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some instances, awareness occurred after the death of the surviving spouse.

Repealed Section 1022. It was later repealed, but an executor could file an amended Form 8939 (if timely filed originally) under the provisions of Treas. Reg. § 301.9100-2(b) for any purpose except to make or revoke an election. That limitation was limiting to say the least.

Narrow opportunity for relief. An executor could apply for relief to supplement a timely-filed Form 8939 under a different regulation to deal with a basis increase that had not been previously allocated if (1) additional property was discovered or (2) the fair market value of the property was adjusted by the Internal Revenue Service.

Finally… Relief just might be possible under the general relief provision, although that was generally rated as unlikely.

Significant relief – A Long Time Coming

In Revenue Procedure 2017-34, an easing of the administrative framework of portability became reality. A simplified method of obtaining an extension of time to file a portability election for small estates that are not normally subject to filing a Form 706 was authorized.

Many of our readers recall that, in the months after portability became available, attention by those who failed to meet the requirements was focused primarily on the regulation that was available for a fairly broad range of situations. In general, relief could be granted if the taxpayer established to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the taxpayer acted reasonably and in good faith and that the grant of relief would not prejudice the interests of the Government. In early 2014 (since February 10, 2014 to be exact), IRS published a simplified method for an extension of time to elect portability. That simplified method was available only not later than December 31, 2014.

As many of our readers know, IRS responded to a flood of letter rulings after that date, some weeks with a dozen or more rulings listing as approved, some in situations where the decedent’s estate was not required to file an estate tax return. In some instances, the executor did not know about the need to file a return to elect portability or did not discover the failure to elect portability. In some instances, awareness occurred after the death of the surviving spouse.

The Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service grew weary of allocating manpower, especially in instances where estates of decedents have no filing requirement to obtain an extension of time under Treas. Reg. § 301.9100-3.

The contrast of the attitude of IRS and Treasury in the early years of portability compared to the current attitude is substantial. With twenty-twenty hind sight, IRS and Treasury both could have avoided expending scarce resources and saved money for those who could have made use of a simplified system.
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STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS. The decedent died in 1997 and
an estate tax return was timely filed. The IRS, however, determined
that additional taxes were owed. In 2004, the Tax Court entered
a stipulation decision for a lower amount of estate taxes but the
taxpayers, heirs of the estate, did not pay the tax judgment. The
IRS entered a new assessment based on that judgment on July 16,
2004. In 2013 and 2014, the IRS placed liens on the real property
in the estate and sent the taxpayers a Notice of Intent to Levy. On
October 5, 2013, the estate mailed request for a Collection Due
Process hearing. The IRS did not acknowledge receipt of the request
until May 2014, after the estate sent proof of the mailing. The IRS
eventually ruled that it was received on October 6, 2013 after the
tax. The IRS commenced the current case on March 10, 2015 to
foreclose on the tax liens and obtain a money judgment, 10 years
and 237 days after the post-judgment assessment was made. The
estate claimed that the 10 year statute of limitations thus prohibited
the current case. The IRS claimed that the request for the CDP
hearing sent on October 5, 2013 suspended the statute of limitations
until the hearing was started on June 2, 2014. The court held that
the estate was barred by the duty of consistency from denying the
mailing of the request for the CDP hearing on October 5, 2013; therefore, the statute of limitations was tolled from October 5, 2013
to the hearing date on June 2, 2014 and the 10-year statute of
limitations had not expired at the time the current case was filed.
United States v. Holmes, 2017-1 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) ¶ 60,702
(5th Cir. 2017), aff’g, 2016-2 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) ¶ 60,693 (S.D. Tex. 2016).

TRUSTS. The taxpayers had created a grantor retained annuity
trust (GRAT) in which the retained term had expired and the trust
property reverted to the continuing trust. The trust was split into two
trusts, each with two sons as beneficiaries. The trustees petitioned
a state court to further split the trusts so that each trust had one son
as a beneficiary. The new trusts otherwise had the same terms as
the old trusts. The IRS ruled that the reorganization of the trusts (1)
did not create or result in a transfer of property subject to federal
gift tax under I.R.C. § 2501; (2) the divisions of the trust into the
two successor trusts will not cause any portion of the assets of
the original trusts or the successor trusts to be includible in the gross
estate of any beneficiary under I.R.C. §§ 2035, 2036, 2037 or 2038;
(3) the division of the trust will not result in any income, gain or
loss to the trusts or beneficiaries; (4) the division of the trust will
not result in income, gain or loss to the trusts under I.R.C. §§ 661,
662, or Treas. Reg. § 1.661(a)-2(f); and (5) the basis of assets in
the original trust will have the same basis in the successor trusts.

FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS

GRAIN STANDARDS. The GIPSA has announced that it is
suspending the fees that it charges for the supervision of official
inspection and weighing services performed by delegated states
and/or designated agencies under the United States Grain Standards

FEDERAL INCOME TAXATION

CHARITABLE DEDUCTION. The taxpayer was a limited
partnership which owned a historic warehouse in New York City.
The taxpayer executed an easement deed, entitled “Conservation
Deed of Easement,” granting a facade easement on the property to
the National Architectural Trust, Inc. (NAT). The deed was signed
on December 30, 2004 but was not recorded until December 14,
2006. The taxpayer claimed a noncash charitable deduction for the
value of the easement on its 2004 income tax return. A taxpayer is
generally not allowed a charitable contribution deduction for a gift of
property consisting of less than an entire interest in that property;
however, I.R.C. § 170(h)(3)(A), (B)(iii) allows a deduction for a
donation of a “qualified conservation contribution.” I.R.C. §
170(h)(1) provides that a qualified conservation contribution is a
contribution (1) of a “qualified real property interest” (2) to a “qualified organization” (3) “exclusively for conservation purposes.” I.R.C. § 170(h)(1) defines “qualified real property interest” to include a restriction (granted in perpetuity) on the use
which may be made of the real property. In addition, I.R.C. § 170(h)
(5)(A) provides a separate and distinct perpetuity requirement that “[a] contribution shall not be treated as exclusively for
conservation purposes unless the conservation purpose is protected
in perpetuity.” Treas. Reg. § 1.170A-14(g)(1) provides: “In the
case of any donation under this section, any interest in the property
retained by the donor (and the donor’s successors in interest)
must be subject to legally enforceable restrictions (for example,
by recordation in the land records of the jurisdiction in which the
property is located) that will prevent uses of the retained interest
inconsistent with the conservation purposes of the donation . . . .”
The IRS argued that, because the easement was not recorded in
2004, the grant of the easement was not effective. The taxpayer
argued that, under New York law, the taxpayer conveyed only a
restrictive covenant which became effective upon the transfer of
the deed of easement. The court cited three cases with very similar
facts and arguments, all of which held that such an easement deed
did not create or result in a transfer of property subject to federal
gift tax under I.R.C. § 2501; (2) the divisions of the trust into the
two successor trusts will not cause any portion of the assets of
the original trusts or the successor trusts to be includible in the gross
estate of any beneficiary under I.R.C. §§ 2035, 2036, 2037 or 2038;
(3) the division of the trust will not result in any income, gain or
loss to the trusts or beneficiaries; (4) the division of the trust will
not result in income, gain or loss to the trusts under I.R.C. §§ 661,
662, or Treas. Reg. § 1.661(a)-2(f); and (5) the basis of assets in
the original trust will have the same basis in the successor trusts.

COURT AWARDS AND SETTLEMENTS. The taxpayer had filed a series of military, administrative and court cases alleging that the taxpayer had suffered “sexual harassment and reprisal actions while . . . [the taxpayer] was working as a civilian technician . . . as well as ongoing reprisals and sexual harassment in her current [military] position with the National Guard.” In
none of the complaint or allegations of sexual harassment, did the
taxpayer allege any physical injury. The parties eventually
reached a monetary settlement plus attorney fees. The taxpayer
excluded the payments from gross income and the IRS assessed
taxes on the excluded amounts. I.R.C. § 104(a)(2) provides that
gross income does not include “the amount of any damages (other
than punitive damages) received (whether by suit or agreement .
... on account of personal physical injuries or physical sickness.” The court noted that at no point in any of the taxpayer complaints, from the initial complaints to the taxpayer’s superiors to the final court case, did the taxpayer allege any physical injuries from the sexual harassment or employment reprisals. Therefore, the court held that the settlement payments were not made to compensate the taxpayer for physical injuries or sickness and the payments were taxable income. Devine v. Comm’r, T.C. Memo. 2017-111.

