

PRESENTERS



Howard Davis, Inland Revenue, Wellington

Howard is the Tax Counsel Office's Group Leader (Customer Advice) in Inland Revenue. He was formerly Director (Taxpayer Rulings) and in both roles, since 2004, he has been responsible for Inland Revenue's taxpayer rulings service. Prior to joining Inland Revenue, he worked in law and accounting firms in tax. Howard's principal areas of interest in tax law are tax avoidance, the financial arrangement rules and business taxation.



Mike Lennard, Stout Street Chambers, Wellington

Mike is a litigation lawyer, specialising in tax and civil cases. His career to date has involved eight years' practice as a Crown prosecutor and civil litigation lawyer, then eight years as head of litigation for Inland Revenue, and practice at the independent bar since June 2004. Mike's practice includes intellectual property, competition law, professional negligence, and relationship property litigation. He has a particular interest in financial regulatory and criminal issues, including money laundering and administration of the AML/CFT legislation.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. BACKGROUND – ANTI-AVOIDANCE LAW BEFORE <i>FRUCOR</i> (SC)	3
THE STATUTORY PROVISION AND ITS DIFFICULTY	3
CASES UP UNTIL <i>BEN NEVIS</i>	4
<i>Challenge (PC)</i>	4
<i>Developments after Challenge (PC) until 2000</i>	5
<i>Developments 2000 to 2008</i>	6
<i>BEN NEVIS</i> (SC).....	7
3. FACTS OF <i>FRUCOR</i> (SC)	11
4. MAJORITY DECISION IN <i>FRUCOR</i> (SC)	15
5. POST-<i>FRUCOR</i> (SC) INLAND REVENUE INTERPRETATION OF TAX AVOIDANCE ...	19
6. IMPLICATIONS OF <i>FRUCOR</i> (SC) FOR DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE IN TAX DISPUTES.....	23
INTRODUCTION AND GENESIS OF THE ISSUE	23
LEGAL FRAMEWORK	23
THE CONUNDRUM	24
JUDICIAL JUSTIFICATION	24
<i>ALESCO</i>	25
FIRST PRINCIPLES.....	26
<i>FRUCOR</i>	27
7. <i>FRUCOR</i> (SC) PENALTIES DECISION.....	29
PENALTY PROVISIONS	29
EARLY APPROACHES TO THE “ABOUT AS LIKELY AS NOT TO BE CORRECT” TEST	29
THE MAJORITY APPROACH TO THE TEST	29
<i>50% test inappropriate</i>	30
<i>Approach to “about as likely as not to be correct” focussed on “legal soundness”</i>	30
<i>Frucor failed the test</i>	30
DOMINANT PURPOSE	30
THOUGHTS.....	31
8. ADDITIONAL INLAND REVENUE OBSERVATIONS	33
9. APPENDIX 1: THE <i>BEN NEVIS</i> (SC) [107] TWO-STAGE INQUIRY APPROACH.....	35