.

* Prepared by Nicole Bernadette F. Occeño, Legal Assistant II and Atty. Ravienne Jeru Lim, Attorney III. Reviewed and approved by Atty. Jocet Consisa P. Dita, Attorney V, Legal Research and Communication Division.

The NTRC Tax Research Journal is the official publication of the National Tax Research Center. The views and opinions expressed are those of the NTRC and do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the Department of Finance, its bureaus and government corporations under its supervision.

However, in the case at bar, the Memorandum Referral was issued and signed only by the Revenue District Officer. The CTA En Banc affirmed the ruling of the Second Division.

Issue: Whether the assessments issued against Robiegie are valid.

Ruling: No. The assessments against Robiegie are **invalid** as they are based on an unauthorized investigation into its account. In G.R. No. 222743², the Court held that a LOA is the authority given to the appropriate RO assigned to perform assessment functions. It empowers or enables said RO to examine a taxpayer's books of account and other accounting records to collect the correct amount of tax. Based on Sec. 6(A) of the NIRC of 1997, an examination of the taxpayer cannot ordinarily be undertaken unless authorized by the CIR himself or his duly authorized representative through a LOA. Likewise, Sec. 10(c) of the same Code directly authorizes the BIR Revenue Regional Directors to "[i]ssue LOAs for the examination of taxpayers within the region," subject to regulation by the CIR. In relation thereto, Sec. C(5) of RMO 43-90 specifically requires that any re-assignment/transfer of cases to another RO shall require the issuance of a new LOA.

The issuance of a new LOA as a requisite for the valid reassignment of a tax investigation to a different RO is not irreconcilable with the "one LOA per taxpayer" rule. RMO 8-2006 does not prohibit the issuance of a new LOA within the same taxable period if such new LOA is necessitated by the reassignment, retirement, or other inability of the incumbent RO to continue an investigation. The old LOA in favor of the reassigned RO shall be deemed cancelled, and the new LOA issued to the subsequently designated RO shall prevail.

In the case at bar, not only did the BIR fail to issue a new LOA in favor of RO Dy to investigate Robiegie's accounts, but the Memorandum Referral, which effected the transfer of the investigation to RO Dy, was issued by a BIR official who did not have the requisite authority to issue LOAs.

B. Tax on Income

Aces Philippines Cellular Satellite Corporation, Petitioner, vs. CIR, Respondent. En Banc | G.R. No. 226680 | 30 August 2022

Doctrine: *As an inherent attribute of sovereignty, the scope of taxing power is limited within a state's territorial jurisdiction. There must be an established nexus between the subject and the state that intends to tax it. In resolving the issue of whether payments to foreign entities are subject to Final Withholding Tax (FWT) requires a two-tiered approach: (a) source of the income; and (b) situs of that source.*

Facts: The Philippine Long Distance Telephone Company (PLDT) and Aces Indonesia entered into two executory contracts, to wit: (a) a *Gateway Agreement* that allowed Aces Indonesia to supply PLDT the equipment, software, data, documentation

² Medicard Philippines, Inc., Petitioner vs. CIR, Respondent, 05 April 2017.

necessary for the construction and operation of gateways in the Philippines; and (b) an *Air Time Purchase Agreement* which allowed Aces Indonesia to sell satellite communications time (Aces Services) to PLDT, which, in turn, shall become the exclusive provider/distributor thereof to Philippine subscribers. Eventually, the original parties to the *Air Time Purchase Agreement* transferred their rights and obligations to third parties, viz.: (a) Aces Indonesia transferred in favor of Aces International Limited, a company incorporated in Bermuda (Aces Bermuda); and (b) PLDT to Aces Philippines.

In 2007, the BIR audited Aces Philippines' books of account and other accounting records in relation to all internal revenue taxes for TY 2006. The BIR discovered that Aces Philippines failed to withhold 35% FWT when it paid Aces Bermuda, a non-resident foreign corporation (NRFC), satellite air time fees. Aces Philippines protested the findings at the administrative level. However, the CIR still issued a Final Decision on Disputed Assessment (FDDA). Aces Philippines filed its judicial protest before the CTA. It argues the income from these payments was not sourced from the Philippines because Aces Bermuda: (a) performed the relevant service completely outside of the Philippines; and (b) does not own equipment in the Philippines. Nonetheless, as affirmed by CTA En Banc, the CTA Division upheld the ruling of the CIR and held that the satellite air time fees are considered Philippine-sourced income.

Issue: Whether the satellite air time fee payments to Aces Bermuda constitute income from sources within the Philippines.

Ruling: Yes. As an inherent attribute of sovereignty, the scope of taxing power is limited within a state's territorial jurisdiction. There must be an established nexus between the subject (e.g., person, property, income, or business) and the state that intends to tax it. In resolving the issue of whether the satellite air time fee payments to Aces Bermuda are subject to FWT requires a two-tiered approach: (a) source of the income; and (b) situs of the source.

As to the source of income, "Aces System" is described in the *Air Time Purchase Agreement* as consisting of satellite/s, terminals, and gateways. The satellite (outer space) receives, switches, amplifies, and/or transmits radio signals to and from the terminals and gateways (terrestrial/ground, including Philippine territory). The Court identifies the gateway's receipt of the call as the income source as it coincides with (a) the completion or delivery of the service and (b) the inflow of economic benefits in favor of Aces Bermuda.

The fulfillment of Aces Bermuda's undertaking requires the satellite to have transmitted/routed the call (first segment) and a gateway to have received the call as routed by the satellite (second segment). The act of transmission alone does not constitute completion or delivery of the service; rather, it is completed when the call is actually routed to its gateway so that Aces Philippines can connect its local subscriber to the intended recipient of the call. Aces Bermuda's service fulfillment necessitates both the satellite's transmission and reception by the gateway. Aces Philippines gains access to the Aces System only when the call reaches its gateway, connecting the local subscriber to the intended recipient and marking the completion of Aces Bermuda's

service. Sec. 3.2 of the Air Time Purchase Agreement further reveals that satellite air time fees accrue only upon the delivery of satellite air time to Aces Philippines and are utilized by the Philippine subscriber for a voice or data call. The accrual of fees payable to Aces Bermuda signifies the inflow of economic benefits.

As to the situs of the source, the following establishes the Philippines as the situs of Aces Bermuda's income from satellite air time fee payments: (a) the income-generating activity is directly associated with the gateways located within the Philippine territory; and (b) engaging in the business of providing satellite communication services in the Philippines is a government-regulated industry.

Aces Philippines admits receiving calls routed by the satellite (second segment of Aces System) occurs in the Philippines. The Court emphasizes that Aces Bermuda's services cover both the first and second segments of the Aces System, with the service extending beyond transmission until the satellite communication time is delivered to the Philippine gateway. Despite Aces Philippines being the legal owner/operator of the gateways, they were primarily constructed to serve the Aces System's needs. The income generation (i.e., accrual of satellite airtime fee payments and completion of the principal undertaking) coincides with receiving routed calls by gateways in Philippine territory. Although Aces Philippines legally owns the gateways, Aces Bermuda has significant economic interest in these properties, as its Philippine operations rely on these facilities. Further, only telecommunications entities with a state-granted franchise can operate within the country's territory. The involvement of a foreign satellite service provider in offering services to Philippine subscribers or participating in the telecommunications industry invokes Philippine sovereignty and government intervention/protection. The Court believes it is fair to subject the income of such foreign entities, like Aces Bermuda, to Philippine taxation. This is seen as a means of holding Aces Bermuda accountable for its share to compensate the government for the protection provided to its arrangements, operations, and transactions in the Philippines.

C. Value-Added Tax

Fritz Bryn Anthony M. Delos Santos, Petitioner, vs. CIR, Respondent.
Second Division | G.R. No. 222548 | 22 June 2022

Doctrine: Secs. 105 to 108 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, impose Value-Added Tax (VAT) on transactions involving the sale, barter, or exchange of goods, the rendition of services, and the use or lease of properties. However, condominium association dues, membership fees, and other charges do not arise from these transactions. They are not intended for profit but for maintaining condominium projects; thus, they are not subject to VAT.

Facts: On 31 October 2012, then BIR Commissioner Kim S. Jacinto-Henares issued Revenue Memorandum Circular (RMC) No. 65-2012, imposing VAT on condominium owners' association dues. This has adversely affected the herein petitioner, Delos Santos, a resident of Classica Tower Makati, prompting him to file a Petition for Certiorari before the Supreme Court. Delos Santos contends that Sec. 105 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, does not apply to condominium owners' or tenants' payment of

association dues, for they do not buy, transfer, or lease any goods, property, or services from the condominium corporation. The condominium corporation does not acquire ownership over the association dues, but only holds the same in a fiduciary capacity for payment of periodic maintenance costs of the project.

Issue: Whether RMC 65-2012 imposing VAT on association dues, membership fees, and other assessments and charges collected by homeowners associations and condominium corporations is valid.

Ruling: No. In 2020, the Court, in G.R. Nos. 215801 and 218924³ already declared RMC 65-2012 invalid, holding that the Circular did not merely interpret or clarify but changed altogether the long-standing rules of the BIR. Secs. 105 to 108 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, impose VAT on transactions involving the sale, barter, or exchange of goods, the rendition of services, and the use or lease of properties. However, condominium association dues, membership fees, and other charges do not arise from these transactions. These assessments or charges form part of a pool from which a condominium corporation must draw funds to bear maintenance, repair, improvement, reconstruction, and other administrative expenses. They are not intended for profit but to maintain the condominium project. Collecting association dues, membership fees, and other charges is purely for the benefit of the condominium owners. Thus, by their very nature, they are not subject to VAT.

Chevron Holdings, Inc. (Formerly Caltex Asia Limited), Petitioner, vs. CIR, Respondent.

En Banc | G.R. No. 215159 | 05 July 2022

Doctrine: *The request for a refund of unutilized input VAT from zero-rated sales shall not be denied on the basis that the taxpayer does not have "excess" input VAT from the output VAT.*

Facts: Chevron Holdings (petitioner) is a VAT-registered corporation licensed to transact business in the Philippines as a Regional Operating Headquarter (ROHQ). For the TY 2006, the petitioner rendered services to its affiliates in the Philippines and abroad. The services rendered to foreign and Philippine affiliates were subjected to a 0% and 12% rates respectively. The input taxes attributable to zero-rated sales were not credited against output taxes because of the substantial amounts of input taxes carried forward from the previous quarters. Chevron Holdings declared in its Amended Quarterly VAT Return for the fourth quarter of 2005 the amount of P55,784,357.71 as excess input tax.

