

2006

. 2006/9/4

.....	. 1
.....	. 2
.....	. 3

()

1	()
3	
3	
4	
4	()
5	:
7	:
10	:
13	:
15	/ :
16	:
19	:
20	:
33	:
41	:
46	:
47	:

53	:
54	:
58	:
68	
71	
72	
73	
b	Abstract

12	.	(1)

.

.

:

с

()

()

(1)

(2)

1999 1 :

(1)

1999 1

:

(2)

.1994

:

-1

() -2

:

.

: .1

.()	:
.		:
.		:
.		:

(1)»

.

.

.

.

.

()

(1)

.9 1974

:

1945

"

(1)"

"

(2)"

"

(3)"

"

(4)"

.40

1963

2

:

(1)

.143

.

.

(2)

.11

1,1998

:

(3)

.3

:

(4)

"

(1)"

.

.

" .

(2)"

.

:

:

.1

.

:

.2

.

.3

66

(1)

(2)

.

"

:

(1)"

:

.3

"

(2)" .

"

(3)" .

.

:

.4

.

.143	.	(1)
.22 2006	.	(2)
.70	.	(3)
9		

(1)

:

:

(2)

: **.1**

.

.

.

.

"

.

.

(3)"

.42

.226 ()

30

10

(1)

: (2)

(3)

"

(1)"

.

"

"

.

: .2

.

: .3

.

: .4

:

.

: .5

:(1)

.1		
() .2		
.3		
.4		
.5		
.6		
.7		
.8		
.9		
.10		
.11		
.12		
.13		()
.14		

:(1) () :

:

:

:

:

" .

"(2)

:(3) () :

وحسب هذه النظرية فإن الدخل لا يعنى ان يتصف فقط بالاستمرارية والدورية والانتظار
وانما يجب ان يشمل ايضا اي زيادة في قيمة رأس المال الذي يحصل عليه الفرد، وبالتالي حسب
هذه النظرية فإن فرض الضريبة على الدخل لا يكون على الدخل بالمفهوم التقليدي فقط

1997 131 .

(1) :

(2) 77 .

(3) : 157 .

:

:

:

:

.1

"

(1)"

.

.

:

.2

"

(2)"

.

:

:

.133

.23

(

)

:

(1)

:

(2)

：

。

。

。

。

。

。

(1)

：

。

.

:

.

.

.

()

.

.

()

.()

.

:

:

:

：

”

。(1)”

。

。

。

。

。

.

(1)

.

.

:

()

.

)

(

.

:

.

:

.

.

：

★

★

。(1)

：

。

。

。

(1)

:

: .1

.

.

: .2

.

: .3

.4

.

: .5

.

:

.186

: (1)

.6

:

.

.(1)

:

.

.

.

.

:

.

.90

30

:

(1)

:

:

:

.

"Geny"

.

()

.

.

11

(1)ii

.160

$$\vdots$$

(1)

1950

.

.

:

:

.

(1)

:

.

(1)

143



:

-1

:))

.((

:))

.((

2

:))

.((

:))

.((

3

.

.(- -)

:

4

:

.

:

.

:

-

(())

.

.

(1)

:

.

:

-1

.

.

147

36

:

(1)

:-

.

.

.

:-

.

:-

.

:-2

.

-

.

-

()

•

.40

38

$$\vdots \quad (1)$$

: -1

: 1

(120)

: "

.

-

.

.

-

(183)

.

"
.

...

:

.

.

. -

. -

:

.

:

. -1

. -2

. -3

. -4

. -5

. -6

. -7

(1)

. -1

. -2

.50

40

_____ : . (1)

.	-3
.	-4
.	-5
.	-6
.	-1
.	-2
.	-3
.	-4
.	-5
.	-6
.	-7
.	-8
:	

(1)
 %78 (2002)

"

(2003) (1)

.

(1)»

.

(2)

.

.

.

-1

.

-2

.

-3

.

-4

.

(1964) (25)

(13)

(1967)

(1947)

.

.87 : (1)

2003 : (2) أبو

.18

	:	
.		-1
.		-2
.		-3
.		-4
.		-5
.		-6
.		-7
.()	-8

.		-
.		-

.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:



.60

:

:

-1

.

-2

.

" -3

.(1)"

.50

45

:

(1)

⋮
⋮
⋮
⋮

:

.

"

(1)"

.

(())

-

(())

.

.

:

-1

-2

-3

.15

()

2000 :

(1)

-4

"

(1)"

:

.65

48

:

(1)

1789

.

.

.

.

.

.

"

.

(1)"

.

:

.80

50

:

(1)

:

.

-

.

-

.

-

.

"

(1)"

.

.

.

.

.95

51

:

(1)

.

.

()

.

.()

.

()

.

"

"

.

.

()

.

(1)

:

:

:

()

.

.

:

:

.()

.

:

.

:

))

((

))

"

((

.(1)"

.86

54

:

(1)

:

()

()

.

(1)

.

:

:

:

.

.

:

.

(1)

.

.

:

:

:

-1

.

:

-2

.

:

-3

.

.

:

4

.

.

.

:

:

:

(1)

.(2)
.

:

.

.

:

.

.90

:

(1)

:

(2)

.194

:

1972 47

.

:

.

.

(1)

:

:

.

.

.

