ACADEMY OF TAX LAW
learn • share • connect

# INTERNATIONAL TAX CASE SUMMARY

## BOERDERY vs SARS

MARCH 2024

# ACADEMY OF TAX LAW

## PUBLISHING SERVICES

This Publication is copyrighted under the Berne Convention.

No reproduction or use of this material is allowed without prior permission

**Copyright©, 2024** - Academy of Tax Law (Division of International Institute for Tax And Finance)

First Edition Published on 08 November 2024

Published by Academy Of Tax Law

CONTACT US
www.academyoftaxlaw.com | info@academyoftaxlaw.com

# HEAD OF ACADEMICS

Welcome to the Academy of Tax Law's case and judgment summaries. These documents have been carefully curated to support professionals, students, and researchers navigating the complex landscape of international tax and transfer pricing. At the Academy, we understand that tax law is ever-evolving, with key rulings continuously shaping its practice.

Each summary you'll find here is designed to provide not just the facts, but the context and implications of pivotal legal decisions. These case summaries are created to serve as a valuable resource for legal teams, multinationals, revenue authorities, and academics, offering insights that go beyond the surface. Our goal is to ensure you remain informed and prepared, whether you are dealing with tax planning, dispute resolution, or risk management.

We believe that knowledge is the foundation of sound decision-making, and with these resources, we hope to empower you in your professional journey. As you delve into the analysis, remember that staying ahead in tax law requires not just understanding the rules but how to apply them in a dynamic, global environment.

Thank you for choosing the Academy of Tax Law as your partner in this ongoing learning experience.

Sincerely,
Dr. Daniel N Erasmus

# PART 1

# SUMMARY

# JUDGEMENT SUMMARY

## CASE OVERVIEW

| | |
|---|---|
| **Court:** | Tax Court of South Africa |
| **Case No:** | IT 45979 |
| **Applicant:** | Taxpayer Boerdery |
| **Defendant:** | The Commissioner for the South African Revenue Servic |
| **Judgment Date:** | 20 March 2024 |
| **Full Judgment:** | https://academyoftaxlaw.com/document/boerd-ery-vs-sars-judgment/ |
| **View Online:** | https://academyoftaxlaw.com/boerdery-sars-premi-um-deductibility/ |

# JUDGMENT SUMMARY

In Boerdery v SARS, the South African Tax Court addressed whether premiums paid by Boerdery under insurance contracts with Company XYZ were deductible under section 11(a) of the Income Tax Act. Boerdery claimed the premiums as deductible expenses, arguing they represented insurance costs necessary for its farming business. However, SARS viewed these premiums differently, asserting that the refundable nature and the embedded investment return in the "experience account" meant they were, in effect, capital assets rather than expenses. SARS's disallowance of the deductions led to substantial additional assessments, penalties, and interest against Boerdery.

The court found in favor of SARS, determining that the premiums did not qualify for deduction because they had characteristics of capital rather than typical insurance expenses. The judgment emphasized the contract's refund provision, which allowed Boerdery to reclaim the premiums if no claims were made. The ruling reinforced the principle that expenses qualifying as capital assets do not meet the criteria for deductibility. This decision not only resulted in Boerdery's appeal being dismissed but also imposed penalties and interest, underscoring the critical importance of accurate tax classifications.

In the ruling, the court highlighted that the onus is on taxpayers to ensure compliance with tax laws. This case serves as a cautionary tale for taxpayers, particularly businesses with complex transactions involving deductible expenses and capital outlays. The judgment emphasizes the need for clarity in asset classification, as misinterpretations can lead to costly tax liabilities, penalties, and interest charges. SARS's position and the court's findings reflect a heightened scrutiny of deductible expenses, especially where they carry attributes of capital. This case underscores the critical role of tax professionals and proper tax risk management in guiding corporations through complex asset classifications.

# KEY POINTS

## OF THE JUDGMENT

## BACKGROUND

Taxpayer Boerdery operates a farming business that generates income from the sale of crops. Seeking protection against risks to its operations, Boerdery entered into agreements with Company XYZ, covering 2018 and 2019, under what was termed a "Multi-Peril Contingency Policy Contract." The contract allowed Boerdery to pay a premium that would cover specific risks, yet, if no claims were made, the premium would be largely refunded at the contract's end. This refund mechanism was structured through an "experience account" that recorded the premiums and any returns, functioning similarly to an investment account. Boerdery treated the premiums as insurance expenses and claimed deductions on this basis under section 11(a) of the Income Tax Act, which permits deductions for expenses directly incurred in income production.

