
Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Preface</i> | v |
| <i>Table of Cases</i> | xv |
| <i>Table of Statutes</i> | xxv |
| | |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| A. Thematic Outline | 2 |
| B. Chapter Summaries | 2 |
| Part I The Foundations | 7 |
| | |
| 2 Introduction to the Defence of Disimpoverishment | 9 |
| A. Introduction | 9 |
| B. Questions in Unjust Enrichment | 9 |
| C. Definition | 10 |
| D. Change of Name | 11 |
| 1. History of 'Passing on' | 12 |
| 2. Errors of Exclusion | 12 |
| 3. Errors of Inclusion | 14 |
| (a) <i>Source of the Errors</i> | 14 |
| (b) <i>Problems with Errors</i> | 15 |
| (c) <i>Example of the Errors</i> | 16 |
| E. Another Problem with Pseudonyms | 17 |
| F. Triggering the Defence of Disimpoverishment | 19 |
| 1. Not Restricted to Cases of Unlawful Taxation | 19 |
| 2. Anticipatory Disimpoverishment | 20 |
| G. Assumptions | 20 |
| 1. The 'Windfall' Assumption | 20 |
| (a) <i>The Defendant will Also Receive an Undeserved Windfall</i> | 20 |
| (b) <i>The Role of Third Parties</i> | 21 |
| 2. Causation | 21 |
| H. Taxation Agents | 23 |
| I. Burden of Proof | 25 |
| 1. Onus is on the Claimant | 25 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----|
| 2. | Onus is on the Defendant | 25 |
| 3. | Is Reversal of the Onus of Proof Apparent but Not Real? | 27 |
| | (a) <i>A Presumption of Disimpoverishment</i> | 28 |
| | (b) <i>It is Sufficient to Raise, but not Prove, the Defence</i> | 28 |
| 4. | Where should the Burden Lie? | 29 |
| J. | Judicial Responses to Disimpoverishment | 30 |
| 1. | Acceptance of the Defence at Law | 31 |
| | (a) <i>Accept at Law and on the Facts</i> | 31 |
| | (b) <i>Accept at Law but Reject on the Facts</i> | 31 |
| 2. | Rejection of the Defence at Law | 31 |
| 3. | Qualified Rejection | 32 |
| K. | Conclusion | 34 |
| 3 | Common Law Cases on the Defence of Disimpoverishment | 35 |
| A. | Introduction | 35 |
| B. | England | 35 |
| 1. | <i>Linz v Electric Wire Company of Palestine Ltd</i> | 35 |
| 2. | The Swaps Cases | 36 |
| | (a) <i>The Decisions</i> | 36 |
| | (b) <i>Are the Decisions Binding?</i> | 39 |
| 3. | <i>Woolwich Equitable Building Society v Inland Revenue Commissioners</i> | 40 |
| 4. | <i>Banque Belge Pour L'étranger v Hambrouck</i> | 41 |
| C. | Australia | 43 |
| 1. | <i>Mason v New South Wales</i> | 43 |
| 2. | <i>Commissioner State Revenue (Victoria) v Royal Insurance Australia Ltd</i> | 44 |
| 3. | <i>Roxborough v Rothmans Pall Mall</i> | 46 |
| D. | Canada | 47 |
| 1. | Acceptance at Law and on the Facts | 47 |
| | (a) <i>Unlawful Demand by a Public Authority</i> | 47 |
| | (b) <i>Mistake</i> | 48 |
| 2. | Acceptance at Law but Rejection on the Facts | 49 |
| | (a) <i>Unlawful Demand by a Public Authority</i> | 49 |
| | (b) <i>Mistake</i> | 50 |
| 3. | Rejection at Law | 50 |
| E. | United States of America | 52 |
| 1. | Rejection at Law | 52 |
| 2. | Qualified Rejection | 57 |
| 3. | Acceptance at Law | 59 |
| F. | Conclusion | 62 |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 4 | Statutory Defence of Disimpoverishment | 63 |
| | A. Introduction | 63 |
| | B. The Defence of Unjust Enrichment | 63 |
| | 1. Relevant Statutory Provisions..... | 63 |
| | 2. The Meaning of ‘Unjustly Enrich’ | 64 |
| | (a) <i>The Meaning of ‘Enrichment’</i> | 65 |