.90

:

(1)

16

% 16

7/1

% 15

% 16

.

.

∴

.

"

.

∴

()

.

.

:

"

.

.

:

.

:

(1)

))

.((

.

17

34

)) : 2004

.⁽²⁾((

. : (1)
.2004/47 34 (2)

：

！

．

：

．

：

”

．

．(1)”

：

．

.1991

1989-1965

：

(1)

:

.

.

.1931 4 1913 17 1895 13
)) :

.⁽¹⁾((

:

()

(2).
:

.

:()

:

.

:()

.

: (1)

: (2)

:

:()

.

.

(1)

:

!

!

.

.88 1960

65

:

(1)

()

-1

.

-2

.

-3

.

.

)

(

(

)

(

)

()

.

!

.

.

!

)

(

.

.





. 1976 :

2003 :

.18

.70 :

1998 :

1974 :

.

. :

2006

.

1999 :

.

, 1998 :

.

() :

.

.

.66

.

. 2 1963 :

2001 :

.1991 **1989-1965** :

. :

. () 2000 :

. :

.226 () :

. 1960 :

. :

. :

. :

. 1997:

. :

1998

.

An-Najah National University
Faculty of Graduate Studies

**Balance Limits between Tax Authorities
and Tax Payers**

Prepared by:
Hani Mohamed Hasan Shubeitah

Supervised by
Dr. Nael Ahmad Taha

*Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master in Taxation Disputes, Faculty of Graduate studies, at An-Najah
National University, Nablus, Palestine.*

2006

**Balance Limits between Tax Authorities
and Tax Payers**

Prepared by:

Hani Mohamed Hasan Shubeitah

Supervised by

Dr. Nael Ahmad Taha

Abstract

Efforts have been focused to quadrate the advantages, which were conflicted with treasury advantages and supplier advantages.

Therefore the tax laws has applied the cods which keep the treasury rights and perform its goals while at the same time it keeps the taxpayer rights and decrease the tax Heaviness.

The tax should be equal in which all taxpayer share every one as his ability to pay due to the rate of income he has, the tax define surely without ambiguity or control it must be pointed out. quantity ,date of payment.

The ways of collecting tax and the procedures of collecting and carrying out the encourage and fixity of tax system are subjected to this field. It will never be changeable, the taxpayer must accustomed to pay it and will never feel the heaviness upon him so this will never sulfite with facility and it will be collected in suitable times and ways for taxpayer and treasury.

Tax law has put arrangement for ways and rights to attain to the section subjected to the tax and to estimate the value of tax debit in accurate way and applied obligations that guarantees for the management to keep it rights.

Thus. we can give the right to look at books and Registers and document enable it to renew the amount of tax in exact way with protesting

against its secret that the tax management is keeping all the secrets that aware at.

The pen penalties code put forward every thing that disturb using management for this right either to escape from offer documents or refuse to let the employees to aware at the documents before the expire date.

The law gives management law an authority to estimate the substance that subjected to tax either at random or by outside appearance and to give it a wide freedom to collect the evidence and in formations and statistics and to discuss the taxpayer to remove the cover at tax amount and the management has the right to follow this mean as a penalty for taxpayer for refusal to offer tax licenses deliberately or by neglecting this freedom which lead to control the estimation but to the truly of tax by evidence and proofs.

In addition to that the tax law applied several penalties upon every one who rejects his rules as a guarantee to the treasury rights to estimate the amount of tax exactly and to define its amount and collect it so the tax low applied penalties in case the records and the document were rejected to apply and in the case of wrong declarations and acknowledgements were offered or not in definite time.

The penalties were either for fit or imprisonment upon the taxpayer or those who share him either in encouragement or help him to evade the tax.

But the low arranged the rules of collection to keep quality and the taxpayer rights.

First of these rules to prove the episode that caused it by indicating the procedure to fix and collect it.

For this reason the taxpayer has been given the right to reject the decisions of estimation by tax law and to oppose it to area who responsible for tax to review it self and to make sure of the a curacy of his appeasement and gave him the right to apply his oppression to the rejection committee and to the court to reject the decision of management this is to make sure of management's be heavier and to keep the rights of taxpayer and applied it to the law.

The tax authority may miss using its authority against the taxpayer and it supposed that those taxpayer must regain their rights in the court when the oppressed against any mistake in the fact or in law that the tax management committed or when she exceed its tax authority.

Therefore the importance of rejection appear and the role of tax law and its observation on the work of tax management upon practicing its authorities to apply tax law. Court observation makes the management practicing it authority in favor of low without exceeding the rights and guarantees of taxpayers.

Tax quarrels has its importance while the tax authority have a great authority to face the taxpayer who remains the poor part in the tax relation ship he has no way but to reject as an only mean to defend which considered to be the origin way.

Tax quarrel has its importance while the taxpayer ignore either deliberately or un deliberately his rights and charges towards tax this makes

him truthfully or untruthfully to arise tax arguments in the face of management.

Therefore this research will deal to treat the matter of balances generally and in details that enable the management and the taxpayer to aware of the issue from all sides.

It confirms the taxpayers attitude to keep his right and to defend himself.

The management will therefore practice its authorities without oppression in away to slight the cases of rejection from one hand and it could decide its matter as soon as possible in case it happens on the other hand.