

Gerling International Insurance Co. v. Commissioner, 87 T. C. 687 (1986)

The court may grant summary judgment to the Commissioner when a taxpayer cannot meet its burden of proof due to non-compliance with court orders related to foreign law.

Summary

In *Gerling International Insurance Co. v. Commissioner*, the Tax Court granted summary judgment to the Commissioner after the taxpayer, Gerling, failed to comply with orders to produce foreign records, citing Swiss law constraints. The case involved a dispute over the tax treatment of a reinsurance treaty with *Universale Reinsurance Co. , Ltd.* The court held that the Commissioner's insistence on Swiss government approval for an audit was reasonable, and Gerling's failure to produce the records precluded it from meeting its burden of proof, leading to summary judgment for the Commissioner.

Facts

Gerling International Insurance Co. was involved in a tax dispute with the Commissioner over the reporting of its transactions with *Universale Reinsurance Co. , Ltd.* under a reinsurance treaty. Gerling had historically reported only the net income or loss from *Universale*. The Commissioner challenged this, seeking to audit *Universale's* books and records. Gerling attempted to arrange an audit in Switzerland but refused the Commissioner's condition that the Swiss Federal Government approve the audit, citing Swiss Penal Code restrictions.

Procedural History

The Tax Court initially issued an order on March 12, 1986, directing Gerling to produce *Universale's* books and records. After Gerling's non-compliance, the court issued a second order on April 9, 1986, precluding Gerling from offering evidence derived from those records at trial. Cross-motions for summary judgment were filed, leading to the court's decision to grant summary judgment to the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Commissioner's requirement for Swiss Federal Government approval of an audit in Switzerland was unreasonable.
2. Whether Gerling's inability to produce *Universale's* books and records warranted summary judgment for the Commissioner.

Holding

1. No, because the Commissioner's condition was not unreasonable given the constraints of Swiss law and the need to respect international relations.
2. Yes, because Gerling's failure to comply with court orders precluded it from

meeting its burden of proof, justifying summary judgment for the Commissioner.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied principles of international comity, recognizing that the Commissioner's request for Swiss government approval for an audit was reasonable due to potential violations of Swiss Penal Code Article 271. The court noted that the Commissioner's insistence on such approval was not arbitrary, given the complexities of international tax enforcement. The court also considered Gerling's failure to produce the records as a critical factor, leading to the preclusion of evidence and justifying summary judgment. The decision emphasized that a taxpayer's inability to meet its burden of proof due to non-compliance with court orders could result in a decision in favor of the Commissioner. The court cited precedents like *United States v. Vetco, Inc.* , and *Societe Internationale, Etc. v. Rogers* to support its reasoning on balancing taxpayer obligations with foreign law compliance.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of compliance with court orders in tax disputes involving foreign entities. Taxpayers must navigate the complexities of foreign law while fulfilling their obligations to U. S. tax authorities. The decision highlights that failure to produce foreign records can lead to severe consequences, such as summary judgment against the taxpayer. Practitioners should advise clients to seek legal counsel in foreign jurisdictions to ensure compliance with both local and U. S. laws. Subsequent cases like *United States v. Davis* have further explored the balance between foreign law and U. S. tax enforcement, reinforcing the principles established in Gerling.