

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
Court of Tax Appeals
QUEZON CITY

SECOND DIVISION

**AICHI FORGING COMPANY OF
ASIA, INC.,**

Petitioner,

- versus -

C.T.A. CASE NO. 7314

Members:

CASTAÑEDA, JR., *Chairperson*
UY, *and*
PALANCA-ENRIQUEZ, JJ.

**COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL
REVENUE,**

Respondent.

Promulgated:

NOV 21 2007

4:02 p.m.

x-----x

DECISION

CASTAÑEDA, JR., J.:

This is a Petition for Review which seeks the refund of SIX MILLION FIVE HUNDRED TWENTY ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED EIGHTY AND 16/100 PESOS (P6,521,980.16) representing alleged unutilized input Value-added taxes (VAT) from petitioner's domestic purchases of goods, services and capital goods and importation of goods and capital goods attributable to its zero-rated sales for the Third Quarter of 2003.

Aichi Forging Company of Asia, Inc. (Petitioner) is a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the Republic of the 



Philippines, with principal office address at Barrio Pulong Sta. Cruz, Sta. Rosa, Laguna, Philippines.¹ It is registered with the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR) as a VAT entity pursuant to Section 107 (now Section 236) of the National Internal Revenue Code (Tax Code) on May 19, 1995 and was consequently issued Certificate of Registration with RDO Control No. 95-570-000481 (BIR Form No. 1556)² and OCN IRC00000148499 (BIR Form No. 2302), respectively.³

Petitioner is engaged primarily in the business of manufacturing, producing and processing of all kinds of steel and steel by-products, particularly, but not limited to closed impression die steel forging and all automotive steel parts, and in subjecting such products to any process or treatment for purposes of increasing their value and utility, and engaged in the purchase, sale, and exportation of all kinds of steel and steel by-products.⁴ Petitioner also registered its products "closed impression die steel forgings" and "tools and dies" as a pioneer status with the Board of Investments (BOI) on June 28, 1974, April 22, 1992, and June 8, 1995, under Registration Numbers DP-74-336, DP-92-057, and EP-95-132, respectively⁵. On May 31, 2005, BOI issued a Certification⁶ showing the incentives being enjoyed by petitioner before it transferred its registration to the Philippine Economic Zone Authority (PEZA), with a further statement that the incentives so enjoyed have

Je

¹ Par. 1, Joint Stipulation of Facts and Issues, Docket, p. 87

² Exhibit "B", Docket, p. 200

³ Par. 3, Joint Stipulation of Facts and Issues, Docket, p. 87

⁴ Exhibit "A-1", Docket, p. 187

⁵ Par. 4, Joint Stipulation of Facts and Issues, Docket, p. 87

⁶ Exhibit "D", Docket, p. 202

418

already expired from the end of the tenth (10th) year from the date of registration.

Respondent is the duly appointed Commissioner of Internal Revenue vested with authority to exercise the functions of said office, including *inter alia*, the power to refund any internal revenue tax erroneously or illegally assessed or collected, or of any penalty claimed to have been collected without authority, or of any sum alleged to have been excessively or in any manner wrongfully collected, or of VAT input taxes attributed to zero-rated revenue. He holds office at the BIR National Office Building, Diliman, Quezon City.⁷

For the period covering July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003, petitioner allegedly generated and recorded zero-rated sales in the amount of P171,327,944.34⁸ and such amount was supposedly paid partly in Philippine Peso and in acceptable foreign currency, which was inwardly remitted in accordance with existing regulations of the Central Bank of the Philippines, pursuant to Section 106(A)(2)(a)(1), (2), and (3) of the Tax Code.

