Hackl v. Comm'r, 118 T. C. 279 (2002) (United States Tax Court)

In Hackl v. Comm'r, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that gifts of LLC interests did not qualify for the annual gift tax exclusion under section 2503(b) because they were future interests. The court found that the donees did not receive immediate economic benefit from the gifted units due to restrictions in the LLC's operating agreement, impacting estate planning strategies involving LLCs.

Parties

Christine M. Hackl and Albert J. Hackl, Sr. , as petitioners, filed separate petitions against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as respondent. They were designated as petitioners at both the trial and appeal stages before the U. S. Tax Court.

Facts

In 1995, Albert J. Hackl, Sr. (A. J. Hackl) purchased two tree farms in Florida and Georgia, establishing Treeco, LLC to operate them. In December 1995, A. J. Hackl and Christine M. Hackl (Christine Hackl) each contributed $500 to Treeco in exchange for 500,000 units, becoming initial members. They gifted Treeco units to their children, their children's spouses, and a trust for their grandchildren in 1995 and 1996. The operating agreement of Treeco vested exclusive management in A. J. Hackl and restricted unit transfers and distributions, which required his approval. Treeco and its successors operated at a loss and made no distributions from 1995 to 2001.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued deficiency notices for the 1996 federal gift tax liability of Christine Hackl ($309,866) and A. J. Hackl ($309,950). The Hackls filed for redetermination with the U. S. Tax Court, which consolidated their cases due to identical issues. Partial stipulations were filed, narrowing the dispute to whether the gifts of Treeco units qualified for the annual exclusion under section 2503(b). The court reviewed the case de novo, applying a statutory interpretation standard.

Issue(s)

Whether gifts of Treeco, LLC units to family members and a trust for grandchildren qualified as present interests under section 2503(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, thus eligible for the annual gift tax exclusion?

Rule(s) of Law

Section 2503(b) of the Internal Revenue Code allows an annual exclusion from gift tax for gifts of present interests, but not future interests. A present interest is defined by the regulations as an unrestricted right to the immediate use, possession,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

or enjoyment of property or income from property. The Supreme Court has held that for a gift to qualify as a present interest, it must confer a substantial present economic benefit, free from contingencies or joint action requirements that postpone enjoyment.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that the gifts of Treeco, LLC units did not qualify for the annual exclusion under section 2503(b) because they were future interests. The court found that the donees did not receive an unrestricted, noncontingent right to immediate use, possession, or enjoyment of the units or income from the units due to the restrictions in the operating agreement.

Reasoning

The court applied the principles established by the Supreme Court in cases such as *Fondren v. Commissioner* and *Ryerson v. United States*, which require a present interest to confer a substantial present economic benefit. The court rejected the Hackls' argument that the gifts were outright transfers, focusing instead on the economic substance of the rights received by the donees. The operating agreement's provisions, which required A. J. Hackl's consent for any withdrawals, sales, or distributions, prevented the donees from accessing any economic benefit from the units. The court also noted that Treeco's business purpose was long-term growth, not immediate income, and it operated at a loss without making distributions during the relevant period. The court concluded that the gifts were future interests because the economic benefit was postponed, thus not qualifying for the annual exclusion under section 2503(b).

Disposition

The court's final decision was to enter judgments under Rule 155, affirming the deficiency notices issued by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and denying the Hackls' claims for annual exclusions for their gifts of Treeco, LLC units.

Significance/Impact

The *Hackl* decision is significant for its clarification of the requirements for a gift to qualify as a present interest under section 2503(b). It established that gifts of interests in closely held entities, such as LLCs, must confer immediate economic benefit to the donee to qualify for the annual exclusion. This ruling impacts estate planning strategies involving LLCs, as it requires careful structuring to ensure that gifts of entity interests are not treated as future interests. The decision has been cited in subsequent cases and has influenced the IRS's position on similar issues, emphasizing the importance of economic substance over legal form in determining the nature of a gift.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.