Rent-A-Center, Inc. v. Commissioner, 142 T. C. No. 1 (2014)

The U. S. Tax Court ruled in favor of Rent-A-Center, Inc. , allowing the company to deduct payments made to its captive insurance subsidiary, Legacy Insurance Co. , Ltd. , as insurance expenses under I. R. C. sec. 162. The decision hinges on the court's finding that the arrangement between Rent-A-Center's operating subsidiaries and Legacy constituted bona fide insurance, shifting risk from the subsidiaries to the captive insurer. This case clarifies the conditions under which payments to a captive insurer within an affiliated group can be treated as deductible insurance premiums, impacting how businesses structure their risk management and insurance strategies.

Parties

Rent-A-Center, Inc. and its affiliated subsidiaries were the petitioners, challenging deficiencies determined by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the respondent, in notices of deficiency issued in 2008, 2009, and 2010. The case was heard before the United States Tax Court.

Facts

Rent-A-Center, Inc. (RAC), a domestic corporation, was the parent of numerous subsidiaries, including Legacy Insurance Co. , Ltd. (Legacy), a Bermudian corporation. RAC operated its business through stores owned and operated by its subsidiaries. The subsidiaries entered into insurance contracts with Legacy, which covered workers' compensation, automobile, and general liability risks up to certain thresholds. Legacy, in turn, reimbursed the subsidiaries for claims within these thresholds. RAC's subsidiaries deducted these payments as insurance expenses. The IRS challenged these deductions, asserting that the payments were not deductible.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of deficiency to RAC for the tax years 2003 through 2007, disallowing the deductions for payments made to Legacy. RAC timely filed petitions with the U. S. Tax Court seeking redeterminations of these deficiencies. The Tax Court reviewed the case under a de novo standard, focusing on whether the payments to Legacy constituted deductible insurance expenses.

Issue(s)

Whether the payments made by RAC's subsidiaries to Legacy Insurance Co. , Ltd. are deductible pursuant to I. R. C. sec. 162 as insurance expenses?

Rule(s) of Law

The Internal Revenue Code does not define "insurance," but the Supreme Court has established that insurance requires risk shifting and risk distribution. Additionally,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the arrangement must involve insurance risk and conform to commonly accepted notions of insurance. For a payment to be deductible as an insurance expense under I. R. C. sec. 162, it must be an ordinary and necessary business expense and must not be a self-insurance reserve.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that the payments made by RAC's subsidiaries to Legacy were deductible as insurance expenses under I. R. C. sec. 162. The court found that the arrangement between the subsidiaries and Legacy involved risk shifting and risk distribution, and that Legacy operated as a bona fide insurance company.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning focused on several key points:

1. **Legitimacy of Legacy as an Insurance Company:** The court found that Legacy was not a sham entity, as it was formed for legitimate business purposes, including cost reduction and risk management. The court rejected the IRS's argument of a circular flow of funds and emphasized Legacy's compliance with Bermuda's regulatory requirements.

2. **Risk Shifting:** The court applied a balance sheet and net worth analysis to conclude that risk was shifted from the subsidiaries to Legacy. The subsidiaries' balance sheets and net worth were unaffected by claims paid by Legacy, indicating genuine risk shifting.

3. **Risk Distribution:** The court determined that Legacy achieved adequate risk distribution by insuring a sufficient number of statistically independent risks across RAC's numerous subsidiaries.

4. **Commonly Accepted Notions of Insurance:** Legacy's operation as a regulated insurance company, charging actuarially determined premiums, and paying claims from its own account aligned with commonly accepted insurance practices.

5. **Parental Guaranty:** The court found that the parental guaranty issued by RAC to Legacy did not negate risk shifting because it did not affect the subsidiaries' balance sheets and was limited in scope to ensuring Legacy's compliance with Bermuda's solvency requirements.

The court distinguished this case from prior cases where parental guarantees or undercapitalization invalidated captive insurance arrangements, emphasizing that Legacy was adequately capitalized and operated independently.

Disposition

The U. S. Tax Court entered decisions under Rule 155, affirming the deductibility of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the payments made by RAC’s subsidiaries to Legacy as insurance expenses.

Significance/Impact

This case provides significant guidance on the deductibility of payments to captive insurers within an affiliated group. It clarifies that such arrangements can be treated as insurance for tax purposes if they involve genuine risk shifting and distribution, and if the captive insurer operates as a bona fide insurance company. The ruling has implications for how businesses structure their captive insurance programs and may influence future IRS challenges to similar arrangements. The decision also highlights the importance of the captive’s capitalization and operational independence from the parent company in determining the validity of such arrangements for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.