Taiyo Hawaii Co. v. Commissioner, 108 T. C. 590 (1997)

The excess interest tax under IRC section 884(f)(1)(B) applies to foreign corporations even if the interest is not currently deductible.

Summary

Taiyo Hawaii Co. , a Japanese corporation, borrowed funds from foreign banks and received advances from its parent and another related corporation for its real estate activities in Hawaii. It paid interest on the bank loans but accrued interest on the related party advances without payment. The IRS determined that the accrued interest was subject to the excess interest tax under IRC section 884(f)(1)(B). Taiyo argued that the advances were equity, not debt, and that the accrued interest was not deductible. The Tax Court held that the advances were debt and that the excess interest tax applied, even if the interest was not currently deductible. Furthermore, the court included certain unimproved properties in the tax computation, finding them to be assets used in Taiyo's U. S. trade or business.

Facts

Taiyo Hawaii Co. , a Japanese corporation, was engaged in real estate development in Hawaii. It borrowed funds from foreign banks and received advances from its parent, Seiyo, and another related corporation, Taiyo Development. Taiyo paid interest on the bank loans but accrued interest on the related party advances without payment. On its tax returns, Taiyo reported the interest as deductible. After an audit, the IRS determined that the accrued but unpaid interest was subject to the excess interest tax under IRC section 884(f)(1)(B).

Procedural History

The IRS audited Taiyo's tax returns for the years ending September 30, 1989, 1990, and 1991, and determined deficiencies due to the application of the excess interest tax. Taiyo filed amended returns and petitioned the Tax Court, arguing that the advances were equity and the accrued interest was not deductible. The Tax Court upheld the IRS's determination and ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the advances from related parties were debt or equity for tax purposes.
2. Whether the accrued but unpaid interest on the advances was subject to the excess interest tax under IRC section 884(f)(1)(B).
3. Whether certain unimproved properties were to be included in the computation of the excess interest tax.

Holding

1. Yes, because the advances were treated as debt for all financial and tax reporting

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

purposes, and Taiyo did not demonstrate that the substance of the transaction differed from its form.
2. Yes, because the excess interest tax applies to interest allocable to effectively connected income (ECI), even if not currently deductible under IRC section 267.
3. Yes, because the properties were held for development and sale in the ordinary course of Taiyo's real estate business, thus generating ECI.

Court's Reasoning

The court rejected Taiyo's argument that the advances were equity, noting that Taiyo had consistently treated them as debt for financial and tax purposes. The court held that the form of the transaction was controlling, as Taiyo did not show that the substance was different. The court also found that the excess interest tax under IRC section 884(f)(1)(B) applied even if the interest was not currently deductible, as confirmed by the 1996 retroactive amendments to the statute. The court included the unimproved properties in the tax computation, finding that they were held for development and sale in the ordinary course of Taiyo's U. S. trade or business, thus generating ECI. The court cited legislative history and regulations to support its interpretation of the excess interest tax provisions.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that the excess interest tax applies to foreign corporations even if the interest is not currently deductible, ensuring parity between foreign branches and U. S. subsidiaries. Tax practitioners advising foreign corporations should be aware that treating advances as debt for financial and tax reporting purposes can lead to the application of the excess interest tax. The decision also highlights the importance of accurately classifying assets as used in a U. S. trade or business for tax purposes. Subsequent cases have followed this ruling, and it has influenced the IRS's guidance on the application of the branch profit tax regime to foreign corporations engaged in U. S. business activities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.