

## ***Hillman v. Commissioner, 263 F. 3d 338 (4th Cir. 2001)***

In a significant ruling on tax law, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the IRS's disallowance of offsetting management fees between related entities under Section 469 of the Internal Revenue Code. The court rejected the self-charged concept for management fees, a ruling that underscores the strict application of passive activity loss rules and highlights the necessity for explicit regulatory provisions to allow such offsets, impacting how taxpayers can manage income and expenses across related entities.

### **Parties**

David H. Hillman and Carol A. Hillman, Petitioners-Appellants, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent-Appellee. The case was initially heard at the Tax Court, with the decision appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

### **Facts**

David H. Hillman owned 100% of Southern Management Corp. (SMC) in 1993 and 94. 34% in 1994. SMC, an S corporation, provided management services to approximately 90 pass-through entities involved in real estate rental activities. Hillman held direct and indirect interests in these entities and actively participated in SMC's management services, which he treated as a separate activity from other SMC operations. During the tax years in question, SMC reported management fee income, and the pass-through entities deducted management fees as expenses. Hillman sought to treat these management fees as offsetting self-charged items under Section 469, arguing that the fees constituted a separate trade or business activity.

### **Procedural History**

The Tax Court initially ruled in favor of Hillman, allowing the offset of management fees as self-charged items. The Commissioner appealed this decision to the Fourth Circuit, which reversed the Tax Court's holding, ruling that the offset was not permissible under Section 469 without specific regulatory authorization. The standard of review applied was *de novo* for legal conclusions.

### **Issue(s)**

Whether the management fee deductions by the real estate pass-through entities constituted a separate trade or business activity, thus allowing Hillman to offset these deductions against the management fee income from SMC under Section 469 of the Internal Revenue Code?

### **Rule(s) of Law**

Section 469 of the Internal Revenue Code limits the use of passive activity losses to offset nonpassive income, unless specifically permitted by regulation. The relevant regulation, Section 1.469-7 of the Proposed Income Tax Regulations, provides for self-charged interest but does not explicitly extend to management fees. The definition of a “trade or business” under Section 162 requires continuity and regularity and a primary purpose of income or profit.

## **Holding**

The Fourth Circuit held that the management fee deductions by the real estate pass-through entities did not constitute a separate trade or business activity, and therefore, Hillman could not offset these deductions against the management fee income from SMC under Section 469 of the Internal Revenue Code.

## **Reasoning**

The court reasoned that the management fees were incurred in connection with the rental activities of the pass-through entities and thus were passive in nature. The court rejected Hillman’s argument that the fees constituted a separate trade or business, citing that the activities did not meet the Section 162 criteria for a trade or business. The court also emphasized the lack of specific regulatory authorization for offsetting management fees as self-charged items, contrasting this with the self-charged interest provisions in Section 1.469-7. The court acknowledged the potential inequity of its ruling but stated that only Congress or the Secretary could address such issues through legislation or regulation. The court’s decision underscores the strict application of Section 469 and the necessity for explicit regulatory provisions to allow offsets between related entities.

## **Disposition**

The Fourth Circuit reversed the Tax Court’s decision and entered a decision in favor of the Commissioner, disallowing the offset of management fees as self-charged items under Section 469.

## **Significance/Impact**

The Hillman case is significant for its strict interpretation of Section 469’s passive activity loss rules, particularly in the context of related party transactions. It highlights the need for specific regulatory provisions to allow offsets of self-charged items beyond interest, such as management fees. The decision has practical implications for taxpayers and tax practitioners, emphasizing the importance of understanding the limitations on offsetting passive losses against nonpassive income. Subsequent cases and IRS guidance have continued to grapple with the self-charged concept, but Hillman remains a key precedent in the application of Section 469.