HOBBY LOSSES. In 2003, the taxpayer formed several partnerships which paid $6.4 million for investigations into the death of the taxpayer’s father in 1946. Although the investigations did not solve the questions about the death, the taxpayer did make an attempt to create a book about the case and sought publicity in order to attract commercial interests. Although a draft of the book was completed, no final book was published and marketed. No other commercial use of the story was made and the taxpayer’s activities never produced any revenue. The court held that the taxpayer did not operate the investigative operation with the intent to make a profit because (1) the operation never earned any revenue or profit; (2) the operation did not have a business plan or budget; (3) the operation was not adjusted to minimize losses and generate revenue; (4) the operation did not create assets which might appreciate in value; and (5) the taxpayer received personal satisfaction from the operation. The appellate court affirmed in a decision designated as not for publication. Vest v. Comm’r, 2017-1 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) ¶ 50,240 (5th Cir. 2017), aff’g, T.C. Memo. 2016-187.

The taxpayer owned and operated an automobile racing company. The taxpayer reported losses from the activity for 2011 and 2012 but small profits for 2013, 2014 and 2015. However, the court found that the taxpayer had not reported some of the activity expenses and that the activity had net losses for 2013 and 2014. The court held that the activity was not engaged in with the intent to make a profit because (1) the activity was not carried on in a business-like manner because the taxpayer did not keep separate records or bank accounts, did not have a written business plan, and did not make any changes to his activity to improve profitability; (2) the taxpayer had no expectation that the activity’s assets would appreciate; (3) the taxpayer had no history of profit from racing activities; (4) the activity had four years of losses and one year of profit, although the court expressed scepticism that the taxpayer had reported all costs in the year with profits; and (5) the taxpayer received personal pleasure and enjoyment from the racing activity. Stettner v. Comm’r, T.C. Memo. 2017-113.

INSTALLMENT SALES. The taxpayer and spouse owned an 85 percent interest in a partnership which operated an internet dating website and developed internet software. The partnership owned two other limited liability companies, taxed as partnerships. The partnership sold equipment and intangible property to the LLCs in exchange for 10-year promissory notes at 10 percent interest. The sales produced substantial taxable gain and the partnership elected to report the gain using the installment method of reporting. The LLCs claimed a stepped-up basis in the assets to equal their purchase price. I.R.C. § 453(a) provides that income from an installment sale shall be taken into account for purposes of taxation under the installment method. I.R.C. § 453(c) provides that “the income recognized for any taxable year from a disposition . . . shall be that proportion of the payments received in that year which the gross profit (realized or to be realized when payment is completed) bears to the total contract price.” Installment sale treatment allows a taxpayer to defer the reporting of gain during the period of the installment note, in this case ten years, thus minimizing current tax. However, I.R.C. § 453(g)(1) provides that this treatment generally is not available “[i]n the case of an installment sale of depreciable property between related persons.” In the case of a related-party sale of depreciable property, installment sale treatment is available only “if it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the disposition did not have as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income tax.” I.R.C. § 453(g)(2). The court found that the partnership and the two LLCs were related persons in that the taxpayer and spouse owned 85 percent of the partnership and the partnership owned 100 percent of the LLCs. The taxpayer argued that the sale had the valid business purpose of spreading the assets among the entities. The court held that even though the taxpayer may have a business reason for the sales, the actual effect was that no change in control occurred from the sale and the taxpayer received significant tax benefits through both the installment method of reporting the gain and the increase in basis of the assets which allowed depreciation deductions. Thus, the court held that the taxpayer was not entitled to use the installment method of reporting the gain because one principal purpose of the transaction was the avoidance of tax. The appellate court affirmed in a decision designated as not for publication. Vest v. Comm’r, 2017-1 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) ¶ 50,240 (5th Cir. 2017), aff’g, T.C. Memo. 2016-187.

