

The complaint

Mr L complains, with the help of a representative, that James Hay Administration Company Ltd (James Hay) accepted the in-specie transfer of Elysian Fuels shares into his self-invested personal pension (SIPP) without undertaking appropriate due diligence, ensuring the shares were independently valued or having proper procedures in place for transactions of this nature.

What happened

Mr L established a James Hay SIPP and purchased Elysian Fuels shares in two separate tranches of the investment in his personal capacity. As I understand it, both tranches were purchased by way of Mr L paying a 16p per share cash contribution and with the 84p per share balance financed by a limited recourse loan provided by Future Capital Partners (FCP) the promoters of the investment.

Mr L then sold these shares to his company for £1 per share. The company then transferred these to his SIPP by way of two employer in-specie contributions.

The first transaction was the subject of a separate complaint. This complaint relates only to the second tranche of Elysian Fuels Mr L purchased and what happened in connection with them, by which point Mr L had a SIPP and held the initial tranche of Elysian Fuels shares within it.

A James Hay in-specie contribution notification and declaration was completed for £96,000 to be made by way of a transfer of 96,000 shares in Elysian Fuels purportedly valued at £1 per share, it was noted that Mr L's business was paying the contribution. This was signed and dated 25 October 2013.

A share certificate dated 28 October 2013 confirmed that Mr L's business was the registered holder of 96,000 fully paid Preference shares of £1 each in Elysian Fuels. And subsequently a share certificate dated 28 April 2014 confirmed that Mr L's SIPP was the registered holder of 96,000 fully paid Preference shares of £1 each in Elysian Fuels.

On 7 May 2014, James Hay wrote to Mr L confirming the completion of the re-registration of the Elysian Fuels shares to his SIPP.

James Hay provided us with a copy of a transaction history for Mr L's SIPP account, this shows that the SIPP also received a cash employer contribution of £1,195 shortly before the in-specie contribution was completed.

The Elysian Fuels scheme has since failed and Mr L's SIPP closed.

Background to the complaint

Mr L complained to James Hay. James Hay didn't uphold Mr L's complaint and concluded that it had been made late. Unhappy with its response, Mr L referred his complaint to this service.

One of our investigators reviewed this complaint and concluded that it had been made in time but that it shouldn't be upheld because Mr L hadn't suffered a loss in his personal capacity for which James Hay was responsible. Mr L disagreed and made further submissions.

Mr L's submissions:

- The losses claimed aren't limited to the tax loss associated with the transaction.
- If James Hay hadn't accepted the in-specie contribution, then Mr L's business would have paid an equivalent cash contribution into his pension. And Mr L would have enjoyed tax free growth on this.
- Mr L has incurred numerous fees, including specifically in relation to the Elysian Fuels shares and James Hay failed to provide the services for which it charged.
- These fees wouldn't have been incurred if James Hay had not authorised the in-specie contribution of the Elysian Fuels shares.
- As a result of James Hay's actions Mr L has suffered a significant amount of distress and inconvenience.

Our investigator reviewed the additional submissions made but they weren't minded to change their view. Because agreement couldn't be reached, this case was passed to me for review. I sent my provisional decision explaining why I didn't think Mr L's complaint should be upheld to the parties to the complaint. I said I would consider any additional submissions either party wanted to make. Neither party made any further submissions.

My findings remain as set out in my provisional decision; I've reiterated these below.

What I've decided – and why

I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

The parties to this complaint have provided detailed submissions to support their respective positions and I'm grateful to them for taking the time to do so. I've considered these submissions in their entirety. However, I trust that they will not take the fact that my decision focuses on what I consider to be the central issues as a discourtesy. The purpose of this decision is not to address every point raised in detail, but to set out my findings, on what I consider to be the *main points*, and reasons for reaching them.

Where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive, or contradictory (as some of it is here), I reach my decision on the balance of probabilities – in other words, what I consider is most likely to have happened in light of the available evidence and the wider circumstances.

The Elysian Fuels scheme was an unusual arrangement. It involved buying shares largely with a limited recourse loan and then typically – in the cases that we've seen – selling those shares to a SIPP so that funds were paid out of the pension scheme to the investor. This is, as I have said, an unusual arrangement and on closer inspection HMRC was not happy with it. It found that such payments were unauthorised payments and imposed unauthorised payment charges, surcharges and interest. In other cases, investors transferred shares held in their name to their pension by way of in-specie contributions. HMRC has also denied a number of different tax reliefs claimed in connection with the Elysian Fuels scheme.