On August 20, 2003 and September 15, 2003, petitioner filed its Monthly VAT Declaration (BIR Form No. 2550M) Return⁹ for the months of July and August 2003, respectively, and its original and amended VAT Return¹⁰ for the 3rd quarter of 2003 (BIR Form No. 2550Q) on October 24, 2003 and November 18, 2003, respectively, and the succeeding quarters.¹¹ *sc*

⁷ Par. 2, Joint Stipulation of Facts and Issues, Docket, p. 87

⁸ Items No. 20 and 21 of Amended 3rd Quarter VAT Return (BIR Form No. 2550Q), Exhibit "G-1", Docket, p. 206

⁹ Exhibits "E" and "F", Docket, pp. 203-204

¹⁰ Exhibits "G" and "G-1", Docket, pp. 205-206

¹¹ Exhibits "I, J, K, L, M, N, O, and P"

4/9

Petitioner's Amended Third Quarterly VAT Return ¹² shows that petitioner incurred VAT input taxes on domestic purchases of capital goods amounting to P439,889.97; on domestic purchases of goods other than capital goods amounting to P1,248,945.77; input taxes on domestic purchases of services amounting to P2,448,967.42; on importation of capital goods amounting to P153,624.00; and importation of goods other than capital goods amounting to P2,230,553.00 or a total of P6,521,980.16.

Petitioner alleges that it paid all the aforementioned input taxes on its domestic purchases of goods, services, and capital goods, and importation of goods which are necessary in the course of its trade and business; and are all attributable to its zero-rated sales. All finished products manufactured were directly exported or sold to PEZA-registered enterprises resulting in indirect export sales.

Claiming that it has not applied its unutilized input taxes against any of its output tax liability during the same period (July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003) or to any succeeding period or quarters, petitioner filed an Application for Tax Credit/Refund¹³ with respondent's Revenue District Office No. 057 in the amount of P6,521,980.16 on August 19, 2005. However, as of the present date, respondent has not acted upon petitioner's claim for refund. Thus, petitioner filed with this Court the instant Petition for Review on August 30, 2005, in order to toll the running of the two-year prescriptive period provided under Section 229 of the Tax Code of 1997. *ju*

¹² Exhibit "G-1"

¹³ Exhibit "H", Docket, p. 207

420

Petitioner submits that being a corporation duly organized and registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission and with the BIR as a VAT-registered entity, it is subject to VAT at 0% rate and its indirect export sales are not subject to 10% VAT but are zero-rated as these are sales to PEZA-registered enterprises, pursuant to Section 106(A)(2)(a)(i), (ii) and (iii) and Section 108(B)(1) of the Tax Code of 1997.

Respondent, in his Answer filed on October 11, 2005, interposed the following Special and Affirmative Defenses¹⁴, to wit:

"4. Petitioner's alleged claim for refund is subject to administrative routinary investigation/examination by the Bureau;

5. The amount of P6,521,980.16 being claimed by petitioner as alleged VAT input taxes for the period July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003 was not properly documented;

6. In an action for refund, the burden of proof is on the taxpayer to establish its right to refund and failure to sustain the burden is fatal to the claim for refund/credit;

7. Petitioner must show that it has complied with the provisions of Sections 204(C) and 229 of the Tax Code on the prescriptive period for claiming tax refund/credit;

8. Claims for refund are construed strictly against the claimant for the same partake the nature of exemption from taxation (*Commissioner of Internal Revenue vs. Ledesma*, 31 SCRA 95) and such, they are looked upon with disfavor (*Western Minolco Corp. vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 124 SCRA 1211)."

During trial, petitioner presented testimonial and documentary evidence in support of its claim while respondent's counsel manifested on March 21, 2007 that she is waiving her right to present evidence and is submitting the case for decision based on the pleadings. Thus, the Court directed the parties 

¹⁴ Docket, pp. 58-59



to file their respective Memorandum within thirty (30) days from March 21, 2007. Upon receipt of the parties' Memoranda, the instant Petition was submitted for decision on May 28, 2007.

The parties jointly stipulated on the following issues¹⁵, for resolution of this Court:

"1. Whether or not Petitioner generated and recorded export sales in the amount of Php171,327,944.34 for the period July 01, 2003 to September 30, 2003;

2. Whether or not Petitioner's export sales for the period July 01, 2003 to September 30, 2003 were partly paid for in acceptable foreign currency and was inwardly remitted to the Philippines in accordance with the regulations of the Central Bank of the Philippines;

3. Whether or not Petitioner incurred domestic purchases of taxable goods and services and capital goods and importation of goods and capital goods in the amount of Php65,219,800.00 for the period July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003.

