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RESALE OF LAND PURCHASED UNDER INSTALLMENT OBLIGATION

— by Neil E. Harl*

For decades, taxpayers have tried various strategies for selling land, qualifying the transaction for installment reporting of the gain with the land then resold to a third party for cash. Often, the initial transaction involved related parties with the resale typically made to a developer who paid cash and received title to the property. The result of the two stage transaction, if successful, was to have the initial buyer in possession of the full purchase price with the initial buyer making payments to the initial seller who reports the gain over the period of the installment obligation.

Escrow arrangements

For several years, taxpayers tried to achieve the desired result with various types of escrow arrangements. A few succeeded but most were unsuccessful. Even a court-ordered escrow arrangement was not successful in delaying recognition of gain.

"Two-year" rule

However, since May 14, 1980, dispositions of property within two years after a sale between related parties triggers recognition of gain by the initial seller based on the seller's gross profit ratio to the extent the amount realized from the second disposition exceeds actual payments made under the installment sale. Thus, acceleration of recognition of gain from the first sale generally results to the extent additional cash and other property flow into the related group as a result of the second disposition of the property. For a second disposition which is not a sale or exchange, the fair market value of the property disposed of is treated as the amount realized.

For installment sales of marketable stock and securities, the resale rule applies without a time limit for resale occurring before the installment obligation is satisfied. However, the disposition rules do not apply in four situations —

• On involuntary conversion of the property.
• On transfers after the death of the installment seller or buyer.
• Where it is established to the satisfaction of the Internal Revenue Service that none of the dispositions had as one of its principal purposes income tax avoidance.
• On sale or exchange of stock to the issuing corporation.

The two-year disposition rule adopts a definition of related party that includes the spouse, children, grandchildren, parents and brothers and sisters. A corporation is considered to be related to another corporation if so related under the I.R.C. § 318 attribution rules. Similarly, attribution rules apply to partnerships, trusts and estates.

Sales of depreciable property between related parties

For sales of depreciable property between closely related parties, the deferred payments are deemed to be received in the taxable year of sale. This rule calls for careful planning attention for virtually all farm and ranch installment sale transactions.

In conclusion

Every installment transaction involving related parties should be subjected to close scrutiny as to all transfers occurring after the initial sale. Any transfer of farm property within two years should be limited to the situations outlined in the exceptions to the rule on recognition of gain or the parties should be prepared to report any deferred gain into income.

* Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor in Agriculture and Professor of Economics, Iowa State University; member of the Iowa Bar.
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6. I.R.C. § 453(e)(1), (3). See Tecumseh Corrugated Box Co. v. Comm’r, 94 T.C. 360 (1990), aff’d, 932 F.2d 526 (6th Cir. 1991) (transfer of property to trust which later assigned property to partnership formed by same parties followed by sale to U.S. Government; transaction represented second disposition by related party).
15. Id. See Ltr. Rul. 8829002, March 18, 1988 (partner owning 40 percent of partnership which received in liquidation of corporation installment obligation for property purchased by partners from corporation was not related to partner’s father who was 60 percent partner; transfer of installment obligation owned by 40 percent shareholder to partnership in liquidation of corporation not disposition of installment obligation causing recognition of all gain where shareholder became 40 percent partner in acquiring partnership and transfer not shown or made for principal purpose of avoiding income tax).
16. I.R.C. §§ 453(g), 1239.
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GENERAL ASSET ACCOUNT DEPRECIATION
The IRS has issued proposed regulations which simplify the computation of depreciation by allowing taxpayers to group assets in one or more general asset accounts with the assets in any particular asset account depreciated as a single asset. The regulations apply to assets placed in service in taxable years ending on or after the date of publication of the final regulation. For prior taxable years, the IRS indicated that it will allow use of any reasonable method that clearly reflects income and is consistently applied to the general asset accounts.

A general asset account includes assets with the same asset class, depreciation method, recovery period and convention which are placed in service in the same taxable year. An asset may not be placed in a general asset account if (1) a credit is claimed under I.R.C. § 47 or § 48, (2) the asset is used in a passive activity, or (3) the asset is used predominantly outside the United States or involves foreign sourced income.

The amount realized upon the disposition of an asset in a general asset account is recognized as ordinary income limited to the unadjusted depreciable basis of the account (disregarding any election under I.R.C. §§ 179, 190) less any amounts previously recognized as ordinary income at the time of disposition. The disposition of an asset does not affect the depreciation claimed on the general asset account. Typically, the entire disposition price is reportable as ordinary income.

A special rule is provided that gain or loss from the disposition of all of the assets or the last asset from the general asset account is determined with reference to the adjusted depreciable basis at termination (the remaining basis). A taxpayer may terminate general asset account treatment for a particular asset if the asset is disposed of as the result of a casualty, charitable contribution, the cessation of a business or in transactions to which nonrecognition provisions apply.

An anti-abuse rule specifies that if an asset in a general asset account is disposed of in a transaction one of the principal purposes of which is to avoid net operating loss limitations or the use of a credit, the disposition of the asset is treated as though a general asset election had never been made for the asset.

The election to apply the general asset account rules is to be made on a timely filed return, including extensions, for the tax year the assets are placed in service. The election is made by typing or printing "GENERAL ASSET ACCOUNT ELECTION MADE UNDER SECTION 168(i)(4)" on the top of Form 4562. 57 Fed. Reg. 39374 (Aug. 31, 1992), adding Prop. Treas. Reg. §§ 1.168(i)-1, 1.56(g)-1.

CASES, REGULATIONS AND STATUTES
by Robert P. Achenbach, Jr.

ADVERSE POSSESSION
LACHES. In 1978, the plaintiff landlord conveyed an irregular shaped partial of land to the defendant who farmed the surrounding land as a tenant of the plaintiff. In building a homestead on the property, the tenant made minor encroachments of the plaintiff’s land in building a pond, driveway and drainage pipe. When the plaintiff became aware of the encroachments, the plaintiff included in the 1982 lease a provision by which the tenant waived any right to the encroachments. The plaintiff then filed an action in 1987 to clear title to the encroachments in the plaintiff. The