| | (b) <i>The Meaning of ‘Unjust’</i> | 65 |
| | 3. Correlation with the Defence of Disimpoverishment..... | 65 |
| | C. Operation of the Unjust Enrichment Defence | 66 |
| | 1. Condition #1: The Claimant Must ‘Pass on’ the Cost of the Tax | 67 |
| | 2. Condition #2: The Claimant Must Avoid Any Loss | 69 |
| | (a) <i>No Change in Price</i> | 70 |
| | (b) <i>The ‘Price Taker’ Argument</i> | 71 |
| | (c) <i>Counter-factual Argument #1: Prices would have Increased Anyway</i> | 75 |
| | (d) <i>Counter-factual Argument #2: Revenue would have Increased</i> | 77 |
| | (e) <i>Increase in Price Not Matched by an Increase in Revenue</i> | 78 |
| | (f) <i>Potential Substitutability of Profitable Products</i> | 79 |
| | 3. Condition #3: Recovery Must ‘Unjustly Enrich’ the Claimant..... | 80 |
| | 4. Conclusion | 80 |
| | D. Recovery for Third Parties of Overpaid VAT | 81 |
| | 1. Direct Recovery by Third Parties..... | 81 |
| | 2. Claimant Recovering for Third Parties | 81 |
| | 3. Conclusion | 84 |
| | E. Influence of European Jurisprudence | 85 |
| | 1. Three General Propositions from the ECJ | 85 |
| | 2. Three Specific Propositions from the ECJ | 86 |
| | F. Conclusion | 86 |
| | 1. Some Specific Observations..... | 86 |
| | 2. Implications for this Book | 87 |
| | Part II ‘At The Expense Of’ | 89 |
| 5 | What Might ‘At the Expense of’ Mean? | 91 |
| | A. Introduction | 91 |
| | B. Two Interpretations of ‘at the Expense of’ | 92 |
| | C. The Meaning of ‘Loss’ | 93 |
| | 1. ‘Loss’ Meaning ‘Detriment’ | 93 |
| | (a) <i>Pecuniary Detriment</i> | 93 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| (b) <i>Non-pecuniary Detriment</i> | 95 |
| 2. 'Loss' Meaning 'Deprivation' (of a Right) | 101 |
| (a) <i>Examples in the Case Law of 'Loss' Meaning 'Deprivation of A Right'</i> | 102 |
| (b) <i>Should a 'Deprivation of a Right' Constitute a 'Loss'?</i> | 103 |
| 3. 'Loss' Meaning 'Opportunity Forgone' | 105 |
| D. Loss and Restitution | 107 |
| 1. Corresponding Loss..... | 107 |
| (a) <i>Only 'Some' Loss is Necessary</i> | 107 |
| (b) <i>A 'Corresponding' Loss is Required</i> | 107 |
| (c) <i>The Preferred Interpretation of whether a Loss Must be Corresponding</i> | 108 |
| 2. Initial or Ultimate Loss? | 109 |
| E. The Meaning of 'From' | 109 |
| 1. Things and Services: What Exactly Comes from the Claimant? | 110 |
| (a) <i>Things</i> | 110 |
| (b) <i>Services</i> | 111 |
| F. Differences between 'From' and 'Loss' | 112 |
| G. Conclusion | 112 |
| H. Addendum | 113 |
| 6 What do the Cases say 'At the Expense of' Means? | 115 |
| A. Introduction | 115 |
| 1. Scope and Purpose | 115 |
| 2. Structure..... | 116 |
| 3. Outcome..... | 116 |
| B. Situation 1: 'Gain' Exceeds 'Loss' at the Moment of Receipt | 116 |
| 1. England | 117 |
| (a) <i>Re BHT (UK) Ltd</i> | 117 |
| (b) <i>Greenwood v Bennett</i> | 118 |
| (c) <i>Hambly v Trott</i> | 119 |
| (d) <i>Banque Financiere De La Cite v Parc (Battersea Ltd)</i> | 121 |
| (e) <i>BP Exploration Co (Libya) v Hunt (No 2)</i> | 122 |
| (f) <i>Debt Discharged at Less Than Full Value</i> | 125 |
| (g) <i>Necessitous Intervention</i> | 127 |
| 2. Australia | 129 |
| (a) <i>Interest Awards</i> | 129 |
| 3. Canada | 132 |
| 4. United States of America | 133 |
| 5. Conclusion | 134 |
| C. Situation 2: 'Gain' Increases After Receipt | 135 |
