

THE DEFENCE OF
PASSING ON

Michael Rush



• HART •
PUBLISHING

The Defence of Passing On

Michael Rush



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON

2006

Published in North America (US and Canada) by
Hart Publishing
c/o International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Avenue, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213-3786
USA
Tel: +1 503 287 3093 or toll-free: (1) 800 944 6190
Fax: +1 503 280 8832
E-mail: orders@isbs.com
Website: www.isbs.com

© Michael Rush 2006

Michael Rush has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, to be identified as the author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of Hart Publishing, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to Hart Publishing at the address below.

Hart Publishing, 16c Worcester Place, Oxford, OX1 2JW
Telephone: +44 (0)1865 517530 Fax: +44 (0) 1865 510710
E-mail: mail@hartpub.co.uk
Website: <http://www.hartpub.co.uk>

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data Available

ISBN-13: 978-1-84113-602-8 (hardback)
ISBN-10: 1-84113-602-6 (hardback)

Typeset by Compuscript Ltd, Shannon
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

Preface

In his preface to the first edition of *The Law of Restitution*, Professor Andrew Burrows described how the late Alfred Wainwright was happy, sorry and relieved after finishing his seven volume guide to hiking in the Lakes District. While such sentiments are apposite for anyone who completes a significant piece of writing, the hiking analogy is particularly befitting.

This book is based on my doctoral thesis undertaken at the University of Oxford. My supervisor, Professor Burrows, was an invaluable guide. His incisive comments on innumerable and often incomprehensible drafts, masterful ability to reduce the complex to the comprehensible, and willingness to always give generously of his time, proved vital in the development and completion of the thesis. Moreover, his approach to legal scholarship did, and will continue to, exert a profound personal influence.

Many others assisted on my journey. I owe them all a debt of gratitude. Dr James Edelman was of particular importance. Though little of what is contained in the book is formally attributed to him, his involvement critically affected its content and shape. Professor Mitchell McInnes and Mr Robert Stevens, my doctoral examiners, were also a source of encouragement and insight. The same is true of Professor Peter Birks and Mr Graham Virgo. This book contains, in one form or another, many ideas canvassed in, or arising from, our lengthy discussions.

Neil Francey and Edward Archibald were also able to provide valuable information on Australian law. Professors Andrew Kull and Colleen Murphy were equally obliging in responding to various queries concerning American law. I am grateful to Albert Dinelli, Joseph Santamaria QC, Monica Chowdry and Professor Charles Mitchell for the time they spent reading and commenting on the manuscript. Professor Colin Tapper and Dr Katharine Grevling, my college supervisors, provided considerable support throughout my time at Magdalen. And I remain indebted to the Wingate Foundation, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer, and UK Government Overseas Research Studentship scheme, for the financial assistance they provided.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the vital role played by my family and, in particular, my wife, Penelope.

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) Source of the Errors	14
(b) Problems with Errors	15
(c) Example of the Errors	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) The Defendant will Also Receive an Undeserved Windfall	20
(b) The Role of Third Parties	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'etranger 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)	The Meaning of 'Enrichment'	65
(b)	The Meaning of 'Unjust'	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)	No Change in Price	70
(b)	The 'Price Taker' Argument	71
(c)	Counter-factual Argument #1: Prices would have Increased Anyway.....	75
(d)	Counter-factual Argument #2: Revenue would have Increased	77
(e)	Increase in Price Not Matched by an Increase in Revenue	78
(f)	Potential Substitutability of Profitable Products.....	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)	Pecuniary Detriment.....	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</i> <i>'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</i> <i>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 Foskett 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</i> <i>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</i> <i>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

