Moore Financial Group, Inc. v. Commissioner, 105 T. C. 53 (1995)

Losses incurred in rehabilitating a corporation are not considered built-in deductions for purposes of consolidated tax returns.

Summary

Moore Financial Group acquired Oregon Mutual Savings Bank (OMSB) through an FDIC-assisted transaction and converted it into Oregon First Bank (OFB). Moore then sold OFB's assets, incurring losses which it claimed as rehabilitation losses on its consolidated tax returns. The issue was whether these losses were built-in deductions or rehabilitation losses under section 1. 1502-15(a)(2), Income Tax Regs. The court held that the losses were rehabilitation losses and not built-in deductions, based on the plain language of the regulation, thus allowing Moore to offset the losses against the income of other group members.

Facts

Moore Financial Group, a regional bank holding company, acquired Oregon Mutual Savings Bank (OMSB) in 1983 through an FDIC-assisted transaction. OMSB was converted into Oregon First Bank (OFB), a state-chartered stock bank. Moore injected capital and restructured OFB's asset base by selling certain investment assets, mortgages, and real estate loans, resulting in losses claimed on Moore's consolidated Federal income tax returns for 1983, 1984, and 1985. These losses were used to offset income from other group members and claimed as carrybacks for prior years.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies and additions to tax for Moore Financial Group for the years 1980 through 1985. Moore contested these determinations, leading to a consolidated case before the Tax Court. The Tax Court was tasked with deciding whether the losses incurred from the sale of OFB's assets were built-in deductions or rehabilitation losses under section 1. 1502-15(a)(2), Income Tax Regs.

Issue(s)

1. Whether losses incurred by Moore on the sale of assets acquired from OMSB are rehabilitation losses within the meaning of section 1. 1502-15(a)(2), Income Tax Regs. , and thus not built-in deductions.

Holding

1. Yes, because the court found that the losses were incurred in rehabilitating OFB and thus fell under the exception to built-in deductions as defined in the regulation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court focused on the plain language of section 1. 1502-15(a)(2)(i), Income Tax Regs. , which states that “built-in deductions” do not include “losses incurred in rehabilitating such corporation. ” The court rejected the Commissioner’s argument that the regulation should not be applied literally, as it would render the specific exclusion for rehabilitation losses meaningless. The court emphasized that the purpose of the asset sales was to rehabilitate OFB, aligning with the normal sense of the word “rehabilitation. ” The court also relied on precedent from Woods Investment Co. v. Commissioner and Honeywell, Inc. v. Commissioner, which supported applying regulations as written unless amended. The court concluded that the losses were rehabilitation losses and not subject to the limitations on built-in deductions.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that losses incurred in the process of rehabilitating an acquired corporation can be treated as exceptions to the built-in deduction rules in consolidated tax returns. It allows acquiring companies to offset these losses against the income of other group members, which can have significant tax planning implications. The ruling emphasizes the importance of the intent and purpose behind asset dispositions in determining their tax treatment. Future cases involving similar acquisitions and restructurings will need to carefully document the rehabilitative nature of any asset sales to qualify for this treatment. Additionally, this case may prompt the IRS to consider amending the regulation to clarify or limit the scope of what constitutes a rehabilitation loss.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.