Krumhorn v. Commissioner, 103 T. C. 29 (1994)

Tax deductions for losses from commodity straddle transactions are not allowed if the transactions are factual or economic shams, lacking economic substance.

Summary

Morris Krumhorn, a professional commodities trader, claimed deductions for losses from straddle transactions allegedly executed on London exchanges. The IRS disallowed these deductions, asserting the transactions were either factual or economic shams. The Tax Court held that Krumhorn failed to prove the transactions actually occurred or had economic substance, thus not qualifying for deductions under Section 108(b) or Section 165(c) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court also upheld the addition to tax for negligence due to Krumhorn's failure to provide adequate documentation and explanations for his transactions.

Facts

Morris Krumhorn, a professional commodities trader, reported significant losses from straddle transactions with Comfin, a London broker, in 1978. These losses were used to offset gains from domestic trading. Krumhorn did not sign required contracts with Comfin, and there were irregularities in the trading documents. He made margin payments after closing loss-generating contracts, and the net result of his trading with Comfin was a financial loss despite reported gains in U. S. dollars. Krumhorn admitted the primary motivation for the London trading was tax benefits.

Procedural History

The IRS disallowed Krumhorn's claimed deductions for 1978 losses from Comfin transactions and assessed an addition to tax for negligence. Krumhorn petitioned the Tax Court, which reviewed the case and determined the transactions were either factual or economic shams, thus not allowing the deductions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Krumhorn's claimed capital losses from commodity transactions with Comfin in 1978 were properly deductible under Section 108(b) or Section 165(c) of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Whether Krumhorn is liable for the addition to tax for negligence as determined by the IRS.

Holding

1. No, because Krumhorn failed to establish that the transactions actually occurred or had economic substance, thus not qualifying for deductions under either Section 108(b) or Section 165(c).
2. Yes, because Krumhorn was negligent in claiming the losses due to inadequate

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

documentation and failure to explain discrepancies in his trading records.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the economic substance doctrine, which requires transactions to have economic significance beyond tax benefits. Krumhorn’s transactions were deemed factual shams due to lack of business formalities, irregularities in documentation, correlation of losses with tax needs, late margin payments, and account balances zeroing out. Additionally, the transactions lacked economic substance because Krumhorn systematically realized losses in year one (1978) and deferred gains to subsequent years, with no genuine economic purpose other than tax benefits. The court rejected Krumhorn’s argument that reported gains negated the sham nature of the transactions, noting discrepancies between reported gains in U. S. dollars and actual losses in British pounds. The court also held that Section 108(b) does not apply to transactions devoid of economic substance, following precedent from other circuits.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the IRS’s ability to challenge tax deductions from commodity straddle transactions that lack economic substance or are factual shams. Taxpayers must ensure their transactions have genuine economic purpose and are properly documented to avoid disallowance of deductions. The case highlights the importance of maintaining clear records and adhering to business formalities when engaging in international trading. For legal practitioners, this ruling underscores the need to thoroughly review client transactions for economic substance and compliance with tax regulations. Subsequent cases have cited Krumhorn in upholding the economic substance doctrine and denying deductions for similar sham transactions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.