Estate of Clara K. Hoover, Deceased, Yetta Hoover Bidegain, Personal Representative, Petitioner v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 102 T. C. 777 (1994)

A minority interest discount cannot be applied in conjunction with the special use valuation under Section 2032A of the Internal Revenue Code for estate tax purposes.

Summary

In Estate of Hoover v. Commissioner, the estate sought to apply a 30% minority interest discount to the decedent's 26% interest in a limited partnership that owned a cattle ranch, in addition to electing special use valuation under Section 2032A. The Tax Court held that such a discount could not be used in conjunction with Section 2032A, following the precedent set in Estate of Maddox. This decision clarified that the sequence of applying the discount and the special use valuation did not affect the outcome, emphasizing that a taxpayer cannot claim both benefits simultaneously on the same property interest.

Facts

Clara K. Hoover, deceased, owned a 26% interest in T-4 Cattle Company Limited, a New Mexico limited partnership that operated a large cattle ranch. Upon her death, her interest in the partnership was held by Hoover Trust A, with her daughter Yetta Hoover Bidegain as the sole trustee. The estate elected special use valuation under Section 2032A for the ranch's real estate and sought to apply a 30% minority interest discount to the value of the decedent's partnership interest. The estate's calculation involved discounting the fair market value of the partnership interest before applying the Section 2032A reduction.

Procedural History

The estate filed a tax return claiming both the special use valuation and the minority interest discount. The Commissioner disallowed the special use valuation, resulting in a deficiency notice. After the Commissioner conceded the validity of the special use valuation election, the remaining issue was whether the estate could also apply the minority interest discount. The case was heard by the United States Tax Court, which issued its decision on June 21, 1994.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the estate could apply a 30% minority interest discount to the decedent's interest in the partnership in conjunction with a Section 2032A special use valuation of the partnership's real estate.

Holding

1. No, because the estate cannot claim both the minority interest discount and the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Section 2032A special use valuation on the same property interest, as established by Estate of Maddox and clarified in this case.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court followed the precedent set in Estate of Maddox, which held that a minority interest discount could not be used with Section 2032A valuation. The court clarified that the sequence of applying the discount and the special use valuation was irrelevant; the key was that both could not be applied to the same interest. The court noted the absence of regulations under Section 2032A(g), which was intended to address the valuation of interests in entities like partnerships. Despite this absence, the court determined that the legislative intent was to prevent the double benefit of discounting the fair market value and then applying the special use valuation. The court emphasized that “the market discount applicable to reflect a minority interest in an entity owning and operating a farm cannot be used in conjunction with the Section 2032A special use ‘value’ that is substituted for the (higher) fair market value of the real estate component of the farm. “

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how estates with interests in partnerships or corporations should approach estate tax valuation. Practitioners must understand that they cannot apply a minority interest discount and then claim Section 2032A special use valuation on the same property interest. This ruling affects estate planning strategies for family businesses held through partnerships or corporations, requiring careful consideration of valuation methods to minimize tax liability without overstepping legal boundaries. Subsequent cases have continued to apply this ruling, emphasizing the importance of clear valuation rules in estate tax planning. The absence of regulations under Section 2032A(g) remains a challenge for practitioners, who must rely on judicial interpretations like this case to guide their planning.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.