EPH-International Journal of Business & Management Science

JUDICIAL REVIEW AND CASE LAW IN SHAPING INDIA'S TRANSFER PRICING REGIME: A SYNTHESIS OF DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCES

Mamta Bhawanishanker Khandelwal[1*], Dr. Farhat Khan[2]

[1]PhD research scholar, School of Law, G.H. Raisoni University, Saikheda, Madhya Pradesh, India, Email: mamta.khandelwal.law@ghru.edu.in, ORCID ID: 0009-0000-4247-7331*

[2]School of Law, G.H. Raisoni University, Saikheda, Madhya Pradesh, India, farhat.khan@ghru.edu.in

Article History
Received: *2026-07-06*
Revised: *2026-09-25*
Accepted: *2026-10-14*
Published: *2026-10-31*

Abstract
This study India's transfer pricing framework, contained in Sections 92–92F of the Income Tax Act, 1961, depends substantially on judicial scrutiny to settle controversies arising from discretionary arm's length price determinations. This review article evaluates the judiciary's contribution by synthesising the multi-tier appellate architecture, pivotal case law (including LG Electronics, Maruti Suzuki and SAP Labs), and recurring doctrinal themes such as substance-over-form and Functional, Asset and Risk analysis. Drawing on empirical patterns extracted from 6,731 Income Tax Appellate Tribunal orders and official statistics on Advance Pricing Agreements, the paper assesses domestic procedural safeguards (Dispute Resolution Panel, Safe Harbour Rules) against the OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines and the United Nations Practical Manual. Structural obstacles—persistent litigation backlogs and residual jurisdictional ambiguity—are identified, and the implications of BEPS Pillars One and Two together with emerging AI-assisted audit tools are examined. The analysis positions India's maturing transfer pricing jurisprudence as a reference point for dispute-resolution design in other emerging economies.

Keywords: *Transfer pricing; judicial review; arm's length principle; OECD Guidelines; Dispute Resolution Panel; Advance Pricing Agreements; BEPS*

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages-187-191
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/mc6yec03

1. Introduction

Transfer pricing rules constitute a central instrument of contemporary international tax policy. Their purpose is to ensure that cross-border transactions between associated enterprises are priced as if the parties were independent, thereby protecting the tax base of market jurisdictions against artificial profit shifting. India's legislative response appears in Chapter X of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (Sections 92–92F). What began as a relatively rigid statutory scheme has been continuously reshaped by administrative practice and, more decisively, by successive layers of judicial interpretation.

India has historically generated a disproportionately large share of global transfer pricing disputes—commonly estimated at roughly one-third of the worldwide caseload. This volume reflects both assertive revenue enforcement and the unavoidable subjectivity inherent in selecting comparables, choosing methodologies and valuing intangibles. Appellate forums therefore perform a dual function: they correct excesses of primary assessment and simultaneously generate interpretive guidance that stabilises future administration.

The present review pursues four interrelated objectives:

- to map the institutional architecture and empirical performance of India's multi-tier appellate system;
- to analyse landmark judicial decisions that have delineated the permissible scope of transfer pricing adjustments;
- to identify thematic currents in judicial reasoning and the operation of alternative dispute-resolution mechanisms; and
- to evaluate policy options for reducing chronic litigation in the light of BEPS 2.0 developments.

2. Literature Review

Scholarship on transfer pricing in emerging markets consistently emphasises the structural asymmetry between multinational enterprises and domestic tax administrations. Developing jurisdictions frequently lack ready access to reliable comparable uncontrolled transaction data, forcing greater reliance on residual profit methods and subjective judgment (Lang et al., 2018; Picciotto, 2018). India's experience has attracted particular attention because of the sheer volume of litigation it generates.

The most comprehensive empirical investigation remains Tandon and Damle's (2019) analysis of 6,731 Income Tax Appellate Tribunal orders covering Assessment Years 2003–04 to 2013–14. Their work documented average dispute durations, success differentials between taxpayer and revenue appeals, and the high incidence of repeated litigation on identical issues. Subsequent qualitative reviews of tribunal and High Court decisions have highlighted persistent problem areas—selection of comparables, valuation of marketing intangibles, intra-group services and financial transactions—while noting gradual improvements in procedural discipline (Meena & Jora, 2025).

