

Court of Final Appeal confirms that Payment in Lieu of Bonus and Share Option Gain arising from a Separation Agreement should not be subject to Salaries Tax

Summary

On 14 November 2019, the Court of Final Appeal handed down its decision on the case of Commissioner of Inland Revenue v Poon Cho-ming, John FACV No. 1 of 2019 that a Payment in Lieu of Bonus and Share Option Gain arising from a Separation Agreement should not be subject to Salaries Tax.

On 14 November 2019, the Court of Final Appeal ("CFA") handed down its decision on the case of Commissioner of Inland Revenue v Poon Cho-ming, John FACV No. 1 of 2019, upholding the Court of Appeal's decision, dismissing the Commissioner's appeal, and ultimately deciding in favour of the taxpayer concluding that a Payment in Lieu of Bonus (referred to as "Sum D") and Share Option Gain arising from a Separation Agreement should not be subject to Salaries Tax.

KPMG commentary

The decision of the CFA is welcomed as it brings further clarity to the taxation of termination payments. The decision affirms the principles established in *Fuchs*¹-i.e., that a payment made in return for acting or being an employee is taxable, whereas a payment that is "for something else" is not. Furthermore, the principles apply even if the consideration is a payment in lieu of a lost bonus or the right to retain share options that would have otherwise been forfeited. The long running nature of this case, differing views and sizeable body of case law on the taxation of termination payments demonstrate that it can often be difficult to apply the principles and there is often a fine distinction between what is taxable as oppose to non-taxable.

In practice, the Inland Revenue Department when assessing the taxability of termination payments will likely continue to consider each case on its own merits. Taxpayers, in determining whether a termination payment is subject to Salaries Tax, will need to consider all relevant documentation and their interpretation. With the law being clear, the question becomes one of fact and substance.

Background

The taxpayer was employed in Hong Kong as the Group Chief Financial Officer and executive director of a company. On 20 July 2008, the taxpayer's employment was terminated pursuant to a Separation Agreement under which the Taxpayer received several sums, namely:

- A. Payment in lieu of notice
- B. Statutory long-service pay
- C. Payment in lieu of unused leave

© 2019 KPMG Huazhen LLP — a People's Republic of China partnership, KPMG Advisory (China) Limited — a wholly foreign owned enterprise in China, and KPMG — a Hong Kong partnership, are member firms of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved. © 2019 KPMG, a Macau partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

@ 2019 KPMG Tax Services Limited, a Hong Kong limited liability company and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

 $^{^{\}rm 1}$ Fuchs v Commissioner of Inland Revenue (2011) 14 HKCFAR 74

- D. Payment in lieu of bonus
- E. Payment in consideration of covenants made by the taxpayer

In addition to the above, the Separation Agreement also permitted the taxpayer to exercise share options granted to him during his employment. Vesting of the share options was accelerated to permit the taxpayer to exercise the options, which he duly did, giving rise to the Share Option Gain in dispute. Of the sums above, Sum D and the Share Option Gain were the two items in contention before the Board of Review and courts.

Both the Board of Review and Court of First Instance decided in favour of the Commissioner, which was subsequently overturned by the Court of Appeal ("CA"), which decided in favour of the taxpayer (i.e., that Sum D and the Share Option Gain were not taxable). The Commissioner appealed the CA's decision claiming the question put forward of great general or public importance, but leave was ultimately granted on the basis that it would be helpful for the CFA to follow up the decision in the Fuchs case.

The Court of Final Appeal decision

The CFA found that the CA was correct in holding that Sum D and the Share Option Gain were not taxable. In coming to its decision, the CFA applied the principles established in *Fuchs*, that a payment made in return for acting or being an employee is taxable, whereas a payment that is "for something else" is not. In the *Fuchs case*, the terminal payments made to the taxpayer were provided for in his contract of employment and were held to be taxable.

With respect to Sum D, the Commissioner contended that, being in lieu of bonus, the sum was made in recognition of the taxpayer's efforts and therefore taxable. The Commissioner also sought to apply a "substitution test" extracted from *Mairs v Haughey* [1994] 1 AC 303, which would operate such that a sum made in true substitution of another, takes on the nature of the of the latter. In considering the substance of Sum D, the CFA referred to the facts and decision of the CA, which found no evidence that the employer's results and his performance had been considered for the purpose of determining a bonus to him. Sum D had been determined arbitrarily and was of a different nature, paid to make him go away quietly.

