REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF TAX APPEALS
QUEZON CITY

THIRD DIVISION

PPD PHARMACEUTICAL DEVELOPMENT PHILIPPINES CORP.
Petitioner,

- versus -

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Respondent.

CTA Case No. 10466

Members:

MANAHAN, *Chairperson,*
REYES-FAJARDO, and
ANGELES, *JJ.*

Promulgated:

JAN 05 2026
1:54 p.m.

x - x

RESOLUTION

REYES-FAJARDO, *J.*:

For the Court's resolution is petitioner's Motion for Partial Reconsideration (Re: Decision dated 6 February 2025) filed on February 27, 2025.[1] It seeks to partially reverse the Court's Decision[2] promulgated on February 6, 2025, which denied petitioner's claim for refund of its alleged unutilized input value-added tax (VAT) credits amounting to ₱9,712,609.43 for the third and fourth quarters of calendar year (CY) 2018, for failing to demonstrate the zero-rated character of its supply of services, in accordance with the parameters set in Section 108(B)(2) of the 1997 National Internal Revenue Code (NIRC). The *fallo* of which reads:[3]

> WHEREFORE, in light of the foregoing considerations, the Petition for Review is DENIED on account of insufficiency of evidence.
>
> SO ORDERED.

---

1 *Rollo*, pp. 3969 - 3978.
2 *Id.*, pp. 3947 - 3960.
3 *Id.*, p. 3960.

Specifically, the Court found that the official receipts, proofs of remittances, and bank certifications on record only show that petitioner received dollar remittances from PPD Global Limited (PPD Global), not that those sums were payments for the services rendered under their Affiliate Services Agreement. Each receipt refers to billing statements, but none were presented in evidence, so the Court could not verify the nature of the charges. Moreover, petitioner's 2018 audited financial statements indicate substantial advances and loans from PPD Global; petitioner did not establish that the amount it received during the subject quarters represented service fees rather than advances or payments for other periods. The connection between the amounts it received and the supply of services which the payments supposedly pertain to was unclear. Hence, the second requisite under Section 108(B)(2) of the NIRC, as amended, was not met, and the claim for refund was denied.

In its Motion for Partial Reconsideration (Re: Decision dated 6 February 2025), petitioner contends that: (1) requiring evidence beyond what is prescribed by law and jurisprudence is contrary to the interests of export-oriented taxpayers; (2) the quarterly VAT returns, summary lists of sales and witness testimony show that the zero-rated sales for the third and fourth quarters of 2018 were wholly to PPD Global and substantially match the dollar remittances; (3) respondent's Tax Audit Review Division (TARD) and VAT Credit Audit Division (VCAD) memoranda constitute judicial admissions that the remittances were payments for zero-rated services; (4) reliance on the audited financial statements is improper because they include transactions outside the quarters in issue; and (5) certifications of inward remittances are sufficient to prove payment.

Respondent, through its *Comment*[4] filed on May 19, 2025, points out that nothing in petitioner's allegations would disrupt the Court's findings, reiterating the ruling of the Court, which exhaustively discussed the factual and legal basis of the denial of petitioner's claim for refund.

We find for respondent.

The Court has already ruled that petitioner failed to establish by evidence the requisite nexus between the amounts it received

---

4 *Rollo*, pp. 4048 - 4052.

from PPD Global and the supply of services to which the payments supposedly pertain. Hence, it cannot be said that these were compensation for petitioner's clinical research services that were paid for by PPD Global. *Sans* sufficient proof of zero-rated sales, a refund of unutilized input VAT under Section 112(A) of the NIRC, as amended, cannot be allowed.

There is no need to belabor petitioner's arguments that merely repackage matters already considered and resolved. The Court is not required to restate, in *seriatim*, its earlier conclusions.

In *Ortigas and Company Limited Partnership v. Judge Tirso Velasco and Dolores V. Molina, and Dolores V. Molina v. Hon. Presiding Judge of RTC, Quezon City, Br. 105, and Manila Banking Corporation*,[5] it was held that a Court is not bound to discuss each argument in a motion for reconsideration that merely reiterates matters already resolved, and may properly be dealt with in a general manner, *viz.*:

> *Effect, and Disposition of Motion for Reconsideration*
>
> The filing of a motion for reconsideration, authorized by Rule 52 of the Rules of Court, does not impose on the Court the obligation to deal individually and specifically with the grounds relied upon therefor, in much the same way that the Court does in its judgment or final order as regards be issues raised and submitted for decision. This would be a useless formality or ritual invariably involving merely a reiteration of the reasons already set forth in the judgment or final order for rejecting the arguments advanced by the movant; and it would be a needless act, too, with respect to issues raised for the first time, these being, as above stated, deemed waived because not asserted at the first opportunity. It suffices for the Court to deal generally and summarily with the motion for reconsideration, and merely state a legal ground for its denial (Sec. 14, ART. VIII, Constitution); *i.e.*, the motion contains merely a reiteration or rehash of arguments already submitted to and pronounced without merit by the Court in its judgment, or the basic issues have already been passed upon, or the motion. discloses no substantial argument or cogent reason to warrant reconsideration or modification of the judgment or final order; or the arguments in the motion are too unsubstantial to require consideration, etc.

---

5 G.R. Nos. 109645 and 112564, Resolution, March 4, 1996.

ǤN

WHEREFORE, petitioner's *Motion for Partial Reconsideration (Re: Decision dated 6 February 2025)* is **DENIED** for lack of merit. The Decision promulgated on February 6, 2025 is **AFFIRMED.**

SO ORDERED.

Catherine T. Manahan

CATHERINE T. MANAHAN
Associate Justice

Marian Ivy F. Reyes-Fajardo

MARIAN IVY F. REYES-FAJARDO
Associate Justice

HENRY S. ANGELES
Associate Justice