SARS, however, did not accept Boerdery's classification, as it viewed the refundable premiums as capital assets due to their investment-like characteristics. SARS issued additional assessments disallowing the deductions, along with penalties and interest for underpayment of provisional tax, citing the premiums as assets rather than expenses. This led Boerdery to appeal against SARS's assessment, contending that the payments met the deductible expense criteria as insurance premiums directly linked to income production.

The court acknowledged a subsequent ruling that set aside the warrant but maintained that this development did not impact the appeal. The appeal was dismissed, reinforcing SARS's power to act broadly on suspicion when enforcing tax laws, especially where assets relevant to compliance may be concealed by third parties. The ruling highlights the need for clear tax risk management by third parties who may unwittingly become involved in tax investigations due to shared premises or associations with investigated entities.

# KEY POINTS
OF THE JUDGMENT

## CORE DISPUTE

The primary dispute in Boerdery v SARS centered on whether the premiums paid to Company XYZ qualified as deductible expenses or should be classified as capital assets. Boerdery argued that the premiums were valid insurance expenses that directly contributed to safeguarding its income-generating activities. In contrast, SARS contended that the refundable nature and return on funds in the experience account transformed these premiums into capital assets, thus disqualifying them from deduction. SARS asserted that the arrangement was effectively a financial vehicle providing investment-like returns, which conflicted with the characteristics of deductible expenses under section 11(a) of the Income Tax Act.

The court was tasked with examining the nature of the premiums, particularly scrutinizing the contract's terms and the experience account's function. The existence of a return on funds in the experience account and the possibility of reclaiming the premiums indicated that the arrangement bore more resemblance to a capital investment than an insurance expense. The classification was pivotal since mischaracterization would mean potential tax compliance issues, resulting in substantial penalties.



# KEY POINTS
OF THE JUDGMENT

## COURT FINDINGS

In its findings, the court focused on the interpretation of the contracts, particularly the mechanisms allowing premium refunds. The court noted that while the contracts were labeled as insurance, the terms presented an investment-like structure with refundable premiums recorded in an experience account. Key clauses allowed Boerdery to receive a return on its "premium" payments if no claims were made, blurring the lines between a standard insurance contract and a capital investment.

The judgment emphasized that while the premiums were paid, they did not represent a final expense; instead, they constituted a transferable asset with intrinsic value, available for refund if unused. The court further referenced previous case law, such as Armgold/Harmony Freegold Joint Venture v Commissioner for SARS, which established the distinction between deductible expenses and capital outlays. This precedent strengthened the view that Boerdery's premiums, due to their refundable and return-generating nature, fell under capital classification. SARS's disallowance of the deductions was, therefore, upheld by the court as appropriate under section 11(a).

# KEY POINTS
## OF THE JUDGMENT

## OUTCOME

The court dismissed Boerdery's appeal, confirming SARS's additional assessments, penalties, and interest. The judgment clarified that premiums, which have the potential for refund and return, constitute capital assets and do not meet the criteria for deductible expenses under section 11(a) of the Income Tax Act. This outcome has broader implications for tax compliance, reinforcing the importance of accurately distinguishing between capital outlays and deductible expenses.

In addition to rejecting Boerdery's appeal, the court ordered that it bear the costs of the appeal. The penalties and interest imposed by SARS were upheld, with the court noting that Boerdery's position created an understatement in its tax liabilities. The judgment underscores that misclassifications in tax filings, even if unintentional, can lead to financial repercussions and emphasizes the necessity for precise accounting in expense classifications.

# PART 2

# SIGNIFICANCE

# MAJOR ISSUES

## AREAS OF CONTENTION

The major contention in Boerdery v SARS was rooted in the classification of the premiums. Boerdery viewed these as deductible expenses necessary for its farming operations, while SARS identified them as capital assets based on their refundable nature and the contractual terms that allowed Boerdery to earn a return. Boerdery's argument relied on the assertion that premiums paid for insurance should be deductible as part of business operations. SARS countered this by arguing that the terms of the experience account converted these payments into capital assets.

