Forseth v. Commissioner, 84 T. C. 152 (1985)

Losses from commodity straddles will be disallowed if the underlying transactions are found to be factual shams lacking economic substance.

Summary

In Forseth v. Commissioner, the Tax Court disallowed losses claimed by petitioners from gold and platinum forward contract straddles executed by L. M. E. Investments, Ltd. (LMEI) and its successor. The court found these transactions to be factual shams, designed solely to generate tax losses without economic substance. The petitioners were unable to prove the transactions' legitimacy or the existence of a real market. Additionally, the court upheld negligence penalties against some petitioners for failing to adequately investigate the operations of LMEI and for improperly reporting their losses. This case underscores the importance of ensuring the economic reality of transactions to support tax deductions.

Facts

L. M. E. Investments, Ltd. (LMEI) and its successor, L. M. E. Commodities, Ltd. (LMEC), engaged petitioners in transactions involving gold and platinum forward contracts. These transactions were facilitated by InterAct Trading Corp. , which promoted LMEI to investors. Petitioners, seeking to offset income, invested in these contracts, which were executed on a discretionary basis by LMEI/LMEC. The contracts were canceled or offset to generate losses, which petitioners claimed as deductions. The IRS challenged these deductions, asserting the transactions were shams without economic substance.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies and additions to tax against the petitioners, disallowing the claimed losses and related deductions. The petitioners contested these determinations in the Tax Court. The court heard the case, focusing on whether the transactions had economic substance and whether the petitioners acted negligently in their tax reporting.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioners are entitled to deduct losses from the dispositions of forward contracts in gold and platinum by LMEI/LMEC?
2. Whether certain petitioners are entitled to deduct fees paid to InterAct Trading Corp. ?
3. Whether certain petitioners are liable for additions to tax for negligence?

Holding

1. No, because the transactions were factual shams lacking economic substance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because the fees were related to the sham transactions.
3. Yes, because the petitioners were negligent in failing to adequately investigate LMEI/LMEC and in their tax reporting.

Court’s Reasoning

The court found that the transactions lacked economic substance because they were designed solely to generate tax losses, with no real market or trading activity. The correlation between the petitioners’ tax needs and the losses provided by LMEI/LMEC, the lack of margin calls, and the inability to verify transaction prices supported the conclusion that the transactions were shams. The court also noted that LMEI/LMEC’s trading documentation was manipulated to fit the tax year, further evidencing the artificial nature of the transactions. The court applied the principle from Gregory v. Helvering, emphasizing that substance, not form, governs in determining deductible losses. The petitioners failed to meet their burden of proving the transactions’ legitimacy, and the court upheld the IRS’s disallowance of the losses and related deductions.

Practical Implications

This decision emphasizes the importance of economic substance in tax transactions, particularly in commodity straddles. Practitioners must ensure that transactions have a legitimate business purpose and economic reality to support deductions. The case also highlights the need for due diligence in investigating investment vehicles and the potential consequences of negligence in tax reporting. Later cases, such as Miller v. Commissioner, have reinforced the principle that only bona fide transactions qualify for tax benefits. This ruling serves as a cautionary tale for taxpayers and advisors engaging in complex tax shelters, reminding them that the IRS and courts will scrutinize such arrangements for their economic substance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.