PARTNERSHIPS

ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS. The IRS has issued proposed regulations replacing the TEFRA unified partnership audit and litigation rules. The new rules reflect the provisions of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, as amended by Protecting Americans from Tax Hikes Act of 2015, Pub. L. 114-113, div. Q, § 411, 129 Stat. 3121 (2015). The proposed regulations contain provisions and procedures for partnerships with 100 or fewer eligible partners to elect out of the new centralized partnership audit regime. Eligible partners are individuals, C corporation, eligible foreign entity, S corporation, or the estate of a deceased partner. Married taxpayers are to be considered as separate partners for the election purposes. The electing partnership is to provide the names, TINs, and federal tax classifications of all partners and must notify all partners about the election. The proposed regulations require consistent reporting of partnership items by the partners. A partner who reports an item inconsistent with the partnership return must identify the inconsistency on the partner’s tax return. As under the TEFRA rules, the proposed regulations require partnerships to designate a representative. Any adjustment of partnership items by the IRS are issued in a notice of proposed partnership adjustment (NOPPA) provided to the partnership.
and partnership representative. The proposed regulations allow a partnership to pass on the assessment of taxes in a NOPPA to the partners. The proposed regulations affect partnerships for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017 and any partnerships that elect application of the centralized partnership audit regime pursuant to Treas. Reg. § 301.9100-22T for taxable years beginning after November 2, 2015 and before January 1, 2018. See also Harl, “Protecting Americans from Tax Hikes Act of 2015 (PATH)” 27 Agric. L. Dig. 1 (2016). 82 Fed. Reg. 27333 (June 14, 2017).

ELECTION TO ADJUST BASIS. The taxpayer was a limited liability company which elected to be taxed as a partnership. During the tax year several members sold their interests in the LLC. Although the taxpayer intended to file an election under I.R.C. § 754 as a result of the sales, the taxpayer inadvertently failed to include the election with its return. The IRS granted an extension of time to file the election. Ltr. Rul. 201722013, March 2, 2017.

SMALL PARTNERSHIP EXCEPTION. Two individuals, father and son each formed a limited liability company (individual LLCs) which owned an interest in the taxpayer LLC which was taxed as a partnership. The individual LLCs were disregarded entities for federal tax purposes. The taxpayer LLC did not designate a tax matters partner. In 2001, the taxpayer LLC claimed a loss from a trust fund in which the taxpayer LLC invested. In 2004 the IRS audited the son’s individual tax return and disallowed deductions relating to expenses passed through from the taxpayer LLC but did not disallow the pass-through of the loss reported through the taxpayer LLC. The statute of limitations on the individual return expired in 2005. In 2004 the IRS audited the taxpayer LLC and in 2010 issued a final partnership administrative adjustment (FPAA) notice disallowing the loss from the taxpayer LLC’s trust investment and imposing penalties. The son filed a petition in tax court on behalf of the taxpayer LLC, challenging the IRS’s notice in regard to the taxpayer LLC’s 2001 taxes. The son argued that the IRS’s notice was invalid because the taxpayer LLC was exempt from the otherwise-applicable partnership TEFRA audit procedures because of the small-partnership exception set forth at I.R.C. § 6231(a)(1)(B)(i). The IRS obtained a summary judgment in the Tax Court on the basis that the small partnership exception did not apply and that the son lacked standing to bring the suit because the son was not the taxpayer LLC’s tax matters partner. In a TEFRA partnership-level proceeding, I.R.C. § 6226(f) provides that a Tax Court has jurisdiction to determine “all partnership items of the partnership for the partnership taxable year to which the notice of final partnership administrative adjustment relates, the proper allocation of such items among the partners, and the applicability of any penalty, addition to tax, or additional amount which relates to an adjustment to a partnership item.” Under I.R.C. § 6231(a)(1)(B)(i), an entity will not be considered a “partnership” for the purposes of TEFRA’s audit procedures if the entity has “10 or fewer partners each of whom is an individual …, a C corporation, or an estate of a deceased partner.” Treas. Reg. § 301.6231(a)-1(A)(2) provides that Section 6231(a) “does not apply to a partnership for a taxable year if any partner in the partnership during that taxable year is a pass-thru partner as defined in section 6231(a)(9).” Rev. Rul. 2004-88, 2004-2 C.B. 165 holds that a disregarded LLC which is a partner in a partnership is a pass-through entity as to the owner of the disregarded entity. Thus, the appellate court affirmed the Tax Court’s holding that the taxpayer LLC was not eligible for the small partnership exception. Because the taxpayer LLC did not designate a tax matters partner, the son’s LLC became the default tax matters partner because the LLC owned the largest interest in the taxpayer LLC’s profits. The appellate court affirmed the Tax Court’s holding the son’s LLC was the proper tax matters partner and that the son did not have standing to bring the suit under TEFRA. See Harl, “The ‘Small Partnership’ Exception: The Best Tax Simplification in Half Century Is In Jeopardy,” 28 Agric. L. Dig. 25 (2017); Harl: “Repeal of the ‘Small Partnership’ Exception: A Devious and Highly Suspicious Congressional Move,” 27 Agric. L. Dig. 41 (2016). Seaview Trading, LLC v. Comm'r, 2017-1 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) ¶ 50,243 (9th Cir. 2017), aff’d unpub. T.C. Order.