This issue reflects broader tax challenges where expenses have characteristics of both deductible costs and capital assets. Such ambiguity often requires a detailed contractual and financial review, as tax authorities prioritize compliance accuracy. The court's decision in this case has highlighted the complexity in distinguishing expenses for risk management from capital investments, an area that requires further clarification and careful scrutiny by businesses engaged in such transactions.

# EXPECTED
## OR CONTROVERSIAL?

This decision was expected given the established tax principles that distinguish between deductible expenses and capital assets. The court applied prevailing legal standards and referenced similar judgments to classify the premiums. Despite the expected outcome, the case may still be seen as controversial for businesses, particularly those in high-risk industries like farming, as it questions the scope of deductible insurance premiums.

The judgment reinforces a stringent interpretation of deductible expenses, potentially impacting similar arrangements where premiums have refundable characteristics. For businesses that rely on complex insurance mechanisms, this ruling underscores the need for explicit definitions in insurance contracts. By clarifying that returns on premiums render them capital, this case sets a precedent that may challenge companies aiming to deduct such costs in future tax filings.

# SIGNIFICANCE
## FOR MULTINATIONALS

For multinationals, the Boerdery v SARS decision highlights the importance of clarity in asset classification, especially when contracts blur the line between expenses and capital investments. Misclassification risks lead to substantial penalties, underscoring the need for multinational enterprises (MNEs) to engage in precise tax compliance practices. Given the judgment's emphasis on financial structures that mimic investments, multinationals with similarly structured contracts must evaluate whether their arrangements genuinely qualify as deductible expenses.

The case suggests that tax authorities may scrutinize global operations more closely, particularly financial contracts with potential investment characteristics. As businesses seek tax efficiency in diverse jurisdictions, they must ensure compliance with local laws, recognizing that misinterpretation can lead to significant fiscal consequences. This case reinforces that in the face of global tax scrutiny, robust compliance checks and a detailed understanding of local tax classifications are vital.

# SIGNIFICANCE

## FOR REVENUE SERVICES

For revenue authorities, Boerdery v SARS serves as a valuable precedent for evaluating business expenses that carry capital characteristics. The judgment provides a clear endorsement of stringent asset classification, empowering tax authorities to question expense claims that may not directly align with income production. This case strengthens the position of revenue services in scrutinizing claims for deductible expenses, particularly where premiums or similar payments have refund provisions and embedded returns.

The decision bolsters revenue authorities' mandate to enforce compliance, especially for transactions that may be structured to optimize tax outcomes. For SARS and similar agencies, this judgment enables a robust framework for asset classification, emphasizing that deductible expenses must meet strict criteria to prevent tax avoidance through misclassified capital assets. This case underscores the importance of thorough tax audits and clarifies that claims for deductible expenses should be based on transparent contractual terms.

# RELEVANT CASES

## CANADA TRUSTCO VS CANADA

In Canada Trustco, the Supreme Court of Canada examined whether certain tax deductions claimed by a mortgage company were allowable. Canada Trustco had entered into transactions that involved leasing depreciable assets, aiming to claim capital cost allowances (CCAs) as deductions under Canadian tax law. The Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) challenged these deductions, arguing that they did not represent genuine business expenses but rather transactions structured primarily for tax benefits.

This case is relevant to Boerdery v SARS as it addresses the complex interplay between capital assets and deductible expenses. It underscores the need for clear business purposes in transactions involving capital outlays, a principle crucial for multinational enterprises structuring similar transactions.

## BP AUSTRALIA LTD. V.S AUSTRALIA

In BP Australia Ltd. v. Commissioner of Taxation, the issue revolved around whether payments made by BP to secure exclusive rights at gas stations were deductible as business expenses or should be classified as capital outlays. BP argued that the payments, intended to secure sales and improve distribution, were deductible as operating expenses under Australian tax law.

This case parallels Boerdery v SARS in its examination of payments with dual characteristics. It highlights the importance of classifying payments based on their long-term benefits, providing a basis for distinguishing deductible expenses from capital assets in multinational tax planning.

## INDOPCO, INC. V.S USA

In Indopco, the U.S. Supreme Court evaluated whether expenses incurred during a corporate acquisition were deductible as ordinary business expenses or represented capital expenditures. Indopco, a company undergoing a friendly takeover, incurred professional fees and other expenses to facilitate the acquisition.

