

# Landmark Ruling by Federal Court of Australia on Crypto Margin Extensions

October 8, 2024

In the recent case of **Australian Securities and Investments Commission v Bit Trade Pty Ltd [2024] FCA 953**, the Federal Court delivered a pivotal judgment that resonates deeply within the cryptocurrency industry. The court scrutinized the nature of Bit Trade's "Margin Extension" product, ultimately finding that it constitutes a credit facility under Australian law. This finding has significant implications for crypto exchanges operating in Australia, particularly regarding regulatory compliance.

**Bit Trade**, trading as Kraken in Australia, offers a platform where customers can purchase and sell digital assets, including cryptocurrencies. One of their offerings is the "**Margin Extension**" product, which allows customers to receive extensions of margin—in the form of digital assets or legal tender—to make spot purchases and sales of digital assets on the Kraken Exchange.

The crux of the case revolved around whether the Margin Extension product is a financial product requiring a **target market determination (TMD)** under **Part 7.8A of the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth)**. The Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC) alleged that Bit Trade contravened sections 994B(1) and (2) of the Act by issuing this product to retail clients without first making a TMD.

Bit Trade contended that the product was exempt under **regulation 7.8A.20 of the Corporations Regulations**, arguing that it did not involve a "deferred debt" as required by

subparagraph (a) of regulation 2B(3) of the **ASIC Regulations**. They asserted that obligations arising from the Margin Extension did not constitute a debt because they might not involve an obligation to pay money.

However, the court disagreed. **Justice Nicholas** meticulously analyzed the Terms of Service (TOS) under which the Margin Extension product was offered. He highlighted that the provision of a Margin Extension in national currency, such as Australian or US dollars, indeed gives rise to a **“deferred debt”**.

From the judgment:

*“The provision of a Margin Extension in national currency (including in Australian or US dollars) gives rise to a ‘deferred debt’ which is incurred by the customer when they are provided with the Margin Extension and which becomes payable upon the customer ceasing to be eligible to receive the Margin Extension.”*

This finding was pivotal. It established that the Margin Extension is a **credit facility involving credit of a kind referred to in subparagraph (a) of regulation 2B(3) of the ASIC Regulations**. Consequently, the exception under regulation 7.8A.20 did not apply.

Justice Nicholas further elaborated:

*“By issuing the Product to retail clients without having first made a target market determination for the Product, Bit Trade contravened s 994B(1) of the Corporations Act when read with s 994B(2).”*

The court’s reasoning hinged on the interpretation of “debt” within the regulatory framework. Bit Trade argued that “debt” implies an obligation to pay money and that cryptocurrency is not money. Therefore, obligations to return cryptocurrency do

not create a debt. However, the court noted that the Margin Extension could be provided in national currency, and obligations arising from such transactions do constitute a debt.

Justice Nicholas emphasized:

*“An obligation to pay an amount of cryptocurrency of some type is not an obligation to pay a sum of money and therefore cannot be a debt... However, in circumstances where a Margin Extension is provided by Bit Trade in a national currency... this amounts to ‘a conditional but unavoidable obligation to pay a sum of money at a future time.’”*

The judgment underscores the importance of understanding how financial regulations apply to products offered in the crypto space, especially when traditional financial concepts like “debt” intersect with digital assets. The court’s interpretation aligns with the view that when a product involves an obligation to repay in national currency, it falls within the ambit of a credit facility under the regulations.

For crypto exchanges and service providers, this case serves as a cautionary tale. Offering products that involve financial accommodations in national currency without adhering to regulatory requirements can lead to significant legal repercussions. The need for a **target market determination** is not merely a procedural formality but a critical compliance requirement designed to protect consumers.

The court’s decision also reflects a broader trend of regulators and courts applying existing financial laws to the evolving crypto industry. While cryptocurrencies themselves may not be considered money in the traditional sense, products and services involving them can still be subject to financial regulations when they intersect with national currencies or create obligations akin to traditional financial instruments.

In conclusion, the **Federal Court's judgment in ASIC v Bit Trade** reinforces the necessity for crypto businesses to diligently assess their products against the regulatory landscape. The provision of margin extensions in national currency creates a **deferred debt**, categorizing the product as a credit facility requiring compliance with specific provisions of the Corporations Act.

As the crypto industry continues to mature, adherence to regulatory obligations becomes ever more critical. Exchanges must ensure that they are not only innovative in their offerings but also compliant with the laws that govern financial products. This case highlights that the intersection of crypto and traditional finance is not a legal vacuum; existing laws can and will be applied to new technologies and products.

The judgment serves as a reminder that while cryptocurrencies may challenge traditional notions of money and finance, the legal frameworks in place are adaptable. Businesses operating in this space must stay informed and proactive in their compliance efforts to navigate the complex regulatory environment successfully.

The decision reaffirms the principle that innovative financial products are not beyond the reach of existing legal and regulatory frameworks. Companies must ensure that their offerings are compliant, thereby safeguarding both their operations and their customers.

**Author:** Mahmoud Abuwasel

**Title:** Partner – Disputes

**Email:** [mabuwasel@waselandwasel.com](mailto:mabuwasel@waselandwasel.com)

**Profile:**

<https://waselandwasel.com/about/mahmoud-abuwasel/>

**Lawyers and consultants.**

Tier-1 services since 1799.

[www.waselandwasel.com](http://www.waselandwasel.com)

[business@waselandwasel.com](mailto:business@waselandwasel.com)