On 28 March 2008, Chevron Holdings filed an administrative claim for refund or issuance of a tax credit certificate on the unutilized input VAT attributable to the sale of services to its foreign affiliates. The CIR failed to act on the claim; hence, on 24 April and 23 July of the same year, Chevron Holdings filed Petitions for Review before the CTA Division for the refund or credit of excess input VAT for TY 2006, which were denied for being prematurely filed. However, the CTA En Banc reversed the

³ BIR, Petitioner, vs. First E-Bank Tower Condominium Corp., Respondent, 15 January 2020.

decision and held that the judicial claims were timely filed since the administrative and judicial claims were all filed during the period of validity of BIR Ruling No. DA-489-03.

As regards input VAT attributable to zero-rated sales, the CTA En Banc ruled that only P155,654,748.22 qualified for VAT zero-rating of sales of services to non-resident foreign affiliate clients under Sec. 108(B)(2) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended. The CTA En Banc declared that some of the foreign affiliate clients were not adequately supported by the required documents and that VAT official receipts issued to foreign affiliates must have the corresponding foreign currency inward remittances.

The CTA En Banc further disallowed a certain amount of input claims for having no supporting VAT invoices or official receipts and failing to comply with the invoicing requirements under the NIRC of 1997, as amended. The appellate Court also observed that there was no excess input VAT that may be the subject of a claim for refund or tax credit for the second, third, and fourth quarters of 2006, while the excess input tax for the first quarter shall be allocated to Chevron Holdings' valid zero-rated sales; thus, only P15,085.24 shall be refundable.

Issues:

- 1) Whether the sales rendered to Chevron Holdings' non-resident foreign affiliates qualify for VAT zero-rating under Sec. 108(B)(2) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended.
- 2) Whether it is proper to charge validated input taxes against output tax liabilities and only when excess input taxes exist that it allows the refund.

Ruling:

- 1) No. Chevron Holdings failed to meet the third and fourth requisites to qualify for VAT zero-rating. To qualify for VAT zero-rating, Sec. 108(B)(2) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, requires the concurrence of four conditions: (a) the services rendered should be other than "processing, manufacturing, or repacking of goods"; (b) the services are performed in the Philippines; (c) the service-recipient is (1) a person engaged in business conducted outside the Philippines; or (2) a non-resident person not engaged in a business that is outside the Philippines when the services are performed; and (d) the services are paid for in acceptable foreign currency inwardly remitted and accounted for in conformity with Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP) rules and regulations.

The first and second requisites were undisputed. As an ROHQ, Chevron Holdings' services in the Philippines are not in the same category as "processing, manufacturing, or repacking of goods" (e.g., general administration and planning, business planning and coordination, etc.). Anent the third requisite, the Court emphasized that for sales to a NRFC to qualify for zero-rating, there must be sufficient proof showing not only that the clients are foreign corporations but also that they are not doing business in the Philippines. Therefore, the taxpayer-claimant must present, at the very least, both the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Certificates of Non-Registration — to prove that the affiliate is foreign; and the Articles or Certificates of Foreign Incorporation, printed screenshots of the US SEC website showing the

state/province/country where the entity was organized, or any similar document — to prove the fact of not engaging in trade or business in the Philippines at the time the sales are rendered. Here, these two documents did not adequately support some foreign affiliate clients.

Regarding the fourth condition, the Court stressed that the certification of inward remittances proves the fact of payment in acceptable foreign currency and is accounted for under the BSP rules and regulations. In this case, however, Chevron Holdings failed to substantiate the inward remittance of the proceeds of P10,025,869.35 sales duly accounted for in conformity with BSP rules.

2) No. Under Sec. 112(A) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, to be refunded or issued a tax credit certificate, the following must be complied with: (a) the input tax is a creditable input tax due or paid; (b) the input tax is attributable to the zero-rated sales; (c) the input tax is not transitional; (d) the input tax was not applied against the output tax; and (e) in case the taxpayer is engaged in mixed transactions, only the input taxes proportionately allocated to zero-rated sales based on sales volume may be refunded or issued a tax credit certificate.

The first, second, third, and fifth requisites have been established. In relation to the fourth requisite, the Court underscored that the taxpayer can only charge its input tax against its output tax. The taxpayer cannot request a refund or credit against its other internal revenue tax liabilities, the "excess" input tax because the tax is not an excessively collected tax under Sec. 229 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended. And, even if the "excess" input tax is, in fact, "excessively" collected, the person who can file the judicial claim for refund is the person legally liable to pay the input tax, not the person to whom the tax was passed on as part of the purchase price. The taxpayer will only be entitled to the refund or tax credit of the "excess" and unused input tax when its VAT registration is cancelled.

Thus, the input tax attributable to zero-rated sales may, at the option of the VAT-registered taxpayer, be: (a) charged against output tax from regular 12% VAT-able sales, and any unutilized or "excess" input tax may be claimed for refund or the issuance of tax credit certificate; or (b) claimed for refund or tax credit in its entirety. It must be stressed that the remedies of charging the input tax against the output tax and applying for a refund or tax credit are alternative and cumulative. Furthermore, the option is vested with the taxpayer-claimant, as the taxpayer is more interested in reducing the output tax payable. The courts cannot condition the refund of input taxes allocable to zero-rated sales on the existence of "excess" creditable input taxes, which include the input taxes carried over from the previous periods, from the output taxes.

Maibarara Geothermal, Inc., Petitioner, vs. CIR, Respondent.
Second Division| G.R. No. 250479| 18 July 2022

Doctrine: *Sec. 112(A) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, provides that any claim for refund or tax credit of unutilized VAT must be attributable to zero-rated or effectively zero-rated sales; thus, the refund or tax credit of unutilized input VAT is premised on the existence of zero-rated or effectively zero-rated sales.*

Facts: In 2013, Maibarara Geothermal, Inc. (MGI), a VAT-registered domestic corporation, filed administrative claims to refund its unutilized input VAT for the TY 2011 with the CIR. However, the CIR left these claims unacted, prompting MGI to file four Petitions for Review before the CTA. In a decision subsequently affirmed by the CTA En Banc, the CTA Division denied the consolidated petitions for review for lack of merit.

Issue: Whether MGI is entitled to the refund of its unutilized input VAT for the TY 2011.

Ruling: No. MGI is not entitled to a refund for its unutilized input VAT. Sec. 112(A) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, provides that any claim for refund or tax credit of unutilized input VAT must be attributable to zero-rated or effectively zero-rated sales. It gives the option to export enterprises whose nature of sales does not incur output VAT to claim as a refund or apply as a tax credit the input VAT that is passed on to them. As laid down in G.R. No. 180345⁴, to claim a refund or tax credit under Sec. 112(A), the petitioner must comply with the following criteria:

- 1) The taxpayer is VAT-registered;
- 2) The taxpayer is engaged in zero-rated or effectively zero-rated sales;
- 3) The input taxes are due or paid;
- 4) The input taxes are not transitional input taxes;
- 5) The input taxes have not been applied against output taxes during and in the succeeding quarters;
- 6) The input taxes claimed are attributable to zero-rated or effectively zero-rated sales;
- 7) For zero-rated sales under Secs. 106(A)(2)(1) and (2); 106(B); and 108(B)(1) and (2), the acceptable foreign currency exchange proceeds have been duly accounted for in accordance with BSP rules and regulations;
- 8) Where there are both zero-rated or effectively zero-rated sales and taxable or exempt sales, and the input taxes cannot be directly and entirely attributable to any of these sales, the input taxes shall be proportionately allocated based on sales volume; and
- 9) The claim is filed within two years after the close of the taxable quarter when such sales were made.

While the two-year prescriptive period for filing an administrative claim for refund begins to run from the close of the taxable quarter when the relevant sales were made and not from the time the input VAT was incurred, in this case, however, MGI admitted that it had no sales—particularly zero-rated or effectively zero-rated sales—during the TY 2011 and only started selling during the first quarter of 2014. Thus, there is no output VAT against which the input VAT may be deducted. It is clear under Sec. 112(A) that the refund or tax credit of unutilized input VAT is premised on the existence of zero-rated or effectively zero-rated sales.

⁴ San Roque Power Corporation, Petitioner, vs. CIR, Respondent, 25 November 2009.

Domingo F. Estomo, Petitioner, vs. Civil Service Commission, Regional Office No. X, as represented by the Regional Director, CSC Region X, Respondent.
Third Division | G.R. No. 248971 | 31 August 2022

Doctrine: *According to the definition of gross receipts under the NIRC of 1997, as amended, retention money is part of the contract price on which the withholding VAT shall be based.*

Facts: In 1997, Civil Service Commission (CSC) Region X and Domingo F. Estomo Trading & Construction executed a Contract for Works for the complete construction of the third floor of the CSC-X building. Estomo sent several demand letters to the CSC, including a final demand letter for P604,278.60, representing the balance from the Contract for Works and the extra work. Despite this, Estomo has not received payment. Thus, he filed before the Regional Trial Court (RTC) a complaint for specific performance, the sum of money, plus damages against the CSC. The RTC ruled in favor of the Estomo. However, the Court of Appeals (CA) held that, based on the detailed computation of previous payments made by the CSC, the remaining balance due to Estomo is P371,431.20, or a net amount of P217,174.42 after accounting for tax, recoupment fee, retention fee, and deficiencies.

Issue: Whether the deductions made on the Contract for Works, particularly the withholding taxes, are valid.

Ruling: No. The rates applied by CSC do not conform with the prevailing tax rates during the Contract for Works in 1997. According to Republic Act (RA) No. 8241, amending RA 7716, the applicable law for withholding VAT at that time, the government, its political subdivisions, instrumentalities, or agencies, including government-owned or -controlled corporations, were obliged to withhold VAT at a rate of 6% on gross receipts for services by contractors. The CSC withheld VAT at the 6% rate on progress payments after deducting the 10% retention money from the gross amount. However, "gross receipts" is defined by Sec. 102 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, as "the total amount of money or its equivalent representing the contract price, compensation, service fee, rental, or royalty, including the amount charged for materials supplied with the services and deposits and advanced payments actually or constructively received during the taxable quarter for the services performed or to be performed for another person, excluding VAT." Pursuant to this definition, the retention money is part of the contract price. Retention money is merely deducted and set aside by the government as a form of deposit or security, which, upon final acceptance of the works, will eventually be released to the contractor. By deducting the retention money from the tax base, the CSC effectively excluded it from the VAT coverage, resulting in underpayment.

