Estate of Bernard J. Reis, Deceased, Rebecca G. Reis, Executrix, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 87 T. C. 1016 (1986)

An expectancy interest of a private foundation in estate assets can be treated as an asset of the foundation for self-dealing tax purposes under IRC § 4941.

Summary

Bernard J. Reis, executor of the Mark Rothko estate and director of the Mark Rothko Foundation, entered into a contract with Marlborough Gallery for the sale of Rothko's paintings. The foundation was a beneficiary of the estate. The IRS assessed self-dealing excise taxes against Reis under IRC § 4941, arguing that the contract constituted self-dealing with the foundation's assets. The Tax Court held that the foundation's expectancy interest in the estate's assets was considered an asset of the foundation for self-dealing purposes, but denied summary judgment due to unresolved factual issues regarding the benefits to Reis.

Facts

Mark Rothko died in 1970, bequeathing his estate, primarily his paintings, to the Mark Rothko Foundation. Bernard J. Reis, an executor of the estate, a director of the foundation, and an employee of Marlborough Gallery, facilitated a contract between the estate and the gallery for the exclusive sale of Rothko's paintings. The contract was voided by New York courts due to conflicts of interest, leading to the removal of Reis as executor and damage awards to the estate. The IRS assessed self-dealing excise taxes against Reis under IRC § 4941, asserting that the contract involved the use of the foundation's assets for Reis's benefit.

Procedural History

The IRS assessed self-dealing excise taxes against Reis for 1970-1974. Both parties moved for summary judgment in the U. S. Tax Court. The court denied both motions, finding that while the foundation's expectancy interest in the estate's assets was an asset for self-dealing purposes, unresolved factual issues precluded summary judgment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether IRC § 4941(d)(1)(E) is unconstitutionally vague and imprecise?
2. Whether the foundation's expectancy interest in the estate's assets constitutes an asset of the foundation for self-dealing purposes under IRC § 4941?
3. Whether the use of the estate's assets for Reis's benefit constituted self-dealing under IRC § 4941?

Holding

1. No, because IRC § 4941(d)(1)(E) is not unconstitutionally vague as it clearly

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

defines self-dealing acts and has been upheld by courts.
2. Yes, because under Treasury regulations, the foundation's expectancy interest in the estate's assets is treated as an asset of the foundation for self-dealing purposes.
3. Undecided, as factual issues regarding the benefits to Reis remain unresolved and cannot be determined on summary judgment.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied IRC § 4941 and related Treasury regulations to determine that the foundation's expectancy interest in the estate's assets was considered an asset of the foundation for self-dealing purposes. The court cited Section 53. 4941(d)-1(b)(3), Excise Tax Regs. , which treats transactions affecting estate assets as affecting foundation assets when the foundation is a beneficiary of the estate. The court rejected the argument that IRC § 4941(d)(1)(E) was unconstitutionally vague, citing previous court decisions upholding its constitutionality. The court also noted that non-pecuniary benefits to a disqualified person could constitute self-dealing, but incidental benefits were excepted. The court declined to take judicial notice of New York court findings, stating that specific factual findings from other cases do not qualify as "adjudicative facts" under Federal Rule of Evidence 201. The court emphasized that unresolved factual issues regarding the benefits to Reis precluded summary judgment.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that private foundations' expectancy interests in estate assets can be considered assets for self-dealing tax purposes, expanding the scope of IRC § 4941. Practitioners must be cautious when dealing with estate assets that will pass to a foundation, ensuring that transactions do not inadvertently result in self-dealing. The decision also underscores the importance of factual determinations in self-dealing cases, as unresolved factual issues can prevent summary judgment. Subsequent cases may reference this ruling when determining the scope of foundation assets for self-dealing purposes. The decision highlights the need for clear separation between the roles of executors, foundation directors, and other potentially conflicted parties to avoid self-dealing issues.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.