PENSION PLANS. For plans beginning in June 2017 for purposes of determining the full funding limitation under I.R.C. § 412(c)(7), the 30-year Treasury securities annual interest rate for this period is 2.96 percent. The 30-year Treasury weighted average is 2.91 percent, and the 90 percent to 105 percent permissible range is 2.62 percent to 3.05 percent. The 24-month average corporate bond segment rates for June 2017, without adjustment by the 25-year average segment rates are: 1.71 percent for the first segment; 3.83 percent for the second segment; and 4.75 percent for the third segment. The 24-month average corporate bond segment rates for June 2017, taking into account the 25-year average segment rates, are: 4.16 percent for the first segment; 5.72 percent for the second segment; and 6.48 percent for the third segment. Notice 2017-34, I.R.B. 2017-26.

The IRS has published an updated list of I.R.C. § 403(b) pre-approved retirement plans that have received an IRS favorable opinion or advisory letter. A favorable opinion or advisory letter for a Section 403(b) pre-approved plan means that the IRS has determined that the plan satisfies the requirements of Section 403(b) (these requirements are specifically outlined in an opinion or advisory letter). https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-tege/preapproved_403b_plans_list.pdf

QUARTERLY INTEREST RATES. The IRS has announced that, for the period July 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017, the interest rate paid on tax overpayments remains at 4 percent (3 percent in the case of a corporation) and for underpayments remains at 4 percent. The interest rate for underpayments by large corporations remains at 6 percent. The overpayment rate for the portion of a corporate overpayment exceeding $10,000 remains at 1.5 percent. Rev. Rul. 2017-13, I.R.B. 2017-26.

S CORPORATIONS

PASSIVE INVESTMENT INCOME. The taxpayer was an S corporation engaged in the business of farming. The taxpayer had accumulated earnings and profits. The taxpayer leased land under
a sharecropping lease arrangement to a third party. Under the lease, the taxpayer and lessee shared all taxes in the same proportion as each's share of the crop and shared equally the cost of fertilizer and soil conditioner. The taxpayer paid the cost of the power and fuel necessary to operate the drainage pumping plants as well as the cost of maintaining the irrigation and drainage canals and irrigation pipe line. The taxpayer was also responsible for paying box rent and the grower's share of the state inspection fee. Any processing expenses incurred with the preparation of crops for sale, which were related to the taxpayer's share of the crops, are paid by the taxpayer. The taxpayer determined the percentage of the property to be farmed and the types of crops to be planted. The taxpayer was at risk for crop yields and marketing. The taxpayer was responsible for providing and maintaining insurance on all improvements and fixtures owned by the taxpayer. The taxpayer paid the costs and expenses associated with the repair, maintenance and replacement of the irrigation drainage pumps as well as the insurance, water reclamation tax, water rights fees, water coalition dues and property taxes. I.R.C. § 1362(d)(3)(A)(i) provides that an S corporation election terminates whenever the corporation has accumulated earnings and profits at the close of each of 3 consecutive taxable years and has gross receipts for each of such taxable years more than 25 percent of which are passive investment income. I.R.C. § 1362(d)(3)(C) provides that, except as otherwise provided in I.R.C. § 1362(d)(3)(C)(i), the term "passive investment income" means gross receipts derived from rents, royalties, dividends, interest, and annuities. Treas. Reg. § 1.1362-2(c)(5)(ii)(B)(2) provides that "rents" does not include rents derived in the active trade or business of renting property. Rents received by a corporation are derived in the active trade or business of renting property only if, based on all the facts and circumstances, the corporation provides significant services or incurs substantial costs in the rental business. The IRS stated that, generally, significant services are not rendered and substantial costs are not incurred in connection with net leases. Whether significant services are performed or substantial costs are incurred in the rental business is determined based upon all the facts and circumstances, including but not limited to, the number of persons employed to provide the services and the types and amounts of costs and expenses incurred (other than depreciation). The IRS ruled that the revenue received by the taxpayer under the sharecropping lease arrangement was not passive investment income. Ltr. Rul. 201722019, March 2, 2017.