D. Remedies

Asian Transmission Corporation, Petitioner, vs. CIR, Respondent.
Second Division | G.R. No. 230861 | 14 February 2022

Doctrine: *If a waiver suffers from defects on account of both parties, the waiver's validity in relation to the timeliness of the CIR's subsequent issuance of a tax assessment is not determined by a mere plurality of the defects committed between the BIR and the taxpayer.*

Facts: Based on a LOA dated 09 August 2004, the BIR initiated an audit and investigation of Asian Transmission Corporation's (ATC) books of account and other accounting records covering the TY 2002. Despite CIR's right to assess ATC was due to prescribe in the first quarter of 2006, the BIR's investigation period and CIR's assessment period were extended until 31 December 2018, through the Waivers executed. Consequently, the CIR issued a FLD on 15 July 2008, assessing ATC for deficiency withholding taxes. ATC filed an administrative protest contesting the assessment, alleging (a) violation of due process in the issuance of PAN; and (b) erroneous details of discrepancies in the FLD. The CIR denied ATC's protest and request for reconsideration. ATC then filed a judicial protest before the CTA, asserting the invalidity of LOAs due to lack of revalidation and defects in the waivers, rendering them ineffective in extending the assessment period. The CTA ruled in favor of ATC and canceled the tax assessments on account of prescription. However, on appeal, the CTA En Banc reinstated the assessments. Aggrieved, ATC assailed the CTA En Banc ruling before the Court.

The Court affirmed the decision of the CTA En Banc, stating that both parties were at fault. While the BIR failed to observe the procedures in the execution of a valid waiver, ATC was also remiss in its responsibility of preparing the waiver prior to submission to and filing before the BIR. Hence, the ATC filed a motion for reconsideration.

Issue: Whether the CIR is divested of its right to assess and collect deficiency taxes on account of alleged defects caused by the BIR that outnumber the ones caused by ATC.

Ruling: No. If a waiver suffers from defects on account of both parties, the waiver's validity in relation to the timeliness of the CIR's subsequent issuance of a tax assessment is not determined by a mere plurality of the defects committed between the BIR and the taxpayer. The defects attributable to one party had been greater in number, which cannot diminish the seriousness of the counter-party's fault or negligence. Further, the taxpayer's contributory fault or negligence, coupled with belated action on questioning the waiver's validity, will render an otherwise flawed waiver effective, regardless of the physical number of mistakes attributable to a party. ATC raised the waivers' validity for the first time in its appeal to the CTA after obtaining an unfavorable CIR decision on their administrative protest. Certainly, no taxpayer may be allowed to execute haphazard waivers deliberately, go through the motions that the waivers are effective, and lead the tax authorities to believe that the assessment period has been extended, only to deny the validity thereof when it becomes unfavorable to him.

Republic of the Philippines, represented by the BIR, Petitioner, vs. First Gas Power Corporation, Respondent.
First Division | G.R. No. 214933 | 15 February 2022

Doctrine: *Sec. 222(b) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, authorizes the extension of the original three-year prescriptive period for assessment and collection upon the execution of a valid waiver between the taxpayer and the BIR, provided: (a) the agreement was made before the expiration of the three-year period, and (b) the guidelines in the proper execution of the waiver are strictly followed (e.g., date of acceptance and due date for payment must be indicated in the waiver).*

Facts: On 24 October 2002, First Gas Power Corporation (First Gas) received an LOA from the BIR representative to examine its book of accounts and other accounting records for TYs 2000 and 2001 revenue taxes. Thereafter, on 11 March 2004, First Gas received a PAN dated 15 December 2003, and 28 January 2004, for deficiency taxes and penalties for TYs 2000 and 2001. Then, on 06 September 2004, it received FANs and FLDs, all dated 19 July 2004. Records also show that First Gas and the BIR executed three Waivers of Defense of Prescription under the Statute of Limitations, the summary of which are as follows:

Waiver	Date of waiver	Period extended	Person who signed the waiver
First	12 April 2004	15 June 2004	Celia C. King
Second	14 June 2004	15 August 2004	Celia C. King
Third	13 August 2004	15 October 2004	Celia C. King

On 05 October 2004, First Gas filed a Letter of Protest, which the BIR did not act upon. Thus, on 30 June 2005, it filed a petition for review before the CTA to assail the FANs and FLDs. The CTA Third Division ruled in favor of First Gas, which CTA En Banc affirmed.

Issue: Whether the deficiency tax assessments for TYs 2000 to 2001 issued by the BIR against First Gas are valid.

Ruling: No. The FANs and FLDs issued are all invalid assessments. First, as to the validity of the FANs and FLDs for TY 2000, the Court held that the period of the BIR to issue the same has already been prescribed. While Sec. 203 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, provides that internal revenue taxes shall be assessed within three years after the last day prescribed by law for the filing of the return or the day the return was filed, if filed beyond the period prescribed, Sec. 222(b) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, authorizes the extension of the original three-year prescriptive period upon the execution of a valid waiver between the taxpayer and the BIR, provided: (a) the agreement was made before the expiration of the three-year period; and (b) the guidelines in the proper execution of the waiver are strictly followed.

Records show that the respondent filed two Income Tax Returns (ITRs) for the TY 2000 on 16 October 2000 and 16 April 2001. Thus, in accordance with Sec. 203 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, the petitioner had until 16 October 2003 and 16 April 2004, within which to assess the respondent for deficiency income tax for TY 2000. However, in this

case, the respondent received the FAN and FLD, all dated 19 July 2004, only on 06 September 2004. Although the BIR contends that the prescription had not set in because the parties executed three waivers, such waivers are defective because the date of acceptance by the petitioner is not indicated therein as mandated by RMO 20-90 and Revenue Delegation of Authority Order No. 05-01. This is necessary to determine whether the waiver was validly accepted before the expiration of the original three-year period. Further, the date of notarization cannot be regarded as the date of acceptance for the same refers to different aspects, as the notary public is distinct from the Commissioner of the BIR, who is authorized by law to accept Waivers of the Statute of Limitations.

Second, as to the validity of the FAN and FLD for TY 2001, the Court likewise finds that the same is not valid due to BIR's failure to indicate a definite due date for payment. The statement made by the BIR in the FAN failed to clearly indicate the due date of payment, which made it seem that the total amount depended upon when the respondent decided to pay.

**CIR, Petitioner, vs. Philippine Bank of Communications, Respondent.
Second Division | G.R. No. 211348 | 23 February 2022**

Doctrine: *Failing to comply with the requirements of an administrative claim for Creditable Withholding Tax (CWT) refund/credit does not preclude filing a judicial claim. Secs. 204(C) and 229 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, allow the filing of both claims contemporaneously within the two-year prescriptive period, provided that the administrative claim must be filed for the judicial claim to be maintained.*

Facts: On 16 April 2007, the Philippine Bank of Communications (PBCOM) filed with the BIR its annual ITR for TY 2006, which was subsequently amended on 02 May 2007, reflecting a net loss of P903,582,307.00 and a creditable tax withheld for the fourth quarter of 2006 in the amount of P24,716,655.00. In the said ITR, PBCOM also indicated its intention to apply for the issuance of a tax credit certificate (TCC) for its excess/unutilized CWT. Almost two years later, on 03 April 2009, PBCOM requested the BIR to issue a TCC for the excess CWT. Due to the inaction of the CIR, on 15 April 2009, PBCOM filed a petition for review with the CTA for the issuance of a TCC for its excess/unutilized CWT for the year 2006. In its answer, the CIR argued that PBCOM's claim is in the nature of a refund and thus subject to administrative examination by the BIR and that PBCOM failed to fully comply with the requirements provided in Revenue Regulations (RR) No. 6-86 and jurisprudence.

The CTA Third Division partially granted the petition and ruled that PBCOM timely filed the claim for refund within the two-year prescriptive period, but the other requirements were only satisfied as to the amount of P4,624,554.63. The CTA En Banc affirmed the Division's decision in toto.

Issue: Whether PBCOM's non-submission of the required documents under RMO 53-98 and RR 2-2006 rendered its administrative claim for issuing a TCC pro forma; thereby making its judicial claim premature.

Ruling: No. The failure of PBCOM to comply with the requirements of an administrative claim for CWT refund/credit does not preclude the filing of its judicial claim. The independence of the judicial claim for a CWT credit/refund from its administrative counterpart is implied in Secs. 204(C) and 229 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, which allow the filing of both claims contemporaneously within the two-year prescriptive period.

The provisions require both administrative and judicial claims to be filed within the same two-year prescriptive period. With reference to Sec. 229 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, the only requirement for a judicial claim of tax credit/refund is that a claim of refund or credit has been filed before the CIR; there is no mention in the law that the claim before the CIR should be acted upon first before a judicial claim may be filed. Clearly, the legislative intent is to treat the judicial claim as an independent and separate action from the administrative claim; provided that the latter must be filed for the former to be maintained. While the CIR should be given the opportunity to act on PBCOM's claim, PBCOM should not be faulted for lawfully filing a judicial claim before the expiration of the two-year prescriptive period, notwithstanding the alleged defects in its administrative claim. This is considering that, unlike administrative claims for Input Tax refund/credit before the CIR, which have a required specific period of action (the expiration of which shall be deemed as a denial), there is no such period of action required in administrative claims for CWT refund/credit before the CIR.

Harte-Hanks Philippines, Inc., Petitioner, vs. CIR, Respondent.
Second Division | G.R. No. 205189 | 07 March 2022

Doctrine: *The 120+30-day period provided under Sec. 112(C) of the NIRC of 1997 is generally mandatory and jurisdictional from the effectivity of the NIRC of 1997 on 01 January 1998 up to the present. By way of exception, judicial claims filed during the window period from 10 December 2003 to 06 October 2010 need not wait for the exhaustion of the 120-day period.*

Facts: On 23 March 2010, Harte-Hanks Philippines, Inc. filed with the CIR a written application (administrative claim) for refund or issuance of a tax credit for its excess and unutilized input VAT for the first and second quarters of 2008. The CIR did not act on the application. On 29 June 2010, Harte-Hanks filed a petition for review (judicial claim) with the CTA Second Division, or before the lapse of the 120-day period on 21 July 2010. The CIR filed his answer on 19 August 2010, and a supplemental answer on 04 October 2010, praying that the petition for review be dismissed for failure of Harte-Hanks to exhaust administrative remedies under Sec. 112(C) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, and for lack of jurisdiction, as there had been no decision or inaction that is tantamount to a denial by the CIR and appealable to the CTA. The CTA Second Division dismissed the petition for having been prematurely filed. The CTA En Banc affirmed the assailed resolutions of the CTA Second Division and dismissed the petition for lack of merit.

