

Vines v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 126 T. C. 279 (U. S. Tax Court 2006)

In *Vines v. Comm’r*, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that a securities trader, who failed to timely file an election for mark-to-market accounting under IRC Section 475(f), was entitled to relief. The court found that the trader acted reasonably and in good faith, and granting relief would not prejudice the government’s interests. This decision clarifies the criteria for obtaining relief for late elections, emphasizing the importance of reasonableness and good faith in tax compliance.

Parties

L. S. Vines, the petitioner, was the plaintiff at the trial level and on appeal. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue was the respondent and defendant throughout the litigation.

Facts

L. S. Vines, an attorney with over 34 years of practice, settled a class action lawsuit in 1999 and decided to transition from law to securities trading. He established brokerage accounts in 1999 and began trading securities on January 28, 2000. On April 14, 2000, Vines’s accounts were liquidated due to a failure to meet a margin call, resulting in a \$25,196,151. 54 loss. Vines relied on his accountant, J. Wray Pearce, for tax advice. On April 17, 2000, Vines filed for an extension on his 1999 tax return but did not make the mark-to-market election under IRC Section 475(f) because Pearce was unaware of it. Vines learned of the election in June 2000 and promptly hired a law firm to file the election and request relief under Section 301. 9100-3 of the Procedure and Administration Regulations. The election was filed on July 21, 2000, without any trading activity or change in losses between April 17 and July 21, 2000.

Procedural History

Vines filed a private letter ruling request for relief under Section 301. 9100-3 on October 27, 2000, which was denied by the Commissioner on December 5, 2001. Vines then filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court challenging the denial. The Tax Court reviewed the case *de novo*, focusing on whether Vines was entitled to an extension of time to make the Section 475(f) election.

Issue(s)

Whether, pursuant to Section 301. 9100-3 of the Procedure and Administration Regulations, Vines should be granted an extension of time to file a Section 475(f) election for his taxable year 2000?

Rule(s) of Law

Section 475(f) of the Internal Revenue Code allows a securities trader to elect the mark-to-market method of accounting, treating gains or losses as ordinary income or loss. Section 301. 9100-3 of the Procedure and Administration Regulations permits the Commissioner to grant a reasonable extension of time to make a regulatory election if the taxpayer acted reasonably and in good faith and the grant of relief will not prejudice the interests of the Government.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that Vines was entitled to an extension of time to file his Section 475(f) election pursuant to Section 301. 9100-3. Vines acted reasonably and in good faith, and the interests of the Government were not prejudiced by granting relief.

Reasoning

The court analyzed Vines's compliance with Section 301. 9100-3, focusing on the criteria for reasonableness and good faith. Vines met several benchmarks under Section 301. 9100-3(b)(1), including requesting relief before the IRS discovered the failure to elect and relying on the advice of a qualified tax professional. The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that granting relief would provide Vines with the benefit of hindsight, as Vines's losses remained unchanged between the due date for the election and the date it was filed. The court also found that the interests of the Government were not prejudiced, as granting relief would not result in a lower tax liability than if the election had been timely made. The court determined that unusual and compelling circumstances were present, defeating the presumption of prejudice under Section 301. 9100-3(c)(2).

Disposition

The court granted Vines an extension of time to file his Section 475(f) election, allowing him to treat his securities trading losses as ordinary losses for the taxable year 2000.

Significance/Impact

This case clarifies the application of Section 301. 9100-3 relief for late tax elections, emphasizing the importance of reasonableness and good faith in tax compliance. It provides guidance on the criteria for granting such relief and the interpretation of what constitutes prejudice to the Government's interests. The decision may encourage taxpayers to seek relief when they have acted in good faith and can demonstrate that granting relief will not harm the Government's interests.