Robin Haft Trust v. Commissioner, 61 T. C. 398 (1973)

Filing agreements under section 302(c)(2)(A)(iii) after the court's decision does not constitute substantial compliance with the statutory requirement.

Summary

In Robin Haft Trust, the Tax Court addressed whether agreements filed under section 302(c)(2)(A)(iii) after the court's decision could qualify as a complete termination of interest in a corporation for tax purposes. The petitioners argued that their late filing should be considered due to uncertainty and the respondent's position that trusts could not file such agreements. The court denied the motion, emphasizing that the agreements should have been filed earlier, and that reconsideration at this stage would be unfair to both parties. The ruling underscores the importance of timely filing and the court's reluctance to allow new issues post-decision.

Facts

The petitioners, Robin Haft Trust, had their stock redeemed, and the distributions were treated as dividends under section 302(b)(1) due to the application of section 318 attribution rules. After the court's decision, the petitioners filed agreements under section 302(c)(2)(A)(iii), which they argued should be considered to qualify the redemption as a complete termination of their interest in the corporation. The respondent objected, arguing that the agreements were filed too late and that trusts cannot file such agreements.

Procedural History

The Tax Court initially held that the distributions were essentially equivalent to dividends. Following this decision, the petitioners filed agreements under section 302(c)(2)(A)(iii) and moved for reconsideration and vacation of the decision. The court denied the motion, finding that the agreements were filed too late to qualify under the statute.

Issue(s)

1. Whether filing agreements under section 302(c)(2)(A)(iii) after the court's decision constitutes substantial compliance with the statutory requirement.
2. Whether a trust can file an agreement under section 302(c)(2)(A)(iii).

Holding

1. No, because filing the agreements after the court's decision does not constitute substantial compliance with the statutory requirement.
2. No, because the issue of whether a trust can file such an agreement was not considered at this stage of litigation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court emphasized the importance of timely filing, noting that the agreements should have been filed with the tax return or during the audit process. The court cited cases like Fehrs Finance Co. v. Commissioner, which held that agreements filed after a decision on appeal did not satisfy the requirement. The court also considered the policy against piecemeal litigation and the need for finality in judicial proceedings. It rejected the petitioners’ arguments of uncertainty and the respondent’s position as insufficient justification for the delay. The court highlighted that the petitioners could have filed the agreements earlier, as seen in Lillian M. Crawford, where estates successfully filed such agreements despite similar objections. The court’s decision was influenced by the need to avoid hindsight-driven changes to settled legal positions and the importance of giving both parties a fair opportunity to present their views.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the necessity of timely filing of agreements under section 302(c)(2)(A)(iii) to ensure they qualify as a complete termination of interest. Practitioners should advise clients to file these agreements promptly, ideally with their tax returns or during the audit phase. The ruling also highlights the court’s reluctance to reconsider decisions based on new issues or theories post-trial, emphasizing the importance of raising all relevant arguments during the initial litigation. For trusts, this case suggests that they should be cautious about filing such agreements, as their ability to do so remains unresolved. Subsequent cases should analyze the timeliness of filings and consider the court’s policy against piecemeal litigation when addressing similar issues.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.