4. Whether or not the above purchases and importations were paid by Petitioner in the course of trade and business and are duly supported by invoices and/or receipts showing the information required by law.

5. Whether or not Petitioner is entitled for the credit/refund of the tax arising from domestic purchases of taxable goods and services and capital goods and importation of goods and capital goods from July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003 in the amount of Php5,307,313.37 subject of this Petition."

The crux of this entire controversy is whether or not petitioner is entitled to a refund in the amount of P6,521,980.16 of unutilized input VAT attributable to its zero-rated sales. And in resolving this principal issue, this Court finds it crucial to carefully examine all documentary and testimonial evidence submitted, case records, and all pertinent laws and regulation. *Je*

¹⁵ Joint Stipulation of Facts and Issues, Docket, p. 88

422

Under Article 112(A) of the 1997 Tax Code, a VAT-registered entity, such as petitioner, whose sales are zero-rated or attributable to zero-rated sales, may validly claim refund of its unutilized input VAT, provided there is compliance with the requirements laid down in said provision which reads as:

“SEC. 112. Refunds or Tax Credits of Input Tax. –

(A) Zero-rated or Effectively Zero-rated Sales. – Any VAT-registered person, whose sales are zero-rated or effectively zero-rated may, within two (2) years after the close of the taxable quarter when the sales were made, apply for the issuance of a tax credit certificate or refund of creditable input tax due or paid attributable to such sales, except transitional input tax, to the extent that such input tax has not been applied against output tax: *Provided, however,* That in the case of zero-rated sales under Section 106(A)(2)(a)(1), (2) and (B) and Section 108(B)(1) and (2), the acceptable foreign currency exchange proceeds thereof had been duly accounted for in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP): *Provided, further,* That where the taxpayer is engaged in zero-rated or effectively zero-rated sale and also in taxable or exempt sale of goods or properties or services, and the amount of creditable input tax due or paid cannot be directly and entirely attributed to any one of the transaction, it shall be allocated proportionately on the basis of the volume of sales.”

Pursuant to the above quoted provision, petitioner must comply with the following requisites: (1) the taxpayer is VAT-registered; (2) the taxpayer is engaged in sales which are zero-rated or effectively zero-rated; (3) the claim must be filed within two (2) years after the close of the taxable quarter when such sales were made; and (4) the creditable input tax due or paid must be attributable to such sales, except the transitional input tax, to the extent that such input tax has not been applied against the output tax.

This Court finds that petitioner has complied with all three (3) requisites provided in Section 112 of the 1997 Tax Code, as amended. *gr*

423

First, the Certificate of Registration with RDO Control No. 95-570-000481 (BIR Form No. 1556)¹⁶ and OCN IRC00000148499 (BIR Form No. 2302)¹⁷, issued by respondent proved compliance with the requirement that petitioner must be VAT-registered.

Second, the pieces of evidence submitted by petitioner such as sales invoices, VAT returns and other relevant documents show that it is engaged in sales which are zero-rated. In this case, it is undisputable that most of the sales entered into by petitioner from July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003 were all export sales to PEZA-registered entities¹⁸ and are therefore considered indirect export sales subject to 0% VAT. These PEZA-registered enterprises had paid their purchases to petitioner in Philippine Peso as evidenced by Official Receipts issued by petitioner and recorded in its Cash Receipts Book.¹⁹ Zero-rated sales whenever made by a VAT-registered person to a PEZA-registered entity shall be subject to 0% VAT, pursuant to Section 106 (A)(2)(a)(5) of the 1997 NIRC, as amended, in relation to Revenue Memorandum Circular (RMC) No. 74-99, quoted hereunder for ready reference:

"SEC. 106. Value-added Tax on Sale of Goods or Properties.—

(A) *Rate and Base of Tax.*—There shall be levied, assessed and collected on every sale, barter or exchange of goods or properties, a value-added tax equivalent to ten percent (10%) of the gross selling price or gross value in money of the goods or properties sold, bartered or exchanged, such tax to be paid by the seller or transferor. *je*

¹⁶ Exhibit "B", Docket, p. 200

¹⁷ Exhibit "C", Docket, p. 201

¹⁸ Aichi Steel Corporation, Asian Transmission Corporation, Isuzu Autoparts Manufacturing Corporation, Laguna Autoparts Manufacturing Corporation, and Toyota Autoparts Philippines Corporation

¹⁹ Independent CPA Report, p. 8, Docket, p. 265

424

xxx

xxx

xxx

(2) The following sales by VAT-registered persons shall be subject to zero percent (0%) rate:

(a) Export Sales. — The term 'export sales' means:

xxx

(5) Those considered export sales under Executive Order No. 226, otherwise known as the Omnibus Investment Code of 1987, and other special laws."