With respect to the Share Option Gain, the Commissioner put forward arguments placing emphasis on the fact that share options were originally granted during the taxpayer's employment and therefore arose substantially from his employment. The CFA found otherwise, agreeing with the CA that acceleration of vesting leading to the Share Option Gain was not to reward the taxpayer for past services (and clearly could not be for future services), but rather, was for something else – to make him go away quietly.

Contact us:



Lewis Y. Lu National Head of Tax Tel: +86 21 2212 3421 lewis.lu@kpmg.com



Curtis Ng Head of Tax, Hong Kong Tel: +852 2143 8709 curtis.ng@kpmq.com

Corporate Tax Advisory



Matthew Fenwick
Partner
Tel:+ 852 2143 8761
matthew.fenwick@kpmg.com



Eva Chow Director Tel: +852 2685 7454 eva.chow@kpmg.com



Stanley Ho Partner Tel: +852 2826 7296 stanley.ho@kpmg.com



Elizabeth de la Cruz Director Tel: +852 2826 8071 elizabeth.delacruz@kpmg.com



Alice Leung
Partner
Tel: +852 2826 8070
alice.leung@kpmg.com



William Ngai Director Tel: +852 2685 7553 william.ngai@komg.com



Ivor Morris
Partner
Tel: +852 2826 8070
ivor.morris@kpmg.com



Natalie To Director Tel: +852 2143 8509 natalie to@kpmg.com



John Timpany
Partner
Tel: +852 2826 8070
john.timpany@kpmg.com



Johnson Tee Director Tel: +852 2143 8827 johnson.tee @kpmg.com



Eugene Yeung Director Tel: + 852 2143 8575 eugene.yeung@kpmg.com

Deal Advisory, M&A



Darren Bowdern Head of Financial Services Tax, Hong Kong Tel: +852 2826 7166 darren.bowdern@kpmq.com



Sandy Fung
Partner
Tel: +852 2143 8821
sandy.fung@kpmg.com



Benjamin Pong Partner Tel: +852 2143 8525 benjamin.pong@kpmg.com



Nigel Hobler Partner Tel: +852 2978 8266 nr.hobler@kpmg.com



Kasheen Grewal Director Tel: +852 3927 4661 kasheen.grewal@kpmg.com



Anthony Pak
Director
Tel: +852 2847 5088
anthony.pak@kpmg.com

China Tax



Daniel Hui Partner Tel: +852 2685 7815 daniel.hui@kpmg.com



Adam Zhong Partner Tel: +852 2685 7559 adam.zhong@kpmg.com



Travis Lee
Director
Tel: +852 2143 8524
travis.lee@kpmg.com



Anlio Shi Director Tel: +852 2685 7583 anlio.shi@kpmg.com



US Tax

Wade Wagatsuma Head of US Corporate Tax, Hong Kong Tel: +852 2685 7806 wade.wagatsuma@kpmg.com



Vivian Tu Director Tel: +852 2913 2578 vivian.l.tu@kpmg.com



Becky Wong Director Tel: +852 2978 8271 becky.wong@kpmg.com

Global Transfer Pricing Services



Patrick Cheung Partner Tel: + 852 3927 4602 patrick.p.cheung@kpmg.com



Michelle Sun Partner Tel: + 852 3927 5625



Irene Lee
Partner
Tel: +852 2685 7372
irene_lee@kpmg.com

People Services



Murray Sarelius National Head of People Services Tel: +852 3927 5671 murray.sarelius@komg.com



David Siew Partner Tel: +852 2143 8785 david.siew@kpmg.com



Gabriel Ho Director Tel: +852 3927 5570 Gabriel.ho@kpmg.com



Kate Lai Director Tel: +852 2978 8942 kate.lai@kpmg.com

Indirect Tax & Tax Technology



Lachlan Wolfers Global Head of Indirect Taxes Tel: +852 2685 7791 lachlan.wolfers @ kpmq.com

kpmg.com/cn

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavour to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act upon such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

© 2019 KPMG Huazhen LLP — a People's Republic of China partnership, KPMG Advisory (China) Limited — a wholly foreign owned enterprise in China, and KPMG — a Hong Kong partnership, are member firms of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

© 2019 KPMG, a Macau partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

© 2019 KPMG Tax Services Limited, a Hong Kong limited liability company and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.