SAFE HARBOR INTEREST RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Semi-annual</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 percent AFR</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 percent AFR</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 percent AFR</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 percent AFR</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 percent AFR</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 percent AFR</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TAX RETURN PREPARERS. The plaintiffs were tax return preparers required by the IRS to obtain preparer tax identification numbers (PTINs) and pay a fee. See Treas. Reg. § 1.6109-2(d): “Beginning after December 31, 2010, all tax return preparers must have a preparer tax identification number or other prescribed identifying number that was applied for and received at the time and in the manner, including the payment of a user fee, as may be prescribed by the Internal Revenue Service.” I.R.C. § 6109(a)(4) provides that “[a]ny return or claim for refund prepared by a tax return preparer shall bear such identifying number for securing proper identification of such preparer, his employer, or both, as may be prescribed.” 31 U.S.C. § 9701(b) provides that agencies “may prescribe regulations establishing the charge for a service or thing of value provided by the agency.” The plaintiffs argued that, because the court in Loving v. I.R.S., 742 F.3d 1013 (D.C. Cir. 2014) held that the IRS could not regulate tax return preparers, the assignment of a PTIN did not confer any benefit to return preparers and was not authorized by 31 U.S.C. § 9701(b). The court held that the IRS had the authority to issue PTINs but did not have authority to charge a fee for a PTIN. Steele v. United States, 2017-1 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) ¶ 50,238 (D. D.C. 2017).

INSURANCE

EMPLOYEE. The plaintiff provided an insurance policy on a truck driver’s vehicles. The driver was injured while driving a grain truck owned by a company insured by the defendant insurance company. The issue was the priority of the two insurance policies in covering the injuries of the driver. The plaintiff held the priority if the driver was an independent contractor and the defendant had the priority if the driver was an employee of the truck owner. Mich. Cod. Laws § 500.3114(3) provides: “An employee, his or her spouse, or a relative of either domiciled in the same household, who suffers accidental bodily injury while an occupant of a motor vehicle owned or registered by the employer, shall receive personal protection insurance benefits to which the employee is entitled from the insurer of the furnished vehicle.” The parties agreed that the issue of whether a person is an employee is determined by “economic reality test.” Four factors are considered under the test: “(a) control of the worker’s duties, (b) payment of wages, (c) right to hire, fire and discipline, and (d) the performance of the duties as an integral part of the employer’s business towards the accomplishment of a common goal.” The trial court held that the driver was an employee because (1) the driver had no control over the driver’s work; (2) the driver could be fired by the company; (3) the wages were set by the company; and (4) the hauling of the grain was an integral part of the company’s business. The appellate court reversed, holding that the driver was an independent contractor because (1) the company exerted little control over the duties of the driver other than to assign the driver to haul grain to a particular location; (2) the driver was free to haul grain for other companies or refuse to haul any particular load at any particular time; (3) the driver submitted time reports as needed and often received some compensation in-kind; (4) the company did not withhold employment taxes or provide health benefits; (5) the company
scheduled deliveries, the driver agreed to these on a casual basis and
the driver was not required to make all deliveries; and (6) although
the hauling of grain was integral to the company’s business, the
company had other means of accomplishing the deliveries and the
driver’s services were not essential to the business. Farm Bureau