"Revenue Memorandum Circular No. 74-99

SECTION. 3.- Tax Treatment Of Sales Made By A VAT Registered Supplier From The Customs Territory, To A PEZA Registered Enterprise. —

(1) If the Buyer is a PEZA registered enterprise which is subject to the 5% special tax regime, in lieu of all taxes, except real property tax, pursuant to R.A. No. 7916, as amended:

(a) Sale of goods (i.e., merchandise). — This shall be treated as indirect export hence, considered subject to zero percent (0%) VAT, pursuant to Sec. 106(A)(2)(a)(5), NIRC and Sec. 23 of R.A. No. 7916, in relation to ART. 77(2) of the Omnibus Investments Code.

(b) Sale of service. — This shall be treated subject to zero percent (0%) VAT under the 'cross border doctrine' of the VAT System, pursuant to VAT Ruling No. 032-98 dated Nov. 5, 1998.

xxx

xxx

xxx

3. In the final analysis, any sale of goods, property or services made by a VAT registered supplier from the Customs Territory to any registered enterprise operating in the ecozone, regardless of the class or type of the latter's PEZA registration, is actually qualified and thus legally entitled to the zero percent (0%) VAT. Accordingly, all sales of goods or property to such enterprise made by a VAT registered supplier from the Customs Territory shall be treated

je

425

subject to 0% VAT, pursuant to Sec. 106(A)(2)(a)(5), NIRC, in relation to ART. 77(2) of the Omnibus Investments Code, while all sales of services to the said enterprises, made by VAT registered suppliers from the Customs Territory, shall be treated effectively subject to the 0% VAT, pursuant to Section 108(B)(3), NIRC, in relation to the provisions of R.A. 7916 and the 'Cross Border Doctrine' of the VAT system."

Third, petitioner filed its administrative claim for refund on August 19, 2005²⁰ and the present Petition on August 30, 2005, both within the two-year prescriptive period from October 24, 2005, the date when petitioner filed its Original Quarterly VAT Return for the Third Quarter of 2002.²¹

As to the fourth and last requisite, an examination of the evidence on record discloses that petitioner did not carry over its unutilized input VAT for the Third Quarter of 2003. This is evidenced by petitioner's Quarterly VAT Returns for the succeeding quarters: Third and Fourth Quarters of 2003; all four (4) quarters of 2004; and First and Second Quarters of 2005.²² Inasmuch as petitioner did not carry over to the succeeding quarters its unutilized input VAT for the Third Quarter of taxable year 2003, the same may then be refunded, pursuant to Section 112(A) of the 1997 Tax Code, as amended, in relation to Section 4.100-2(a) of Revenue Regulations No. 7-95.

However, the Court finds that the input VAT being claimed for refund was not fully supported by sufficient documentary evidence which necessarily resulted in the reduction of refundable input VAT, particularly, in the amount of **P5,519,185.13**, computed as follows: *Jr*

²⁰ Exhibit "H"

²¹ *Atlas Consolidated Mining and Development Corporation vs. CIR*, G.R. Nos. 141104 and 148763, June 8, 2007

²² Exhibits "G", "G-1", "I", "J", "K", "L", "M", "N", "O", and "P"

Claimed Input VAT		P 6,521,980.16
Less:		
Outside the period covered-local purchases	131,903.70	
Outside the period covered-importation	52,701.00	
Missing official receipts and sales invoices-local		
Purchases	81,728.45	
Missing official receipts and sales invoices-importation	5,073.00	
Name of payee is not indicated- local purchases	182.92	
Undated Official Receipt- importation	975.00	
Difference between VAT return & purchases		
Schedule	<u>65,848.37</u>	<u>338,412.44</u>
Total Substantiated Input Tax		P 6,183,567.72
Less: Output VAT		<u>664,382.59</u>
Total Input VAT available for refund		<u>P 5,519,185.13</u>

