

## PRESENTERS



### **Vivian Cheng, Chapman Tripp, Wellington**

Vivian is an experienced tax practitioner who advises on all aspects of New Zealand tax law, with particular expertise in corporate restructuring, mergers and acquisitions, financing transactions and cross border taxation. She has been with Chapman Tripp since 2012 and was previously a Special Counsel at another New Zealand law firm.



### **Geoff Clews, Barrister, Auckland**

Geoff is an experienced tax litigator who advises clients in contentious tax matters, representing them with the Inland Revenue and before the Courts in both criminal and civil jurisdictions. He is a longstanding member of the NZLS Tax Committee, the New Zealand branch of the International Fiscal Association, the International Bar Association Tax Committee and the American Bar Association Foreign Lawyers Forum on tax issues. Geoff is an adjunct member of the faculty of the Commercial Law Department at Auckland University, co-presenting the Masters module on tax disputes.

*The statements and conclusions contained in this paper are those of the author(s) only and not those of the New Zealand Law Society. This booklet has been prepared for the purpose of a Continuing Legal Education course. It is not intended to be a comprehensive statement of the law or practice, and should not be relied upon as such. If advice on the law is required, it should be sought on a formal, professional basis.*

# CONTENTS

<b>“CASTLES ON A CLOUD” – DEDUCTIBILITY OF FEASIBILITY EXPENDITURE.....</b>	<b>1</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK.....	1
ACCEPTED PRACTICE PRIOR TO <i>TRUSTPOWER</i> .....	2
<i>General permission and the nexus with income</i> .....	2
<i>Capital limitation and the “commitment” test</i> .....	2
<i>TRUSTPOWER</i> CASE – FACTUAL BACKGROUND .....	4
<i>Development pipeline</i> .....	4
<i>Expenditure at issue</i> .....	5
<i>History of the dispute</i> .....	5
<i>TRUSTPOWER</i> CASE – THE ARGUMENTS .....	6
<i>TrustPower’s position</i> .....	6
<i>The Commissioner’s position</i> .....	6
<i>TRUSTPOWER</i> CASE – HIGH COURT DECISION .....	7
<i>Resource consents were not stand-alone assets</i> .....	7
<i>If stand-alone assets, resource consents were revenue assets</i> .....	8
<i>Date from which expenditure would be classified as capital if resource consents were capital assets</i> .....	9
<i>TRUSTPOWER</i> CASE – COURT OF APPEAL DECISION.....	9
<i>Capital/revenue distinction – Expenditure is capital under general principles</i> .....	9
<i>Capital/revenue distinction – Application of the BP Australia factors</i> .....	11
<i>Time of commitment</i> .....	11
OUR COMMENTS ON THE <i>TRUSTPOWER</i> CASE .....	12
<i>Approach to factual issues</i> .....	12
<i>Approach to the deductibility question</i> .....	14
<i>Weight given to authorities</i> .....	15
<i>Appeal to the Supreme Court</i> .....	16
IMPLICATIONS FOR DEDUCTIBILITY OF FEASIBILITY EXPENDITURE.....	16
CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	18