Marine v. Commissioner, 93 T. C. 265 (1989)

A taxpayer cannot deduct losses from tax shelter investments lacking economic substance, even if the investments were promoted as offering tax benefits.

Summary

In Marine v. Commissioner, the Tax Court disallowed deductions claimed by taxpayers who invested in limited partnerships promoted by Gerald L. Schulman. The partnerships purportedly purchased post offices to generate tax deductions, but the transactions were shams with no economic substance. The court held that the partnerships' activities were not engaged in for profit, and thus the taxpayers could not deduct losses. The decision underscores that for tax deductions to be valid, the underlying transactions must have economic reality and be entered into with a profit motive, not merely for tax avoidance.

Facts

James B. Marine and his wife invested in two limited partnerships, Clark, Ltd. and Trout, Ltd. , promoted by Gerald L. Schulman. The partnerships claimed to acquire post offices leased to the U. S. Government, with the investment structured to provide tax deductions equal to the investors' cash contributions through purported interest expenses. However, the partnerships engaged in circular financing schemes and purchased the properties at inflated prices using nonrecourse notes. The transactions lacked economic substance, and Schulman was later convicted of tax fraud related to these schemes.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the Marines' claimed deductions and assessed deficiencies. The taxpayers petitioned the Tax Court, which held a trial in July 1988. The court issued its opinion in 1989, disallowing the deductions and upholding the Commissioner's determinations.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the taxpayers are entitled to deduct theft losses on their initial cash contributions to the limited partnerships.
2. Whether the taxpayers can claim losses in connection with the real estate activities of the limited partnerships.
3. Whether the taxpayers are liable for additions to tax under sections 6653(a) and 6661, and additional interest under section 6621(c).

Holding

1. No, because the taxpayers did not discover the alleged theft loss during the taxable years in issue and the transactions were not thefts but rather tax shelters

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

lacking economic substance.
2. No, because the partnerships' activities were not engaged in for profit, and the transactions lacked economic substance, making the claimed deductions invalid.
3. Yes, because the taxpayers were negligent in claiming the deductions and the understatements were substantial and attributable to tax-motivated transactions.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the economic substance doctrine, holding that the partnerships' transactions were shams designed solely for tax avoidance. The court found that the purchase prices of the post offices were grossly inflated, the nonrecourse notes had no economic significance, and the partnerships had no realistic chance of generating a profit. The court rejected the taxpayers' theft loss argument, stating that they received what they bargained for – tax deductions – and did not discover the loss until years later. The court also found the taxpayers negligent for failing to conduct due diligence before investing and claiming the deductions. The court's decision was influenced by policy considerations favoring the integrity of the tax system over allowing deductions from transactions lacking economic reality.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the importance of the economic substance doctrine in tax law. Taxpayers and practitioners must ensure that transactions have a legitimate business purpose beyond tax avoidance. The decision impacts how tax shelters and similar investments should be analyzed, emphasizing the need for a profit motive and economic reality to support deductions. It also underscores the importance of due diligence before investing in tax-driven schemes. Subsequent cases, such as ACM Partnership v. Commissioner, have further developed the economic substance doctrine, solidifying its role in determining the validity of tax transactions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.