Relative to the observations made by the Independent Certified Public Accountant (CPA) pertaining to the claimed input taxes paid on local purchase and importations in the respective amounts of P131,903.70 and P52,701.00 totalling P184,604.70, the same shall be denied because the dates of the related VAT invoices and official receipts fall outside the period of claim. As such, the input VAT supported by VAT invoices and official receipts dated earlier than the period of claims can no longer be the subject of a refund claim. Petitioner ought to have declared these input taxes in the corresponding taxable quarters when payments for the services were made as evidenced by VAT official receipts and when purchases of goods were consummated as evidenced by VAT invoices, as held by this Court in the case of **Lepanto Consolidated Mining Co., vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue**²³. The pertinent portions of the said Decision are hereunder quoted, to wit:

"We agree with the respondent.

The alleged unutilized input VAT of P5,820,863.87 should be denied since the supporting invoices and official receipts



²³ CTA Case Nos. 6368 and 6480, December 15, 2004



thereof bore dates which were earlier than the period of petitioner's claim. Section 110(A)(2) of the 1997 Tax Code provides:

'SEC. 110. *Tax Credits.* —

(A) *Creditable input Tax.* —

(2) The input tax on domestic **purchase of goods** or properties shall be creditable:

(a) To the purchaser **upon consummation** of sale and on importation of goods or properties; and

However, in the case of **purchases of services**, lease or use of properties, the input tax shall be creditable to the purchaser, lessee or licensee **upon payment** of the compensation, rental, royalty or fee.'

It is clear from the above-quoted provisions of law that for purchases of goods, the corresponding input value added taxes of which is creditable to the purchaser upon consummation of sale, that is, upon the issuance of the corresponding invoice. On the other hand, for purchases of services, the corresponding input value added taxes of which is creditable to the purchaser upon payment of compensation, rental, royalty, or fee, that is, upon the date of official receipt. Section 110(A) is explicit. It states 'upon consummation', in the case of domestic purchases of goods, and 'upon payment', in the case of purchases of services. It does not provide any qualification, such as 'upon delivery of invoice or official receipt' which is the main thesis of petitioner's contention.

In a resolution of the case entitled ***Telecommunications Technologies Philippines, Inc. vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, CTA Case No. 6168, promulgated on July 28, 2004***, this Court elucidated that "the input VAT on domestic purchases of goods or properties shall be allowed as tax credit to the purchaser upon consummation of sale, which means upon issuance by the seller of the VAT sales invoices evidencing the sale of goods/properties. On the other hand, the input VAT on purchases of services shall be available as tax credit to the purchaser only upon payment of the compensation or fee, i.e., upon issuance by the seller of the VAT official receipt evidencing receipt of the payment for services performed or yet to be performed." *je*



Thus, it is indubitable on the part of the petitioner to declare the input value added taxes on domestic purchases of goods and services at the end of the corresponding taxable quarter where purchases of goods were consummated, as evidenced by VAT invoice and for payment of services, as evidenced by VAT official receipt.

Therefore, the amount of input VAT of P5,820,863.87 which is supported by VAT invoices and official receipts dated earlier than the period of petitioner's claims can no longer be claimed for refund pursuant to Section 110(A) in relation with Section 112(A) of the 1997 National Internal Revenue Code." (*Emphasis supplied*)

While it is true that Article 112(A) of the 1997 Tax Code, as amended, allows tax refund or credit on input tax of zero-rated or effectively zero-rated sale, nonetheless, compliance with certain invoicing requirement must be met before such claim for refund or credit can be granted. Sections 113(A) and 237 of the 1997 Tax Code, provides for the invoicing requirements for VAT-registered persons. Section 4-108-1 of Revenue Regulations No. 7-95, specifically enumerates the information that must appear on the face of receipts or invoices issued by all VAT-registered persons. The applicable portions thereof are quoted hereunder:

"SEC. 4-108-1. **Invoicing Requirements.**- All VAT-registered persons shall, for every sale or lease of goods or properties or services, issue duly registered receipts or sales or commercial invoices which must show:

1. the name, TIN and address of seller;
2. date of transaction;
3. quantity, unit cost and description of merchandise or nature of service;
4. the name, TIN, business style, if any, and address of the VAT-registered purchaser, customer or client;

gr

429

5. the word 'zero-rated' imprinted on the invoice covering zero-rated sales; and
6. the invoice value or consideration.

xxx xxx xxx

Only VAT-registered persons are required to print their TIN followed by the word 'VAT' in their invoice or receipts and this shall be considered as 'VAT Invoice'. All purchases covered by invoices other than 'VAT Invoice' shall not give rise to any input tax.

If the taxable person is engaged in exempt operations, he should issue separate invoices or receipts for the taxable and exempt operations. A 'VAT Invoice' shall be issued only for sales of goods, properties or services subject to VAT imposed in Sections 100 and 102 of the Code.

The invoice or receipt shall be prepared at least in duplicate, the original to be given to the buyer and the duplicate to be retained by the seller as part of his accounting records."

Thus, the amounts of P81,728.45, P5,073.00, P182.92 and P975.00, corresponding to the input VAT arising from petitioner's purchases of capital goods and services and its importations that are not duly supported by VAT Invoices/Official Receipts, in clear violation of Section 113(A) of the 1997 Tax Code, as amended, and those with insufficient information required under Section 4.108.1 of Revenue Regulations No. 7-95, should be disallowed.

The Independent CPA found that there was a noted input VAT difference in the amount of P65,848.37 between purchases and input VAT that petitioner paid both for local purchases and importation as appearing in the VAT return filed for the Third Quarter of 2003 and the schedule of purchases and VAT. There being no supporting documents to substantiate *Je*

430

petitioner's claim as to this discrepancy, the same should likewise be denied.

The details of which are as follows:

	Per VAT Return	Per Schedule	Purchases Difference	Input VAT Difference
Local Purchases - Services	24,489,673.77	23,834,580.11	655,093.66	65,509.37
Importation - Other than Capital goods	22,305,530	22,302,140	3,390	339.00
Total Noted Difference between the VAT return and Schedule				<u>65,848.37</u>

Finally, a careful examination of petitioner's Monthly and Quarterly VAT Return covering the period July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003 readily showed that while such return reflected that petitioner had zero-rated sales, sales subject to 10% VAT, and exempt sales; there are actually only two (2) types of sales appearing on the Schedule submitted by petitioner to the Court commissioned Independent CPA, namely: (1) zero-rated sales, and (2) sales subject to 10% VAT. Moreover, the input VAT being applied for by petitioner in the amount of P6,521,980.16 was not reduced by the amount of P664,351.91 representing the total output VAT for sales that are subject to 10% VAT.

WHEREFORE, the instant Petition for Review is hereby **PARTIALLY GRANTED**. Respondent is hereby **ORDERED TO REFUND** in favor of petitioner the reduced amount of FIVE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED NINETEEN THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY FIVE AND 13/100 (P5,519,185.13) representing the unutilized input taxes paid by petitioner on its domestic purchases of goods and importation of goods and services which are *jc*

431

attributable to its zero-rated sales for the period covered July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003.

SO ORDERED.

Juanito C. Castañeda, Jr.
JUANITO C. CASTAÑEDA, JR.
Associate Justice

WE CONCUR:

Erlinda P. Uy
ERLINDA P. UY
Associate Justice

Olga Palanca-Enriquez
OLGA PALANCA-ENRIQUEZ
Associate Justice

ATTESTATION

I attest that the conclusions in the above Decision were reached in consultation before the case was assigned to the writer of the opinion of the Court's Division.

Juanito C. Castañeda, Jr.
JUANITO C. CASTAÑEDA, JR.
Associate Justice
Chairperson

432

CERTIFICATION

Pursuant to Article VIII, Section 13 of the Constitution, and the Division Chairperson's Attestation, it is hereby certified that the conclusions in the above Decision were reached in consultation before the case was assigned to the writer of the opinion of the Court.


ERNESTO D. ACOSTA
Presiding Justice

433