Rosenthal v. Commissioner, 123 T. C. 16 (U. S. Tax Court 2004)

In Rosenthal v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court upheld the IRS's position that self-rental income from a property leased to a business in which the taxpayer materially participates should be treated as nonpassive income under the self-rental rule. The court rejected the taxpayers' argument that income and losses from multiple rental properties grouped as a single activity under section 469 could be netted before applying the self-rental rule. This decision reinforces the IRS's ability to prevent taxpayers from sheltering nonpassive income with passive losses, significantly impacting tax planning involving rental activities.

Parties

Plaintiffs/Appellants: Petitioners, residents of Apple Valley, California, referred to as the Rosenthals.

Defendant/Appellee: Respondent, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Facts

The Rosenthals, husband and wife, owned two commercial real estate properties in Apple Valley, California. They leased one property to their wholly owned S corporation, Bear Valley Fabricators & Steel Supply, Inc. , which paid rent of $120,000 per year. The other property was leased to another S corporation they owned, J&T's Branding Co. , Inc. , which failed to pay the agreed rent of $60,000 per year. The Rosenthals grouped both properties as a single activity for tax purposes. They reported net rental income from the first property and net rental losses from the second, arguing that the losses should offset the income within the grouped activity. The IRS disallowed the losses as passive activity losses under section 469 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Procedural History

The Rosenthals filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court challenging the IRS's determination of tax deficiencies for 1999 and 2000. The case was submitted fully stipulated under Tax Court Rule 122. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner, upholding the disallowance of the passive activity losses.

Issue(s)

Whether, under section 469 of the Internal Revenue Code, the self-rental rule under section 1. 469-2(f)(6) of the Income Tax Regulations applies to recharacterize net rental income from an item of property as nonpassive income before netting income and losses within a grouped rental activity?

Rule(s) of Law

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Section 469 of the Internal Revenue Code disallows passive activity losses for individual taxpayers, defining passive activity as any rental activity regardless of material participation. Section 1. 469-2(f)(6) of the Income Tax Regulations, the self-rental rule, provides that "An amount of the taxpayer's gross rental activity income for the taxable year from an item of property equal to the net rental activity income for the year from that item of property is treated as not from a passive activity if the property is rented for use in a trade or business activity in which the taxpayer materially participates. "

Holding

The Tax Court held that the self-rental rule under section 1. 469-2(f)(6) of the Income Tax Regulations applies to recharacterize net rental income from the Bear Valley Road property as nonpassive income before netting income and losses within the grouped rental activity. Consequently, the net rental loss from the John Glenn Road property remained a passive activity loss and was properly disallowed under section 469(a).

Reasoning

The court reasoned that the self-rental rule is a legislative regulation authorized by section 469(l)(2), which allows the Secretary to promulgate regulations to remove certain items of gross income from the calculation of income or loss from any activity. The court noted that section 1. 469-2(f)(6) specifically recharacterizes net rental income from an "item of property," not from the entire rental activity, thereby distinguishing between income from an item of property and income from the entire activity. The court cited previous cases upholding the validity of the self-rental rule and emphasized that allowing the netting of income and losses within a grouped activity before applying the self-rental rule would undermine the congressional purpose of section 469 to prevent the sheltering of nonpassive income with passive losses. The court also considered the policy implications, noting that the Rosenthals' interpretation would allow taxpayers to manipulate rental payments to shelter nonpassive income, contrary to the legislative intent of section 469.

Disposition

The Tax Court entered a decision in favor of the Commissioner regarding the tax deficiencies for 1999 and 2000 but entered a decision in favor of the petitioners regarding the accuracy-related penalties under section 6662(a).

Significance/Impact

Rosenthal v. Commissioner significantly impacts tax planning involving rental activities, particularly where taxpayers attempt to group multiple rental properties to offset passive losses against nonpassive income. The decision reinforces the IRS's authority to apply the self-rental rule to recharacterize income from properties

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

rented to businesses in which the taxpayer materially participates, thus preventing the use of such income to offset passive losses. This ruling aligns with prior case law and legislative intent to curb tax shelters and has been cited in subsequent cases to support the application of the self-rental rule. Taxpayers must carefully consider the implications of the self-rental rule when structuring their rental activities and tax strategies.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.