Sundstrand Corp. v. Commissioner, 96 T.C. 226 (1991)

In intercompany transactions, the arm's length standard requires that prices for goods, services, and intangible property reflect what unrelated parties would have agreed to under similar circumstances, focusing on economic substance over form.

Summary

Sundstrand Corp. challenged the IRS's reallocation of income under Section 482 related to transactions with its Singapore subsidiary, SunPac. The IRS argued that Sundstrand overpaid SunPac for parts and undercharged royalties for technology transfer, failing the arm's length standard. The Tax Court found the IRS's initial cost-plus method arbitrary and unreasonable. While disagreeing with both parties' proposed comparables, the court determined an arm's length price for parts using a 20% discount from catalog price and a 10% royalty rate for intangible property, also requiring Sundstrand to include technical assistance costs as income. The court emphasized the importance of comparable uncontrolled transactions but ultimately made its determination based on the record, applying the Cohan rule due to evidentiary shortcomings from both sides.

Facts

Sundstrand Corp. established SunPac in Singapore to manufacture spare parts for constant speed drives (CSDs). Sundstrand sold parts to SunPac at catalog price less 15%, and SunPac paid Sundstrand a 2% royalty for technology. The IRS argued these intercompany prices were not at arm's length, reallocating income to Sundstrand. SunPac was set up to leverage lower labor costs and tax incentives in Singapore. SunPac manufactured parts based on Sundstrand's forecasts and used Sundstrand's technology and quality control standards. Sundstrand guaranteed SunPac's loans and provided extensive technical and administrative support during SunPac's startup phase.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency, reallocating income to Sundstrand under Section 482. Sundstrand petitioned the Tax Court. The Tax Court reviewed the IRS's allocations and considered expert testimony from both sides regarding transfer pricing, location savings, and economic comparability. The IRS amended its answer to include a claim for increased interest under Section 6621(c) for tax-motivated transactions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the IRS's allocations of gross income under Section 482 were arbitrary, capricious, and unreasonable.
2. Whether the royalties paid by SunPac to Sundstrand for intangible property were at arm's-length consideration under Section 482.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

3. Whether the prices paid by Sundstrand to SunPac for spare parts were at arm's-length consideration under Section 482.
4. Whether Sundstrand is entitled to foreign tax credits for Singapore income taxes imposed on royalties.
5. Whether Sundstrand is subject to increased interest under Section 6621(c) due to a valuation overstatement.

Holding

1. No, because the IRS's cost-plus method, treating SunPac as a mere subcontractor, was deemed arbitrary and unreasonable given SunPac's operational independence and risk.
2. No, because the 2% royalty was not an arm's length consideration. The court determined a 10% royalty rate to be arm's length.
3. No, because the catalog price less 15% was not fully arm's length. The court determined catalog price less 20% to be arm's length.
4. Yes, because despite the Section 482 adjustments, Sundstrand was still deemed to have a valid Singapore tax liability on royalty income at an arm's length rate.
5. No, because there was no valuation overstatement within the meaning of Section 6659(c) as required to trigger increased interest under Section 6621(c).

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court found the IRS's cost-plus method arbitrary because it incorrectly characterized SunPac as a mere subcontractor, ignoring SunPac's operational independence and market risks. The court rejected both parties' comparable transaction analyses as insufficiently similar. For transfer pricing, the court determined an arm's length price for parts to be catalog price less a 20% discount, considering distributor agreements with unrelated parties and customs valuations. For royalties, the court established a 10% arm's length rate, referencing higher rates in certain Sundstrand licenses and accounting for SunPac's market advantages and limited technology transfer scope compared to in-bed licenses. The court also mandated that Sundstrand include the value of technical assistance provided to SunPac as income, based on cost. Despite finding deficiencies, the court rejected increased interest penalties under Section 6621(c) because no valuation overstatement under Section 6659(c) was found.

Practical Implications

Sundstrand provides guidance on applying the arm's length standard in transfer pricing cases, particularly emphasizing the need for robust comparability analysis and economic substance. It highlights that simply labeling a foreign subsidiary as a 'subcontractor' is insufficient for Section 482 purposes; the subsidiary's actual functions, risks, and assets must be considered. The case underscores the Tax

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s willingness to make its own determination when comparable uncontrolled prices are lacking, using the Cohan rule to estimate reasonable allocations based on available evidence. It also illustrates the importance of contemporaneous documentation and consistent methodologies in intercompany pricing to withstand IRS scrutiny. The decision suggests that location savings can be a valid factor in transfer pricing but must be properly quantified and justified. Finally, it clarifies that foreign tax credits are still available even with Section 482 adjustments, provided a valid foreign tax liability exists at the arm’s length income level.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.