
THE PERSONAL TAX PLANNING REVIEW

EDITORIAL BOARD

Robert Venables QC (Consulting Editor)
Peter Vaines FCA, Barrister, Haarmann Hemmelrath
(Joint Managing Editor)
Andrew Hitchmough, Barrister (Joint Managing Editor)
Elizabeth Wilson, Barrister (Assistant Managing Editor)
Roger Madsen, Solicitor (Assistant Editor)

Sir Michael Hart
Leolin Price QC
Peter Taylor QC
Christopher McCall QC
Stephen Allcock QC
Stephen Brandon QC
Kevin Prosser QC
Brian Green QC
Professor Anthony Mellows
Professor Adrian Shipwright
Robert Argles
Philip Baker OBE
Timothy Lyons
James Kessler
Paul Matthews
Colin Tyre

All editorial correspondence should be addressed to
Andrew Hitchmough, Joint Managing Editor, Pump Court Tax Chambers
16 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EB
Telephone (020) 7414 8080
Facsimile (020) 7414 8099

The Personal Tax Planning Review
is published by
Key Haven Publications PLC
Unit 6, Hurlingham Business Park
Sullivan Road, London SW6 3DU
Tel: (020) 7731 7700, Fax: (020) 7731 6622

Visit our Website at www.khpplc.com

Disclaimer

DISCLAIMER

The views contained herein are put forward for further consideration only and are not to be acted upon without independent and professional advice.

Neither the Publishers nor the Authors or Contributors can accept any responsibility for any loss occasioned to any person no matter howsoever caused or arising as a result of or in consequence of action taken or refrained from in reliance on the contents hereof.

© 2002 KEY HAVEN PUBLICATIONS PLC

Conditions of Sale

All rights strictly reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Any person infringing the publisher's copyright will be liable to criminal and/or civil proceedings.

Contents of Volume 9, Issue 1

CONTENTS

	Page No
From the Editors	v
Loans From Trusts After <i>Billingham v Cooper</i> Robert Venables QC	1
The Historical Background to Section 397 – Hobby-Farm Losses David Stopforth	9
SCIs, “Shadow Directors” and Benefits in Kind Peter Harris	17
<i>Re Benham’s Will Trusts and Re Ratcliffe Deceased, Holmes v McMullan</i> Ralph Ray	43
<i>Grimm and Grimmer</i> Robert Venables QC	47
Book Review Taxation of Foreign Domiciliaries	71

From the Editors

EDITORIAL

The Court of Appeal decided in *Billingham v Cooper (Inspector of Taxes) v Cooper*¹ that a loan made by trustees to a beneficiary on favourable terms but repayable on demand can result in a tax charge on the latter under the capital gains tax Offshore Beneficiary Provisions. In his article, “Loans From Trusts after *Billingham v Cooper*”, the Consulting Editor canvasses the possibility that there will be no imputing of gains under the Provisions if a loan is made on arm’s length terms to a beneficiary entitled for an interest in possession, even if the interest is never in fact paid.

In “The Historical Background to Section 397 – Hobby-farm Losses”, Professor David Stopforth considers the origin of an anti-avoidance provision which arguably no longer serves any useful purpose.

In many states outside the British Isles, it is decreed that not only shall a man’s estate be subject to taxes on his death but that he shall be denied the fundamental human right to will it to whosoever he wishes. A device which has been adopted in France to enable non-resident foreigners to avoid forced heirship provisions applying to secondary homes which they own in that country is the *Société Civile Immobilière*. While it appears to be generally agreed that it achieves its immediate purpose, it has been suggested that its use may have unfortunate United Kingdom tax consequences for United Kingdom residents. In his long article, “SCIs, ‘Shadow Directors’ and Benefits in Kind”, Peter Harris expresses some most interesting views on the nature of the SCI in French law and the treatment of the SCI and its members for United Kingdom tax purposes.

A difficult question of will construction arises where residue is left only partly to beneficiaries who are exempt from inheritance tax. In “*Re Benham’s Will Trusts* and *Re Ratcliffe Deceased Re Holmes v McMullan*”, Ralph Ray discusses how these two cases can be reconciled and offers advice on the clear drafting of wills and variations of wills.

¹ [2001] EWCA Civ 1041 [2001] STC 1177, upholding the decision of Lloyd J, reported at [2000] STC 122. An identical case heard with it was *Edwards (Inspector of Taxes) v Fisher*.

“When things go wrong, they go badly wrong.” Whatever the truth of this maxim in general life, it does seem to apply to cases of alleged professional negligence by tax advisers. In “Grimm and Grimmer”, the Consulting Editor discusses the decision of Etherton J in *Grimm v Newman*, in which the defendant accountant was held liable for alleged negligence as to the operation of the Schedule E income tax remittance rules. He suggests that the advice which was given was not in fact wrong. He also advises on how we can all help to protect ourselves from actions in negligence, by ensuring, as far as possible both that they never occur, and, if they do, that the defence is conducted in the best possible way.

The Editors welcome contributions, particularly on points raised in articles appearing in the *Review* (or indeed, other *Reviews* and *Journals*). All articles (whether long or short), ideas for articles and other correspondence on editorial matters should be addressed to: Andrew Hitchmough, Managing Editor, *The Personal Tax Planning Review*, Pump Court Tax Chambers, 16 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EB, Tel: (020) 7414 8080, Fax: (020) 7414 8099.

Robert Venables QC Peter Vaines Andrew Hitchmough Elizabeth Wilson

August 2002