However, what happened in this instance, as set out above, is quite different. And, whilst the transaction involved some of the same attributes as those described above (such as the

manner in which Mr L purchased the shares and the transfer of those to a SIPP), it's of note that the shares were transferred into the SIPP by way of an in-specie employer contribution, so no monies were released from the SIPP – and, whilst Mr L may have purchased the shares in the manner set out above, the party (Mr L's business) transferring the shares to his SIPP had actually paid his £1 per share.

There are numerous examples of investment schemes that are set up to make use of tax concessions which push, with varying amounts of aggression, at the boundaries of the purpose of the concession. Sometimes people invest in those schemes without understanding there is a risk that HMRC might challenge the scheme. Sometimes people invest in those schemes understanding and accepting the risk HMRC might challenge the scheme. And over recent years, as seen for example with film partnerships, HMRC has been more and more active in challenging the schemes it thinks are tax avoidance schemes.

We've been provided with redacted correspondence from HMRC in which it said, in relation to the Elysian Fuels scheme, that:

“Elysian Fuels is an undisclosed mass marketed multi use tax avoidance scheme which HMRC considers one of the main purposes of the arrangements was to secure a tax advantage. You have entered into a scheme where the tax benefit exceeds the potential return from the underlying business plan. You did not pay a cash contribution of the purported £1 per share and the loan finance was provided on uncommercial terms in addition the loan finance was never in your control being paid directly to the special purpose vehicle. The funding of the whole scheme is of a circular nature and the funds were never available for the underlying purpose.

The promoter of the scheme has recently confirmed that no formal valuation of the shares was carried out and did not consider any third parties had sufficient information or access to documentation to carry [out] independent valuations. There was a valuation of the underlying business assets which were owned by another entity but neither the Elysian Fuels LLP nor the Special Purpose Vehicle funding company owned any tangible assets. This is a complex valuation issue and HMRC's initial view is the shares had no value when the transaction took place.”

Mr L purchased 96,000 shares in Elysian Fuels in his personal capacity. He then sold these shares to his company at £1 per share, in connection with this sale as I understand it £96,000 was paid to him by his company. 96,000 shares were subsequently transferred in-specie into his SIPP by way of an employer contribution from his company. So, the activity that's the subject of this complaint was part of a wider endeavour undertaken by Mr L and I've considered this carefully in reaching the conclusions set out below.

Mr L complains, in his personal capacity, that James Hay failed to comply with its regulatory obligations and act in his best interests in connection with its decision to accept the in-specie contribution/transfer of the Elysian Fuels shares from his company.

I'm not persuaded that Mr L has personally suffered adverse tax implications because of James Hay's decision to permit the in-specie contribution of the Elysian Fuels shares. No monies were released from Mr L's SIPP in connection with this transaction, so he hasn't been pursued for an unauthorised payment charge and James Hay has confirmed that no at source relief was claimed on this contribution.

I acknowledge that Mr L may have suffered tax implications as a result of his personal investment in Elysian Fuels shares and subsequent sale of these to his business, but I don't think this could fairly and reasonably be linked to an act or omission on James Hay's part.

It's also possible that Mr L's business has faced tax implications as a result of these transactions, but it's not the complainant in this case.

Mr L's SIPP has incurred charges in connection with the transaction that is the subject of this complaint but in the circumstances of his case, I'm not persuaded that it would be fair and reasonable to direct James Hay to refund these charges to Mr L. As noted above, the activity that's the subject of this complaint was part of a wider endeavour undertaken by Mr L and, in any event, it was Mr L's company – not Mr L – that paid a cash contribution into the SIPP shortly before this transaction proceeded which covered the fees paid in connection with it.

Mr L has also said that his employer (his business) would have paid a cash contribution into his pension, if James Hay hadn't accepted the Elysian Fuels shares as an in-specie contribution. At the point James Hay decided to permit the in-specie contribution of Elysian Fuels shares into Mr L's SIPP, his business had already paid £96,000 to him in cash for the purchase of the shares in question. I'm not persuaded it's more likely than not that if James Hay had refused to accept the in-specie transfer of these shares that Mr L's business would have instead made a cash contribution to his SIPP.

I'm also not persuaded that James Hay has caused Mr L distress and inconvenience for which it should fairly and reasonably compensate him.

In my view, in the unusual circumstances of Mr L's case, even if James Hay did not carry out adequate due diligence on the Elysian Fuels scheme and or undertake sufficient steps before deciding to accept this in-specie contribution (and I make no finding on that point), I don't think Mr L – in his personal capacity – has been caused a loss for which it would be fair and reasonable to hold James Hay responsible. So, I do not uphold Mr L's complaint and I make no award.

My final decision

For the reasons set out above, my final decision is that I don't uphold Mr L's complaint against James Hay Administration Company Ltd and I make no award.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr L to accept or reject my decision before 8 January 2025.

Nicola Curnow
Ombudsman