SDI International B. V. v. Commissioner, 107 T. C. 254 (1996)

Royalties do not retain their U. S. source character when paid by a foreign corporation to another foreign corporation under a separate licensing agreement.

Summary

SDI International B. V. , a Netherlands corporation, was assessed withholding tax deficiencies by the IRS for royalties paid to its Bermuda parent, SDI Bermuda Ltd. , derived from U. S. royalties received from its U. S. subsidiary, SDI USA, Inc. The Tax Court held that the royalties paid by SDI International to SDI Bermuda did not constitute income received from U. S. sources, rejecting the IRS's argument that U. S. source income retains its character through multiple licensing steps. The court's decision was based on the separate nature of the licensing agreements and the independent role of SDI International, preventing a 'cascading' of withholding taxes.

Facts

SDI International B. V. , a Netherlands corporation, licensed software from SDI Bermuda Ltd. , its Bermuda parent, and sublicensed it worldwide, including to SDI USA, Inc. , its U. S. subsidiary. SDI International paid royalties to SDI Bermuda based on a percentage of the royalties it received from sublicensees, including SDI USA. The IRS assessed deficiencies in withholding taxes on these payments, asserting they were U. S. source income due to their origin from SDI USA.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of deficiency for the years 1987-1990, asserting that SDI International failed to withhold taxes on royalties paid to SDI Bermuda. SDI International petitioned the Tax Court, which ruled in favor of SDI International, holding that the royalties paid to SDI Bermuda were not U. S. source income.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the royalties paid by SDI International to SDI Bermuda constitute income "received from sources within the United States" under sections 881(a), 1441(a), and 1442(a) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. No, because the royalties paid by SDI International to SDI Bermuda were separate payments under a worldwide licensing agreement and did not retain their U. S. source character from the royalties received by SDI International from SDI USA.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court analyzed whether the U. S. source income from SDI USA flowed through to the royalties paid by SDI International to SDI Bermuda. The court distinguished this case from prior cases where the U. S. withholding tax was imposed directly on payments from a U. S. payor, noting that here, the royalties were paid under a separate licensing agreement between two foreign corporations. The court emphasized the separate and independent nature of the licensing agreements and SDI International's role as a substantive business entity, not merely a conduit. The court was concerned about the potential for "cascading" withholding taxes if the IRS's position were upheld, which could lead to multiple levels of withholding on the same income. The court cited Northern Indiana Public Service Co. v. Commissioner, where a similar structure was not treated as a conduit for tax purposes, supporting its decision that the royalties did not retain their U. S. source character.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that royalties paid by a foreign corporation to another foreign corporation under a separate licensing agreement do not automatically retain their U. S. source character, even if derived from U. S. source income. Legal practitioners should consider the separate nature of licensing agreements and the independent role of the intermediary in structuring international royalty payments to avoid unintended withholding tax liabilities. The ruling may affect how multinational corporations structure their licensing agreements to minimize tax exposure. It also highlights the importance of treaties in determining tax liabilities and the potential for changes in treaty provisions to impact future tax assessments. Subsequent cases may need to consider this decision when analyzing the character of income through multiple licensing steps.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.