| 1. England | 135 |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| (a) | <i>The Decisions</i> | 135 |
| (b) | <i>Reasons for Judgment</i> | 136 |
| (c) | <i>The True State of Affairs in FC Jones and Foscett v Mckeown?</i> | 137 |
| (d) | <i>Implications for the 'at the Expense of' Requirement</i> | 138 |
| 2. | Australia | 138 |
| 3. | United States of America | 140 |
| D. | Conclusion | 142 |
| 7 | What should 'at the Expense of' Mean? | 143 |
| A. | Introduction..... | 143 |
| 1. | The Inquiry..... | 143 |
| 2. | Structure and Outcome..... | 143 |
| B. | The Problem Restated: The <i>Status Quo Ante</i> cannot be Restored..... | 144 |
| 1. | Restitution when Loss and Gain Correspond..... | 144 |
| (a) | <i>Pre-exchange Equilibrium</i> | 145 |
| (b) | <i>Identification of the Parties</i> | 145 |
| (c) | <i>The Appropriate Response is Restitution</i> | 145 |
| 2. | Conclusion | 146 |
| C. | Four Conceptions of What 'At the Expense of' Means..... | 146 |
| D. | Whenever Loss and Gain Do Not Equate..... | 148 |
| 1. | The Work is Done Elsewhere | 148 |
| 2. | The Meaning of 'Restitution' | 149 |
| 3. | Windfalls | 150 |
| 4. | Conservation of Judicial Resources..... | 151 |
| (a) | <i>Are the Parties Equally Undeserving?</i> | 151 |
| (b) | <i>What If the Claimant Incurs Some Loss?</i> | 152 |
| (c) | <i>Difficulty in Proving Loss</i> | 152 |
| 5. | Presumption of Self-reliance | 153 |
| E. | 'Gain' Exceeds 'Loss' at the Moment of Receipt..... | 154 |
| 1. | Symmetry with Restitution for Wrongs..... | 154 |
| (a) | <i>Restitution Versus Disgorgement for Wrongs</i> | 154 |
| (b) | <i>Restitution for Wrongs and Unjust Enrichment</i> | 154 |
| (c) | <i>The Implications of Symmetry</i> | 155 |
| (d) | <i>Wrongs and Unjust Enrichment: Different Events</i> | 156 |
| 2. | Corrective Justice and Kantian Rights..... | 157 |
| (a) | <i>Corrective Justice on Aristotle's Terms</i> | 157 |
| (b) | <i>Corrective Justice Through a Kantian Lens</i> | 158 |
| (c) | <i>No Intent</i> | 160 |
| (d) | <i>Policy-based Restitution</i> | 161 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| (e) <i>When Gain and Loss Do not Equate</i> | 161 |
| 3. Conclusion | 163 |
| F. 'Gain' Increases After Receipt | 163 |
| 1. Introduction..... | 163 |
| (a) <i>The Issue and the Perspectives</i> | 163 |
| (b) <i>Four Preliminary Matters</i> | 164 |
| 2. What Has Come 'At the Expense of' the Claimant? | 165 |
| (a) <i>The Normative Position</i> | 166 |
| (b) <i>Unjust Enrichment at the Expense of the Defendant</i> | 167 |
| (c) <i>Directness</i> | 168 |
| (d) <i>The Transfer</i> | 169 |
| (e) <i>Symmetry (of Risk) with the Defence of Disenrichment</i> | 169 |
| 3. Conclusion | 171 |
| G. Conclusion | 171 |
| Part III Other Reasons to Reject or Accept the Defence of Disimpoverishment | 173 |
| 8 Other Arguments for Accepting the Defence of Disimpoverishment..... | 175 |
| A. Introduction..... | 175 |
| B. False Bases for Accepting the Defence | 175 |
| 1. Inflation Reduction | 175 |
| 2. Third Parties Incur Two Losses | 177 |
| 3. Symmetry with the Defence of Disenrichment..... | 179 |
| 4. Litigation Chains | 181 |
| (a) <i>Limited Application</i> | 181 |
| (b) <i>In Support of the Defence of Disimpoverishment</i> | 182 |
| (c) <i>Unsupported Fears and Conclusions</i> | 182 |
| 5. Protection of Government Finances | 183 |
