Crescent Holdings, LLC v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 141 T. C. 477 (U. S. Tax Ct. 2013)

In Crescent Holdings, LLC v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that undistributed partnership income allocated to a nonvested capital interest, transferred in exchange for services, should be recognized by the partnership itself, not the individual who forfeited the interest. This decision clarifies the tax treatment of nonvested partnership capital interests, impacting how partnerships allocate income and losses when interests are subject to forfeiture conditions.

Parties

Crescent Holdings, LLC (Petitioner) and Arthur W. Fields and Joleen H. Fields (Petitioners) versus Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent). Duke Ventures, LLC intervened as the tax matters partner.

Facts

Crescent Holdings, LLC, a partnership for federal tax purposes, was formed on September 7, 2006. On the same day, Crescent Resources, LLC, which was wholly owned by Duke Ventures, LLC, entered into an employment agreement with Arthur W. Fields, granting him a 2% restricted membership interest in Crescent Holdings. This interest was subject to forfeiture if Fields terminated his employment before September 7, 2009. The interest was classified as a partnership capital interest and was not transferable until the forfeiture restrictions lapsed. Fields did not make a Section 83(b) election to treat the interest as vested upon receipt. He resigned before the interest vested, forfeiting his rights to the interest. Despite this, Crescent Holdings allocated partnership income to Fields for the tax years 2006 and 2007, which he included in his gross income.

Procedural History

The Commissioner issued a Final Partnership Administrative Adjustment (FPAA) for the tax years 2006 and 2007, increasing Crescent Holdings' ordinary income by $11,177,727 for 2006 and decreasing it by $5,999,968 for 2007. The FPAA also determined that Fields should be treated as a partner for allocating partnership items. Fields, as a partner other than the tax matters partner, filed petitions for readjustment of partnership items. Duke Ventures, as the tax matters partner, intervened. The cases were consolidated for trial, briefing, and opinion.

Issue(s)

Whether the undistributed partnership income allocations attributable to a nonvested 2% partnership capital interest, transferred to Arthur Fields in exchange for services, should be recognized in the income of Fields or the remaining partners of Crescent Holdings?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Rule(s) of Law

Section 83 of the Internal Revenue Code applies to the transfer of property in connection with the performance of services, deferring income recognition until the property becomes transferable or not subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture. Section 1. 83-1(a)(1) of the Income Tax Regulations states that the transferor is regarded as the owner of the property until it becomes substantially vested. Section 1. 721-1(b)(1) of the Income Tax Regulations addresses the receipt of a partnership capital interest in exchange for services, stating that the fair market value of the interest is income to the partner, but is silent on who owns the interest before it vests.

Holding

The court held that the undistributed partnership income allocations attributable to the nonvested 2% partnership capital interest should be recognized in the income of the transferor, Crescent Holdings, LLC, and allocated on a pro rata basis to the remaining partners, Duke Ventures and MSREF.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that the 2% interest was a partnership capital interest subject to Section 83, as it would entitle Fields to a share of the proceeds in a hypothetical liquidation. Since the interest was subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture and never vested, Fields should not have been allocated any partnership profits or losses. The court found that the undistributed income allocations were subject to the same risk of forfeiture as the interest itself, and thus should not be recognized in Fields' income. The court also held that there was no conflict between Sections 1. 83-1(a)(1) and 1. 721-1(b)(1) of the Income Tax Regulations, as the former explicitly states that the transferor is treated as the owner of the property until it vests. The court identified Crescent Holdings as the transferor of the 2% interest, thus the income allocations should be recognized by Crescent Holdings and allocated to its remaining partners.

Disposition

The court's decision was to be entered under Rule 155, indicating that the undistributed partnership income allocations for the years at issue should be allocated on a pro rata basis to Duke Ventures and MSREF.

Significance/Impact

This case is significant for clarifying the tax treatment of nonvested partnership capital interests under Section 83 of the Internal Revenue Code. It establishes that undistributed partnership income allocated to such interests should be recognized by the partnership itself, not the individual who forfeits the interest. This ruling impacts how partnerships structure compensation arrangements involving

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

partnership interests and how they allocate income and losses when such interests are subject to forfeiture conditions. The decision also provides guidance on the interplay between Sections 83 and 721 of the Code and their respective regulations, offering clarity on the taxation of partnership interests received in exchange for services.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.