International tax literature underscores that although the OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines supply a common economic vocabulary, domestic courts routinely adapt those principles to local market conditions, location savings and marketing intangibles (Avi-Yonah & Xu, 2017; Brauner, 2016). Indian judicial practice illustrates this adaptive process: early enthusiasm for mechanical bright-line tests has given way to insistence on contractual evidence and economic substance analysis. Comparative studies further observe that India's Dispute Resolution Panel and Advance Pricing Agreement programmes represent significant institutional innovations relative to many peer emerging economies (Owens, 2013).

Despite this growing body of work, few studies integrate doctrinal analysis of Supreme Court and High Court rulings with longitudinal empirical data and official APA statistics. The present review seeks to fill that gap by offering a synthesised account of how judicial review has shaped, and continues to shape, the Indian transfer pricing regime.

3. Research Methodology

The study employs a mixed-methods design that combines doctrinal legal analysis with secondary empirical synthesis.

Doctrinal legal analysis. Primary materials comprise the statutory text of Chapter X of the Income Tax Act, 1961, the Income Tax Rules, 1962 (Rules 10A–10E), Central Board of Direct Taxes circulars and notifications, and the full text of landmark decisions rendered by the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, High Courts and the Supreme Court of India.

Empirical data synthesis. Secondary analysis draws upon the dataset of 6,731 ITAT transfer pricing orders examined by Tandon and Damle (2019) and upon official CBDT statistics on Advance Pricing Agreements published through financial year 2024–25.

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages-187-191
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/mc6yec03

Comparative regulatory analysis. Domestic judicial interpretations are systematically benchmarked against the OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines (2022) and the United Nations Practical Manual on Transfer Pricing for Developing Countries (2021).

4. Results: Appellate Architecture and Case-Law Synthesis

4.1 Multi-Tiered Dispute Resolution Framework

Transfer pricing controversies in India proceed through a structured hierarchy designed to combine administrative efficiency with independent judicial oversight.

Primary assessment. Where the aggregate value of international or specified domestic transactions exceeds statutory thresholds, the Assessing Officer refers the matter to a Transfer Pricing Officer. The TPO determines the arm's length price by applying one of the prescribed methods—Comparable Uncontrolled Price, Resale Price, Cost Plus, Profit Split, Transactional Net Margin Method, or the residual "Other Method"—and transmits the order to the Assessing Officer for incorporation into a draft assessment.

Dispute Resolution Panel. Section 144C, inserted by the Finance Act, 2009, created a collegium of three Commissioners that hears objections to the draft order within a statutory nine-month window. Directions issued by the Panel are binding on the Assessing Officer.

Commissioner (Appeals). Taxpayers may alternatively wait for the final assessment and appeal to the Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals), whose statutory disposal target is one year.

Income Tax Appellate Tribunal. The Tribunal is the final fact-finding body. It possesses plenary jurisdiction over both factual and legal questions and is expected to dispose of appeals within four years.

High Courts and Supreme Court. Appeals from the Tribunal lie to the High Court under Section 260A exclusively on substantial questions of law. Further appeal to the Supreme Court settles binding precedent. Concurrently, taxpayers may invoke the Mutual Agreement Procedure under applicable tax treaties.

Table 1. Statutory disposal mandates and functional roles

Forum / Authority	Disposal Mandate	Primary Function
Dispute Resolution Panel	9 months	Pre-assessment collegium; binding directions
CIT (Appeals)	1 year	First appellate administrative review
ITAT	4 years	Final fact-finding tribunal
High Court	No fixed limit	Review confined to substantial questions of law
Supreme Court	No fixed limit	Final constitutional and statutory arbiter

1.1 Empirical Patterns in Tribunal Litigation

Analysis of the 6,731 ITAT orders covering Assessment Years 2003–04 to 2013–14 yields several robust patterns (Tandon & Damle, 2019).

