

INFORMATION EXCHANGE CORPORATION

L17, 40 Mount Street,
North Sydney NSW, 2060

E: admin@ifx.com

T: 61 2 9956 7775

W: www.ifx.com.au

ARCHIVE SEARCHING?

Use your username and
password to log onto
www.ifx.com.au to search our
archives and retrieve copies.

NEED TO ASK AN ADVISER?

Go to www.ifx.com.au
to connect.

Please call customer support
on 1300 360 905 if you have
any difficulties.

SUBSCRIBE TO THIS PUBLICATION

[Click here](#)

Can we help?

Call 1300 360 905
Email admin@aifx.com.au

IN THIS ISSUE

SECTION 1 – PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	1
TAX EVASION, TAX AVOIDANCE AND ‘TAX AVOISION’	1
¶5.1 The Mylan Australia Holding Pty Ltd case	2
¶5.2 The Minerva Financial Group case	3
¶5.3 The PepsiCo Inc. case	3
SECTION 2 – PROFESSIONAL CURRENCY	4
BILLS AND LEGISLATION	4
¶5.4 ASIC instrument allows website disclosure in place of FSG	4
¶5.5 Phase-out of FBT exemption for hybrid vehicles	5
¶5.6 Tax whistleblower laws extended	5
¶5.7 ATO data-matching program	6
¶5.8 The ATO warns that 90% of tip offs are ‘suitable’ for further investigation	6
¶5.9 Operation Protego sees woman sentenced for GST fraud	7
¶5.10 Treasury releases its 2023–24 annual report	7
¶5.11 Code of Professional Conduct	8
¶5.12 Penalty units increase from \$313 to \$330	9
¶5.13 Bills under review by Senate Committees	9
CASES AND DECISIONS	9
¶5.14 Luxury cars held solely as trading stock	9
¶5.15 Ignorance of the law ‘not special circumstances’	11
¶5.16 Claims for home office, car and other expenses	12
¶5.17 Work-related car expenses and depreciation claim rejected	13
¶5.18 Documents not relevant to disputed tax issues	14
¶5.19 Third party not required to give evidence	15
¶5.20 Unexplained bank deposits	16
APPEALS NEWS	17
¶5.21 Singtel denied special leave application to the High Court	17
¶5.22 Special leave refused for dividend-stripping case	18

Continued

2505 : NOVEMBER 2024

The IFX Legal Tax Team

INFORMATION EXCHANGE CORPORATION

L17, 40 Mount Street,
North Sydney NSW, 2060

E: admin@ifx.com

T: 61 2 9956 7775

W: www.ifx.com.au

ARCHIVE SEARCHING?

Use your username and
password to log onto
www.ifx.com.au to search our
archives and retrieve copies.

NEED TO ASK AN ADVISER?

Go to www.ifx.com.au
to connect.

Please call customer support
on 1300 360 905 if you have
any difficulties.

SUBSCRIBE TO THIS PUBLICATION

[Click here](#)

Can we help?

Call 1300 360 905
Email admin@aifx.com.au

IN THIS ISSUE

RULINGS AND GUIDELINES.....	19
¶5.23 GST and 'prepared meals'	19
¶5.24 ATO website updates	21
¶5.25 The end of an era: AAT replaced by ART.....	24
¶5.26 The new thin cap rules	25
¶5.27 Class and Product Rulings (plus addenda to PR 2022/10 and PR 2023/22)	26
¶5.28 Practice Statements	27
STATE TAXES	27
New South Wales.....	27
¶5.29 Payroll tax Relief for Medical Centres.....	27
¶5.30 Land tax	29
¶5.31 Surcharge land tax.....	29
Victoria	29
¶5.32 Vic stamp duty appeal.....	29
¶5.33 Primary production exemption not available	30
¶5.34 Principal place of residence exemption	31
ACT	31
¶5.35 Landholder duty	31
SECTION 3 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	32
¶5.36 GST – Supply of a going concern under an arrangement	32
¶5.37 Tax-free trust distribution	33
¶5.38 Trust losses offset against CGT in family trust.....	34
¶5.39 GST – entitlement to account for GST on a cash basis.....	35
¶5.40 Foreign income tax offset.....	36
¶5.41 Foreign income	37
¶5.42 Reimbursement agreements	38
¶5.43 Australian tax residency status for proposed relocation to Saudi Arabia	38

SECTION 1 – PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

TAX EVASION, TAX AVOIDANCE AND ‘TAX AVOISION’

At one time, the distinction between tax avoidance and tax evasion was relatively clear: the first was legally permissible, whilst the second was not. In more recent times however, there has been a blurring of these two concepts,¹ mainly because the use of tax planning (particularly international tax planning) became more and more widespread.²

The term ‘tax avoision’ is a term that was coined to mean the grey area between tax avoidance and tax evasion. The confusion surrounding this concept has even caused some tax officers to use terms such as ‘compliance’ and ‘noncompliance’, rather than trying to explain and counter ‘tax avoision’.

Originally, the strategy of ‘tax avoidance’ was perfectly legitimate and involved reducing one’s tax by employing legitimate methods or ‘schemes’. It simply involved paying less tax than would normally be the case had the strategy not been implemented (see, for example, *FCT v. Westgarth*³).

This process was sometimes also referred to as ‘tax minimisation’ or ‘legitimate tax planning’. Most taxpayers have probably engaged in some form of tax planning, even though they may not have been aware of it.

In the last few decades, ‘tax avoidance’ has acquired a distinctively pejorative connotation, leading to some forms of tax avoidance being made illegal under amendments to the provisions of Part IVA of the ITAA36 in 2013. These have shifted the focus towards scrutinising arrangements where the *core substance* of the transaction could have been achieved in a more straightforward or commercial manner. This meant that the emphasis is no longer on merely identifying artificial schemes, rather the focus is now on examining whether a transaction’s *form* could have been executed differently so as not to secure the associated tax benefit.

It should come as no surprise then that the practice of negatively geared investments (mostly in real estate) has drawn the attention of the current Labor Government. It is well recognised that those in the highest income bracket can benefit handsomely by investing in properties that are ‘negatively geared’.

Through careful planning, taxpayers are able to legally reduce their assessable income by diverting income (that would otherwise be subject to taxation at the highest marginal tax rate) into a legitimate property investment that runs at a loss (i.e. has negative income). The net effect is that a taxpayer’s equity in the unprofitable investment is increased while his or her overall income (and therefore tax liability) is reduced.

The object of negative gearing focuses firstly on offsetting gains derived from one source of income against losses incurred from the negatively geared investment on the one hand. Secondly, it focuses on making a capital gain that will only be taxed on half of the capital gain amount. This is sometimes seen as unfair because high income earners can potentially derive more of an advantage from it.

¹ Illersic, Alfred Roman & Seldon, Arthur, 1979. *Tax Avoision: The Economic, Legal and Moral Inter-relationships Between Avoidance and Evasion*. Institute of Economic Affairs.

² The Labor Government abolished exchange controls in 1983.

³ (1950) 81 CLR 396 at 414.