UT LAW CLE THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SCHOOL OF LAW

PRESENTED AT

64th Annual Taxation Conference

November 30-December 1, 2016
Austin, Texas

Recent Developments in Federal Income Taxation

Bruce A. McGovern

Author Contact Information:
Bruce A. McGovern
Vice President, Associate Dean and
Professor of Law
South Texas College of Law
Houston, Texas 77002

Tele: 713-646-2920
e-mail: bmcgovern@stcl.edu

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN FEDERAL INCOME TAXATION

"Recent developments are just like ancient history, except they happened less long ago."

By

Bruce A. McGovern
Vice President, Associate Dean and Professor of Law
South Texas College of Law
Houston, Texas 77002
Tele: 713-646-2920
e-mail: bmcgovern@stcl.edu

University of Texas Taxation Conference
November 30, 2016

Note: This outline was prepared jointly with Martin J. McMahon, Jr., James J. Freeland Eminent Scholar in Taxation and Professor of Law, University of Florida College of Law, Gainesville, FL.

This recent developments outline discusses, and provides context to understand the significance of, the most important judicial decisions and administrative rulings and regulations promulgated by the Internal Revenue Service and Treasury Department during the most recent twelve months — and sometimes a little farther back in time if we find the item particularly humorous or outrageous. Most Treasury Regulations, however, are so complex that they cannot be discussed in detail and, anyway, only a devout masochist would read them all the way through; just the basic topic and fundamental principles are highlighted – unless one of us decides to go nuts and spend several pages writing one up. This is the reason that the outline is getting to be as long as it is. Amendments to the Internal Revenue Code generally are not discussed except to the extent that (1) they are of major significance, (2) they have led to administrative rulings and regulations, (3) they have affected previously issued rulings and regulations otherwise covered by the outline, or (4) they provide an opportunity to mock our elected representatives; again, sometimes at least one of us goes nuts and writes up the most trivial of legislative changes. The outline focuses primarily on topics of broad general interest (to us, at least) – income tax accounting rules, determination of gross income, allowable deductions, treatment of capital gains and losses, corporate and partnership taxation, exempt organizations, and procedure and penalties. It deals summarily with qualified pension and profit sharing plans, and generally does not deal with international taxation or specialized industries, such as banking, insurance, and financial services.

I. ACCOUNTING 3
A. Accounting Methods 3
B. Inventories 4
C. Installment Method 5
D. Year of Inclusion or Deduction 5
II. BUSINESS INCOME AND DEDUCTIONS 7
A. Income 7
B. Deductible Expenses versus Capitalization 8
C. Reasonable Compensation 8
D. Miscellaneous Deductions 10
E. Depreciation & Amortization 11
F. Credits 13

G. Natural Resources Deductions & Credits 15
H. Loss Transactions, Bad Debts, and NOLs 15
I. At-Risk and Passive Activity Losses 15

III. INVESTMENT GAIN AND INCOME 15

A. Gains and Losses 15
B. Interest, Dividends, and Other Current Income 20
C. Profit-Seeking Individual Deductions 21
D. Section 121 21
E. Section 1031 21
F. Section 1033 21
G. Section 1035 21
H. Miscellaneous 21

IV. COMPENSATION ISSUES 21

A. Fringe Benefits 21
B. Qualified Deferred Compensation Plans 25
C. Nonqualified Deferred Compensation, Section 83, and Stock Options 26
D. Individual Retirement Accounts 28

V. PERSONAL INCOME AND DEDUCTIONS 30

A. Rates 30
B. Miscellaneous Income 30
C. Hobby Losses and § 280A Home Office and Vacation Homes 34
D. Deductions and Credits for Personal Expenses 35
E. Divorce Tax Issues 37
F. Education 39
G. Alternative Minimum Tax 39

VI. CORPORATIONS 40

A. Entity and Formation 40
B. Distributions and Redemptions 41
C. Liquidations 42
D. S Corporations 42
E. Mergers, Acquisitions and Reorganizations 42
F. Corporate Divisions 43
G. Affiliated Corporations and Consolidated Returns 46
H. Miscellaneous Corporate Issues 46

VII. PARTNERSHIPS 47

A. Formation and Taxable Years 47
B. Allocations of Distributive Share, Partnership Debt, and Outside Basis 47
C. Distributions and Transactions Between the Partnership and Partners 47
D. Sales of Partnership Interests, Liquidations and Mergers 51
E. Inside Basis Adjustments 53
F. Partnership Audit Rules 53
G. Miscellaneous 54

VIII. TAX SHELTERS 55

A. Tax Shelter Cases and Rulings 55
B. Identified “tax avoidance transactions” 59
C. Disclosure and Settlement 60
D. Tax Shelter Penalties 60

IX. EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS AND CHARITABLE GIVING 60
A. Exempt Organizations 60
B. Charitable Giving 61
X. TAX PROCEDURE 64
A. Interest, Penalties, and Prosecutions 64
B. Discovery: Summonses and FOIA 66
C. Litigation Costs 72
D. Statutory Notice of Deficiency 74
E. Statute of Limitations 74
F. Liens and Collections 75
G. Innocent Spouse 81
H. Miscellaneous 82
XI. WITHHOLDING AND EXCISE TAXES 93
A. Employment Taxes 93
B. Self-employment Taxes 94
C. Excise Taxes 95
XII. TAX LEGISLATION 96
A. Enacted 96