| (a) <i>Reasons for Refusing Restitution</i> | 184 |
| (b) <i>A Nuanced Response</i> | 185 |
| (c) <i>Reasons for Awarding Restitution</i> | 185 |
| C. A Legitimate Basis for Rejecting the Defence | 187 |
| 1. The Claimant will Receive a Windfall | 187 |
| (a) <i>Receipt via An Unimpeachable Contract or Gift</i> | 188 |
| (b) <i>Receipt via an Unjust Enrichment at the Expense of a Third Party</i> | 189 |
| D. Conclusion | 190 |
| 9 Other Arguments for Rejecting the Defence of Disimpoverishment | 191 |
| A. Introduction..... | 191 |

| | | |
|---------|--|-----|
| B. | False Bases for Rejecting the Defence | 191 |
| 1. | Symmetry with Tort Law | 191 |
| 2. | Undertaking to Pass-back | 193 |
| (a) | <i>Rejecting the Defence</i> | 193 |
| (b) | <i>True Rejection?</i> | 193 |
| 3. | It is Only a Complete, Not Partial, Defence..... | 194 |
| C. | Potential Bases for Rejecting the Defence | 194 |
| 1. | Problems of Proof..... | 194 |
| (a) | <i>The Problems</i> | 195 |
| (b) | <i>Examination of the Problems</i> | 195 |
| (c) | <i>Proof of Impoverishment</i> | 198 |
| (d) | <i>Conclusion</i> | 202 |
| 2. | Recovery Based on Economic Assumptions should not be Permitted..... | 202 |
| 3. | Unlawful Demands for Tax..... | 204 |
| D. | Three Reasons for Rejecting the Defence | 207 |
| 1. | <i>Res Inter Alios Acta Alteri Nocere Non Debet</i> | 207 |
| 2. | The Claimant's Defective Transfer..... | 208 |
| 3. | The Ideal Corrective Justice Solution will not be Attained..... | 209 |
| (a) | <i>Problems with Attaining Corrective Justice when the Defence is Upheld</i> | 209 |
| (b) | <i>What are the Alternatives?</i> | 211 |
| E. | Conclusion | 218 |
| Part IV | Third Parties..... | 219 |
| 10 | Third Parties..... | 221 |
| A. | Introduction..... | 221 |
| B. | When Can an Action be Brought Against a Claimant? | 221 |
| 1. | Third Party v Claimant | 221 |
| 2. | <i>Parens Patriae</i> | 222 |
| C. | Class Actions | 223 |
| 1. | What is a Class Action? | 224 |
| 2. | What are Some of the Advantages of Class Actions? | 224 |
| 3. | Two Illustrations..... | 225 |
| (a) | <i>Javor v State Board of Equalization</i> | 225 |
| (b) | <i>Cauvin v Phillip Morris</i> | 226 |
| (c) | <i>Conclusion</i> | 228 |
| D. | Recovery of Overpaid Tax by a Third Party (from the Claimant) | 228 |
| 1. | The Issue | 228 |
| (a) | <i>An Illustration</i> | 228 |
| (b) | <i>The Purpose of this Inquiry</i> | 229 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 2. | Is Restitution within a Valid Contract Permitted?..... | 230 |
| (a) | <i>Composite Charge</i> | 230 |
| (b) | <i>Itemized Charge</i> | 231 |
| (c) | <i>Conclusion</i> | 234 |
| 3. | Is Restitution within a Valid Contract Justified? | 234 |
| (a) | <i>The Item is Severable and Not Negotiated</i> | 234 |
| (b) | <i>Analysis of the Beatson and Birks Perspective</i> | 235 |
| E. | Conclusion | 242 |
| 11 | Conclusion | 245 |
| A. | The Problems Restated | 245 |
| B. | The Conclusions Reached | 245 |
| 1. | A Change of Name | 245 |
| 2. | Three Possible Responses, Not Two | 246 |
| 3. | The Meaning of 'At the Expense of' | 246 |
| 4. | Other Arguments For and Against the Defence | 247 |
| 5. | Implications for the Statutory Defence | 248 |
| 6. | Third Party Claims | 248 |
| C. | Restatement | 249 |
| | <i>Bibliography</i> | 251 |
| | <i>Index</i> | 257 |