

## ***Trask v. Commissioner, 82 T. C. 89 (1984)***

The determination of whether a transaction is in pursuance of a plan having tax avoidance as one of its principal purposes under section 367 requires a substantial evidence standard, focusing on all relevant facts and circumstances, rather than a mechanical application of guidelines.

### **Summary**

In *Trask v. Commissioner*, the Tax Court reviewed a transaction where U. S. shareholders of Yellowstone Petroleum, Inc. (YPI) transferred their stock to a newly formed Canadian corporation, Yellowstone Petroleum, Ltd. (YPL), to facilitate a public offering on the Alberta Stock Exchange. The Commissioner determined that this exchange was tax-motivated under section 367, denying nonrecognition treatment. The court held that the Commissioner's determination was unreasonable, emphasizing that the transaction was driven by legitimate business needs for capital and not primarily for tax avoidance. The court applied a substantial evidence standard, considering the overall facts and circumstances rather than strictly adhering to IRS guidelines.

### **Facts**

Yellowstone Petroleum, Inc. (YPI), a Montana corporation, was engaged in oil and gas exploration and needed capital to commence drilling on leased properties to avoid losing these interests. A domestic public offering would have required costly SEC registration, leading YPI's management to opt for a foreign public offering in Canada. To circumvent SEC restrictions on YPI stock, a Canadian holding company, Yellowstone Petroleum, Ltd. (YPL), was formed. U. S. shareholders, including the petitioners, transferred their YPI shares to YPL in exchange for YPL shares, which were then offered on the Alberta Stock Exchange. The petitioners offered to enter a closing agreement to recognize any gain on YPI stock sold by YPL before a specified date, but the Commissioner rejected this offer and ruled against nonrecognition treatment under section 367.

### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner issued an initial adverse ruling on February 27, 1981, followed by a final adverse ruling on June 3, 1982, denying nonrecognition treatment for the exchange under section 367. The petitioners sought a declaratory judgment under section 7477(a) to challenge the reasonableness of the Commissioner's determination. The case was submitted for decision based on the stipulated administrative record.

### **Issue(s)**

1. Whether the Commissioner's determination that the transfer of YPI stock to YPL was in pursuance of a plan having tax avoidance as one of its principal purposes was

reasonable.

## **Holding**

1. No, because the court found that the Commissioner's determination was not supported by substantial evidence, given the legitimate business purpose behind the transaction and the lack of evidence of tax avoidance as a principal purpose.

## **Court's Reasoning**

The court applied the substantial evidence standard, as established in prior cases under section 7477, to assess the reasonableness of the Commissioner's determination. It rejected the Commissioner's argument for an "arbitrary and capricious" standard. The court focused on the business necessity driving the transaction—raising capital for YPI's operations—rather than adhering strictly to the IRS guidelines. The petitioners' willingness to enter a closing agreement to recognize any gain on the sale of YPI stock by YPL further supported the lack of tax avoidance motive. The court emphasized that potential tax avoidance alone was insufficient without substantial evidence of tax avoidance as a principal purpose. It also noted that deferral of tax, inherent in any nonrecognition transaction, should not be equated with tax avoidance under section 367.

## **Practical Implications**

This decision clarifies that the IRS must consider all facts and circumstances when determining whether a transaction under section 367 has tax avoidance as a principal purpose. It underscores the importance of a substantial evidence standard rather than a mechanical application of guidelines. For practitioners, this case suggests that legitimate business purposes, especially when supported by offers to mitigate potential tax avoidance (like closing agreements), can overcome presumptions of tax avoidance. This ruling may encourage taxpayers to structure international transactions with clear business objectives and consider offering closing agreements to support their position. Subsequent cases have continued to apply this standard, affecting how similar transactions are analyzed and how the IRS approaches rulings under section 367.