Superior Trading, LLC v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 137 T. C. 70 (2011)

The U. S. Tax Court ruled against Superior Trading, LLC, and related entities, denying them tax deductions for losses claimed on distressed Brazilian consumer receivables. The court determined that no valid partnership was formed, and the receivables had zero basis. The decision highlights the importance of substance over form in tax transactions and upholds accuracy-related penalties for gross valuation misstatements.

Parties

Superior Trading, LLC, along with other related entities such as Nero Trading, LLC, Pawn Trading, LLC, and Warwick Trading, LLC, were the petitioners. Jetstream Business Limited served as the tax matters partner for most of these entities. The respondent was the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Facts

Superior Trading, LLC, and related entities claimed losses on distressed consumer receivables acquired from Lojas Arapua, S. A. , a Brazilian retailer in bankruptcy reorganization. These receivables were purportedly contributed to Warwick Trading, LLC, by Arapua in exchange for a 99% membership interest. Warwick subsequently transferred portions of the receivables to various trading companies, which then claimed deductions for partially worthless debts. Individual U. S. investors acquired interests in these trading companies through holding companies. The IRS challenged these deductions, asserting that the receivables had zero basis and that the transactions lacked economic substance.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of final partnership administrative adjustment (FPAAs) denying the deductions and adjusting the partnerships' bases in the receivables to zero. The petitioners challenged these adjustments in the U. S. Tax Court, which conducted a trial in October 2009. The court upheld the IRS's determinations, ruling that no valid partnership was formed and that the receivables had zero basis.

Issue(s)

Whether a bona fide partnership was formed for Federal tax purposes between Arapua and Warwick for the purpose of servicing and collecting distressed consumer receivables?

Whether Arapua made a valid contribution of the consumer receivables to the purported partnership under section 721?

Whether the receivables should receive carryover basis treatment under section

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

723?

Whether the claimed contribution and subsequent redemption from the purported partnership should be collapsed into a single transaction and recharacterized as a sale of the receivables?

Whether the section 6662 accuracy-related penalties apply due to gross valuation misstatements?

Rule(s) of Law

Under section 721(a), the basis of property contributed to a partnership is preserved, deferring unrecognized gain or loss until realized by the partnership. However, section 721(a) only applies to contributions in exchange for a partnership interest. Section 707(a)(2)(B) allows for the recharacterization of partner contributions as sales if the partner receives distributions considered as consideration for the contributed property. The step transaction doctrine may be invoked to disregard intermediate steps in a transaction and focus on its overall substance.

Holding

The court held that no valid partnership was formed between Arapua and Warwick, and Arapua did not make a valid contribution of the receivables under section 721. Consequently, the receivables had zero basis in Warwick's hands, and the transactions were properly recharacterized as a sale. The court also upheld the accuracy-related penalties under section 6662(h) for gross valuation misstatements.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that Arapua and Jetstream, the managing member of Warwick, did not have a common intention to collectively pursue a joint economic outcome, which is necessary for a valid partnership. Arapua's primary motivation was to derive cash for its receivables, while Jetstream sought to exploit the receivables' built-in losses for tax benefits. The court found no evidence that Arapua intended to partner with Jetstream in servicing the receivables, thus invalidating the purported contribution under section 721(a).

Additionally, the court applied the step transaction doctrine, collapsing the intermediate steps of the transaction into a single sale of the receivables by Arapua to Warwick. The court considered the binding commitment test, the end result test, and the interdependence test, concluding that the transaction's form did not reflect its true substance.

The court also noted that even if a valid contribution had been made, Arapua's financial statements indicated that the receivables had a basis closer to zero than their face amount. The court found that the petitioners failed to substantiate the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

amount paid for the receivables, supporting the IRS's zero basis determination.

Regarding the accuracy-related penalties, the court determined that the claimed basis of the receivables constituted a gross valuation misstatement under section 6662(h). The court found no evidence of reasonable cause or good faith on the part of John E. Rogers, the sole owner and director of Jetstream, who designed and executed the transactions.

Disposition

The court entered decisions for the respondent, upholding the FPAAs and sustaining the accuracy-related penalties.

Significance/Impact

This case reinforces the principle that substance over form governs the tax treatment of transactions. It highlights the importance of establishing a valid partnership and a bona fide contribution of property to achieve the desired tax outcomes. The decision also underscores the application of the step transaction doctrine in recharacterizing transactions that are structured to achieve specific tax benefits. The imposition of accuracy-related penalties emphasizes the need for taxpayers to substantiate the basis of contributed property and act with reasonable cause and good faith in tax planning.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.