Indopco is analogous to Boerdery v SARS as it examines the distinction between current expenses and capital outlays, especially where expenses yield a lasting benefit. This case serves as a guide for multinational enterprises in evaluating transaction costs and aligning tax treatment with the long-term impacts on business assets.

# PART 3

# PREVENTION

## ENGAGING EXPERTS

Engaging with tax lawyers is crucial for multinational enterprises (MNEs) to navigate the complex landscape of international tax compliance and minimize exposure to risks. Tax laws and regulations vary significantly across jurisdictions, and tax authorities are increasingly collaborating globally to enforce compliance. Tax lawyers provide MNEs with strategic guidance tailored to specific jurisdictions, ensuring that transactions and tax structures align with both local and international tax laws.

One of the primary advantages of consulting tax lawyers is their expertise in safeguarding sensitive information under legal professional privilege, especially in cross-border contexts. This confidentiality is essential for MNEs, as it allows open communication with legal counsel, protecting strategic tax planning discussions from disclosure to tax authorities. Tax lawyers are also well-versed in complex anti-avoidance laws, transfer pricing regulations, and disclosure obligations, which vary across jurisdictions but significantly impact MNEs.

Moreover, tax lawyers play a vital role in risk management, advising MNEs on compliance strategies and helping establish robust tax governance frameworks. With proactive legal advice, MNEs can adopt preventative measures—such as setting up a tax steering committee or implementing a tax risk management process—that help in identifying, managing, and mitigating tax risks before they escalate into costly disputes or reputational issues.

In an environment where global tax regulations are continually evolving, engaging tax lawyers allows MNEs to stay compliant and responsive to regulatory changes, reducing potential risks while upholding best practices in tax transparency and governance.

# PREVENTATIVE

## MEASURES TO AVOID SIMILAR CASES

## TAX RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Implementing a comprehensive tax risk management process is essential to identify, assess, and mitigate tax risks associated with cross-border transactions. This process should involve:

- Regular reviews of intra-group transactions to ensure they have genuine economic substance.
- Proactive engagement with tax authorities to seek clarity on the application of anti-abuse rules.
- Thorough documentation of the business rationale for each transaction to support

## DOWNLOAD FREE BOOK

**TAX INTELLIGENCE: THE 7 HABITUAL TAX MISTAKES MADE BY COMPANIES**

Tax Intelligence: The 7 Habitual Tax Mistakes Made by Companies" by Dr. Daniel N. Erasmus is a must-read for businesses seeking to navigate the intricate world of tax compliance and risk management. By highlighting common pitfalls and offering strategic solutions, Erasmus equips companies with the knowledge to improve their tax practices and secure financial stability.

https://support.academyoftaxlaw.com/product/tax-intelligence-by-prof-dr-daniel-n-erasmus/



# PREVENTATIVE

## MEASURES TO AVOID SIMILAR CASES

## TAX STEERING COMMITTEE

Establishing a tax steering committee can help ensure that tax policies are aligned with the broader business strategy and that transactions are vetted for both commercial and tax implications. A tax steering committee can:

- Review all significant cross-border transactions before they are executed.
- Ensure that tax decisions are made in the context of overall business objectives, not solely for tax savings.
- Monitor changes in international tax laws to ensure ongoing compliance and avoid disputes like the X BV case.

## DOWNLOAD FREE E-BOOK

**DRIVING TAX COMPLIANCE: THE ESSENTIAL ROLE OF THE TAX STEERING COMMITTEE**

The eBook "Driving Tax Compliance: The Essential Role of a Tax Steering Committee" by Prof. Dr. Daniel N. Erasmus, Renier van Rensburg, and Gilbert Ferreira, emphasizes the critical importance of establishing a Tax Steering Committee (TSC) within multinational corporations to ensure tax compliance and manage tax-related risks effectively.

https://support.academyoftaxlaw.com/product/essential-role-of-the-tax-steering-committee/

INTERNATIONAL TAX
# CASE SUMMARY

## ACADEMY OF TAX LAW

Copyright © 2024/2025
International Institute for Tax and Finance Ltd (I/I/T/F) Academy of Tax Law

This publication was accurate at time of publishing.
It may be necessary for reasons beyond the control of the organisers to alter the content.