Boswell v. Commissioner, 91 T. C. 151 (1988)

To deduct losses from commodity straddle transactions entered into before June 23, 1981, taxpayers must demonstrate that their primary motive was to realize an economic profit.

Summary

In Boswell v. Commissioner, the Tax Court clarified that under Section 108(a) of the Tax Reform Act of 1984, as amended, taxpayers must prove a primary profit motive to deduct losses from pre-1981 commodity straddle transactions. The case involved William Boswell, who participated in straddle transactions through a limited partnership and claimed ordinary loss deductions. The court rejected the 'reasonable prospect of any profit' test from Miller v. Commissioner, emphasizing that a primary profit motive is required for loss deductions. This ruling significantly impacts how taxpayers can claim losses from such transactions, reinforcing the traditional profit-motive standard and affecting tax planning involving commodity straddles.

Facts

William Boswell owned a 1. 98% interest in Worcester Partners, which engaged in commodity straddle transactions involving U. S. Treasury bill options in 1979 and 1980. These transactions, executed through Arbitrage Management Investment Co. , were structured as vertical put spreads. The partnership reported ordinary losses and short-term capital gains, with Boswell claiming his proportionate share on his tax returns. The IRS disallowed these losses, leading to a dispute over the interpretation of the 'for-profit' test under Section 108(a) of the Tax Reform Act of 1984, as amended in 1986.

Procedural History

The case came before the U. S. Tax Court on cross-motions for summary judgment. The parties stipulated all issues except the legal interpretation of the 'for-profit' test under Section 108(a). The Tax Court reviewed its prior decision in Miller v. Commissioner, which had been reversed by the 10th Circuit, and considered the 1986 amendment to Section 108(a) that clarified the profit-motive requirement.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the 'for-profit' test under Section 108(a) of the Tax Reform Act of 1984, as amended, requires taxpayers to demonstrate a primary profit motive to deduct losses from commodity straddle transactions entered into before June 23, 1981.

Holding

1. Yes, because the 1986 amendment to Section 108(a) clarified that a primary profit

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

motive is necessary for loss deductions, reversing the Tax Court's prior 'reasonable prospect of any profit' test from Miller v. Commissioner.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court analyzed the legislative history and text of Section 108(a), as amended, concluding that the primary profit motive test aligns with the traditional standard under Section 165(c)(2). The court rejected the 'reasonable prospect of any profit' test from Miller, noting that the 1986 amendment explicitly aimed to clarify and revalidate the primary profit motive requirement. The court emphasized that this test applies retroactively to transactions before June 23, 1981, and that taxpayers could not have relied on the later-enacted statutory language. The court also addressed Boswell's constitutional concerns, finding no due process violation since the primary profit motive test was the standard before Section 108(a) was enacted.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the requirement for taxpayers to demonstrate a primary profit motive to deduct losses from pre-1981 commodity straddle transactions, aligning with the traditional tax principles. Practitioners must now advise clients to carefully document their profit motives when engaging in such transactions. The ruling may affect ongoing tax disputes and planning strategies involving commodity straddles, as taxpayers can no longer rely on the 'reasonable prospect of any profit' test. It also underscores the importance of legislative amendments in clarifying tax law, potentially influencing future interpretations of similar provisions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.