Ancira v. Commissioner, 119 T. C. 135 (U. S. Tax Court 2002)

In Ancira v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that Robert Ancira did not receive a taxable distribution from his IRA when he facilitated the purchase of non-publicly traded stock on behalf of his IRA. The court held that Ancira acted merely as a conduit for the IRA's custodian, Pershing, and thus the transaction did not constitute a distribution under IRS regulations. This decision clarifies the legal bounds of IRA transactions, offering guidance on permissible actions by IRA holders in facilitating investments.

Parties

Robert Ancira was the petitioner, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was the respondent. Ancira was the taxpayer at the trial level and remained the petitioner throughout the proceedings before the U. S. Tax Court.

Facts

Robert Ancira maintained a self-directed IRA with Pershing as the custodian and Hibernia Investments as the investment advisor. In 1998, Ancira sought to invest $40,000 from his IRA in S. K. /R. M. A. , Inc. (Smoothie King) stock, which was not publicly traded. Pershing, due to its policy, would not purchase the stock directly but agreed to issue a check payable to Smoothie King if Ancira instructed them to do so. Ancira filled out a distribution request form, and Pershing issued a check for $40,000 to Smoothie King, which was sent to Ancira. Ancira forwarded the check to Smoothie King, which then issued 714. 28 shares of stock to Ancira's IRA. The stock was later physically transferred to Pershing, and Pershing issued a Form 1099-R indicating a distribution to Ancira, which he did not report on his 1998 tax return.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency of $17,393 and a section 6662 accuracy-related penalty of $3,479 in Ancira's 1998 Federal income tax. After concessions, the issue narrowed to whether the transaction with Smoothie King constituted a taxable distribution from Ancira's IRA. The case was submitted fully stipulated to the U. S. Tax Court under Rule 122 and assigned to Special Trial Judge Carleton D. Powell. The court's decision was that no distribution occurred, and the case was to be entered under Rule 155 for computation of the tax liability based on the court's holding.

Issue(s)

Whether the transaction involving the purchase of Smoothie King stock, where Ancira acted as a conduit for the IRA's custodian, constituted a taxable distribution from Ancira's IRA under section 408(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Rule(s) of Law

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Section 408(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code states that “any amount paid or distributed out of an individual retirement plan shall be included in gross income by the * * * distributee * * * in the manner provided under section 72. ” The court also considered the principle from Diamond v. Commissioner, 56 T. C. 530 (1971), affd. 492 F. 2d 286 (7th Cir. 1974), that a taxpayer need not treat as income moneys which he did not receive under a claim of right, which were not his to keep, and which he was required to transmit to someone else as a mere conduit.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that the transaction did not result in a taxable distribution to Ancira from his IRA. Ancira acted as a conduit for Pershing in facilitating the investment, and thus the check’s issuance to Smoothie King and subsequent transfer of stock to the IRA did not constitute a distribution under section 408(d)(1).

Reasoning

The court reasoned that Ancira’s actions were consistent with his role as a conduit for the IRA custodian, Pershing. The check was made payable to Smoothie King and was never negotiated by Ancira, nor was he in constructive receipt of the funds. The court distinguished this case from Lemishow v. Commissioner, 110 T. C. 110 (1998), as Ancira did not receive cash but facilitated the investment directly from his IRA to the stock issuer. The court also noted that the delayed transfer of the stock certificate did not alter the IRA’s ownership of the shares, drawing a parallel to Wood v. Commissioner, 93 T. C. 114 (1989), where a bookkeeping error did not invalidate a transaction. The court’s decision was grounded in the legal principle that funds not received under a claim of right and not subject to the taxpayer’s unfettered command are not constructively received income.

Disposition

The court ruled in favor of Ancira, finding that no taxable distribution occurred from his IRA. The case was to be entered under Rule 155 for the computation of any remaining tax liability.

Significance/Impact

The Ancira decision is significant for clarifying the extent to which an IRA holder may act as a conduit for their IRA’s custodian without triggering a taxable distribution. This ruling provides guidance for IRA holders on permissible actions in facilitating investments, particularly in non-publicly traded securities. It underscores the importance of the nature of control over funds and the legal concept of conduit transactions in the context of retirement accounts. Subsequent cases and IRS guidance have referenced Ancira in defining the boundaries of IRA transactions and the concept of constructive receipt.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.