Setty Gundanna and Prabhavahti Katta Viralam v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 136 T. C. 151 (2011)

In Gundanna v. Comm'r, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that taxpayers could not claim a charitable contribution deduction for stock transfers to a foundation due to retained control over the assets. The court found that the taxpayers anticipated using the foundation's funds for student loans to their children, indicating a lack of donative intent. This decision underscores the importance of relinquishing control over donated assets to qualify for tax deductions and highlights the scrutiny applied to donor-advised funds.

Parties

Setty Gundanna and Prabhavahti Katta Viralam were the petitioners, while the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was the respondent. The case was heard at the trial level in the United States Tax Court.

Facts

Setty Gundanna, a medical doctor, sold his medical practice in 1998 and sought tax reduction strategies. He became a member of xélan, a financial planning organization for doctors, which recommended establishing a donor-advised fund through the xélan Foundation. Gundanna transferred stocks valued at $262,433 and paid a $1,400 setup fee to the Foundation, expecting to direct the use of the funds for student loans to his children. The Foundation sold the stocks and maintained a segregated account for Gundanna, which was used to fund student loans for his son Vinay in 2001 and 2002, totaling $70,299. Gundanna claimed a charitable contribution deduction for these transfers on his 1998 tax return.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued a notice of deficiency for 1998, disallowing the charitable contribution deduction and determining an accuracy-related penalty. The case proceeded to the United States Tax Court, where it was argued and decided on the merits. The standard of review applied was de novo.

Issue(s)

Whether taxpayers are entitled to a charitable contribution deduction under I. R. C. § 170 for transfers of appreciated stocks to the xélan Foundation?

Whether taxpayers must include in gross income capital gains from the Foundation's sales of the transferred stocks and investment income generated by the assets held in the Foundation account?

Whether taxpayers are liable for an accuracy-related penalty under I. R. C. § 6662?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Rule(s) of Law

A charitable contribution deduction under I. R. C. § 170 requires a completed gift, relinquishment of dominion and control over the donated property, donative intent, and proper substantiation under I. R. C. § 170(f)(8). The donor must not expect a substantial benefit in return for the contribution. Capital gains and income from donated property remain taxable to the donor if control is retained. Accuracy-related penalties under I. R. C. § 6662 may apply for negligence or substantial understatement of income tax.

Holding

The court held that the taxpayers were not entitled to a charitable contribution deduction because they retained dominion and control over the transferred stocks. The court also held that the taxpayers must include in gross income the capital gains realized from the Foundation's sale of the stocks and the investment income generated by the assets in the Foundation account. Additionally, the court sustained the accuracy-related penalty for negligence or substantial understatement of income tax.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that Gundanna retained control over the donated stocks because he anticipated and directed their use for student loans to his children, which constituted a substantial benefit. The court applied the legal test of relinquishment of control and donative intent, finding that Gundanna's actions did not meet these standards. The court also considered policy implications, emphasizing the need for donors to truly relinquish control over donated assets to qualify for deductions. The court rejected the taxpayers' reliance on the xélan Foundation's tax-exempt status and promotional materials, noting that these did not provide authority for the deductions claimed. The court found that the taxpayers were negligent in claiming the deduction without adequately ascertaining its validity and in failing to substantiate the deduction properly under I. R. C. § 170(f)(8). The court addressed counter-arguments, such as the taxpayers' reliance on professional advice, but found these insufficient to establish reasonable cause for the understatement.

Disposition

The court entered a decision under Rule 155, disallowing the charitable contribution deduction, requiring inclusion of capital gains and investment income in gross income, and sustaining the accuracy-related penalty.

Significance/Impact

This case is doctrinally significant for its clarification of the requirements for charitable contribution deductions, particularly in the context of donor-advised funds. It underscores the necessity of relinquishing control over donated assets and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the importance of proper substantiation. The decision has been cited in subsequent cases involving similar issues and has implications for tax planning involving charitable contributions. It serves as a reminder to taxpayers and practitioners of the strict scrutiny applied to deductions claimed for donations to donor-advised funds.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.