Starker's Estate v. United States, 602 F.2d 1341 (9th Cir. 1979)

A real estate transaction qualifies as a like-kind exchange under I.R.C. § 1031, even if the taxpayer does not receive the replacement property immediately and has the right to identify and receive property at a later date, so long as the property received is of like kind to the property exchanged and the transaction otherwise meets the requirements of the statute.

Summary

This case concerns the interpretation of Section 1031 of the Internal Revenue Code, which allows taxpayers to defer taxes on gains from property exchanges if the properties are of a "like kind." The case involved a land exchange where the Starkers transferred land to a company in exchange for the company's promise to transfer other real estate to them in the future. The IRS argued this did not qualify as a like-kind exchange because the Starkers did not immediately receive the replacement property. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals disagreed, establishing that a delayed exchange of like-kind property could qualify under Section 1031, even if the specifics of the replacement property were not known at the time of the initial transfer. The court focused on whether the properties were of like kind and whether the exchange was part of an integrated transaction. This decision expanded the scope of tax-deferred exchanges and clarified the meaning of like-kind property, which would shape subsequent interpretations of §1031.

Facts

T.J. Starker and his son Bruce Starker entered into an agreement with Crown Zellerbach Corporation in 1967. Under the agreement, the Starkers conveyed land to Crown Zellerbach. In return, Crown Zellerbach promised to transfer real property to the Starkers, chosen from a list of available properties. The Starkers had five years to identify properties, and Crown Zellerbach was obligated to purchase and transfer them. The Starkers did not receive immediate possession of the replacement property. The agreement provided for a delayed exchange. Over the next few years, the Starkers designated several properties, some of which Crown Zellerbach transferred to them. T.J. Starker died in 1973. The IRS assessed a deficiency, arguing that these transactions were not like-kind exchanges, as the Starkers did not receive property immediately. The Estate of T.J. Starker and Bruce Starker paid the deficiency and sued for a refund.

Procedural History

The Starkers paid the tax deficiency and sued for a refund in the U.S. District Court. The district court found that the transactions were not like-kind exchanges under Section 1031. The Starkers appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Issue(s)

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Whether the agreement between the Starkers and Crown Zellerbach constituted a like-kind exchange under I.R.C. § 1031, even though the Starkers did not immediately receive the replacement property.

2. Whether the fact that the Starkers could receive cash in lieu of property invalidated the exchange under I.R.C. § 1031.

Holding

1. Yes, the Ninth Circuit held that the agreement constituted a like-kind exchange because the properties ultimately exchanged were of like kind and part of an integrated transaction.

2. No, the court held that the possibility of receiving cash did not invalidate the exchange, as the Starkers ultimately received like-kind property. The court considered that the intent was for a property exchange, not a sale for cash.

Court's Reasoning

The court analyzed the language and purpose of I.R.C. § 1031. It found that the statute did not require a simultaneous exchange, only that the properties be of like kind. The court dismissed the IRS's argument that the transactions were taxable sales because the Starkers could have received cash, noting that they ultimately received property. The court emphasized that the central concept of Section 1031 is the deferral of tax when a taxpayer exchanges property directly for other property of a similar nature. The court found that the transactions were an exchange, not a sale. It referenced the legislative history indicating that the statute should be interpreted to ensure that tax consequences did not arise in a situation where a change in form did not create a change in substance.

The court addressed the IRS's concerns that allowing deferred exchanges could lead to tax avoidance. It noted that the statute contained limitations that prevented abuse (e.g., like-kind requirement and time limitations). The court also addressed the fact that the Starkers had a delayed exchange right, also referred to as an "installment" exchange. The court held that the mere fact that the exchange was delayed did not invalidate the exchange as long as it was part of an integrated plan and the properties ultimately exchanged were of a like kind. The court stated, "We see no reason to read the statute more restrictively than its language requires."

Practical Implications

This case significantly broadened the application of I.R.C. § 1031, paving the way for more flexible like-kind exchanges. Attorneys now advise clients that they do not need to complete an exchange simultaneously to qualify for tax deferral. The decision provided certainty and flexibility for taxpayers seeking to exchange properties without triggering capital gains taxes. This case is significant because it allows for what has become known as the "delayed" or "Starker" exchange. The

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Starker exchange has specific procedural and timing requirements. Subsequent regulations and court decisions have further refined the rules for like-kind exchanges, including strict time limits for identifying and receiving replacement property. The decision has been cited in numerous cases involving property exchanges. Businesses can use like-kind exchanges to reinvest their capital in similar assets without incurring an immediate tax liability. The IRS and Congress have addressed the Starker exchange through legislation and regulations, creating several requirements for these exchanges.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.