Schoof v. Commissioner, 110 T. C. 1 (1998)

An individual cannot serve as a qualified trustee for an Individual Retirement Account (IRA) trust, as such a role requires an entity with sufficient continuity to ensure uninterrupted fiduciary duties.

Summary

In Schoof v. Commissioner, taxpayers attempted to roll over distributions from existing IRAs into a new IRA trust managed by Donald L. Thomson, a financial planner operating as a sole proprietor. The court found that Thomson was not qualified to serve as a trustee under the Internal Revenue Code and regulations, which mandate that nonbank trustees demonstrate specific abilities and continuity beyond an individual's capacity. As a result, the attempted rollovers were not tax-free, and the distributions were includable in the taxpayers' income for the year of distribution. The decision underscores the necessity for a qualified trustee in maintaining the tax benefits of an IRA, impacting how similar transactions must be structured to comply with IRS requirements.

Facts

Donald L. Thomson, operating as Financial & Accounting Consultants, Inc. (FAC), a sole proprietorship, sought to serve as a trustee for an IRA trust that would invest in a bus stop shelter program. Taxpayers rolled over distributions from their existing IRAs into this purported IRA trust, which then invested in bus stop shelter units. Thomson had previously applied for IRS approval to serve as a trustee, but the approval letter was actually addressed to another entity, MFS Financial Service Inc. , not Thomson or FAC. The taxpayers did not report these rollovers as taxable events on their 1991 federal income tax returns.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued notices of deficiency to the taxpayers, asserting that the distributions were taxable because they were not rolled over into qualified IRAs. The Tax Court consolidated the cases and ruled in favor of the Commissioner, determining that Thomson was not a qualified trustee and, therefore, the distributions were taxable.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Donald L. Thomson qualified as a trustee for an IRA trust under Section 408(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code and Section 1. 408-2(b)(2) of the Income Tax Regulations.
2. Whether the distributions from the taxpayers' existing IRAs were taxable in the year of distribution and subject to the 10-percent additional tax under Section 72(t) of the Internal Revenue Code.
3. Whether the taxpayers substantially complied with the rollover contribution

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

requirements of Section 408(d) of the Internal Revenue Code to exclude the distributions from income.

Holding

1. No, because Thomson, as an individual operating a sole proprietorship, did not meet the regulatory requirements for a nonbank trustee, which demand an entity capable of ensuring continuity beyond the life of an individual.
2. Yes, because the distributions were not rolled over into a qualified IRA due to the disqualification of the trustee, making them taxable in the year of distribution and subject to the additional tax under Section 72(t).
3. No, because the failure to have a qualified trustee was a substantive defect, not a procedural one, and the substantial compliance doctrine did not apply.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the legal rules from Section 408(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code and Section 1. 408-2(b)(2) of the Income Tax Regulations, which specify that a trustee must be a bank or another entity capable of demonstrating compliance with fiduciary duties. The court found that Thomson, as a sole proprietor, could not meet these requirements due to the lack of continuity in case of his death, as required by Section 1. 401-12(n)(3)(i) of the Income Tax Regulations. The court rejected Thomson's claim of IRS approval, noting that the approval letter was addressed to MFS Financial Service Inc. , not Thomson or FAC. The court also distinguished this case from Wood v. Commissioner, where the substantial compliance doctrine was applied to a procedural error rather than a substantive defect in the trustee's qualification. The decision emphasized the importance of a qualified trustee to the essence of an IRA, citing Congressional concerns about the management and continuity of retirement funds.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the stringent requirements for nonbank trustees of IRAs, affecting how financial planners and other professionals structure IRA trusts. It emphasizes that individuals cannot serve as trustees due to the need for continuity beyond their lifespan. Legal practitioners must ensure that any IRA trust has a qualified trustee to maintain the tax benefits of the account. The ruling also impacts taxpayers who have attempted similar rollovers, as it clarifies that a qualified trustee is essential for tax-free treatment. Subsequent cases, such as Fazi v. Commissioner, have further defined the necessity of formal written plans for retirement accounts, aligning with the principles established in Schoof.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.