- Average overall duration declined from approximately ten years at the beginning of the regime to roughly six years by 2014. Cases routed through the Dispute Resolution Panel resolved in 6.17 years on average, compared with 7.87 years under the traditional Commissioner (Appeals) route.
- Taxpayers initiated 72 per cent of ITAT appeals and obtained full or partial relief in 82 per cent of those cases. Revenue appeals were dismissed in 61.4 per cent of instances, indicating frequent over-assessment at the Transfer Pricing Officer stage.
- Only 6.4 per cent of matters were remanded, demonstrating the Tribunal's preference for final determination of factual benchmarking questions.
- Approximately 39 per cent of the sample (2,647 disputes) involved repeated litigation on identical issues across multiple assessment years for the same taxpayer, underscoring the inefficiency of year-by-year assessment.

1.2 Landmark Judicial Precedents

Three decisions illustrate the evolutionary trajectory of Indian transfer pricing jurisprudence.

LG Electronics India Pvt. Ltd. v. ACIT (2013). The Special Bench of the Delhi Tribunal confronted the question whether routine advertising, marketing and promotion expenditure incurred by an Indian subsidiary could be characterised as an international transaction benefiting the foreign brand owner. The Bench endorsed the "Bright Line Test," holding that AMP spend exceeding the unadjusted average of comparable independent entities constituted an international transaction requiring arm's length reimbursement plus a profit mark-up (LG Electronics India Pvt. Ltd. v. ACIT, 2013).

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages-187-191
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/mc6yec03

Maruti Suzuki India Ltd. v. CIT (2016). The Delhi High Court rejected mechanical application of the Bright Line Test. In the absence of an explicit contractual arrangement obliging the Indian entity to incur AMP expenditure for the benefit of its foreign associated enterprise, excess spend could not automatically be recharacterised as an international transaction. The Court insisted on overall profitability analysis under the Transactional Net Margin Method and on proof of economic ownership of marketing intangibles (Maruti Suzuki India Ltd. v. CIT, 2016).

SAP Labs India Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO (2023). The Supreme Court addressed the jurisdictional reach of High Courts under Section 260A. Overturning a line of High Court authority that treated the Tribunal's selection of comparables as a pure question of fact immune from further review, the Court held that High Courts may examine whether the Tribunal adhered to the statutory guidelines and Transfer Pricing Rules. Where the Tribunal's determination is perverse or procedurally flawed, the matter raises a substantial question of law (SAP Labs India Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO, 2023).

Table 2. Landmark cases and doctrinal contribution

Case	Forum & Year	Core Issue	Doctrinal Outcome
LG Electronics	ITAT Special Bench, 2013	AMP as international transaction	Bright Line Test endorsed; mark-up required
Maruti Suzuki	Delhi High Court, 2016	Validity of BLT without contract	BLT rejected; explicit agreement required
SAP Labs India	Supreme Court, 2023	High Court review of ITAT ALP	Perverse ALP findings reviewable as questions of law

2. Discussion

2.1 Thematic Evolution: Substance over Form and FAR Analysis

Judicial reasoning has steadily migrated from formalistic tests toward economic substance analysis. Courts now routinely examine Development, Enhancement, Maintenance, Protection and Exploitation (DEMPE) functions when allocating returns from intangibles. Functional, Asset and Risk analysis remains the cornerstone for identifying the tested party and selecting the most appropriate method. Decisions such as General Motors India Pvt. Ltd. v. DCIT (2013) confirmed that a foreign associated enterprise may properly be designated the tested party when it performs simpler functions and owns fewer complex intangibles, thereby simplifying the search for reliable comparables.

2.2 Advance Pricing Agreements and Safe Harbour Rules

Recognising the cost of protracted litigation, India introduced the Advance Pricing Agreement programme in 2012 and refined Safe Harbour Rules in 2013. Official CBDT data show steady growth culminating in a record 174 APAs signed during financial year 2024–25, including India's first multilateral APA. Cumulative agreements since inception now exceed 800, covering several thousand assessment years and providing multi-year certainty to both taxpayers and the revenue.