Table of Cases

<i>123 East Fifty Fourth Street Inc v United States</i> 157 F 2d 68 (USCA 1946).....	55, 58, 214, 230, 232
<i>Acme-Evans Co v Smith</i> 13 F Supp 356 (USDC IN 1936).....	209–10, 230,
<i>Agip (Africa) Ltd v Jackson</i> [1990] 1 Ch 265	42
<i>Air Canada v British Columbia</i> [1989] 1 SCR 1161 (1989) 59 DLR (4 th) 161 (CSC).....	15, 26, 40, 47, 150, 184–6, 193, 204, 245
<i>Air Canada v Ontario (Liquor Control Board)</i> (1995) 126 DLR (4 th) 301 (OCA)	50
<i>Allen v Waters</i> [1935] 1 KB 200 (CA).....	214
<i>Allied Air Conditioning Inc v The Queen</i> (1994) 109 DLR (4 th) 463 (BCCA)	49
<i>Amax Potash Ltd v Government of Saskatchewan</i> [1977] 2 SCR 576, (1976) 71 DLR (3d) 1	204, 206
<i>American Chain Co v Hartford-Conneticut Trust Co</i> 86 F 2d 105 (USCA 1936)	22
<i>Amministrazione delle Finanze dello Stato v Denkavit Italiana Srl</i> [1980] ECR 1205	85
<i>Amministrazione delle Finanze dello Stato v SpA San Giorgio</i> [1983] ECR 3595	29–30, 75, 85, 177, 197
<i>Armory v Delamirie</i> (1722) Stra 505.....	104, 152
<i>Atlanta Americana Motor Hotel Corp v Undercofler</i> 222 Ga 295 (1), 149 SE 2d 691 (GASC 1966)	59
<i>Attorney General v Blake</i> [2001] 1 AC 268 (HL).....	133
<i>Avon Products Pty Limited v Federal Comr Taxation</i> [2004] FCA 475	68, 71
<i>Bacchus Imports Ltd v Dias</i> 468 US 263, 104 S Ct 3049 (USSC 1984)	55, 61
<i>Banque Belge pour L'Etranger v Hambrouck</i> [1921] 1 KB 321 (CA).....	41–2
<i>Banque Financière de la Cite v Parc (Battersea Ltd)</i> [1999] 1 AC 221 (HL)	10, 121
<i>Barclays Bank Ltd v W J Simms & Son Ltd</i> [1980] QB 677	42

<i>Bell Bros Pty Ltd v Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale</i> (1969) 121 CLR 137	205
<i>Benzoline Motor Fuel Co v Bollinger</i> 353 Ill 600, 187 NE 657 (ILSC 1933)	57–8, 193, 209, 213
<i>BHT (UK) Ltd</i> [2004] EWHC 201	117–8, 142, 149
<i>Birra Wuhrer SpA v Council and Commission of the European Communities</i> [1984] ECR 3693	85
<i>Blackmon v Georgia Independent Oilmen's Association</i> 129 Ga App 171(3), SE 2d 896 (GASC 1973).....	59
<i>Blackmon v Premium Oil Stations Inc</i> 129 Ga App 169(2), 198 SE 2d 900 (GASC 1973).....	59
<i>Boardman v Phipps</i> [1967] 2 AC 46 (HL)	167
<i>BP Exploration Co (Libya) v Hunt (No 2)</i> [1979] 1 WLR 783, aff'd [1981] 1 WLR 232 (CA), [1983] 2 AC 352 (HL)	122–3
<i>British American Tobacco Australia Ltd v Western Australia</i> [2003] HCA 47	186
<i>Bronco Wine Company v Frank A Logoluso Farms</i> 214 Cal App 3d 699, 262 Cal Rptr 899 (CACA 1989)	212–3
<i>Builder's Club of Chicago v United States</i> 14 F Supp 1020 (USCC 1936)	53
<i>Butcher v Churchill</i> (1808) 14 Ves Jun 567, 33 ER 638	126
<i>C B Cones & Son Mfg Co v United States</i> 123 F 2d 530 (USCA 1941)	22
<i>Canadian Pacific Airlines Ltd v British Columbia</i> [1989] 1 SCR 1133, (1989) 59 DLR (4th) 218 (CSC)	47
<i>Case Y46 91 ATC</i> 431.....	16
<i>Cauvin v British American Tobacco Aust Services Ltd</i> [2002] NSWCA 253	227
<i>Cauvin v Phillip Morris</i> [2002] NSWSC 736.....	209, 217, 226–7, 230
<i>Cauvin v Phillip Morris</i> [2004] HCATrans 93.....	227
<i>Cherubini Metal Works Ltd v Nova Scotia (AG)</i> (1995) 137 NSR (2d) 197 (NSCA).....	50
<i>Christopher v Hoyer</i> 160 Misc 21, 289 NYS 105 (NYMC 1936)	230
<i>City of Prichard v Hawkins</i> 255 Ala 676 (SCAL 1951).....	55
<i>Coho Creek Estates Ltd v Maple Ridge</i> (1995) 53 ACWS (3d) 890, 27 MPLR (2d) 129 (BCSC).....	26, 28, 49, 50
<i>Commerzbank AG v Gareth Price-Jones</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 1663	20
<i>Commonwealth v Kaplan</i> 311 Pa 539, 166 A 883 (RISC 1922)	23
<i>Comr State Revenue (Victoria) v Royal Insurance Australia Ltd</i> (1994) 182 CLR 51 (HCA).....	91, 101, 186, 198, 205, 209, 214, 232
<i>Consolidated Distilled Products Inc v Mahin</i> 56 Ill 2d 110, 306 NE 2d 465 (ILSC 1973).....	26, 59
<i>Cook v Sears Roebuck & Co</i> 212 Ark 308, 206 SW 2d 20 (ARSC 1974).....	23
<i>Cth v McCormack</i> (1984) 155 CLR 273 (HCA)	129, 132

