Chapman Glen Ltd. v. Commissioner, 140 T. C. 294 (2013)

In *Chapman Glen Ltd. v. Commissioner*, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that the termination of a foreign insurance company's election to be treated as a domestic corporation under Section 953(d) resulted in a taxable exchange of its assets. The court upheld the IRS's determination that the period of limitations remained open due to the company's failure to file a valid tax return for 2003, and it clarified the fair market value of real properties involved in the taxable exchange. This decision underscores the importance of proper tax filing and the tax implications of changes in corporate status under the Internal Revenue Code.

Parties

Chapman Glen Ltd. , the petitioner, was a foreign insurance company that had elected to be treated as a domestic corporation for U. S. tax purposes under Internal Revenue Code Section 953(d). The respondent was the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, responsible for determining and assessing Chapman Glen Ltd. 's tax liabilities.

Facts

Chapman Glen Ltd. (CGL), a foreign insurance company, elected under I. R. C. Section 953(d) to be treated as a domestic corporation effective December 27, 1997. This election was made by CGL's secretary, Deanna S. Gilpin, and was later utilized in an application for tax-exempt status as an insurance company under I. R. C. Section 501(c)(15), granted effective January 1, 1998. CGL's tax-exempt status was revoked effective January 1, 2002, after it was determined that CGL was not operating as an insurance company. In 2003, following the revocation, the IRS deemed CGL to have sold its assets on January 1, 2003, triggering a taxable event under I. R. C. Sections 354, 367, and 953(d)(5). CGL's primary asset was its interest in Enniss Family Realty I, L. L. C. (EFR), which owned various real properties. The fair market value of these properties was contested, with the IRS asserting a higher value than CGL.

Procedural History

CGL filed petitions in the U. S. Tax Court to challenge the IRS's determinations of deficiencies and additions to tax for the years 2002, 2003, and 2004. The IRS had issued a notice of deficiency on August 5, 2009, asserting that CGL's Section 953(d) election was terminated in 2002, leading to a taxable exchange in 2003. The Tax Court consolidated the cases for trial, briefing, and opinion. The court's decision was based on the validity of CGL's tax filings, the effect of the termination of the Section 953(d) election, and the valuation of the real properties involved in the taxable exchange.

Issue(s)

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Whether the three-year period of limitations under I. R. C. Section 6501(a) remained open for 2003 because CGL's Form 990 was not signed by one of its officers?
Whether CGL properly elected under I. R. C. Section 953(d) to be treated as a domestic corporation?
Whether the termination of CGL's Section 953(d) election resulted in a taxable exchange under I. R. C. Sections 354, 367, and 953(d)(5) during the one-day taxable year in 2003?
Whether the real property owned by EFR was included in that taxable exchange?
What was the fair market value of the real property at the time of the exchange on January 1, 2003?
Whether CGL's gross income for the respective taxable years includes amounts reported as "insurance premiums"?

Rule(s) of Law

Under I. R. C. Section 953(d), a foreign insurance company can elect to be treated as a domestic corporation if it meets certain criteria. The termination of this election results in a deemed transfer of the company's assets under I. R. C. Section 953(d)(5), which is treated as a taxable exchange under I. R. C. Sections 354 and 367. I. R. C. Section 6501(a) provides a three-year period of limitations for assessing income tax, which begins when a valid return is filed. A valid return must be signed by an authorized officer of the corporation, as required by I. R. C. Section 6062.

Holding

The Tax Court held that the three-year period of limitations under I. R. C. Section 6501(a) remained open for 2003 because CGL's Form 990 for that year was not signed by one of its officers, thus not constituting a valid return. The court also upheld the validity of CGL's Section 953(d) election and determined that its termination in 2002 resulted in a taxable exchange on January 1, 2003, as provided by I. R. C. Sections 354, 367, and 953(d)(5). The court further held that EFR's real property was included in this exchange, and it determined the fair market value of the disputed properties. Lastly, the court ruled that the amounts reported as "insurance premiums" by CGL were not taxable as such, but as contributions to capital, as CGL was not operating as an insurance company during the relevant period.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that CGL's Form 990 for 2003 was not a valid return because it lacked the signature of an authorized officer, as required by I. R. C. Section 6062. The court also found that CGL's Section 953(d) election was valid because it was signed by a responsible corporate officer, despite CGL's argument to the contrary. Regarding the termination of the election, the court applied the statutory language of I. R. C. Section 953(d)(5), which mandates a deemed transfer of assets upon termination, resulting in a taxable exchange under Sections 354 and 367. The court

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

determined the fair market value of the real properties by considering expert testimony and the highest and best use of the properties, ultimately rejecting CGL's proposed values and applying a bulk sale discount. Finally, the court rejected the IRS's late-stage argument that the reported "insurance premiums" were actually rental income, finding that these amounts were contributions to capital due to CGL's cessation of insurance operations.

Disposition

The Tax Court ruled in favor of the IRS on the issues of the period of limitations, the validity and termination of the Section 953(d) election, and the taxable exchange. The court determined the fair market values of the real properties and rejected the IRS's recharacterization of the "insurance premiums" as rental income. The case was set for further proceedings under Rule 155 to compute the final tax liabilities.

Significance/Impact

This case reaffirms the importance of proper tax filing procedures, including the requirement for corporate officers to sign tax returns. It also clarifies the tax consequences of terminating a Section 953(d) election, establishing that such termination results in a taxable exchange of assets. The court's valuation methodology for real properties in taxable exchanges provides guidance for future cases, emphasizing the consideration of highest and best use and the application of market absorption discounts. Additionally, the case highlights the limitations on the IRS's ability to change its legal theory late in litigation, as the court rejected the IRS's attempt to recharacterize the "insurance premiums" as rental income.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.