Cook v. Commissioner, 90 T. C. 975 (1988)

The per se rule for commodity dealer losses under section 108 does not apply to transactions lacking economic substance or conducted on foreign exchanges.

Summary

In Cook v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court addressed whether a commodity dealer could claim losses from prearranged straddle transactions on the London Metal Exchange (LME) under the per se rule of section 108(b) of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984, as amended. The court held that the per se rule did not apply because the transactions lacked economic substance and were conducted on a foreign exchange not subject to U. S. regulation. This decision emphasized that even commodity dealers must demonstrate actual economic loss and that the legislative intent behind section 108 was to protect dealers trading in domestic markets, not to shield transactions devoid of substance or conducted abroad.

Facts

David Cook, a commodities dealer, incurred losses from commodity straddle trading activities conducted through Competex, S. A. , on the London Metal Exchange (LME) in 1976 and 1977. These transactions were part of the so-called London options transaction, which the Tax Court in Glass v. Commissioner had previously determined lacked economic substance and was a sham. Cook sought to deduct these losses under section 108(b) of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984, as amended, which provided a per se rule for losses incurred by commodity dealers in the trading of commodities.

Procedural History

Cook’s case was initially part of the consolidated group in Glass v. Commissioner, but he filed a motion for reconsideration after the court’s ruling. The Tax Court granted Cook’s motion, severing his case from the group to address the applicability of the per se dealer rule under section 108(b). The court then held a hearing and issued its opinion, denying Cook’s deduction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the per se rule under section 108(b) applies to losses from a transaction that lacks economic substance and was previously determined to be a sham.
2. Whether the per se rule under section 108(b) applies to losses from transactions undertaken on a foreign exchange not regulated by a U. S. entity.

Holding

1. No, because the transactions lacked economic substance and were prearranged, resulting in no actual losses being incurred.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because the legislative intent behind section 108 was to protect commodity dealers trading in domestic markets, not on foreign exchanges.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the per se rule under section 108(b) was not applicable to Cook’s losses for several reasons. First, the court emphasized that the legislative history of section 108(b) indicated that the rule was not intended to apply to transactions that were fictitious, prearranged, or in violation of exchange rules. The court found that the London options transaction fit this description, as it was prearranged and lacked economic substance, thus resulting in no actual losses being incurred. The court also considered the legislative intent behind section 108, noting that it was designed to protect commodity dealers trading in domestic markets, not on foreign exchanges like the LME. The court distinguished this case from King v. Commissioner, where the per se rule was applied to a domestic exchange transaction, and noted that the legislative history suggested an exception for foreign exchange transactions. The concurring opinions further supported the majority’s view, with one judge emphasizing the foreign exchange issue and another agreeing with the majority’s interpretation of “prearranged” transactions.

Practical Implications

The Cook decision has significant implications for commodity dealers and tax practitioners. It clarifies that the per se rule under section 108(b) does not automatically apply to all losses incurred by commodity dealers. Instead, dealers must demonstrate that their transactions have economic substance and are not prearranged shams. The decision also limits the application of section 108(b) to domestic transactions, excluding losses from foreign exchanges. This ruling affects how similar cases should be analyzed, emphasizing the need to scrutinize the economic substance of transactions and the location of the exchange. It may lead to changes in legal practice, requiring more thorough documentation and justification of losses, especially for transactions on foreign exchanges. The decision also has business implications for commodity dealers, who must now be cautious about the tax treatment of losses from foreign transactions. Subsequent cases, such as Sochin v. Commissioner, have reinforced the need for transactions to be bona fide before applying section 108(a), further supporting the practical implications of Cook.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.