<i>Cummings v Noyes</i> (1813) 10 Mass R 433	120
<i>Customs & Excise Comrs v McMaster Stores (Scotland) Ltd</i> (1996) SLT 935, [1995] STC 846, [1995] BTC 5390	64–5, 82–3, 118, 193
<i>Customs & Excise Comrs v National Westminster Bank</i> <i>plc</i> [2003] EWHC 1822 (Ch), [2003] BVC 633	64–5, 67, 73, 86
<i>David Securities Pty Ltd v Commonwealth of Australia</i> (1992) 175 CLR 353 (HCA)	179
<i>Daynes & Anor v Customs & Excise Comrs</i> [1994] BVC 664	66
<i>Decorative Carpets Inc v State Board of Equalization</i> 373 P 2d 637, 58 Cal 2d 252 (CASC 1962)	26, 59, 214
<i>Dennis v London Passenger Transport Board</i> [1948] 1 All ER 779	214
<i>Extra Bank & Trust Co Ltd v Bank of Jamaica</i> [2002] 1 All ER 193 (PC)	20
<i>Dilexport Srl v Amministrazione delle Finanze dello Stato</i> [1999] ECR I-579	85
<i>Duke of Bedford v Ellis</i> [1901] AC 1 (PC) 8	224
<i>Edwards v Lee's Administrator</i> 265 Ky 418, 96 SW 2d 1028 (KYCA, 1936)	134
<i>Eimco BSP Services Co v Chilivis</i> 241 Ga 263, 244 SE 2d 829 (GASC 1978)	59
<i>Eisen v Carlisle & Jacquelin</i> 391 F 2d 555, 572 (USCA 1973)	228
<i>Elida Gibbs Ltd v Customs & Excise Comrs</i> [1997] BVC 80	74
<i>Empire Life Insurance Co v Neufield Estate</i> (1998) 22 <i>Estates and</i> <i>Trusts Reports</i> (2d) 207 (BCSC)	47
<i>Everson v Rich</i> (1988) 31 ETR 26, 16 RFL (3 rd) 337 (SCA)	96
<i>Express Dairy Foods Ltd v Intervention Board for Agricultural</i> <i>Produce</i> [1980] ECR 1887	85
<i>Falcke v Scottish Imperial Insurance Co Ltd</i> (1886) 34 Ch D 234 (CA) 248	128
<i>Fazzi v Peters</i> 68 Cal 2d 590, 440 P 2d 242 (CASC 1968)	212
<i>FC Jones & Sons v Jones</i> [1997] Ch 159 (CA)	135–8, 165
<i>Fleer Corporation v Topps Chewing Gum Inc</i> 539 A 2d 1060 (DWSC 1988)	140, 142, 165
<i>Foskett v McKeown</i> [2001] 1 AC 102 (HL)	136–8, 149, 165
<i>Furman University v Livingston</i> 244 SC 200, 136 SE 2d 782 (SCSC 1993)	23–4
<i>Gainers Inc v Canadian Pacific Ltd</i> (1995) 120 DLR (4 th) 143 (ACA)	51
<i>Georgia v Pennsylvania Railroad Co</i> 324 US 439 (USSC 1945)	223