I. ACCOUNTING

A. Accounting Methods

1. The Tax Court sides with the taxpayer on application of the completed contact method of accounting to development of planned residential communities. Shea Homes Inc. v. Commissioner, 142 T.C. 60 (2/12/14). The taxpayer was a home builder using the completed contract method allowed by § 460(e) (which provides an exception to the percentage-of-completion method otherwise required); the taxpayer developed large, planned residential communities. The question was whether the subject matter of the contracts consisted only of the houses and the lots on which the houses are built, as argued by the IRS, or the home as well as the larger development, including amenities and other common improvements, as argued by the taxpayer. The contracts were home construction contracts under § 460(e)(6) because Reg. § 1.460-3(b)(2)(iii) provides the cost of the dwelling units includes "their allocable share of the cost that the taxpayer reasonably expects to incur for any common improvements (e.g., sewers, roads, clubhouses) that benefit the dwelling units and that the taxpayer is contractually obligated, or required by law, to construct within the tract or tracts of land that contain the dwelling units." More specifically, the taxpayer's position was that the contracts were completed when they meet the test under Reg. § 1.460-1(c)(3)(i)(A) that the property was used by the customer for its intended purpose and 95 percent of the costs of the development had been incurred. Under this argument, final completion and acceptance pursuant to Reg. § 1.460-1(c)(3)(B) did not occur (excluding secondary items, if any, pursuant to Reg. § 1.460-1(c)(3)(B)(ii)) until the last road was paved and the final bond was released. The Tax Court (Judge Wherry), upheld the taxpayer's position. He rejected the IRS's argument that the common improvements were "secondary items." A key element in the holding was that the taxpayer was required by the contracts and by state law to complete common improvements, and that obligation was secured by "hefty performance bonds."

- The decision might be narrower than it appears on its face. Footnote 24 of the opinion states as follows:

> We are cognizant that our Opinion today could lead taxpayers to believe that large developments may qualify for extremely long, almost unlimited deferral periods. We would caution those taxpayers a determination of the subject matter of the contract is based on all the facts and circumstances. If Vistancia, for example,

attempted to apply the contract completion tests by looking at all contemplated phases, it is unlikely that the subject matter as contemplated by the contracting parties could be stretched that far. Further, sec. 1.460-1(c)(3)(iv)(A), Income Tax Regs., may prohibit taxpayers from inserting language in their contracts that would unreasonably delay completion until such a super development is completed.

a. **And the Ninth Circuit says the Tax Court was correct in holding that homebuyers value amenities.** Shea Homes, Inc. v. Commissioner, 118 A.F.T.R.2d 2016-5593 (9th Cir. 8/24/16). In an opinion by Judge Fernandez, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the Tax Court's decision on the ground that the only issue on which the Tax Court's decision rested was a question of fact—what was the subject matter of the taxpayers' home construction contracts, that is, what were the taxpayers obligated to provide to the buyers—and that the Tax Court's fact finding was not clearly erroneous. The IRS's argument in the Tax Court was limited to "a dispute about the subject matter content of the contracts" and the IRS "took the very crabbed view that the subject matter was limited to the house and the lot." The Tax Court, however, "determined that, as a matter of fact, the subject matter included the house, the lot, "'the development ... and its common improvements and amenities.'" The Court of Appeals observed that "[t]his was not a simple case of buyers purchasing homes and having no substantial interest in whether the development would be and remain the kind of development that they wished to live in for some time in the future," adding that "[e]ach person in the planned community would, indeed, have an interest in the use of other property in the development, and that would include not only the common amenities but also the use that others in the development made of their own properties." Thus, the IRS's argument that "a buyer's contract cannot encompass more than the house and lot or, as a fall-back position, more than the house, the lot, and the common improvements" was rejected.

2. **An attempt to transmute ordinary income to capital gain founders on the accounting method change rules.** Greiner v. United States, 122 Fed. Cl. 139 (7/22/15). The taxpayer received a stream of contingent payments from an acquiring corporation in exchange for surrendering his compensatory stock options in the target. After reporting the payments as ordinary income under the open transaction doctrine for six years, he sought to change to the closed transaction method, reporting as ordinary income the estimated fair market value of the income stream in the year of the exchange, followed by a return of capital and long-term capital gains as payments were received. The Court of Federal Claims (Judge Campbell-Smith) agreed with the government that the refund was properly denied because the change of reporting method from open transaction to closed transaction was a change of accounting method for which permission had not been sought under § 446(e). Regardless of which method was used, the amount of total income reported over the years was the same, but the amount (as well as the character) of the income reported in each year differed.

a. **Affirmed without opinion.** Greiner v. United States, ___ Fed. Appx. ___, 2016 WL 3196753 (Fed. Cir. 6/9/16). Without issuing an opinion, the Federal Circuit affirmed the decision of the Court of Federal Claims.

3. **It doesn't have to be a valid method of accounting to be a method of accounting a change of which requires the IRS's consent.** Nebeker v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 2016-155 (8/16/16). The taxpayer operated a cash method sole proprietorship that began in 1995. He included payments made by clients in the year payment was received but from 2004 through 2009 deducted the expenses associated with generating that revenue in the year payment was received even if the expenses had been incurred in a prior year. The Tax Court (Judge Goeke) held that the taxpayer's method of deferring deductions was erroneous for a cash method taxpayer, see Reg. § 1.466-1(c)(1)(iv)(a), but it nevertheless was a method of accounting that he consistently used. Thus, the IRS's adjustment to that item for tax years 2006 and 2009 constituted a change in his accounting method, which, because the IRS's consent was not secured under § 446(e), triggered the application of § 481.

UT LAW CLE THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS TEXASLAW

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the UT Law CLE eLibrary (utcle.org/elibrary)

Title search: Recent Developments in Federal Income Taxation

Also available as part of the eCourse
2016 Taxation eConference

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
64th Annual Taxation Conference session
"Recent Developments in Federal Income Taxation"