Issue: Whether the petition for review by Harte-Hanks Philippines was prematurely filed.

Ruling: No. The petition was not prematurely filed; thus, the CTA has jurisdiction over the judicial claim. Sec. 112(C) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, clearly provides that the CIR has "120 days from the date of the submission of the complete documents in support of the application [for tax refund/credit]" within which to grant or deny the claim. In case of full or partial denial by the CIR, the taxpayer's recourse is to file an appeal before the CTA within 30 days from receipt of the CIR's decision. However, if after the 120-day period, the CIR fails to act on the application for tax refund/credit, the taxpayer may appeal the inaction of the CIR to the CTA within 30 days. An exception, however, is provided in BIR Ruling No. DA-489-03, which expressly states that the "taxpayer-claimant need not wait for the lapse of the 120-day period before it could seek judicial relief with the CTA by way of a petition for review." Considering that it is a general interpretative rule issued by the CIR, all taxpayers can rely on BIR Ruling No. DA-489-03 from the time of its issuance on 10 December 2003 up to its reversal in G.R. No. 184823⁵ on 06 October 2010, where the Court held that the 120+30-day period is mandatory and jurisdictional.⁶

CIR, Petitioner, vs. CTA Second Division and QL Development, Inc., Respondents.

First Division | G.R. No. 258947 | 29 March 2022

Doctrine: (1) The CTA has jurisdiction to decide not only cases on disputed assessments and refunds of internal revenue taxes but also on "other matters" arising under the NIRC of 1997, as amended, which covers the issue of prescription of the CIR's right to collect taxes; (2) In cases of assessments issued within the three-year ordinary period, the CIR has another three years within which to collect taxes due by distraint, levy, or court proceeding. The tax assessment is deemed made, and the three-year period for collection of the assessed tax begins to run on the date the assessment notice was released, mailed, or sent to the taxpayer.

Facts: On 12 November 2012, QL Development, Inc. (QLDI) received an LOA dated 30 October 2012, covering the TY 2010 for deficiency taxes. On 28 November 2014, the CIR served the PAN along with the Details of Discrepancies to QLDI. QLDI filed its reply to the PAN on 15 December 2014. On 12 December 2014, the CIR sent out the FAN or FLD with Details of Discrepancies, which QLDI failed to protest within the 30-day period provided by law. The CIR issued a FDDA, which QLDI received on 03 March 2015. QLDI filed with the CIR a request for reconsideration dated 30 March 2015, which the CIR denied in the Decision dated 04 February 2020. Consequently, the CIR ordered QLDI to pay the deficiency taxes and the compromise penalty for the TY 2010.

QLDI filed a Petition for Review before the CTA Division, challenging the validity of the assessment against it and the prescription of the CIR's right to collect taxes. QLDI alleged that the CIR's right to collect taxes had been prescribed as early as 12 December

⁵ CIR, Petitioner, vs. Aichi Forging Company of Asia, Inc., Respondent, 06 October 2010.

⁶ CIR, Petitioner, vs. San Roque Power Corporation, Respondent, consolidated with Taganito Mining Corporation, Petitioner, vs. CIR, Respondent, and Philex Mining Corporation, Petitioner, vs. CIR, Respondent, G.R. No. 187485, 12 February 2013.

2019, or five years from the date of mailing/release/sending of the FAN/FLD on 12 December 2014. The CTA Division held that the period within which the CIR may collect deficiency taxes had already lapsed and was already barred by prescription. The CIR issued the BIR letters for the collection of taxes on various dates in 2020, which were all beyond the five-year period (12 December 2019) to collect the assessed tax.

Issues:

- 1) Whether the CTA has jurisdiction over the case.
- 2) Whether the CIR's right to collect taxes had already been prescribed.

Ruling:

1) Yes. The CTA has jurisdiction over the case. The CIR claims that QLDI's failure to file a valid protest to the FAN/FLD rendered the assessment against it already final, executory, and demandable. As such, it is already beyond the CTA Division's jurisdiction. Based on Sec. 7(a)(1) of RA 1125, as amended by RA 9282, the CTA has jurisdiction to decide not only cases on disputed assessments and refunds of internal revenue taxes but also "other matters" arising under the NIRC of 1997, as amended. In G.R. No. 169225⁷, the Court held that the issue of prescription of the CIR's right to collect taxes is covered by the term "other matters" over which the CTA has appellate jurisdiction. The fact that an assessment has become final for failure of the taxpayer to file a protest within the time allowed only means that the validity or correctness of the assessment may no longer be questioned on appeal. However, the validity of the assessment itself is a separate and distinct issue from the issue of whether the right of the CIR to collect the validly assessed tax has been prescribed. This issue of prescription, being a matter provided for by the NIRC of 1997, as amended, is well within the jurisdiction of the CTA to decide.

2) Yes. The CIR's right to collect taxes had already prescribed. Sec. 203 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, which provides for the prescriptive period in the assessment and collection of internal revenue taxes, reads:

SEC. 203. Period of Limitation Upon Assessment and Collection. — Except as provided in Section 222, internal revenue taxes shall be assessed within three (3) years after the last day prescribed by law for the filing of the return, and no proceeding in court without assessment for the collection of such taxes shall be begun after the expiration of such period: Provided, That in a case where a return is filed beyond the period prescribed by law, the three (3)-year period shall be counted from the day the return was filed. For purposes of this Section, a return filed before the last day prescribed by law for the filing thereof shall be considered as filed on such last day.

In G.R. No. 197515⁸, the Court held that in cases of assessments issued within the three-year ordinary period, the CIR has another three years within which to collect taxes due by distraint, levy, or court proceeding. The tax assessment is deemed made, and the

⁷ CIR, Petitioner, vs. Hambrecht & Quist Philippines, Inc., Respondent, 17 November 2010.

⁸ CIR, Petitioner, vs. United Salvage and Towage (Phils.), Inc., Respondent, 02 July 2014.

three-year period for collection of the assessed tax begins to run on the date the assessment notice was released, mailed, or sent to the taxpayer.

Accordingly, the Court held that the three-year, and not the five-year, period of limitation upon assessment and collection applies to this case. The five-year period for collection of taxes only applies to assessments issued within the extraordinary period of 10 years in cases of a false or fraudulent return or failure to file a return, as provided under Sec. 222 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended.

Here, since the FAN/FLD was mailed on 12 December 2014, the CIR had another three years reckoned from said date, or until 12 December 2017, to enforce the collection of the assessed deficiency taxes. Verily, prescriptions had already set in when the CIR initiated its collection efforts only in 2020. The Court also notes that regardless of which period to apply, i.e., five years as determined by the CTA Division or three years, the CIR's collection efforts were, as they are, barred by prescription.

The CIR's collection efforts are initiated by distraint, levy, or court proceedings. The distraint and levy proceedings are validly begun or commenced by issuing a warrant of distraint and levy and the service thereof on the taxpayer. And a judicial action for the collection of a tax is initiated: (a) by the filing of a complaint with the court of competent jurisdiction; or (b) where the assessment is appealed to the CTA, by filing an answer to the taxpayer's petition for review, wherein payment of the tax is prayed for. However, in this case, no warrant of distraint and/or levy was served on QLDI, and the CIR initiated no judicial proceedings within the prescriptive period to collect.

BIR, Petitioner, vs. Tico Insurance Company, Inc., Glowide Enterprises, Inc., and Pacific Mills, Inc., Respondents.
Second Division | G.R. No. 204226 | 18 April 2022

***Doctrine:** Sec. 219 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, provides that a tax lien is enforceable against all property and rights to property belonging to the taxpayer, and retroacts on the time when the tax assessment was made. However, the tax lien shall not be valid against any judgment creditor until notice of such lien is filed and annotated with the Register of Deeds of the city, or province, where the taxpayer's properties are located.*

Facts: Tico Insurance Company, Inc. (TICO) is a domestic corporation engaged in the sale of life insurance, whereas Glowide Enterprises, Inc. (Glowide) and Pacific Mills, Inc. (PMI) are its clients who secured fire insurance policies in 1997. While their fire insurance policy with TICO was in effect, a fire broke out that destroyed the properties insured. Due to TICO's failure to pay the full amount of the insurance proceeds, despite demand, Glowide and PMI filed a complaint for a sum of money and damages with prayer for a writ of preliminary attachment against TICO before the RTC. Concurrently, TICO was served several final assessment notices for its alleged deficiency in internal revenue taxes with the BIR for the TYs 1996 and 1997. As a consequence of non-payment, BIR resorted to issuing a warrant of distraint and/or levy on TICO's real and personal properties and caused the annotation of the notice of tax lien on the condominium units of TICO. BIR asserted that it has a superior claim over the

condominium units, considering its claim for unpaid revenue taxes enjoys absolute preference under the New Civil Code, and a tax lien over TICO's properties had already been attached at the time the assessments were made.

TICO filed a complaint for interpleader with the RTC to determine which party, between Glowide and PMI on one hand and BIR on the other, has a superior right over the condominium units. The RTC ruled that BIR's claim over the condominium units is superior to that of Glowide and PMI. However, the same was overturned by the CA.

Issue: Which party, between the BIR on one hand and Glowide and PM on the other, is entitled to ownership of the condominium units?

Ruling: The Court ruled that Glowide and PMI's rights over the condominium units are superior to the BIR's claim and are thus entitled to the possession and conveyance of the units. Sec. 219 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, provides that a tax lien is enforceable against all property and rights to property belonging to the taxpayer, and retroacts on the time when the tax assessment was made. However, the tax lien shall not be valid against any judgment creditor until notice of such lien is filed and annotated with the Register of Deeds of the city, or province, where the taxpayer's properties are located. In this case, the BIR annotated its tax lien in February 2005, which was already after the annotation of Glowide and PMI's levy on attachment and sale of the condominium units; hence, Glowide and PMI already had rights over the condominium units, subject only to TICO's right of redemption. Further, pursuant to the New Civil Code, TICO's tax claim is only an ordinary preferred credit under Article 2244 since it is not based on taxes due on the condominium units but on TICO's deficiency in payment of its internal revenue taxes. On the other hand, Glowide and PMI's claim is a special preferred credit under Art. 2242(7) of the Civil Code and is thus superior to BIR's tax claim, which is only an ordinary preferred credit.

