Rent-A-Center, Inc. v. Commissioner, 142 T. C. 1 (2014) (U. S. Tax Court, 2014)

In Rent-A-Center, Inc. v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that payments made by Rent-A-Center's subsidiaries to its captive insurance company, Legacy, were deductible as insurance expenses under I. R. C. § 162. The decision overturned the IRS's determination that these payments were not deductible, emphasizing the importance of risk shifting and distribution in a brother-sister captive insurance arrangement. This case significantly impacts how companies structure their captive insurance programs for tax purposes.

Parties

Rent-A-Center, Inc. (RAC), a domestic corporation, along with its affiliated subsidiaries (collectively, Petitioner), were the taxpayers and appellants in this case. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent) was the opposing party, having issued notices of deficiency to RAC.

Facts

Rent-A-Center, Inc. (RAC) is a Delaware corporation and the parent of numerous subsidiaries, including Legacy Insurance Co. , Ltd. (Legacy), a Bermudian captive insurance company wholly owned by RAC. RAC's subsidiaries operated over 2,600 stores across the U. S. , Canada, and Puerto Rico, employing between 14,300 and 19,740 employees and operating 7,143 to 8,027 insured vehicles during the tax years in question (2003-2007). RAC established Legacy in 2002 to manage its growing insurance costs, seeking to reduce costs, improve efficiency, and obtain coverage unavailable from traditional insurers. Legacy insured RAC's subsidiaries for workers' compensation, automobile, and general liability risks below a certain threshold, with premiums determined actuarially and allocated among the subsidiaries based on their risk exposure. RAC paid these premiums on behalf of its subsidiaries and deducted them as insurance expenses. The Commissioner challenged these deductions, asserting that Legacy was not a bona fide insurance company and that the payments did not qualify as insurance premiums for tax purposes.

Procedural History

The Commissioner 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 redetermination of these deficiencies. The Tax Court reviewed the case, and upon review, the Court's opinion was adopted by the majority of the judges, overruling the Commissioner's position.

Issue(s)

Whether the payments made by RAC's subsidiaries to Legacy Insurance Co. , Ltd.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

were deductible as insurance expenses under I. R. C. § 162?

Rule(s) of Law

The Internal Revenue Code (I. R. C.) § 162 allows a deduction for all ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business, including insurance premiums. The Supreme Court has established that for an arrangement to qualify as insurance for federal tax purposes, it must involve risk shifting and risk distribution, and meet commonly accepted notions of insurance. *See Helvering v. Le Gierse*, 312 U. S. 531 (1941). The Tax Court has applied these criteria in the context of captive insurance arrangements, particularly in brother-sister arrangements where the captive insures the risks of its parent's subsidiaries.

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. § 162. The court found that the arrangement between RAC's subsidiaries and Legacy satisfied the criteria of risk shifting and risk distribution, and was consistent with commonly accepted notions of insurance.

Reasoning

The court's reasoning focused on the following key points:

Legal tests applied: The court applied the risk shifting and risk distribution tests established by *Helvering v. Le Gierse*. It determined that risk was shifted from RAC's subsidiaries to Legacy, as the subsidiaries' balance sheets and net worth were not affected by the payment of claims by Legacy. The court also found that Legacy achieved adequate risk distribution by insuring a sufficient number of statistically independent risks from RAC's subsidiaries.

Policy considerations: The court recognized the business rationale behind RAC's decision to establish Legacy, including cost reduction, efficiency improvements, and access to otherwise unavailable coverage. These considerations supported the court's finding that Legacy was a bona fide insurance company.

Statutory interpretation methods: The court interpreted I. R. C. § 162 in light of the Supreme Court's criteria for insurance, emphasizing that the statute's purpose is to allow deductions for legitimate business expenses, including insurance premiums.

Precedential analysis (stare decisis): The court distinguished its prior decision in *Humana Inc. & Subs. v. Commissioner*, which had held that payments between brother-sister corporations in a captive insurance arrangement were not deductible. The court adopted the Sixth Circuit's critique of *Humana* and overruled it to the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

extent it held that such payments could not be deductible as a matter of law.

Treatment of dissenting or concurring opinions: The court acknowledged dissenting opinions that argued against the deductibility of the payments based on the economic family theory and the presence of a parental guaranty. However, the majority rejected these arguments, emphasizing the separate corporate existence of Legacy and the subsidiaries and the fact that the parental guaranty did not affect the subsidiaries' balance sheets.

Counter-arguments addressed by the majority: The court addressed the Commissioner's arguments regarding the parental guaranty and Legacy's capitalization, finding that the guaranty did not vitiate risk shifting and that Legacy was adequately capitalized under Bermuda's regulatory requirements.

Disposition

The Tax Court entered decisions under Rule 155, allowing RAC to deduct the payments made to Legacy as insurance expenses for the tax years in question.

Significance/Impact

The decision in *Rent-A-Center, Inc. v. Commissioner* has significant implications for captive insurance arrangements within corporate groups. It clarifies that payments between brother-sister corporations can qualify as deductible insurance premiums under I. R. C. § 162, provided they meet the criteria of risk shifting and risk distribution. The case also highlights the importance of the separate corporate existence of the captive and the insured entities in determining the deductibility of premiums. Subsequent courts have considered this decision in evaluating similar arrangements, and it has influenced the structuring of captive insurance programs for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.