

## **PRESENTERS**

### **James Coleman, Barrister, Wellington**

James specialises in all forms of tax litigation. He has had over 17 years tax litigation experience and has appeared in over 135 reported tax cases including appearances in the Supreme Court and Privy Council. He has a particular interest in litigating avoidance cases and those concerning the capital revenue boundary. Prior to joining the independent bar he was at the Crown Law Office where he was appointed Crown Counsel and team leader of the tax team. He writes a regular column on tax matters in the NZLJ and will shortly be publishing a text on the tax avoidance law in New Zealand.

### **Eugen Trombitas, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Auckland**

Eugen leads the firm's indirect taxes team and has 17 years' experience in the tax field, with particular expertise in the area of GST and tax controversy for all tax types.

He has extensive experience in advising clients on all aspects of IRD audits, dispute resolution process and settlement of tax disputes. Eugen brings a practical and strategic focus to tax disputes, and often works closely with barristers in a support role. He has been involved in assisting with tax cases at all levels in New Zealand, including in the High Court of Australia.

Prior to joining PricewaterhouseCoopers, Eugen practised in the tax field in Australia and as a partner in a large New Zealand law firm.

## **Acknowledgement**

Eugen and James would like to acknowledge the invaluable assistance received from Riaan Geldenhuys (Senior Manager) and Siew Mei Ou Yang (Senior Tax Consultant), PricewaterhouseCoopers with several of the chapters. Eugen would particularly like to thank Riaan Geldenhuys for his insights into the disputes reform issues.

*The statements and conclusions contained in this booklet 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>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>INVESTIGATION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
THE INVESTIGATIVE POWERS OF THE IRD .....	6
Section 17: Power to request information.....	6
Validity of s 17 request notices .....	7
Failing to comply with s 17 information requests.....	8
Section 16: Power to enter premises to obtain information.....	8
Recent case law on the application of s 16 .....	9
Failing or refusing to comply with s 16 .....	11
Sections 18 and 19: Power to compel a taxpayer to attend an inquiry.....	11
Failure to attend, or refusal to provide information requested.....	13
USE OF THE COMMISSIONER'S STATUTORY POWERS DURING LITIGATION PROCEEDINGS.....	13
RIGHTS OF CONFIDENTIALITY .....	15
Legal professional privilege.....	15
Statutory right of non-disclosure for tax advice documents.....	16
Protecting Privilege/the right to non-disclosure.....	18
Challenges to Status of Documents .....	18
Amendment to the right of non-disclosure .....	20
<b>DISPUTES RESOLUTION PROCESS.....</b>	<b>21</b>
HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF PART IVA .....	21
Background .....	21
Disputable decision.....	22
More scene setting – towards reform .....	23
A SUMMARY OF THE DISPUTES RESOLUTION PROCESS .....	23
Investigation/audit stages.....	24
The start of the dispute resolution process - exchange of NOPA/NOR.....	25
Notice of proposed adjustment (NOPA).....	25
Specific comments in relation to taxpayer NOPAs.....	30
Taxpayer NOPAs and s 89F(3) documentary requirements .....	31
Notice of Response (NOR).....	32
Rejection of taxpayer's/ Commissioner's NOR.....	34
Dealing with procedural points in NOPA / NOR.....	35
Conference stage.....	35
Disclosure notice and statements of position (SOPs).....	36
Adjudication .....	39
Time bar .....	41
Assessment.....	43
Other issues in relation to the disputes resolution process.....	45
Section 89N – completing the disputes process.....	46
Section 113 of the TAA.....	53
Current concerns with the disputes resolution process.....	54
Suggestions to streamline disputes under the disputes resolution process .....	56
<b>NON – STANDARD DISPUTES.....</b>	<b>65</b>
JUDICIAL REVIEW .....	65
THE JURISDICTIONAL BASIS FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW.....	65
LIMITS ON JUDICIAL REVIEW CONTAINED IN THE TAA .....	65
Pre Assessment Review .....	66
Post assessment review .....	67
JUDICIAL REVIEW OF NON ASSESSMENT DECISIONS .....	69
SPECIFIC GROUNDS OF JUDICIAL REVIEW IN A TAX CONTEXT .....	69
Inconsistency.....	69
Legitimate expectation/estoppel.....	70
Fettering of discretion.....	71

DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS .....	72
SUING ON A CHEQUE .....	73
MAREVA INJUNCTIONS .....	74
DEBT RELATED LITIGATION.....	74
<i>Actions against directors of failed companies</i> .....	75
<i>Goatlands Ltd (in liq)</i> .....	75
<i>Boutique Tanneries Limited (in liquidation)</i> .....	76
<i>Peace and Glory Limited (in Liquidation)</i> .....	77
PROSECUTIONS .....	78
BREACH OF THE NEW ZEALAND BILL OF RIGHTS ACT 1991/ ABUSE OF PROCESS .....	78
<i>Business Records</i> .....	78
<i>Admission of copies</i> .....	79
<i>Circumstances affecting accuracy of copies</i> .....	79
<i>Production of copies</i> .....	79
<i>Notice required</i> .....	79
<b>SHORTFALL PENALTIES AND USE OF MONEY INTEREST .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<i>Summary of shortfall penalties</i> .....	81
THE RATES FOR THE VARIOUS PENALTIES ARE: .....	81
SECTION 141A: 20% SHORTFALL PENALTY FOR NOT TAKING REASONABLE CARE.....	82
SECTION 141B: 20% SHORTFALL PENALTY FOR TAKING AN UNACCEPTABLE TAX POSITION.....	83
SECTION 141C: 40% SHORTFALL PENALTY FOR GROSS CARELESSNESS.....	84
SECTION 141D: 100% SHORTFALL PENALTY FOR TAKING AN “ABUSIVE TAX POSITION” .....	86
<i>Section 141E: 150% shortfall penalty for evasion</i> .....	87
SECTION 141K: 25% FURTHER INCREASE IN PENALTIES FOR OBSTRUCTING THE COMMISSIONER .....	89
<i>In addition to the shortfall penalties discussed above, the Commissioner may increase any shortfall penalty by 25% if the taxpayer obstructs the Commissioner in his investigation of the taxpayer’s tax position: s 141K TAA.</i> .....	89
HOW SHORTFALL PENALTIES MAY BE REDUCED .....	89
OTHER PRACTICAL ISSUES.....	91
<i>Whether shortfall penalties are subject to the time-bar</i> .....	91
<i>When may the Commissioner raise the issue of shortfall penalties during the disputes resolution process?</i> .....	93
USE OF MONEY INTEREST (UOMI).....	94
<b>LITIGATION – STANDARD CIVIL DISPUTES.....</b>	<b>97</b>
STATEMENTS OF CLAIM.....	97
STATUTORY LACUNA.....	98
RESPONSE PERIODS .....	99
ONLY TWO FIRST INSTANCE VENUES FOR CHALLENGE PROCEEDINGS.....	100
LEGAL EXISTENCE NECESSARY FOR A CHALLENGE.....	100
THE TWO JURISDICTIONS OF THE TAXATION REVIEW AUTHORITY .....	100
CHALLENGING DISPUTABLE DECISIONS .....	101
THE CONTENT OF A STATEMENT OF CLAIM .....	101
<i>TRA</i> .....	101
<i>High Court</i> .....	102
PROS AND CONS OF THE TWO JURISDICTIONS.....	102
THE EFFECT OF S 138G.....	103
ONUS OF PROOF .....	104
DISCOVERY .....	105
WHAT CAN BE DISCOVERED .....	107
TIME TABLE CONFERENCES .....	109
EXPERT WITNESSES .....	109
BUNDLES OF DOCUMENTS AND EVIDENCE ACT 2006 .....	112
EVIDENCE .....	113
POWERS OF A JUDGE UNDER S 138P OF THE TAA.....	113
<b>SETTLEMENT.....</b>	<b>115</b>
THE POWER TO SETTLE.....	115
TYPICAL ISSUES CONFRONTED WITH SETTLEMENT .....	116
<i>Settlement of the core tax</i> .....	116

<i>Shortfall penalties</i> .....	117
<i>UOMI</i> .....	117
TYPICAL CONTENT OF A DEED OF SETTLEMENT .....	117
CASH-STRAPPED LITIGANTS .....	118
SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	118