



## Singapore Business Tax Alert

### Stay informed of changes

Greetings from your tax team at Deloitte Singapore. This newsletter is your reference for practical information on relevant business tax issues.

### GBF v Comptroller of Income Tax

In GBF v Comptroller of Income Tax (2016) SGITBR 1, the Income Tax Board of Review had to determine whether Singapore's general anti-avoidance rules ("GAAR") applied to an arrangement put in place by the taxpayer, a medical practitioner, in which "physician compensation" was paid to a partnership comprising two corporate partners owned by himself and his wife respectively.

#### GBF facts

- In 1996, the taxpayer incorporated a company to carry on the business of plastic and cosmetic surgery. The taxpayer has been employed by the company since its incorporation and is the sole medical practitioner at the company. Although not stated explicitly, the taxpayer's income arising from this arrangement should comprise primarily dividends and salaries.
- The taxpayer sold the company in early 2008. Post-sale, the taxpayer remained as an employee and sole medical practitioner of the company; likewise there were no changes to the business operations of the company.

However, the taxpayer elected to form the aforementioned partnership to receive “physician compensation” – essentially his medical practitioner’s income. In streaming this income to be taxed in the hands of the partnership’s corporate partners, the taxpayer was able to enjoy the start-up tax exemption scheme<sup>1</sup> twice, resulting in substantial tax savings.

- The Comptroller of Income Tax sought to disregard the arrangement by invoking anti-avoidance provisions under Section 33 and treat the physician compensation as income as derived by the taxpayer instead of the partnership, so as to negate the benefits of the start-up tax exemption scheme.

### Deloitte’s views

Having considered the overall circumstances of the arrangement and evidence and submissions presented, the Board found that the taxpayer’s arrangement triggered the anti-avoidance provisions<sup>2</sup> and that he was unable to rely on the statutory exception in Section 33(3)(b) of the Singapore Income Tax Act, which require proof that the arrangement was carried out for bona fide commercial reasons and had not as one of its main purposes the avoidance or reduction of tax.

In arriving at its conclusion, the Board followed the principles laid down in the landmark case of *AQQ v Comptroller of Income Tax* (2014) SGCA 15, in which Singapore’s apex court first considered the statutory construction of Section 33. In this regard,

- Based on an objective assessment of the arrangement, the Board regarded it as being formed solely<sup>3</sup> to receive the physician compensation in the most tax efficient manner. In other words, the Board was not convinced that formation of a partnership to receive physician compensation was capable of explanation by reference to ordinary business or family dealings and the “obvious”<sup>4</sup> effect of the arrangement resulted in substantial tax savings.
- Based on a subjective assessment of the taxpayer’s intention for entering into the arrangement, the Board rejected the expressed intention of the taxpayer that the purpose of forming the corporate partnership is due to the various business benefits that it offered and

<sup>1</sup> Briefly, the first \$200,000 of chargeable income derived by a company enjoying the start-up tax exemption scheme is tax exempt.

<sup>2</sup> *GBF v Comptroller of Income Tax* (2016) SGITR 1, at [10](iii); “ ... the requirements of Section 33(1)(a), (b) and (c) have clearly been satisfied”

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, at [10](i)

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, at [10](iii)

protection from practice and business risks. There was no contemporaneous documentation that such benefits were the reasons considered by the taxpayer at the material time when the corporate partnership was formed. In addition, the Board also inferred, based on the acts of the taxpayer and other objective evidence, that such business benefits never materialized; amongst others, there was no record of the partnership (instead of the taxpayer) providing medical services to the company, no other practitioner was ever invited to join the partnership, and the role of the taxpayer's wife as a partner in the partnership was 'inexplicable'<sup>5</sup> as the taxpayer remained the sole medical practitioner.

- It is not apparent whether the Board considered if the tax advantage obtained by the taxpayer was "within the intended scope and Parliament's contemplation and purpose, both as a matter of legal form and economic reality within the context of the entire arrangement"<sup>6</sup>. This consideration formed part of the 'scheme and purpose' approach formulated in AQQ and forms an additional safeguard against the potential 'over-inclusiveness' of Section 33(1), which potentially catches "any arrangement that has an objectively ascertainable purpose of reducing or avoiding tax"<sup>7</sup>. That said, the *raison-d'être* for introducing the start-up tax exemption in Budget 2004 was to 'spur entrepreneurship'<sup>8</sup>. In this regard, it is doubtful that the formation of two additional companies, without any material change to the business operations of the medical practice, falls within the object and purpose of the start-up tax exemption.

## Conclusion

It has always been in the interest of taxpayers to arrange their affairs so as to mitigate the tax outcome of their transactions. However, the line between permissible tax mitigation and objectionable tax avoidance is not always clearly delineated. In this regard, the framework laid down by AQQ on the statutory construction of Section 33 is undoubtedly helpful and was applied by the Board in GBF in determining whether the arrangement undertaken by the taxpayer constitutes tax avoidance. The IRAS has also issued guidance<sup>9</sup> on, amongst others, what it considers as 'hallmarks' of tax avoidance.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 2, at [10](vii)

<sup>6</sup> Comptroller of Income Tax v AQQ (2014) SGCA 15, at [110](c)

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., at [74]

<sup>8</sup> Ministry of Finance, Corporate Income Tax, <http://www.mof.gov.sg/Policies/Tax-Policies/Corporate-Income-Tax>, Accessed 3 November 2016

<sup>9</sup> Income Tax: The General Anti-avoidance Provision and its Application (First Edition), published on 11 July 2016

These are, namely: -

- (i) Circular flow or round-tripping of funds;
- (ii) Set-up of more than one entity for the sole purpose of obtaining tax advantage;
- (iii) Changes in the form of business entity for the sole purpose of obtaining tax advantage; and
- (iv) Attribution of income that is not aligned with economic reality.