LANDLORD AND TENANT

DAMAGES. The plaintiff leased 35 acres of pasture land from the
defendant for $1000 per year under an oral lease. The plaintiff filed
a case alleging that the defendant had allowed four horses to graze
on the pasture and had prevented the plaintiff from entering the land.
The plaintiff sought damages for one-half the fertilizer used on the
pasture and one half of the rent. The defendant counterclaimed for
one year of unpaid rent. The trial court denied the plaintiff’s claims
and awarded the defendant the amount of unpaid rent. Because the
plaintiff failed to submit a trial court transcript, the appellate court
made no judgment as to the factual support for the trial court’s ruling.
However, the plaintiff included in its defense of the defendant’s
counterclaim that the defendant failed to mitigate the cost of the
unpaid rent. On this issue of law, the appellate court affirmed the
trial court in that the defendant could not mitigate the damages
of unpaid rent so long as the plaintiff remained in possession of
the leased property. The court held that the implied covenant of
quiet enjoyment, which exists in every Kansas lease prevented the
defendant landlord from interfering with the tenant’s exclusive use
and possession of the rented property. Thus, the defendant could not
obtain substitute rent by leasing the pasture for other grazing while
the plaintiff had possession of the pasture. Miller v. Burnett, 2017

NUISANCE

RIGHT-TO-FARM. The North Carolina legislature has passed
and the governor has signed a bill which amended the state right-
§ 106-702 which limits the damages in a private nuisance action
against an agricultural or forestry operation based on the plaintiff’s
contractual or business relationship with the operation. If the
nuisance is determined to be permanent, the damages are to be based
on the reduction of the fair market value of the plaintiff’s property
but not more than the total fair market value of the property. If the
nuisance is a temporary nuisance, the damages are limited to
the reduction in the fair rental value of the plaintiff’s property. In
both cases, if the plaintiff brings any subsequent action against the
agricultural or forestry operation, the combined recovery for all such
actions shall exceed the fair market value of the plaintiff’s property.

SECURED TRANSACTIONS

PRIORITy. The farm debtor had granted a security interest to
a bank to secure a loan. The collateral included all farm products,
livestock and their young. The security interest was perfected
by filing a financing statement, including a continuation and an
amendment. The debtor operated under a business name but there
was no proof that the business was structured as a separate entity.
The business established credit accounts with several suppliers under
the business name and purchased farm supplies. One supplier filed
an agricultural supplier’s lien covering unpaid supplies used for the
cattle. The debtor sold some livestock under the business name and
the supplier claimed that the agricultural supplier’s lien attached
to the proceeds of the sales. However, the bank claimed that none
of the cattle was owned in the name of the business. Under North
Dakota law, individuals or businesses who furnish agricultural
supplies may obtain an agricultural supplier’s lien by complying
with the procedures listed in N.D.C.C. § 35-31-02. If the agricultural
supplier complies with these requirements, its lien achieves priority
as to the crops or agricultural products covered by the lien over
all other liens or encumbrances except any agricultural processor’s
lien. See N.D.C.C. § 35-31-03. As used in N.D.C.C. Chapter 35-31,
agricultural products include livestock and their products. The
bank argued that the supplier’s lien was invalid as to the cattle sold
because the lien incorrectly listed the business as the owner of the
livestock which were actually owned individually by the debtor.
The court acknowledge a conflict of evidence as to the ownership
of the cattle on the dates of the sales and held that the agricultural
supplier’s lien was properly perfected as to the cattle sold under
the business name. In re McDougall, 2017 Bankr. LEXIS 1465

FARM ESTATE AND
BUSINESS PLANNING

by Neil E. Harl

The Agricultural Law Press is honored to publish the revised
19th Edition of Dr. Neil E. Harl’s excellent guide for farmers
and ranchers who want to make the most of the state and federal
income and estate tax laws to assure the least expensive and most
efficient transfer of their estates to their children and heirs. The
19th Edition includes all new income and estate tax developments.
We also offer a PDF version for computer and tablet use for
$25.00.

Print and digital copies can be ordered directly from the Press
by sending a check for $35 (print version) or $25 (PDF version) to
Agricultural Law Press, 127 Young Rd., Kelso, WA 98626. Please
include your e-mail address if ordering the PDF version and the
digital file will be e-mailed to you.

Credit card purchases can be made online at www.agrilawpress.
com or by calling Robert at 360-200-5666 in Kelso, WA.

