



## FIELD COURT TAX CHAMBERS

### ***Ardmore* and UK source income<sup>1</sup>**

*Contrary to HMRC's view, the debtor's residence is not the most important factor when determining whether income has a UK source*

The recent case of *Ardmore Construction Limited and Perrin v HMRC* [2015] UKUT 633 (reported in *Tax Journal*, 24 November 2015) was concerned with the meaning of income arising in the UK and therefore whether it was subject to the deduction of tax at source. The classic authority on this matter is the celebrated *Greek Bank case (Westminster Bank Executor and Trustee Company (Channel Islands) Ltd v National Bank of Greece (1970) 46 TC 472*.

In the *Greek Bank* case, the debtor was a foreign company; there was a guarantee by another foreign company, secured on foreign assets; and payment was to be made outside the UK to persons outside the UK. The only reason that anybody suggested that the interest should be regarded as arising in the UK is that the guarantor subsequently acquired a branch in the UK and, for various practical reasons, it could only be enforced in London. The House of Lords decided that the interest did not arise in the UK.

Over the years, HMRC developed its thinking on this subject. The latest version of its manuals explains its current view, which is that the source of income depends on a number of factors, namely:

- the residence of the debtor;
- the location of the debtor's assets;
- the place of performance of the contract and the method of payment;
- the competent jurisdiction for enforcement;
- the proper law of the contract; and
- the location of the any security.

HMRC considers the residence of the debtor to be the most important factor, along with the location of the debtor's assets, because that will be where the creditor will sue for payment. It also says that the residence of the debtor determines the competent jurisdiction.

The Upper Tribunal considered the *Greek Bank* case in detail and concluded that the residence of the debtor was not the most important factor. Furthermore, it said that there is no support for the proposition that there is a link between jurisdiction and residence. This seems directly contrary to the approach of HMRC.

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was first published in the InBrief section of *Tax Journal* published by LexisNexis on 15th January 2016

One aspect of this case was that Mr Perrin had received unsecured loans from a trust in the Isle of Man and the question was whether the interest payable was interest arising in the UK. Mr Perrin was resident in the UK. However, the proper law of the agreement was the Isle of Man; the place in which the payment was actually made was the Isle of Man; the jurisdiction in which judgment could be obtained was the Isle of Man; and the payment of interest was made by Mr Perrin from funds in the Isle of Man.

The Upper Tribunal said that residence is one factor and there are other factors to be taken into account. However, having taken all those other factors into account, the Upper Tribunal concluded that the source is where the debtor is resident. They said that the proper law, the jurisdiction of enforcement, the place of payment are of little or no weight. One might consider that if all the other factors which have to be taken into account have little or no weight, they do not really have to be taken into account at all. This pretty much only leaves the residence of the debtor to be the single conclusive factor.

There was an interesting passage in the judgment relating to specialty debts. The tribunal referred to the distinction between the situs of a simple debt and a speciality debt. It acknowledged that different rules apply to each type of debt and the traditional distinction has been that a speciality debt is regarded as situated where the instrument is physically located. (This is no longer relevant for income tax purposes, because ITA 2007 s 874(6A) makes the situs of a speciality debt irrelevant for income tax purposes.) However, it would seem to follow that the old rules still apply for inheritance tax – in contrast to the view taken by HMRC since 24 January 2013 that both simple debts and speciality debts should both be regarded as situated where the debtor is resident.

**Peter Vaines**

**Field Court Tax Chambers**