Weis v. Commissioner, 94 T. C. 473 (1990)

Section 483 governs the imputation of interest in deferred payment sales contracts, overriding general accrual rules under Section 461 for such interest.

Summary

Fabyan Investments, Ltd. , a limited partnership, purchased a farm for $870,000 with payments spread over six years. The contract did not specify interest, leading to disputes over the amount of interest imputed and the depreciable basis of the property. The court held that Section 483, not Section 461, governs the imputation of interest for deferred payment sales, and only payments due more than six months after the sale date are subject to interest imputation. The court also determined the correct depreciable basis for the farm's improvements and addressed various tax penalties and additions related to the underpayments.

Facts

Fabyan Investments, Ltd. , a limited partnership, purchased a farm in Illinois for $870,000 in 1981. The purchase contract required a $205,000 down payment upon closing, with the remaining $665,000 to be paid in five minimum annual installments of $11,500, plus a balloon payment due six years after closing. The contract did not provide for interest. Fabyan claimed deductions for imputed interest under the contract and depreciation on the farm's improvements. The IRS challenged these deductions, leading to a dispute over the correct amount of interest and the depreciable basis of the improvements.

Procedural History

The case was heard by the United States Tax Court. The court addressed the issues of interest imputation under Section 483, the depreciable basis of the farm's improvements, and the applicability of various tax penalties and additions to tax for the petitioners, who were partners in Fabyan Investments, Ltd.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Section 483 or Section 461 governs the imputation of interest for the deferred payment sales contract?
2. What is the correct depreciable basis for the improvements on the farm?
3. Are the petitioners subject to additions to tax for negligence under Sections 6653(a)(1) and 6653(a)(2)?
4. Are the petitioners subject to an addition to tax for a valuation overstatement under Section 6659?
5. Is petitioner Weis subject to an addition to tax for a substantial understatement under Section 6661?
6. Are petitioners Savaiano and McNamara subject to increased interest for tax-motivated transactions under Section 6621(c)?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because Section 483 specifically governs the imputation of interest in deferred payment sales contracts, overriding the general accrual rules of Section 461 for such interest.
2. The correct depreciable basis for the improvements is $93,400, as determined by the DiPentino appraisal report.
3. Yes for Weis regarding depreciation deductions, because he negligently computed them without relying on available information; No for Savaiano and McNamara, who relied on Weis's expertise.
4. Yes, because the claimed value of the improvements was 243% of the correct value, triggering a 20% addition to tax under Section 6659.
5. No for Weis regarding the interest issue, as substantial authority supported his position, but Yes for the depreciation issue, resulting in a substantial understatement.
6. Yes for Savaiano and McNamara, as the valuation overstatement constituted a tax-motivated transaction under Section 6621(c).

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Section 483 to impute interest based on actual payments made under the contract, rejecting the petitioners' argument that interest should be imputed ratably over the life of the contract under Section 461. The court found that Section 483 specifically addresses interest imputation in deferred payment sales and must control over the general accrual rules of Section 461. For the depreciable basis, the court accepted the DiPentino appraisal report's valuation of the improvements as the best evidence of their fair market value on the date of acquisition. The court determined that the petitioners' negligence in computing depreciation deductions led to underpayments, but reliance on expert advice regarding interest imputation mitigated negligence penalties for some petitioners. The court also found a valuation overstatement under Section 6659 due to the significant discrepancy between the claimed and correct values of the improvements, and applied increased interest under Section 6621(c) for tax-motivated transactions. The court noted that substantial authority existed for the interest imputation method used by Weis, reducing the understatement for that issue under Section 6661.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that Section 483 governs the imputation of interest in deferred payment sales contracts, requiring practitioners to calculate interest based on actual payments rather than economic accrual. This ruling impacts how taxpayers and their advisors structure and report such transactions, emphasizing the need to carefully allocate the purchase price between interest and principal. The case also underscores the importance of using reliable appraisals to establish the depreciable basis of property, as inaccuracies can lead to significant tax penalties.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Practitioners must be diligent in documenting and justifying valuations to avoid valuation overstatement penalties under Section 6659. Additionally, the decision highlights the potential for increased interest rates under Section 6621(c) for tax-motivated transactions, prompting taxpayers to carefully consider the tax implications of their investment structures. Subsequent cases have applied this ruling to similar deferred payment sales scenarios, reinforcing its precedent in tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.