Recent Developments in Federal Income Taxation

Bruce A. McGovern

Professor of Law and Director, Tax Clinic

South Texas College of Law Houston

Houston, Texas

State Bar of Texas Tax Section First Wednesday Tax Update October 6, 2021

To obtain today's outline and slides: https://tinyurl.com/outline10-2021

https://tinyurl.com/slides10-2021

CLE Number for Today's Webcast: 174135596

Mylan, Inc. v. Commissioner, 156 T.C. No. 10 (4/27/21) Outline: item B.1, page 2

- The taxpayer was a manufacturer of brand-name and generic drugs.
- The taxpayer sought FDA approval of generic drugs by submitting an Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ADNAs).
- As required by the ANDA process, the taxpayer:
 - Certified to the FDA that existing patents on the drugs were invalid or would not be infringed by the sale or use of the generic version of the drug, and
 - Sent notice letters to the holders of the patents informing them of the certification
- Issues: (1) were legal expenses incurred to prepare the notice letters capital expenditures? (2) were legal expenses incurred to defend patent infringement suits brought in response to the notice letters capital expenditures?
- Held: (1) Yes. The legal expenses facilitated acquisition of an intangible (an FDA-approved ANDA); (2) No. The legal expenses are a cost incurred to protect business profits, not to defend or perfect title.

De Los Santos v. Commissioner, 156 T.C. No. 9 (4/12/21) Outline: item A.1, page 4

- The taxpayer was the sole shareholder of an S corporation. He and his wife were employees of the corporation.
- Pursuant to a welfare benefit plan, the S corporation paid the premiums on a life insurance contract insuring the taxpayer's life.
- The court had previously ruled that the plan was a compensatory split-dollar life-insurance arrangement.
- <u>Issue</u>: are the economic benefits of the split dollar life-insurance arrangement treated as compensation to the taxpayer or instead as corporate distributions?
- Held: As compensation to the taxpayer. If a corporation provides a benefit to a shareholder in the shareholder's capacity as an employee, the payment does not constitute a distribution subject to the rules of § 301.
 - Court rejects the Sixth Circuit's contrary conclusion in *Machacek v. Commissioner*, 906 F.3d 429 (6th Cir. 2018).

Plentywood Drug, Inc. v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 2021-45 (4/26/21) Outline: item B.1, page 7

- Plentywood Drug, Inc. is a Montana C corporation that operates a pharmacy in a building that the corporation occupies as a tenant.
- The corporation leased the building from its four shareholders (two married couples).
- The corporation paid rent of \$83,548 in one year and \$192,000 in two other years.
- Issue: is the rent paid by the corporation a fair market rent?
- Held: No.
 - The court did not accept the expert methodology used by either side.
 - Instead, court focused on the Post Office building in the small town in which the pharmacy was located as the most comparable property.
 - A fair market rent was \$171,187.50. Additional amounts paid by the corporation were constructive dividends to the shareholders.
 - Court declined to impose accuracy-related penalties.

5

Hohl v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 2021-5 (1/13/21) Outline: item C.1, page 8

- A partner transferred substantial amounts to a partnership with four partners.
- Issue: were the transfers capital contributions or loans?
- <u>Held</u>: Loans. When the partnership ceased business, the result was cancellation of indebtedness income for the partners with negative capital account balances.

Andrews v. United States, 15 Fed. Cl. 665 (5/12/21) Outline: item A.1, page 9

- The executor of an estate authorized an attorney to file a request for an automatic 6-month extension of time to file the estate's return on Form 706.
- The attorney allegedly failed to do so and filed the return late reporting tax liability of \$3 million.
- The IRS assessed a late-filing penalty of just over \$400,000 and a late-payment penalty of just over \$75,000.
- <u>Issue</u>: did the estate have a reasonable cause defense to the penalties because it had relied on counsel?
- <u>Held</u>: No. Under the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. Boyle*, 469 U.S. 241 (1985), relying on an agent to file a return does not excuse late filing. The estate did not rely on mistaken legal advice, which can give rise to reasonable cause.

Lindsay v. United States, 4 F.4th 292 (5th Cir. 7/9/21) Outline: item A.2, page 10

- The taxpayer was incarcerated and appointed an individual (Bertelson) as his attorney-in-fact to manage his affairs.
- Bertelson failed to file the taxpayer's tax returns and embezzled hundreds of thousands of dollars.
- The IRS assessed late-filing and late-payment penalties of more than \$400,000.
- <u>Issue</u>: did the taxpayer have a reasonable cause defense to the penalties because he was under a disability (incarceration)?
- <u>Held</u>: No. Under the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. Boyle*, 469 U.S. 241 (1985), relying on agent to file a return does not excuse late filing. The taxpayer did not rely on mistaken legal advice, which can give rise to reasonable cause.

Seminole Nursing Home, Inc. v. Comm'r, __ F.4th __ (9/2/21) Outline: item F.1, page 10

- In response to a final notice of intent to levy for unpaid employment taxes, the taxpayer, a corporation, requested a collection due process hearing.
- In the CDP hearing, the taxpayer requested relief from the levy on the grounds of economic hardship.
 - The IRS Settlement Officer refused to consider economic hardship because, under Reg. § 301.6343-1(b)(4)(i), such relief is available only to individual taxpayers.
- <u>Issue</u>: is the regulation a valid interpretation of the statute?
- <u>Held</u>: Yes. The regulation is entitled to <u>Chevron</u> deference and, in <u>Chevron</u> step 2, is a permissible construction of the statute.

9

Rowen v. Commissioner, 156 T.C. No. 8 (3/30/21) Outline: item H.1.a, page 12

- The petitioner was a medical doctor licensed in California who frequently traveled to developing countries to offer medical services free of charge to underserved populations.
- He had unpaid federal tax liabilities for more than two decades of \$500,000.
- Pursuant to § 7345, the IRS issued a notice of certification of a "seriously delinquent tax debt" and notified the Secretary of State that his passport should be revoked.
- The taxpayer petitioned the Tax Court for review of the certification.
- Issues: (1) is § 7345 unconstitutional because it prohibits international travel in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment; (2) does the statute violate taxpayer's human rights under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights?
- <u>Held</u>: No. Section 7345 authorizes the IRS Commissioner only to certify that an individual has a seriously delinquent tax debt and leaves all passport-related decisions to the Secretary of State.

)

Maehr v. United States, 5 F.4th 1100 (10th Cir. 7/20/21) Outline: item H.1.b, page 12

- The plaintiff had unpaid federal tax liabilities of roughly \$250,000.
- Pursuant to § 7345, the IRS issued a notice of certification of a "seriously delinquent tax debt" and notified the Secretary of State.
- The State Department revoked the plaintiff's passport.
- The plaintiff challenged the revocation in a U.S. District Court.
- <u>Issues</u>: (1) do the Privileges and Immunities clauses limit the federal government's right to restrict travel, (2) should the court review the revocation under a standard similar to that used in reviewing a writ of *ne exeat republica*, and (3) is § 7345 unconstitutional because it violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment?
- Held: (1) No. The Privileges and Immunities clauses apply only to the states, not the federal government; (2) No. Passport revocation is different from a writ of ne exeat republica; (3) No. International travel is not a "fundamental right," and therefore a rational basis standard of review applies, which § 7345 meets.