<i>Gidney v Feuerstein</i> [1996] 2 WWR 383 (MCA)	96, 98, 132–3
<i>GIO of NSW v Healy (No 2)</i> (1991) 22 NSWLR 380 (NSWCA)	130
<i>Glasgow Corporation v Lord Advocate</i> (1959) SLT 230	184
<i>Gnitrow Ltd v Cape plc</i> [2000] 3 All ER 763 (CA)	127
<i>Goodman v Pocock</i> (1850) 15 QB 576	231
<i>Goring, The</i> [1988] AC 831 (HL)	128, 129
<i>Grantham Cricket Club v Customs & Excise Comrs</i> [1998] BVC 2272	65, 73–4, 80, 84
<i>Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company v City of Lexington</i> 256 Ky 595, 76 SW 2d 894 (KYCA 1934)	184
<i>Great Northern Railway Co v Swaffield</i> (1874) LR 9 Exch 132	128
<i>Green v Portsmouth Stadium</i> [1953] 2 QB 190 (CA) <i>Greenwood</i> <i>v Bennett</i> [1973] QB 195	231
<i>Greenwood v Bennett</i> [1973] QB 195	118–19
<i>Greta Holme, The</i> [1897] AC 596 (HL)	102
<i>Ha v New South Wales</i> (1997) 189 CLR 465 (HCA)	46
<i>Hambly v Trott</i> (1776) 1 Cowp 371; 98 ER 1136	119–21
<i>Hanover Shoe Inc v United Shoe Machinery Corp</i> 392 US 481, 88 S Ct 2224 (USSC 1968)	12, 18, 198
<i>Hans Just I/S v Danish Ministry for Fiscal Affairs</i> [1980] ECR 501	85
<i>Hazell v Hammersmith & Fulham London BC</i> [1992] 2 AC 1 (HL)	37
<i>Heckman & Co Inc v I S Dawes & Son Co Inc</i> 56 App D C 213, 12 F 2d 154 (DCCA 1926)	230, 234
<i>Hobart v Minister of National Revenue</i> (1985) 61 NR 233 (FCA)	47
<i>Honorbilt Products Inc v Comr Internal Revenue</i> 119 F 2d 797 (USCA, 1941)	22
<i>Howell Industries v Sharon Steel</i> 754 F 2d 374 (USCA 1984)	17
<i>Hunt v Severs</i> [1994] 2 AC 350 (HL)	207, 214
<i>Hutzler Bros Co v United States</i> 33 F Supp 801 (USDC MD 1940)	22
<i>Independent Linen Service Co v Stone</i> 192 Miss 832, 6 So 2d 110 (SCMS 1942)	24, 54, 230
<i>Interwoven Stocking Co v United States</i> 114 F 2d 768 (USCA, 1944)	22, 23
<i>Ireks-Arkady GmbH v Council and Commission of the European</i> <i>Communities</i> [1979] ECR 2955	85
<i>James B Beam Distilling Co v Georgia</i> 263 Ga 609, 437 SE 2d 782 (GASC 1993)	59, 61
<i>James B Beam Distilling Co v Georgia</i> 501 US 529, 111 S Ct 2439 (USSC 1991)	61

<i>Javor v State Board of Equalization</i> 527 P 2d 1153, 12 Cal 3d 790 (CASC 1974)	225, 228
<i>Jenkins v Tucker</i> (1788) 1 Hy Bl 90, 126 ER 55	128
<i>Johnson v Nova Scotia (AG)</i> (1990) 96 NSR (2d) 140 (NSCA)	26, 47
<i>Jones v Department of Revenue</i> 60 Ill App 3d 886, 377 NE 2d 202 (ILCA 1978)	236
<i>Jones v Hoar</i> (1827) 22 Mass 285; 5 Pick 285	120
<i>Kastner v Duffy-Mott Co</i> 213 NYS 128 (1925 NYSC)	234
<i>Kesbec Inc v McGoldrick</i> 278 NY 293, 16 NE 2s 288 (NYCA 1938)	23, 26
<i>Kleinwort Benson Ltd v Birmingham City Council</i> [1997] QB 380 (CA)	1, 19, 22–3, 36–41, 115
<i>Kleinwort Benson Ltd v South Tyneside Metropolitan BC</i> [1994] 4 All ER 972 (Com Ct)	1, 21, 23, 36–41
<i>Lamdec Ltd v Customs & Excise Comrs</i> [1991] VATTR 296, [1991] BVC 721	82–3, 118, 193
<i>Lash's Products Company v United States</i> 278 US 175, 49 S Ct 100 (USSC 1929)	230
<i>Law Society of Upper Canada v Ernst & Young</i> (2002) 213 DLR (4 th) 167, 59 OR (3d) 214 (OSC)	52
<i>Law Society of Upper Canada v Ernst & Young</i> (2003) 227 DLR (4 th) 577, 65 OR (3d) 577 (OCA)	17
<i>Leonard v Socony-Vacuum Oil</i> 42 F Supp 369 (USDC WIS 1942)	12
<i>Les Fils De Jules Bianco SA v Directeur General Des Douanes et Droits Indirects</i> [1988] ECR 1099	85
<i>Linz v Electric Wire Company of Palestine Ltd</i> [1948] AC 371 (PC)	35–6
<i>Lipkin Gorman v Karpnale Ltd</i> [1991] 2 AC 548 (HL)	179
<i>Ludwigshafener Walzmuhle Erling KG v Council and Commission of the European Communities</i> [1981] ECR 3211	85
<i>Lytle v Payette-Oregon Slope Irr Dist</i> 152 P 2d 934	140
<i>Maguire v Makaronis</i> (1997) 188 CLR 449 (HCA)	131
<i>Mann v Thompson</i> 118 So 2d 112 (USCA 1960)	140, 142
<i>Marks & Spencer plc v Customs & Excise Comrs (No 1)</i> [1997] V&DR 85, [1997] BVC 2243	77
<i>Marks & Spencer plc v Customs & Excise Comrs (No 1)</i> [1999] 1 CMLR 1152	64, 69, 76, 79, 194, 203
<i>Marks & Spencer plc v Customs & Excise Comrs (No 1)</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 1448	76
<i>Marks & Spencer plc v Customs & Excise Comrs (No 2)</i> [1997] BVC 2255	75