Department of Energy, Petitioner, vs. CTA, Respondent.
Third Division | G.R. No. 260912 | 17 August 2022

Doctrine: *All disputes, claims, and controversies solely between or among executive agencies, including disputes on tax assessments, must be submitted to administrative settlement by the Secretary of Justice or the Solicitor General, as the case may be.*

Facts: The BIR issued a PAN and FLD/FAN to the Department of Energy (DOE) on 07 December 2018, and 17 December 2018, respectively, for its deficiency excise taxes. On 21 December 2018, the DOE responded to the BIR, asserting that it is not liable for the assessed amounts as DOE is not among those liable to pay excise taxes under Sec. 130(A)(1) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, and that the subject transactions are exempt from excise taxes under Item 3.2 of BIR RR 1-2018. On 17 July 2019, the BIR notified the DOE that the assessment had become final, executory, and demandable for its failure to file a formal protest within the thirty (30)-day period prescribed under existing revenue rules and regulations. The CIR issued the two assailed warrants on 19 September 2019.

On 18 October 2019, the DOE filed a Petition for Review (with Urgent Motion for Suspension of Collection of Taxes) with the CTA Second Division, which was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. The DOE filed a Motion for Reconsideration, which was likewise denied for lack of merit. The CTA Second Division maintained that the case before it is a purely intra-governmental dispute, and as such, it is bereft of jurisdiction to take cognizance of the same. On 28 February 2020, the DOE filed a Petition for Review before the CTA En Banc. The CTA En Banc affirmed its Division's earlier Resolutions in its decision.

Issue: Whether the CTA has jurisdiction over appeals on tax disputes solely involving agencies under the Executive Department.

Ruling: No. All disputes, claims, and controversies solely between or among executive agencies, including disputes on tax assessments, must be submitted to administrative settlement by the Secretary of Justice or the Solicitor General, as the case may be.

It is a fundamental rule that special laws prevail over general laws. Presidential Decree (PD) No. 242 deals specifically with resolving disputes, claims, and controversies where the parties involved are the government's various departments, bureaus, offices, agencies, and instrumentalities. Thus, PD 242 should be read as an exception to the general rule set forth in RA 1125, as amended, and the NIRC of 1997, as amended, that the CTA has jurisdiction over tax disputes involving laws administered by the BIR.

Prime Steel Mill, Incorporated, Petitioner, vs. CIR, Respondent.
Third Division | G.R. No. 249153 | 12 September 2022

Doctrine: *The failure to observe the 15-day period provided by RR 12-99 to allow taxpayers to reply to the PAN constitutes a violation of due process, resulting in void assessments.*

Facts: On 07 January 2009, Prime Steel Mill, Inc. (Prime Steel) received a PAN dated 19 December 2008 from the BIR, assessing it with deficiency income tax, VAT, and Expanded Withholding Tax (EWT) for TY 2005. Prime Steel filed a letter protesting the PAN on 22 January 2009. Nonetheless, on 12 February 2009, Prime Steel received a FAN and FLD dated 14 January 2009 from the BIR, reiterating the findings contained in the PAN. Prime Steel disputed the same, but eventually, the BIR issued the FDDA dated 14 April 2014.

Prime Steel filed a Petition for Review before the CTA, challenging the validity of the assessments. The CTA Third Division partially granted the Petition, which was affirmed by CTA En Banc, and cancelled the deficiency VAT assessment against the petitioner while still upholding its deficiency income tax assessment.

Issue: Whether the petitioner's right to due process was violated when the BIR issued the FAN without observing the 15-day period provided by RR 12-99 to allow taxpayers to reply to the PAN.

Ruling: Yes. The failure of the BIR to observe the 15-day period requirement before the issuance of the FAN renders the tax assessment against Prime Steel null and void. The FAN was issued within the 15-day period for the petitioner to reply to the PAN. Without waiting for the petitioner's reply, the BIR apparently issued the FAN on 14 January 2009, albeit it was received by the petitioner only on 12 February 2009. The Court held that the PAN is part and parcel of the due process requirement in issuing a deficiency tax assessment, and the BIR must strictly comply with the requirements laid down by the law and by its own rules. Further, the PAN stage cannot be discounted as it presents an opportunity for both the taxpayer and the BIR to settle the case at the earliest possible time without needing to issue a FAN. Well-settled is the rule that an assessment that fails to strictly comply with the due process requirements set forth in Sec. 228 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, and RR 12-99 is void and produces no effect.

II. Local Government Code of 1991

A. Local Business Taxes

City of Davao and Bella Linda N. Tanjili, in her official capacity as City Treasurer of Davao City, Petitioners, vs. Arc Investors, Inc., Respondent.
Third Division | G.R. No. 249668 | 13 July 2022

Doctrine: *Money market placements of dividends of holding companies cannot amount to "doing business" as a non-bank financial intermediary (NBFI) subject to local business tax (LBT) lacking the element of regularity or recurrence for the purpose of earning a profit.*

Facts: On 20 January 2014, Arc Investors, Inc. (ARCII) was assessed by the City of Davao and City Treasurer Tanjili of LBT amounting to P4,381,431.90, equivalent to 0.55% of the foregoing dividends from its preferred shares of stocks in San Miguel Corporation (SMC) and interest income from its money market placements. This prompted ARCII to file an administrative protest with the City Treasurer of Davao, claiming that the assessment made was erroneous and illegal. Following the alleged inaction on the protest, ARCII filed a petition for review, questioning the LBT assessment with the RTC. ARCII contented that, based on its Articles of Incorporation, it is not characterized as a banking or financial institution and that the receipt of dividends and interest is merely incidental to its ownership of SMC shares and money market placements; hence, not constitutive of "business activity" subject to LBT. It also invoked Sec. 27(D) of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, and the case of G.R. Nos. 177857-58 and 178193⁹, which provides that dividends received by a domestic corporation from another domestic corporation are not subject to tax and that the Coconut Industry Investment Fund (CIIF) block of SMC shares is characterized as government-owned funds not subject to local taxation.

The RTC denied the petition and upheld the validity of the LBT assessments. However, the CTA Division reversed the ruling of the RTC, which was subsequently affirmed by

⁹ COCOFED, Petitioner, vs. Republic of the Philippines, Respondent, 24 January 2012.

the CTA En Banc, stating that ARCII cannot be considered either as a financial intermediary or a NBFI subject to LBT.

Issue: Whether ARCII is an NBFI subject to LBT under Sec. 143(f), in relation to Sec. 151 of the Local Government Code (LGC).

Ruling: No. ARCII is not an NBFI and should not be subject to LBT. Local government units have the power to impose LBT on the privilege of doing business within their territorial jurisdictions, which contemplates some "trade or commercial activity regularly engaged in as a means of livelihood or with a view to profit." Under Sec. 143(f) of the LGC, banks or other financial institutions, whose principal functions include lending, investing, or placement of funds or evidence of indebtedness or equity deposited to them, acquired by them, or otherwise coursed through them, either for their own account or for the account of others, are liable to pay LBT.

In this case, however, ARCII's placement of dividends derived from its SMC shares in the market incidentally earning interests does not negate the corporation's restricted underlying purpose as a CIIF holding company—i.e., to manage the dividends of SMC preferred shares for and on behalf of the government—as would convert it into an active investor or dealer in securities. Lacking in the element of regularity or recurrence for the purpose of earning a profit, ARCII's money market placements cannot amount to "doing business" as an NBFI subject to LBT. The Court, likewise, cited the opinion of the Bureau of Local Government Finance that any tax imposed on interests, dividends, and gains from the sale of shares of non-bank and non-financial institutions are merely passive investment income.

B. Real Property Taxes

Unimasters Conglomeration Incorporated, Petitioner, vs. Tacloban City Government, Privatization and Management Office, Philippine Tourism Authority, and Province of Leyte, Respondents.
Third Division | G.R. No. 214195 | 23 March 2022

Doctrine: *Sec. 234(a) of the LGC exempts the real properties owned by the Republic from RPT except when the beneficial use thereof has been granted, for consideration or otherwise, to a taxable person. A contractual assumption of tax liability by the Republic does not automatically exonerate the "taxable person" from the burden created by law, especially when the validity of the contractual stipulation of the parties is being questioned before the Courts.*

Facts: Leyte Park Hotel, Inc. (LPHI) is a 61,322-square meter property that stands on Magsaysay Boulevard, Tacloban City. It is co-owned by Assets Privatization Trust (APT), now Privatization and Management Office (PMO), the Province of Leyte, and the PTA, now Tourism Infrastructure and Enterprise Zone Authority, holding 34%, 26%, and 40% of the shares, respectively. Then APT, representing the owners of LPHI, and Unimasters Conglomeration Incorporated (UCI) entered into a Contract of Lease over LPHI, which provides that "RPTs shall be for the account of the lessor and any payment of RPT by the lessee shall be credited against any amount due to the lessor."

In December 2000, UCI stopped paying its obligations, prompting PMO to send several letters demanding compliance with the contract's provisions, but to no avail. Meanwhile, the City Treasurer of Tacloban sent several demand letters to collect the unpaid RPT of LPHI for the years 1989 to 2012, but the same remained unpaid despite notice. Hence, the City Treasurer of Tacloban instituted a collection case against LPHI, UCI, APT, PTA, and the Province of Leyte before the CTA. After trial, the CTA found UCI liable, which was subsequently affirmed by the CTA En Banc.

Issue: Whether the payment of realty taxes should rest on the Republic if it has waived its tax exemption by contractually assuming the payment of RPT in the lease contract.

