Veriha v. Commissioner, 139 T. C. 45 (2012)

The U. S. Tax Court ruled in Veriha v. Commissioner that each individual tractor and trailer leased to a trucking company was a separate 'item of property' under the passive activity loss rules. This decision clarified that net rental income from such leased items must be recharacterized as nonpassive income when the taxpayer materially participates in the lessee's business. The case underscores the importance of precise property classification in tax law and impacts how taxpayers structure their leasing arrangements to manage passive activity income and losses.

Parties

Joseph Veriha and Christina F. Veriha were the petitioners, while the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was the respondent. The case was heard in the United States Tax Court.

Facts

Joseph Veriha was the sole owner of John Veriha Trucking, Inc. (JVT), a C corporation engaged in the trucking business. JVT leased its tractors and trailers from two entities: Transportation Resources, Inc. (TRI), an S corporation where Veriha owned 99% of the stock, and JRV Leasing, LLC (JRV), a single-member LLC wholly owned by Veriha. During 2005, TRI generated net income, while JRV generated a net loss. The Verihas treated TRI's income as passive on their joint return and JRV's loss as a passive loss. The Commissioner challenged this classification, arguing that the income from TRI should be recharacterized as nonpassive under the self-rental rule of section 1. 469-2(f)(6) of the Income Tax Regulations.

Procedural History

The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency to the Verihas, determining a tax deficiency and an accuracy-related penalty for 2005, which was later conceded. The Verihas timely filed a petition with the United States Tax Court challenging the recharacterization of TRI's income. The case was submitted fully stipulated under Tax Court Rule 122, and the court's decision was to be entered under Rule 155.

Issue(s)

Whether, for purposes of section 1. 469-2(f)(6) of the Income Tax Regulations, each tractor and trailer leased to JVT by TRI and JRV constituted a separate 'item of property,' such that the net rental income received from TRI should be recharacterized as nonpassive income.

Rule(s) of Law

Section 469(a) of the Internal Revenue Code disallows passive activity losses.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Section 469(c)(2) defines passive activity to include rental activities, regardless of material participation. Section 1. 469-2(f)(6) of the Income Tax Regulations provides that net rental income from an item of property rented for use in a trade or business in which the taxpayer materially participates is treated as nonpassive income. The term ‘item of property’ is not defined in the Code or regulations, leading to the need for interpretation based on ordinary meaning.

Holding

The Tax Court held that each individual tractor and trailer leased to JVT by TRI and JRV was a separate ‘item of property’ under section 1. 469-2(f)(6) of the Income Tax Regulations. Consequently, the net rental income received from TRI by the Verihas was subject to recharacterization as nonpassive income.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that the ordinary meaning of ‘item’ as a separate thing within a collection supports the Commissioner’s position that each tractor and trailer is an ‘item of property. ‘ Dictionary definitions were cited to reinforce this interpretation. The court rejected the Verihas’ argument that the entire fleet of tractors and trailers should be considered one ‘item of property,’ noting that each lease agreement was for a single tractor or trailer, indicating separate treatment. The court also considered the Verihas’ contention that the Commissioner’s position was inconsistent with past rulings but found that the Commissioner was not bound by prior treatments of similar properties. The court emphasized that taxpayers must accept the tax consequences of their business structuring decisions. The Commissioner’s decision not to challenge the netting of gains and losses within TRI was noted as favorable to the Verihas.

Disposition

The court’s decision was to be entered under Tax Court Rule 155, reflecting the recharacterization of TRI’s net income as nonpassive income.

Significance/Impact

The Veriha case clarifies the application of the self-rental rule under section 1. 469-2(f)(6) of the Income Tax Regulations, specifically defining ‘item of property’ in the context of rental activities. This decision has significant implications for taxpayers engaging in leasing arrangements, particularly within family-controlled or related entities. It underscores the necessity of careful structuring of such arrangements to manage passive activity income and losses effectively. The case also illustrates the flexibility of the Commissioner in applying the regulations and the importance of adhering to the ordinary meaning of terms when statutory definitions are absent.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.