

## ***Ramsay v. Commissioner, 83 T. C. 793 (1984)***

Deductions for losses from activities without a profit motive, such as abusive tax shelters, are not allowed under IRC section 162(a).

### **Summary**

In *Ramsay v. Commissioner*, the U. S. Tax Court disallowed deductions claimed by investors in mining projects offered by Resources America, Inc. The court found these projects to be abusive tax shelters lacking any genuine profit motive. Investors had claimed significant deductions based on ‘advanced minimum royalties’ paid through cash and nonrecourse notes. However, the court determined that the projects were structured primarily to generate tax benefits rather than for economic profit, highlighting the importance of economic substance in tax deductions.

### **Facts**

Ernest C. Ramsay and other petitioners invested in various mining projects offered by Resources America, Inc. , including the Venus and Boss silver/gold projects and the Rosedale and Great London gold projects. They claimed deductions for losses based on ‘advanced minimum royalties’ paid in cash and nonrecourse notes. These royalties were part of lease agreements with Resources America, which acted as the lessor. The projects were managed by U. S. Mining & Milling Corp. , later Minerex, Inc. , and were promoted through offering memoranda that promised significant tax write-offs. Despite the promises, no economically recoverable ore was mined from the project claims during the relevant years.

### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued statutory notices of deficiency to the petitioners, disallowing the claimed deductions. The cases were consolidated and brought before the U. S. Tax Court. The court’s decision focused primarily on the Venus project but applied its findings to all similar projects involved in the consolidated cases.

### **Issue(s)**

1. Whether participation in the mining investment projects constituted an activity engaged in for profit?
2. Whether petitioners are entitled to deductions for the claimed ‘advanced minimum royalties’ under section 1. 612-3(b)(3), Income Tax Regs. ?

### **Holding**

1. No, because the court found that the mining investment projects did not constitute an activity engaged in for profit, but rather were blatant, abusive tax shelters designed to generate tax deductions rather than economic profit.

2. No, because the court determined that the ‘advanced minimum royalties’ were not deductible under IRC section 162(a) due to the lack of a profit motive in the underlying activities.

### **Court’s Reasoning**

The Tax Court applied the standard that an activity must be engaged in with a predominant purpose and intention of making a profit to be deductible under section 162(a). The court analyzed several factors indicating a lack of profit motive:

- The offering memoranda were prepared using a ‘cut-and-paste’ method, suggesting a lack of due diligence in assessing the economic viability of the projects.
- The geology and assay reports were misleading, with incorrect titles and inadequate sampling methods that did not support the projected reserves.
- Resources America failed to follow accepted mining industry practices, such as progressing through discovery, exploration, development, and production stages.
- The company did not comply with federal recordation requirements and lacked adequate documentation of mining activities and costs.
- The use of large nonrecourse notes, disproportionate to the value of the mining claims, was seen as an attempt to inflate tax deductions without economic substance.

The court concluded that the projects were structured primarily for tax benefits, not economic profit, and thus disallowed the deductions.

### **Practical Implications**

This decision underscores the importance of economic substance in tax planning and the scrutiny applied to tax shelters. Practitioners should:

- Ensure that any investment or business activity claimed for tax deductions has a genuine profit motive and economic substance.
- Be wary of using nonrecourse financing to inflate deductions, as this can be seen as lacking economic substance.
- Thoroughly document and substantiate the economic viability of any project, especially in industries like mining where specific practices and regulations must be followed.

Later cases, such as *Surloff v. Commissioner*, have cited *Ramsay* in upholding the principle that deductions require a bona fide profit motive. This ruling has influenced the IRS’s approach to auditing tax shelters, emphasizing the need for a comprehensive analysis of the economic realities of any investment.