Whitehouse Hotel Limited Partnership v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 139 T. C. 304 (2012)

In Whitehouse Hotel Ltd. P'ship v. Comm'r, the U. S. Tax Court reevaluated the value of a conservation easement and upheld a penalty for a gross valuation misstatement. The court determined that the partnership overstated the value of the donated easement by more than 400%, leading to a penalty under Section 6662(h) of the Internal Revenue Code. The case underscores the importance of thorough valuation methods and the legal requirements for claiming charitable deductions on conservation easements.

Parties

Whitehouse Hotel Limited Partnership (Petitioner), a Louisiana limited partnership, with QHR Holdings–New Orleans, Ltd. as the Tax Matters Partner, challenged the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent) regarding the value of a qualified conservation contribution and the applicability of an accuracy-related penalty.

Facts

Whitehouse Hotel Limited Partnership (W) acquired the Maison Blanche Building and later the Kress Building in New Orleans. On December 29, 1997, W donated a perpetual conservation restriction on the Maison Blanche Building to Preservation Alliance of New Orleans, Inc. (PRC). W claimed a charitable contribution deduction of $7. 445 million on its 1997 Form 1065. The Commissioner examined the return and reduced the deduction by $6. 295 million, asserting a gross valuation misstatement penalty due to the overstated value of the easement.

Procedural History

The initial Tax Court decision in 2008 (131 T. C. 112) was vacated and remanded by the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit (615 F. 3d 321, 2010). The Appeals Court instructed the Tax Court to reconsider the valuation of the easement and the penalty. On remand, the Tax Court reviewed the case and issued its supplemental opinion in 2012.

Issue(s)

Whether the value of the conservation easement was overstated, leading to a gross valuation misstatement?

Whether the partnership's overstatement of the easement's value subjects it to an accuracy-related penalty under Section 6662(a) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Rule(s) of Law

The value of a conservation easement is determined by the difference between the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

fair market value of the property before and after the easement is granted, as per Section 1. 170A-14(h)(3)(i) of the Income Tax Regulations. A gross valuation misstatement occurs if the value claimed on the tax return is 400% or more of the correct value, as defined in Section 6662(h)(2)(A)(i). The reasonable cause exception under Section 6664(c) requires a qualified appraisal and a good-faith investigation into the value of the contributed property.

Holding

The court held that the value of the conservation easement was overstated by approximately 401%, constituting a gross valuation misstatement. The partnership failed to demonstrate reasonable cause for the underpayment of tax, leading to the application of the accuracy-related penalty under Section 6662(a).

Reasoning

The Tax Court rejected the cost approach and income approach used by the partnership's expert, Richard J. Roddewig, due to their unreliability. The court relied on the comparable-sales approach, which provided a more accurate valuation. The court found that the partnership did not adequately investigate the value of the easement beyond obtaining the Cohen appraisal, which was deemed insufficient for the reasonable cause exception. The court emphasized that the partnership's reliance on professional advice alone did not meet the statutory requirement for a good-faith investigation. The court also noted that the partnership's failure to reconcile the claimed deduction with the property's purchase price indicated a lack of due diligence.

Disposition

The court affirmed the application of the accuracy-related penalty under Section 6662(a) based on a gross valuation misstatement.

Significance/Impact

This case reinforces the stringent requirements for claiming charitable deductions for conservation easements, emphasizing the need for a qualified appraisal and a thorough investigation of the property's value. It also highlights the importance of the comparable-sales approach in valuation disputes and the potential consequences of failing to meet the reasonable cause standard for penalty avoidance. The decision serves as a reminder to taxpayers to conduct comprehensive due diligence when claiming large charitable deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.