With the benefit of hindsight, the arrangement in GBF arguably contains three out of the four 'hallmarks' and the outcome of the case is perhaps not unexpected. Nevertheless, the determination of tax avoidance invariably "depends on the facts" of the specific case and there will be instances where there would be difficulties in the application of the conceptual framework to the facts. As Singapore develops legal jurisprudence in the area of tax avoidance, taxpayers are advised to seek professional advice whenever they are unsure of the tax effects of their contemplated arrangements.

### Contacts

For more information on any of these issues, or any other Business Tax matters, please contact **Low Hwee Chua**, or your usual Business Tax Services contact in Deloitte.

Business Tax Services		
Name	Contact Number	Email
<b>Low Hwee Chua</b> Singapore Leader	+65 6216 3290	<a href="mailto:hwlow@deloitte.com">hwlow@deloitte.com</a>
<b>Ajit Prabhu</b> Mergers & Acquisitions Tax Leader	+65 6530 5522	<a href="mailto:aprabhu@deloitte.com">aprabhu@deloitte.com</a>
<b>Daniel Ho</b> Partner	+65 6216 3189	<a href="mailto:danho@deloitte.com">danho@deloitte.com</a>
<b>Lee Tiong Heng</b> R&D and Government Incentives Leader	+65 6216 3262	<a href="mailto:thlee@deloitte.com">thlee@deloitte.com</a>
<b>Liew Li Mei</b> Partner	+65 6216 3232	<a href="mailto:liliew@deloitte.com">liliew@deloitte.com</a>
<b>Linda Foo</b> Partner	+65 6530 5562	<a href="mailto:lfoo@deloitte.com">lfoo@deloitte.com</a>
<b>Michael Velten</b> Financial Services Tax Leader	+65 6531 5039	<a href="mailto:mvelten@deloitte.com">mvelten@deloitte.com</a>
<b>Ong Siok Peng</b> Partner	+65 6216 3257	<a href="mailto:spong@deloitte.com">spong@deloitte.com</a>
<b>Rohan Solapurkar</b> Partner	+65 6531 5027	<a href="mailto:rohans@deloitte.com">rohans@deloitte.com</a>
<b>See Jee Chang</b> Partner	+65 6216 3181	<a href="mailto:jcsee@deloitte.com">jcsee@deloitte.com</a>

<b>Shantini Ramachandra</b> Deloitte Private Tax Leader	+65 6800 2295	<a href="mailto:sramachandra@deloitte.com">sramachandra@deloitte.com</a>
<b>Steve Towers</b> International Tax Leader	+65 6216 3227	<a href="mailto:stowers@deloitte.com">stowers@deloitte.com</a>
<b>Wong Chee Ming</b> Partner	+65 6530 5595	<a href="mailto:cwong@deloitte.com">cwong@deloitte.com</a>

Deloitte Singapore | Add Deloitte as a safe sender



Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited  
6 Shenton Way, OUE Downtown 2, #33-00,  
Singapore 068809

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee ("DTTL"), its network of member firms, and their related entities. DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL (also referred to as "Deloitte Global") does not provide services to clients. Please see [www.deloitte.com/about](http://www.deloitte.com/about) to learn more about our global network of member firms.

Deloitte provides audit, consulting, financial advisory, risk advisory, tax and related services to public and private clients spanning multiple industries. Deloitte serves four out of five Fortune Global 500® companies through a globally connected network of member firms in more than 150 countries and territories bringing world-class capabilities, insights, and high-quality service to address clients' most complex business challenges. To learn more about how Deloitte's approximately 245,000 professionals make an impact that matters, please connect with us on [Facebook](#), [LinkedIn](#), or [Twitter](#).

#### **About Deloitte Southeast Asia**

Deloitte Southeast Asia Ltd – a member firm of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited comprising Deloitte practices operating in Brunei, Cambodia, Guam, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam – was established to deliver measurable value to the particular demands of increasingly intra-regional and fast growing companies and enterprises.

Comprising 290 partners and over 7,400 professionals in 25 office locations, the subsidiaries and affiliates of Deloitte Southeast Asia Ltd combine their technical expertise and deep industry knowledge to deliver consistent high quality services to companies in the region.

All services are provided through the individual country practices, their subsidiaries and affiliates which are separate and independent legal entities.

#### **About Deloitte Singapore**

In Singapore, services are provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP and its subsidiaries and affiliates.

This communication contains general information only, and none of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, its member firms, or their related entities (collectively, the "Deloitte network") is, by means of this communication, rendering professional advice or services. No entity in the Deloitte network shall be responsible for any loss whatsoever sustained by any person who relies on this communication.

Deloitte & Touche LLP (Unique entity number: T08LL0721A) is an accounting limited liability partnership registered in Singapore under the Limited Liability Partnerships Act (Chapter 163A).

© 2016 Deloitte & Touche LLP