For more information, including discounts for purchases of more
than 10 books, contact robert@agrilawpress.com.
AGRICULTURAL TAX SEMINARS

by Neil E. Harl

August 24-25, 2017 & October 30-31, 2017 - Quality Inn, Ames, IA

Join us for expert and practical seminars on the essential aspects of agricultural tax law. Gain insight and understanding from one of the country’s foremost authorities on agricultural tax law. The seminars will be held on two days from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm. Registrants may attend one or both days. On the first day, Dr. Harl will speak about farm and ranch estate and business planning. On the second day, Dr. Harl will cover farm and ranch income tax. Your registration fee includes written comprehensive annotated seminar materials for the days attended and lunch. A discount ($25/day) is offered for attendees who elect to receive the manuals in PDF format only (see registration form online for use restrictions on PDF files).

The topics include:

First day

FARM ESTATE AND BUSINESS PLANNING

New Legislation
Succession planning and the importance of fairness
The Liquidity Problem
Property Held in Co-ownership
Federal estate tax treatment of joint tenancy
Severing joint tenancies and resulting basis
Joint tenancy and probate avoidance
Joint tenancy ownership of personal property
Other problems of property ownership

Federal Estate Tax
The gross estate
Special use valuation
Property included in the gross estate
Traps in use of successive life estates
Basis calculations under uniform basis rules
Valuing growing crops
Claiming deductions from the gross estate
Marital and charitable deductions
Taxable estate
The applicable exclusion amount
Unified estate and gift tax rates
Portability and the regulations
Federal estate tax liens
Gifts to charity with a retained life estate

Use of the Trust
The General Partnership
Small partnership exception
Eligibility for Section 754 elections

Limited Partnerships
Limited Liability Companies
Developments with passive losses
Corporate-to-LLC conversions

New regulations for LLC and LLP losses
Closely Held Corporations
State anti-corporate farming restrictions
Developing the capitalization structure
Tax-free exchanges
Would incorporation trigger a gift because of severance of land held in joint tenancy?
“Section 1244” stock
Status of the corporation as a farmer
The regular method of income taxation
The Subchapter S method of taxation, including the “two-year” rule for trust ownership of stock
Underpayment of wages and salaries
Financing, Estate Planning Aspects and Dissolution of Corporations
Corporate stock as a major estate asset
Valuation discounts
Dissolution and liquidation
Reorganization
Entity Sale
Stock redemption

Social Security
In-kind wages paid to agricultural labor

Second day

FARM INCOME TAX

New Legislation

Reporting Farm Income
Constructive receipt of income
Deferred payment and installment payment arrangements for grain and livestock sales
Using escrow accounts
Payments from contract production
Items purchased for resale
Items raised for sale
Leasing land to family entity
Crop insurance proceeds
Weather-related livestock sales

Sales of diseased livestock
Reporting federal disaster assistance benefits
Gains and losses from commodity futures, including consequences of exceeding the $5 million limit

Claiming Farm Deductions
Soil and water conservation expenditures
Fertilizer deduction election
Depreciating farm tile lines
Farm lease deductions
Prepaid expenses
Preproductive period expense provisions
Regular depreciation, expense method depreciation, bonus depreciation
Repairs and Form 3115; changing from accrual to cash accounting
Paying rental to a spouse
Paying wages in kind
PPACA issues including scope of 3.8 percent tax

Sale of Property
Income in respect of decedent
Sale of farm residence
Installment sale including related party rules
Private annuity
Self-canceling installment notes
Sale and gift combined.

Like-Kind Exchanges
Requirements for like-kind exchanges
“Reverse Starker” exchanges
What is “like-kind” for realty
Like-kind guidelines for personal property
Partitioning property
Problems in Exchanges of partnership assets

Taxation of Debt
Turnover of property to creditors
Discharge of indebtedness
Taxation in bankruptcy.

Self-employment tax
Meaning of “business”

The seminar registration fees for each of multiple registrations from the same firm and for current subscribers to the Agricultural Law Digest, the Agricultural Law Manual, or Farm Estate and Business Planning are $225 (one day) and $400 (two days). The registration fees for nonsubscribers are $250 (one day) and $450 (two days). Nonsubscribers may obtain the discounted fees by purchasing any one or more of our publications. See www.agrilawpress.com for online book and newsletter purchasing.

Contact Robert Achenbach at 360-200-5666, or e-mail Robert@agrilawpress.com for a brochure.
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