Table 3. Advance Pricing Agreements signed (selected years)

Financial Year	Unilateral	Bilateral / Multilateral	Total
2022–23	63 (approx.)	32	95
2023–24	86	39	125
2024–25	108–109	65 (incl. 1 MAPA)	174

Source: Central Board of Direct Taxes press releases and APA Annual Reports (2023–25).

2.3 Systemic Challenges and the BEPS Horizon

Two structural pressures persist. First, the SAP Labs expansion of High Court jurisdiction over comparability choices risks increasing appellate filings and lengthening overall resolution times. Second, the limited availability of local-market comparables continues to generate disputes over database selection and economic adjustments. Looking forward, implementation of BEPS Pillar One (reallocation of residual profits to market jurisdictions) and Pillar Two (global minimum tax) will require Indian courts to harmonise traditional arm's length analysis with formulaic and minimum-tax rules. Concurrent investment in AI-assisted risk profiling and capacity building for Transfer Pricing Officers may reduce the volume of subjective primary adjustments that currently fuel the appellate pipeline.

Vol. 12 Issue 6s (October, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages-187-191
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/mc6yec03

3. Conclusion

Judicial review has functioned as an indispensable corrective mechanism within India's transfer pricing regime. By rejecting mechanical bright-line tests, insisting on contractual and economic evidence, and clarifying the boundaries of appellate jurisdiction, the courts have translated broad statutory language into workable economic standards. Administrative innovations—particularly the Dispute Resolution Panel and the Advance Pricing Agreement programme—have demonstrably shortened dispute cycles and enhanced certainty. Remaining challenges of repeated litigation and High Court docket pressure will require sustained institutional responses, including multi-year joint audits and closer alignment with evolving international norms under BEPS 2.0. India's experience nevertheless offers a valuable template for other emerging economies seeking to balance revenue protection with a predictable investment climate.

References

1. Avi-Yonah, R. S., & Xu, H. (2017). Evaluating BEPS: A reconsideration of the benefits principle and proposal for UN oversight. Harvard Business Law Review, 6(2), 185–238.
2. Brauner, Y. (2016). What the BEPS? Florida Tax Review, 16(2), 55–115.
3. Central Board of Direct Taxes. (2024). Advance Pricing Agreement Programme of India: Annual Report 2023–24. Ministry of Finance, Government of India.
4. Central Board of Direct Taxes. (2025). Press release: CBDT signs 174 Advance Pricing Agreements in FY 2024–25 (31 March 2025). Ministry of Finance, Government of India.
5. General Motors India Pvt. Ltd. v. DCIT, (2013) 37 taxmann.com 25 (Ahd. ITAT).
6. Income Tax Act, 1961, §§ 92–92F, 144C, 260A (India).
7. Lang, M., et al. (Eds.). (2018). The impact of the OECD and UN model conventions on bilateral tax treaties. Cambridge University Press.
8. LG Electronics India Pvt. Ltd. v. ACIT, (2013) 140 ITD 41 (Del. ITAT SB).
9. Maruti Suzuki India Ltd. v. CIT, (2016) 381 ITR 117 (Del. HC).
10. Meena, G. L., & Jora, N. (2025). Qualitative review of transfer pricing disputes in India. Journal of Informatics Education and Research, 5(1).
11. OECD. (2022). OECD transfer pricing guidelines for multinational enterprises and tax administrations 2022. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/0e655865-en
12. Owens, J. (2013). The taxation of multinational enterprises: An elusive balance. Bulletin for International Taxation, 67(8).
13. Picciotto, S. (2018). International tax, regulatory arbitrage and the boundaries of corporate tax regulation. Accounting, Economics, and Law: A Convivium, 8(2).
14. SAP Labs India Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO, (2023) 453 ITR 229 (SC); (2023) 149 taxmann.com 327 (SC).
15. Tandon, S., & Damle, D. (2019). An analysis of transfer pricing disputes in India (NIPFP Working Paper No. 266). National Institute of Public Finance and Policy.
16. United Nations. (2021). Practical manual on transfer pricing for developing countries (3rd ed.). United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.