Ruling: No. Sec. 234(a) of the LGC exempts real properties owned by the Republic from payment of RPT except when the beneficial use thereof has been granted, for consideration or otherwise, to a taxable person. Certainly, LPHI is owned in common by the Province of Leyte, a political subdivision, and by PMO and PTA, both government instrumentalities that are exempt from payment of RPT. The subsequent execution of a Contract of Lease between the co-owners of LPHI and UCI, a private entity, did not divest the former of their exemption from realty taxes, only that the hotel lost the exemption from being taxed and the burden to pay the taxes due thereon passed on to UCI as the beneficial user thereof. Any remedy for collecting taxes should then be directed against the "taxable person," the same being a personal action. While the Court recognized the existence of the provision in the Lease Contract pertaining to PMO and PTA's assumption of tax liability, such assumption of the obligation to pay RPT does not automatically exonerate UCI from the burden created by law, especially so that the validity of the contractual stipulation of the parties is being questioned before the RTC.

Light Rail Transit Authority, Petitioner, vs. City of Pasay, Represented by the City Treasurer and the City Assessor, Respondent.

En Banc | G.R. No. 211299 | 28 June 2022

Doctrine: *Light Rail Transit Authority (LRTA) is a government instrumentality, not a government-owned and controlled corporation (GOCC). Being such, the LRTA cannot be taxed by local governments pursuant to Sec. 133(o) of the LGC, which recognizes the basic principle that local governments cannot tax the national government. The only exception is when LRTA grants the beneficial use of its real property to a "taxable person" of the LGC, in which case, the specific real property leased becomes subject to real property tax, which must be paid by the "taxable person".*

Facts: From 1985 to 2001, the City of Pasay (City) assessed the LRTA of real estate taxes on its properties. LRTA proposed to pay its tax liabilities on an installment basis and requested the condonation of penalties on its arrears. Nonetheless, the City issued a notice of delinquency with warrants of levy. Aggrieved, LRTA filed a Petition for Certiorari, Prohibition, and Mandamus against the City, questioning its assessments before the RTC of Pasay and claiming that it is a government instrumentality exempt from local taxation. It operates the light rail transit system for the Republic of the Philippines, which is the true owner of the subject real properties.

The RTC dismissed the Petition for being an improper remedy and for lack of merit. LRTA then appealed before the CA, which affirmed the RTC ruling in toto, stating that LRTA was already found to be a taxable entity pursuant to G.R. No. 127316¹⁰.

Issue: Whether LRTA, a government instrumentality, is exempt from realty taxes.

Ruling: Yes. The LRTA is exempt from realty taxes. Under Secs. 2(10) and (13) of the Introductory Provisions of the Administrative Code, which govern the legal relation and status of government units, agencies, and offices within the entire government machinery, LRTA is a government instrumentality and not a GOCC. Being such, the LRTA cannot be taxed by local governments pursuant to Sec. 133(o) of the LGC, which recognizes the basic principle that local governments cannot tax the national government, as the former's power to tax is, historically, merely delegated by the latter. The only exception is when LRTA grants the beneficial use of its real property to a "taxable person" as provided in Sec. 234(a) of the LGC, in which case, the specific real property leased becomes subject to real property tax, which must be paid by the "taxable person". Thus, only portions of the LRT leased to taxable persons like private parties are subject to real property tax by the City.

Art. 420 of the Civil Code provides that the railroads and terminals of the LRT, being devoted to public use, are properties of public dominion and thus owned by the State or the Republic of the Philippines. Thus, the LRT railroads and terminals are expressly exempt from real estate tax under Sec. 234(a) of the LGC and are not subject to execution or foreclosure sale.

When local governments invoke the power to tax national government instrumentalities, such power is construed strictly against local governments. Another rule is that a tax exemption is strictly construed against the taxpayer claiming the exemption. However, when Congress grants a national government instrumentality exemption from local taxation, such exemption is construed liberally in favor of the national government instrumentality.

III. Special Laws

A. Tax Amnesty

BIR, Petitioner, vs. Samuel B. Cagang, Respondent.
Second Division | G.R. No. 230104 | 16 March 2022

Doctrine: *Withholding taxes are not covered by the amnesty program. Moreover, only those who have pending criminal cases before the courts of justice or at the prosecutor's office for tax evasion and other criminal offenses under Chapter II of Title X of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, at the time of availing of tax amnesty or submission of requirements, are disqualified from availing tax amnesty.*

¹⁰ LRTA, Petitioner, vs. Central Board of Assessment Appeals, Board of Assessment Appeals of Manila and the City Assessor of Manila, Respondents, 12 October 2000.

Facts: CEDCO Inc. received a LOA from the BIR dated 20 February 2003, covering TYs 1997 to 2001. In seeking the cancellation of the LOA, CEDCO pointed out that its records had been examined yearly by the BIR, that it had availed of the Voluntary Assessment and Abatement Program for TYs 2000 and 2001, and that it had already paid all deficiency taxes against it. Further, CEDCO informed the BIR that its records from 1997 to 2000 were no longer available for examination as it had already disposed them pursuant to Sec. 235 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended. The BIR denied CEDCO's request and issued a PAN. CEDCO was assessed the following taxes for TYs 2000 and 2001: (a) Income Tax; (b) VAT; (c) EWT; and (d) Withholding Tax on Compensation. Despite its protests, the BIR still issued a FLD. CEDCO, through Cagang, as Director for Administration and Finance, protested the FLD/FAN. Nonetheless, BIR issued a FDDA.

Subsequently, CEDCO availed of the tax amnesty under RA 9480, which covered "all national internal revenue taxes for the TY 2005 and prior years, with or without assessments duly issued therefor, and that have remained unpaid as of December 31, 2005 x x x."

In a collection letter, the BIR directed CEDCO to pay its tax liabilities based on the FDDA. A complaint-affidavit was filed against Cagang and Paredes, in their official capacities as CEDCO's treasurer and president, respectively, for violating Sec. 255 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended, due to CEDCO's failure to settle its tax obligations.

Issues: Whether CEDCO is entitled to avail of the tax amnesty under RA 9480.

Ruling: Yes, CEDCO is entitled to avail of the tax amnesty, but only as to its income tax and VAT for the TYs 2000 and 2001. Tax amnesty refers to the "absolute waiver by a sovereign of its right to collect taxes and power to impose penalties on persons or entities guilty of violating a tax law." RA 9480 granted a tax amnesty covering "all national internal revenue taxes for the TY 2005 and prior years, with or without assessments duly issued therefor, that have remained unpaid as of December 31, 2005." These national internal revenue taxes include (a) Income Tax; (b) VAT; (c) Estate Tax; (d) Excise Tax; (e) Donor's Tax; (f) Documentary Stamp Tax; (g) Capital Gains Tax; and (h) Other Percentage Taxes. However, Sec. 8 of the said law enumerates those persons and cases not covered by the law.

Section 8. Exceptions. — The tax amnesty provided in Section 5 hereof shall not extend to the following persons or cases existing as of the effectivity of RA 9480:

- (a) Withholding agents with respect to their withholding tax liabilities; x x x
- (e) Those with pending criminal cases for tax evasion and other criminal offenses under Chapter II of Title X of the National Internal Revenue Code of 1997, as amended, and the felonies of frauds, illegal exactions and transactions, and malversation of public funds and property under Chapters III and IV of Title VII of the Revised Penal Code; x x x

Clearly, the amnesty program does not cover withholding taxes. Thus, the BIR's submission that CEDCO is not qualified to avail of the tax amnesty with respect to its withholding tax liabilities is merited.

As such, while the CA was correct in ruling that "there was no pending case yet against CEDCO whether before the courts of justice or at the prosecutor's office" considering that the complaint-affidavit was filed on 14 August 2009, and the 2007 Tax Amnesty Law took effect on 24 May 2007 which CEDCO availed of on 28 November 2007, CEDCO is nevertheless disqualified to avail of the tax amnesty for its withholding tax liabilities in accordance with Sec. 8(a) of RA 9480 and Section 5(a) of its implementing rules and regulations.

A tax amnesty, similar to a tax exemption, is never favored or presumed in law. The grant of a tax amnesty must be construed strictly against the taxpayer and liberally in favor of the taxing authority.

B. Data Privacy Act

Philippine Stock Exchange, Inc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Secretary of Finance, CIR, and Chairperson of the SEC, Respondents.
En Banc | G.R. No. 213860 | 05 July 2022

Doctrine: *The taxpayer identification number (TIN) is a sensitive personal information. In processing the TINs of investors, Sec. 13(b) should be observed, which requires that the regulatory enactments guarantee the protection of sensitive personal information and privileged information, and the law or regulation does not require the consent of the data subject.*

Facts: The Philippine Stock Exchange, Inc., Bankers Association of the Philippines, Philippine Association of Securities Brokers and Dealers, Inc., Fund Managers Association of the Philippines, Trust Officers Association of the Philippines, and Marmon Holdings, Inc. (collectively, petitioners) filed a Petition for Certiorari and Prohibition before the Court assailing the constitutionality of RR 1-2014, RMC 5-2014, and the SEC Memorandum Circular (MC) No. 10-2014 (collectively, questioned regulations). The petitioners allege, among others, that these regulations violate their right to privacy and are ultra vires. BIR RR 1-2014 and RMC 5-2014 require all withholding agents to submit to the BIR an alphabetical list (alphalist) of employees and payees with their respective TIN, among others. On the other hand, SEC MC 10-2014 directs the Philippine Depository and Trust Corporation and broker dealers to provide the listed companies or their transfer agents an alphalist of all depository account holders with their TIN, among others. It also seeks to enforce compliance with a tax regulation issued by the Secretary of Finance.

Respondents argue that there is no violation of the right to privacy or the Data Privacy Act (DPA) in collecting and forwarding information as mandated by the questioned regulations. They assert that Sec. 4 of the DPA explicitly excludes information necessary in the performance of regulatory agencies' constitutionally and statutorily mandated functions from the scope of the law. Further, respondents maintain that the

NIRC of 1997, as amended, and SEC confidentiality rules cover all withholding agents who received personal information relating to each disclosed investor.

Issue: Whether the questioned regulations violate the right to privacy.

Ruling: The Court found the questioned regulations void for violating petitioners' right to privacy. The questioned regulations failed the second requirement under the "*strict scrutiny test*," which requires the State to show that the regulation not only serves compelling interest, but is narrowly drawn to prevent abuses. While the regulations aim to achieve the compelling state interest of effective and proper tax collection, the regulations lack evidence to show that they are narrowly tailored as the "least restrictive means for effecting the invoked interest." The absence of proof that taxes were improperly collected or that a deficit resulted from insufficient disclosure further weakens the State's position. Further, the questioned regulations failed to include guarantees to protect the sensitive information to be collected as required under Sec. 13(b) of the DPA.

