Vecchio v. Commissioner, 103 T. C. 170 (1994)

When allocating partnership gain, if a partner has a negative capital account, gain must be allocated first to that partner to bring their capital account to zero, then according to their rights to partnership proceeds.

Summary

In Vecchio v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed the allocation of gain from the sale of partnership property when one partner had a negative capital account. Sam Vecchio, a partner in Johanna Properties Partnership, challenged the IRS's determination of his taxable gain from the sale of the partnership's real property. The court held that the partnership's allocation of gain lacked substantial economic effect under Section 704(b) due to the failure to maintain proper capital accounts and distribute liquidation proceeds based on these accounts. Consequently, gain had to be allocated according to the partners' interests, prioritizing the partner with a negative capital account (Equity Johanna) to bring its account to zero and then to reflect its right to initial proceeds. Vecchio acquired Equity Johanna's interest after the sale, and the court allocated the gain between them based on their respective interests at the time of the sale.

Facts

Johanna Properties Partnership comprised Sam Vecchio, Equity Johanna, and Lawrence Berzon, with profit and loss allocations of 47. 5%, 49%, and 3. 5%, respectively. Equity Johanna had a negative capital account of $1,251,898 at the beginning of 1980 due to prior disproportionate loss allocations. A dispute between Vecchio and Equity Johanna led to a state court order requiring Vecchio to purchase Equity Johanna's interest by September 30, 1981, or transfer half of his interest to Equity Johanna. On December 10, 1980, the partnership sold its real property, realizing a gain of $4,659,832, with $1,986,913 taxable in 1980. The partnership agreement specified that Equity Johanna was entitled to the first $766,100 of sale proceeds. Vecchio reported $563,656 of the gain on his 1980 tax return, while the IRS asserted he should report $943,784.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency to Vecchio for 1980, asserting an additional long-term capital gain of $943,784 from the property sale and $723,566 from the "sale" of Equity Johanna's interest. Vecchio petitioned the Tax Court, and the IRS later amended its answer to assert that Vecchio owned 96. 5% of the partnership at the time of the sale, increasing the asserted deficiency.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the partnership's allocation of gain recognized in 1980 from the sale of the real property had substantial economic effect under Section 704(b).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether the gain from the sale should be allocated first to Equity Johanna's interest in an amount necessary to bring its capital account to zero and then to reflect its right to the first $766,100 of sale proceeds.
3. Whether Vecchio acquired Equity Johanna's interest before or after the sale of the real property on December 10, 1980.
4. How the gain allocable to Equity Johanna's interest should be allocated between Vecchio and Equity Johanna.

Holding

1. No, because the partnership failed to maintain capital accounts properly and did not distribute liquidation proceeds based on positive capital account balances, the allocation lacked substantial economic effect.
2. Yes, because Equity Johanna had a negative capital account and a right to initial proceeds, gain should be allocated first to bring its capital account to zero and then to reflect its right to the first $766,100 of proceeds.
3. No, because the state court's final judgment and subsequent clarification indicated that Vecchio acquired Equity Johanna's interest after the sale of the real property.
4. Yes, because Equity Johanna received prior deductions and Vecchio acquired the right to the initial proceeds upon purchasing Equity Johanna's interest, allocating gain to bring Equity Johanna's capital account to zero and the remainder to Vecchio is reasonable under the partners' interests in the partnership.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Section 704(b) to determine that the partnership's allocation of gain lacked substantial economic effect due to the failure to maintain capital accounts in accordance with regulations and distribute liquidation proceeds based on positive capital account balances. The court emphasized that a partner's distributive share must be determined by their interest in the partnership when an allocation lacks economic effect. The court considered Equity Johanna's negative capital account and its right to initial proceeds from the sale as key factors in allocating gain. The court also relied on the state court's clarification that Vecchio acquired Equity Johanna's interest after the sale of the real property, thus rejecting the IRS's assertion that Vecchio owned 96. 5% of the partnership at the time of the sale. The court's allocation of gain between Vecchio and Equity Johanna was deemed reasonable under Section 706(c) and the regulations, reflecting their respective interests at the time of the sale.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of maintaining accurate capital accounts and ensuring that partnership allocations have substantial economic effect. Partnerships should carefully draft their agreements to ensure that allocations reflect the partners' economic interests and comply with Section 704(b). The case

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

also highlights the complexities of allocating gain when a partner has a negative capital account, emphasizing the need to prioritize restoring the negative account to zero before allocating gain to other partners. For practitioners, this case serves as a reminder to closely review partnership agreements and ensure that gain allocations are consistent with the partners' rights to proceeds upon the sale of partnership assets. Subsequent cases, such as Elrod v. Commissioner, have applied similar principles to allocate gain to partners with negative capital accounts, reinforcing the Vecchio decision's impact on partnership tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.