



***TD 92/179 - Income tax: company A, in the course of carrying on its investment and sharetrading business, issues to its shareholders, at non-refundable premiums, warrants on shares held in another company which grant to the warrant holders the right to purchase the underlying shares at a fixed price within a certain period of time. The nature of the warrants is similar to that of call options. Do the premiums form part of Company A's assessable income under subsection 25(1) of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936 , and are they derived in the years in which the warrants are issued?***

 This cover sheet is provided for information only. It does not form part of *TD 92/179 - Income tax: company A, in the course of carrying on its investment and sharetrading business, issues to its shareholders, at non-refundable premiums, warrants on shares held in another company which grant to the warrant holders the right to purchase the underlying shares at a fixed price within a certain period of time. The nature of the warrants is similar to that of call options. Do the premiums form part of Company A's assessable income under subsection 25(1) of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936 , and are they derived in the years in which the warrants are issued?*

 This document has changed over time. This is a consolidated version of the ruling which was published on 29 October 1992

This Determination, to the extent that it is capable of being a 'public ruling' in terms of Part IVA of the *Taxation Administration Act 1953*, is a public ruling for the purposes of that Part. Taxation Ruling TR 92/1 explains when a Determination is a public ruling and how it is binding on the Commissioner. Unless otherwise stated, the Determination applies to transactions entered into both before and after its date of issue.

---

## Taxation Determination

---

**Income tax: company A, in the course of carrying on its investment and sharetrading business, issues to its shareholders, at non-refundable premiums, warrants on shares held in another company which grant to the warrant holders the right to purchase the underlying shares at a fixed price within a certain period of time. The nature of the warrants is similar to that of call options. Do the premiums form part of Company A's assessable income under subsection 25(1) of the *Income Tax Assessment Act 1936*, and are they derived in the years in which the warrants are issued?**

1. Yes. The premiums received on issue of the warrants are income according to ordinary concepts, as they arise from activities which fall squarely within the scope of Company A's sharetrading and investment business (*Californian Copper Syndicate (Limited and Reduced) v Harris* (1904) 5 TC 159). Also, the issuing of warrants is viewed as a way of generating income by exploiting existing assets - in this case the underlying shares (*Rolls-Royce Ltd v. Jeffrey* 1 WLR 425).

2. Yes. Warrants are securities in their own right, and the premiums received on issue "come home" at the time of issue of the warrants. Company A does everything that is necessary to derive the premiums by completing its obligations to issue the warrant securities.

Example:

Company A carried on a business which included investing and trading in shares and options. In the course of two financial years Company A issued warrants to its shareholders which granted rights to purchase fully paid ordinary shares in Company X at \$7.50 each on or before certain dates. The warrants were issued at premiums of \$0.50, which were non-refundable. Company A was entitled to receive total premiums of \$1 million and \$3 million in the two consecutive financial years in which it engaged in this activity. The amounts of \$1 million and \$3 million correctly form part of Company A's assessable income in years 1 and 2 respectively.

Commissioner of Taxation  
29/10/92

---

FOI INDEX DETAIL: Reference No. I 1213546

Previously issued as Draft TD 92/D142

Subject Ref: warrant premium; income according to ordinary concepts; time of derivation.

Legislative Ref: ITAA 25(1)

Case Ref: *Californian Copper Syndicate (Limited and Reduced) v Harris* (1904) 5 TC 159; *Rolls-Royce Ltd v Jeffrey* [1962] 1 WLR 425, 40 TC 443

ATO Ref: NOR: J36/354/3

---

ISSN 1038 - 8982