The Court holds that collecting information pursuant to the questioned regulations is unnecessary for the BIR to carry out its functions. There was no showing that there was a problem or inefficacy with the system prior to the issuance of the questioned regulations. Respondents failed to show the aspects of operations under the prior rule that will be improved by collecting the information. As it stands, the prior rule is effective and does not require additional information to collect the taxes properly. Accordingly, the State cannot just use the exception of the performance of mandated functions under the DPA to carry out actions that abridge the right to privacy, there must be a showing of necessity.

LEGISLATION AND ISSUANCES WITH REVENUE OR TAX IMPLICATIONS July-August 2024

REPUBLIC ACT (RA)

Legislation	Subject	Date of Approval	Date of Effectivity
RA 12006	<p><i>An Act Mandating Private Higher Education Institutions to Waive College Entrance Examination Fees and Charges of Certain Students Qualified to Apply for College Admission</i></p> <p>Section 5 provides that a graduate or graduating student shall be eligible for the waiver of college entrance examination fees and charges upon the satisfaction of the following qualifications and requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Must be a natural-born Filipino citizen; b. Must belong to the top ten percent (10%) of his or her graduating class; c. Must belong to a family whose combined household income falls below the poverty threshold as defined by the National Economic and Development Authority or cannot afford in a sustained manner to provide for their minimum basic needs of food, health, education, housing and other essential amenities of life duly certified as such by the Department of Social Welfare and Development; d. Must apply for college entrance examination to any private higher educational institutions within the country; and e. Must satisfy all other requirements as specified by the private higher education institutions 	Lapsed into law on 14 June 2024 without the signature of the President	Immediately following its publication in the Official Gazette or in two (2) newspapers of general circulation

Legislation	Subject	Date of Approval	Date of Effectivity
RA 12019	<p><i>An Act Granting Juridical Personality and Legal Capacity to the Board of the Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage Due to Climate Change</i></p> <p>Section 4 provides:</p> <p>“SEC. 4. Privileges, Immunities, and Exemptions. – The Board shall enjoy the status, immunities, privileges, and exemptions granted under relevant treaties, international agreements, and agreements that may be entered into between the Government of the Philippines and the Board.”</p>	28 August 2024	Upon publication in the Official Gazette or in a newspaper of general circulation

REVENUE REGULATIONS (RR)

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
RR 14-2024	<p><i>Rules and Regulations Governing the Modes of Disposition of Seized/Forfeited Articles in Line with Sections 130, 131 and 225 of the National Internal Revenue Code (NIRC) of 1997, as Amended</i></p> <p>Prescribes the rules and regulations governing the modes of disposition of seized/forfeited articles in line with Sections 130, 131, and 225 of the National Internal Revenue Code (NIRC) of 1997, as amended, in light of the increasing enforcement operations on the illicit trade of cigarettes, vape, perfumes, toilet waters, sweetened beverages, and other locally manufactured and imported articles subject to excise tax leading to confiscation, there is a pressing need to dispose of such articles deemed either as injurious to public health or prejudicial to the enforcement of the law.</p>	14 August 2024	15 days after publication in the Official Gazette, Bureau's official website, or any newspaper of general circulation, whichever comes earlier

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
	Articles subject to excise tax that are injurious to public health and prejudicial to the enforcement of the law and other regulated articles that were seized/forfeited during the enforcement operations (relative to the unlicensed/illicit/unauthorized production, importation, trade, sale, or possession) may be disposed in any of the following manner: a) public auction; b) negotiated or private sale; c) official use of the BIR; d) donation; and/or e) destruction.		
RR 15-2024	<p><i>Prescribing Policies and Guidelines in the Mandatory Registration of Persons Engaged in Business and Administrative Sanctions and Criminal Liabilities for Non-Registration</i></p> <p>Section 236(A) of the Tax Code provides that every person subject to any internal revenue tax shall register once, either electronically or manually, with the BIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Within 10 days from the date of employment; or On or before the commencement of business; or Before payment of any tax due; or Upon filing a return, statement, or declaration as required under the Tax Code. <p>Consequently, any person engaged in any trade or business in the Philippines and fails to register with the BIR shall be administratively and criminally liable for fines and penalties. Also, any person who willfully aids or abets in the commission of a crime penalized under the Tax Code or who causes the commission of any such offense by another shall be liable in the same manner as the principal</p>	15 August 2024	Fifteen (15) days after its publication in the Official Gazette, Bureau's official website, or in any newspaper of general circulation, whichever comes earlier

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
	pursuant to Section 253(b) of the Tax Code.		

REVENUE MEMORANDUM ORDER (RMO)

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
RMO 25-2024	<i>Providing Guidelines, Policies and Procedures in the Processing of Claims for Tax Credit/Refund of Excess/Unutilized Creditable Withholding Taxes on Income Pursuant to Section 76(C), in Relation to Sections 204(C) and 229 of the National Internal Revenue Code of 1997, as Amended (Tax Code), Except Those Under the Authority and Jurisdiction of the Legal Group</i>	03 July 2024	Fifteen (15) days following its publication in the Official Gazette or posting on the BIR website, whichever comes first

Provides:

- a. Uniform policies and guidelines in the processing and grant of claims for the issuance of tax credit certificate or cash refund of excess/unutilized creditable withholding taxes on income under Sections 76(C), in relation to Sections 204(C) and 229 of the Tax Code;
- b. Define the processes and identify the offices or personnel responsible in carrying out the said procedures;
- c. Prescribe the documents to be submitted by the taxpayer-claimant; and
- d. Prescribe the documents to be attached to the income tax credit/refund docket and the required notice to the claimant.

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
RMO 26-2024	<p><i>Amending Certain Provisions of RMO No. 16-2023, Prescribing Supplemental Guidelines and Procedures on the Implementation of Revenue Memorandum Order (RMO) No. 40-2022</i></p> <p>The continuous influx of confiscated items due to the enforcement efforts against illicit trade of various articles subject to excise tax necessitates decongesting storage spaces in the BIR premises.</p> <p>The RMO amends the provisions under the Policies and Procedures Supplementing RMO No. 40-2022, turnover of apprehended items to the BIR storage facility, which is read as follows:</p> <p>7.5. xxx</p> <p>“The storage facility shall be designated by either ACIR, LTS/ACIR, EAS/Regional Director, in their capacities as Team Head/s of the concerned BIR Strike Team.</p> <p>The Large Taxpayers Service and Regional Offices may initiate the lease of a storage facility in accordance with the 2016 Revised Implementing Rules and Regulations of RA 9184, otherwise known as the Government Procurement Reform Act.”</p>	03 July 2024	Immediately

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
RMO 27-2024	<p><i>Providing Guidelines, Policies and Procedures in the Processing of Claims for Credit/Refund of Taxes Erroneously or Illegally Received or Collected or Penalties Imposed Without Authority Pursuant to Section 204(C), in Relation to Section 229 of the National Internal Revenue Code of 1997, as Amended (Tax Code), Except Those Under the Authority and Jurisdiction of the Legal Group</i></p> <p>Provides the policies and procedures in processing claims for credit/refund of taxes erroneously or illegally received or collected or penalties imposed without authority.</p> <p>All pending applications that are in the possession of the Revenue District or Regional Offices as of the effectivity of this Order, including those claims that require further review and approval by the National Office pursuant to Revenue Memorandum Circular (RMC) No. 17-2018, shall no longer be transmitted to the National Office.</p>	03 July 2024	Fifteen (15) days following its publication in the Official Gazette or posting on the BIR website, whichever comes first
RMO 28-2024	<p><i>Further Amending Revenue Memorandum Order (RMO) No. 24-2007, as amended by RMO No. 22-2009, on the Preparation, Consolidation and Monitoring of BIR Form No. 1170 (Comparative Monthly Summary of Tax Returns/Payment Forms Filed) and its Prescribed Format</i></p> <p>Prescribes the use of the revised BIR Form No. 1770 as a monitoring tool that would provide a demographic profile of the filing patterns of registered tax filers.</p>	11 July 2024	Thirty (30) days after the issuance of this Order

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
RMO 29-2024	<i>Amending RMO No. 11-2024, Prescribing the Revised Allocation of the CY 2024 BIR Collection Goal, by Implementing Office</i>	22 July 2024	Immediately
	<p>The BIR collection target for CY 2024 was revised as approved through the Development Budget Coordination Committee Ad Referendum on 12 July 2023</p>		
RMO 32-2024	<i>Policies and Procedures in the Certification of Total National Tax Collections from Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM) and the Corresponding Seventy - Five Percent (75%) Share of the Bangsamoro Government (BG)</i>	13 August 2024	Immediately
	<p>Pursuant to Section 10 Article XII of Republic Act (RA) No. 11054 or the Organic Law for the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM), the national taxes, fees, and charges collected in the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region (BAR) shall be allocated as follows:</p> <p>a) twenty-five percent (25%) to the National Government (NG) to be accrued to the BG for the first 10 years following the effectivity of the Organic Law, provided that upon petition of the BG, the NG may extend the period as it shall deem necessary; and b) seventy-five percent (75%) to the BG.</p> <p>Furthermore, Section 11 Article XII of the same RA specifies that tax collection shall be undertaken by the BIR until such time that the Bangsamoro Revenue Office is established, and only they will start collecting taxes regularly.</p>		

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
RMO 33-2024	<p><i>Rules and Regulations Implementing Revenue Regulations (RR) No. 14-2024 on the Modes of Disposition of Seized/Forfeited Articles</i></p> <p>Amends the rules and regulations implementing Revenue Regulations (RR) No. 14-2024 on the modes of disposition of seized/forfeited articles. There will be two BIR Disposition Committees – Team I for large taxpayers and Team II for non-large taxpayers. All recommendations of the Non-Large Taxpayers Committees shall be subject to the approval of the Deputy Commissioner, Operations Group (DCIR-OG). There will be a BIR Strike Team, which may hire a third-party service contractor through the most appropriate and convenient mode of procurement in accordance with the 2016 Revised Implementing Rules and Regulations of Republic Act No. 9184, otherwise known as the Government Procurement Reform Act, to destroy the seized/forfeited articles.</p>	30 August 2024	Immediately

REVENUE MEMORANDUM CIRCULAR (RMC)

