T.C. Memo. 2001-105

Legal fees incurred to defend against an antitrust lawsuit challenging a corporate acquisition must be capitalized as part of the acquisition costs, rather than being immediately deductible as ordinary business expenses, because the origin of the claim relates to the acquisition itself and provides long-term benefits.

Summary

American Stores acquired Lucky Stores and sought to deduct legal fees incurred defending against California's antitrust suit challenging the merger. The Tax Court ruled against American Stores, holding that these fees must be capitalized. The court reasoned that the origin of the antitrust claim was the acquisition itself, and defending the suit was integral to securing the long-term benefits of the merger. Despite the ongoing business operations, the legal fees were directly connected to the capital transaction of acquiring Lucky Stores, thus requiring capitalization rather than immediate deduction.

Facts

American Stores acquired Lucky Stores in 1988. To facilitate the acquisition amidst FTC concerns, American Stores agreed to a "Hold Separate Agreement," preventing immediate integration. Post-acquisition, the State of California sued American Stores, alleging antitrust violations due to reduced competition from the merger and sought to unwind the transaction. American Stores incurred significant legal fees defending against this antitrust suit. For financial reporting, American Stores capitalized these fees under purchase accounting rules but sought to deduct them as ordinary business expenses for tax purposes.

Procedural History

The State of California filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, which issued a temporary restraining order. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the District Court's finding of likely success for California but limited the remedy. The Supreme Court reversed the Ninth Circuit, holding that divestiture was a possible remedy under the Clayton Act. Ultimately, American Stores settled with California, agreeing to divestitures but retaining Lucky Stores. The Tax Court then considered the deductibility of the legal fees incurred during this antitrust litigation.

Issue(s)

1. Whether legal fees incurred by American Stores in defending against the State of California's antitrust lawsuit, which challenged its acquisition of Lucky Stores, are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Or, whether these legal fees must be capitalized under Section 263(a) as costs

associated with the acquisition of a capital asset.

Holding

1. No, the legal fees are not deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses.
2. Yes, the legal fees must be capitalized. The Tax Court held that the origin of the antitrust claim was the acquisition of Lucky Stores, and the legal fees were incurred to secure the long-term benefits of this capital transaction.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the "origin of the claim" test, established in *United States v. Gilmore* and *Woodward v. Commissioner*, to determine whether the legal fees were deductible or capitalizable. The court emphasized that the inquiry focuses on the transaction's nature giving rise to the legal fees, not the taxpayer's purpose. The court noted that while expenses defending a business are typically deductible, costs "in connection with" acquiring a capital asset must be capitalized, citing *Commissioner v. Idaho Power Co.* The court found that the antitrust lawsuit directly challenged the acquisition of Lucky Stores. Quoting *California v. American Stores Co.*, the court highlighted that the suit sought to "divest American of any part of its ownership interest" in Lucky Stores. The court reasoned that even though Lucky Stores was operating as a subsidiary, the legal fees were essential to securing the long-term benefits of the acquisition, which were contingent on resolving the antitrust challenge. The court distinguished deductible defense costs from capitalizable acquisition costs, concluding that American Stores was not defending its existing business but establishing its right to a new, merged business structure. The court likened the situation to *INDOPCO, Inc. v. Commissioner*, where expenses providing long-term benefits must be capitalized.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that legal fees related to corporate acquisitions, even if incurred post-acquisition and framed as defending business operations, are likely capital expenditures if they originate from and are integral to the acquisition itself. Attorneys advising clients on mergers and acquisitions should counsel them to anticipate the potential capitalization of legal fees incurred in defending antitrust challenges, even after the initial acquisition closes. This ruling clarifies that the "origin of the claim" test is paramount; the timing of the legal fees (pre- or post-acquisition legal title transfer) is less critical than the fundamental connection to the acquisition transaction. Later cases will likely cite *American Stores* when determining the deductibility versus capitalization of legal expenses in similar acquisition-related disputes, particularly antitrust litigation.