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
RMC 74-2024	<p><i>Prescribing the Mandatory Requirements for Claims for Credit/Refund of Taxes Erroneously or Illegally Received or Collected or Penalties Imposed Without Authority Pursuant to Section 204(C), in Relation to Section 229 of the National Internal Revenue Code of 1997, as Amended (Tax Code), Except Those Under the Authority and Jurisdiction of the Legal Group</i></p>	03 July 2024	Fifteen (15) days following its publication in

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
	Provides the guidelines and mandatory documentary requirements in the processing of claims for the issuance of tax credit certificates or cash refunds of erroneously or illegally received or collected taxes. However, this does not cover actions or requests for tax credit/refund based on a writ of execution issued by the Court of Tax Appeals and the Supreme Court under the authority and jurisdiction of the Legal Group.		the Official Gazette or posting on the BIR website, whichever comes first
RMC 75-2024	<i>Prescribing the Mandatory Requirements for Claims for Tax Credit or Refund of Excess/Unutilized Creditable Withholding Taxes on Income Pursuant to Section 76(C), in Relation to Sections 204(C) and 229 of the National Internal Revenue Code of 1997, as Amended (Tax Code), Except Those Under the Authority and Jurisdiction of the Legal Group</i>	03 July 2024	Fifteen (15) days following its publication in the Official Gazette or posting on the BIR website, whichever comes first
RMC 76-2024	<i>Circularizing the Updated List of Accredited Microfinance Non-Government Organizations (NGOs)</i>	03 July 2024	To be given as wide a publicity as possible.
RMC 77-2024	<i>Clarification on the Invoicing Requirements Provided Under Revenue Regulations (RR) No. 7-2024, as Amended by RR No. 11-2024</i>	11 July 2024	Immediately
RMC 79-2024	<i>Further Extending the Transitory Period Prior to Actual Imposition of Withholding Tax on Gross Remittances Made by Digital Financial Services Providers to Sellers/Merchants Prescribed Under Revenue Regulations No. 16-2023</i>	15 July 2024	To be given as wide a publicity as possible.

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
RMC 81-2024	<i>Tax Treatment of Sukuk (Islamic Bond) as Islamic Banking Arrangement Pursuant to the Tax Neutrality Provision of Republic Act No. 11439 (An Act Providing for the Regulation and Organization of Islamic Banks) as Implemented by Revenue Regulations No. 17-2020</i>	18 July 2024	To be given as wide a publicity as possible.
RMC 83-2024	<p><i>Tax Returns/Payment Forms Generated from the Electronic One-Time Transaction (eONETT) System</i></p> <p>Notifies the public that taxpayers who have filed ONETT applications via the eONETT System and will manually pay the tax due computed thereon to any Authorized Agent Banks/Revenue Collection Officers shall present the tax return/payment form generated from the said system, which bears the notation provided in this Circular.</p>	30 July 2024	To be given as wide a publicity as possible.
RMC 84-2024	<p><i>Clarification on the Publication of Revenue Issuances Under Section 245 of the National Internal Revenue Code of 1997, as Amended by Republic Act No. 11976, Otherwise Known as the "Ease of Paying Taxes Act," as Implemented by Revenue Regulations No. 2-2024</i></p> <p>Clarifies that under Section 245 of the NIRC of 1997, as amended by the EOPT Law, the publication of BIR revenue issuances through the BIR official website or the Official Gazette is allowed.</p>	30 July 2024	Immediately
RMC 85-2024	<i>Circularizing Republic Act No. 12001, Entitled, "An Act Instituting Reforms in Real Property Valuation and Assessment in the Philippines, Reorganizing the Bureau of Local Government Finance, Granting of Tax Amnesty on Real Property, and Special Levies on Real</i>	30 July 2024	To be given as wide a publicity as possible.

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
	<i>Property, and Appropriating Funds Therefor"</i>		
RMC 87-2024	<i>Frequently-Asked Questions Relative to the Filing of Tax Returns and Payment of Taxes Pursuant to Revenue Regulations No. 4-2024, Implementing the Provisions of Republic Act No. 11976, Otherwise Known as "Ease of Paying Taxes (EOPT) Act"</i>	07 August 2024	To be given as wide a publicity as possible.
RMC 89-2024	<i>Clarifying the Taxability of Income Derived by Local Government Units (LGUs) Engaged in Proprietary Functions</i>	13 August 2024	Immediately
RMC 91-2024	<i>Clarification on Registration Procedures Pursuant to Revenue Regulations No. 7-2024, as Amended by Revenue Regulations No. 11-2024</i>	14 August 2024	To be given as wide a publicity as possible.
RMC 92-2024	<i>Guidelines on the Proper Sale and Affixture of Loose Documentary Stamps to Taxable Documents</i>	27 August 2024	To be given as wide a publicity as possible.
RMC 93-2024	<i>Publishing the Full Text of the June 20, 2024 Letter from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) of the Department of Health (DOH) Endorsing Updates to the List of VAT-Exempt Products Under Republic Act (R.A.) No. 10963 (TRAIN Law) and R.A. No. 11534 (CREATE Act)</i>	27 August 2024	-
RMC 95-2024	<i>Clarifying certain issues on the filing of monthly Documentary Stamp Tax Declaration by Electronic Documentary Stamp Tax (eDST) taxpayers using BIR Form No. 2000 v 2018 pursuant to RMC No. 48-2024</i>	29 August 2024	To be given as wide a publicity as possible.

OTHERS

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
Bureau of Customs (BOC) Customs Memorandum Circular (CMC) No. 118-2024	<p><i>Implementation of Executive Order No. 62, Series of 2024, on “Modifying the Nomenclature and Rates of Import Duty on Various Products</i></p> <p>The implementation of an updated comprehensive tariff schedule aims to augment supply, manage prices, and temper inflationary pressure of various commodities, consistent with the Philippine national interest and the objective of safeguarding the purchasing power of Filipinos.</p> <p>It provides a transparent and predictable tariff structure and allows businesses to engage in medium- to long-term planning to improve productivity and competitiveness, facilitate trade, and enhance consumer welfare.</p> <p>EO 62 s. 2024 provides for all articles subject to the Most Favored Nation rates of import duty for the years 2024 to 2028.</p> <p>This does not include the tariff rates of the products covered under EO 12 s. 2023, which is in effect until 2028, however, expands its coverage to include: (1) other battery electric vehicles; (2) hybrid electric vehicles; (3) plug-in hybrid electric vehicles; and (4) certain parts and components at zero duty until 2028.</p>	July 2, 2024	-
BOC Customs Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 09-2024	<i>Establishment of an Electronic Tracking of Containerized Cargo System (E-TRACC System) Covering Barge or Domestic Vessel Transfer</i>	08 August 2024	Immediately

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
	<p>This Order shall cover both inland and sea transfers of containerized goods using the E-TRACC System to supplement CMO 4-2020 as amended by CMO 15-2023 by integrating the procedure for the transit of containerized shipments via barge or other domestic vessels with regular inland transfer and to generate real-time and accurate information and to monitor the movement and location of containers using tracking devices and linking it in real-time with the electronic documentation system.</p>		
BOC CMO 08-2024	<p><i>Procedure in the Implementation of the Admission Temporaire or Temporary Admission (ATA) Carnet System in the Philippines under the Istanbul Convention</i></p> <p>This Order implements Customs Administrative Order (CAO) No. 2-2022 on Rules and Regulations in the implementation of ATA Carnet System in the Philippines, as amended by CAO No. 1-2023.</p> <p>This Order aims a) to provide the scope of application in the implementation of ATA Carnet System in the Philippines; b) provide procedure in the exportation and re-importation of temporarily admitted goods covered by ATA Carnets which are issued by the Philippine Chamber of Commerce and Industry (PCCI) as the appointed National Issuing and Guaranteeing Association (NIGA) of the BOC; c) provide a centralized system in the monitoring of processed ATA Carnets; and d) provide procedure in the storage of vouchers which are processed by various ports in the Philippines.</p>	07 August 2024	Immediately

Issuance	Subject	Date of Issue	Date of Effectivity
Department of Budget and Management (DBM) Local Budget Circular (LBC) No. 158	<i>Guidelines on the Release and Utilization of the Fund under the Local Government Support Fund - Green Green Program in the FY 2024 General Appropriations Act, Republic Act No. 11975</i>	11 July 2024	Shall take effect immediately.
DBM LBC 159	<i>Guidelines on the Release and Utilization of the Local Government Support Fund-Growth Equity Fund (LGSF-GEF) under the FY 2023 General Appropriations Act (GAA), Republic Act (RA) No. 11936</i>	16 July 2024	Shall take effect immediately.
Office of the President Memorandum Order No. 29	<i>Exemption of travel tax for passengers departing from international airports and seaports in Mindanao and Palawan heading to areas within the Brunei Darussalam-Indonesia-Malaysia-Philippines East Asean Growth Area (BIMP-EAGA)</i>	06 August 2024	To be given as wide a publicity as possible.

NTRC OFFICIALS

ATTY. MARK LESTER L. AURE

Executive Director

GIAN CARLO D. RODRIGUEZ

Deputy Executive Director

ATTY. MICHAEL F. RICAZA

Deputy Executive Director

ATTY. JOCET CONSISA P. DITA

Deputy Executive Director

MONICA G. REMPILLO

OIC-Deputy Executive Director

DONALDO M. BOO

Chief, Direct Taxes Branch

ATTY. MARRY-JEAN V. YASOL

Chief, Tax Subsidies and Large Investment
Division and OIC, Tax Incentives Division

MONICA G. REMPILLO

Chief, Economics Staff

LOIS RUTH P. SANTIAGO

OIC, Manufacturing Industries Division and
Infrastructure and Resource-Based
Industries Division

MA. BERLIE L. AMURAO

Chief, Indirect Taxes Branch

ROSELYN C. DOMO

Chief, Fiscal Incentives Branch

ATTY. MARC EFRAIM B. MENDOZA

OIC, Services Industries Division

ATTY. JASON P. RAPOSAS

Chief, Special Research and
Technical Services Branch

GRACE A. MANALO

Chief, Finance Division

MARIA CECILIA B. RODRIGUEZ

Chief, Tax Statistics Staff

RAINER N. DITA

OIC, Management and Information
System Division

MA. RHEA L. CARO

Chief, Planning and Coordinating Unit

LORELLI D. VILLAFLORES

OIC, Human Resource Management
and Development Division

MADONNA CLAIRE V. AGUILAR

Chief, Local Taxation Branch

KRYZTAL JEM CZARINA L. ABANES

OIC, General Services Division