TFT Galveston Portfolio, Ltd. v. Commissioner, 144 T. C. 96 (2015) (United States Tax Court, 2015)

In a significant ruling, the U. S. Tax Court determined that TFT Galveston Portfolio, Ltd. ‘s workers were employees, not independent contractors, for employment tax purposes. The court rejected the application of federal common law for successor liability, instead adhering to Texas state law, and found TFT Galveston Portfolio was not a successor in interest to the other partnerships involved. This decision clarifies the application of state law in successor liability cases and impacts how companies classify workers for tax purposes.

Parties

Plaintiff: TFT Galveston Portfolio, Ltd. , as petitioner in docket No. 1082-12 and as successor in interest to TFT #1, Ltd. , TFT #2, Ltd. , TFT #3, Ltd. , TFT #4, Ltd. , TFT Chateau Lafitte-WJT, Ltd. , and TFT Somerset-WJT, Ltd. , in docket Nos. 29995-11, 30001-11, 682-12, 1175-12, 1180-12, and 1533-12.
Defendant: Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as respondent.

Facts

TFT Galveston Portfolio, Ltd. , and its alleged predecessors, TFT #1, Ltd. , TFT #2, Ltd. , TFT #3, Ltd. , TFT #4, Ltd. , TFT Chateau Lafitte-WJT, Ltd. , and TFT Somerset-WJT, Ltd. , were Texas limited partnerships involved in operating apartment complexes. TFT Galveston Portfolio received notices from the IRS determining that its workers were employees for employment tax purposes and that it was liable for taxes, penalties, and interest as a successor to the other partnerships. The IRS also asserted a federal common law standard for successor liability, which TFT Galveston Portfolio contested. The workers in question included apartment managers, a maintenance supervisor, maintenance workers, and security personnel. TFT Galveston Portfolio did not file employment tax returns for the period at issue, and the IRS prepared substitutes for returns.

Procedural History

The IRS issued Notices of Determination Concerning Worker Classification to TFT Galveston Portfolio and its alleged predecessors. TFT Galveston Portfolio filed timely petitions challenging these determinations. The Tax Court consolidated the cases and held that TFT Galveston Portfolio’s workers were employees and liable for employment taxes for the fourth quarter of 2004. However, the court rejected the IRS’s argument to apply federal common law for successor liability, instead applying Texas state law, and held that TFT Galveston Portfolio was not a successor in interest to the other partnerships.

Issue(s)

Whether the workers listed in the notice for TFT Galveston Portfolio’s fourth quarter

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

of 2004 were properly classified as employees for Federal employment tax purposes?
Whether TFT Galveston Portfolio is liable for employment taxes as a successor in interest to TFT #1, Ltd. , TFT #2, Ltd. , TFT #3, Ltd. , TFT #4, Ltd. , TFT Chateau Lafitte-WJT, Ltd. , and TFT Somerset-WJT, Ltd. ?
Whether TFT Galveston Portfolio is liable for additions to tax under section 6651(a)(1) and (2) and penalties under section 6656?

Rule(s) of Law

The common law test for determining employee status is outlined in Section 31. 3121(d)-1(c)(2), Employment Tax Regs. , which states that an employer-employee relationship exists when the employer has the right to control and direct the individual not only as to the result to be accomplished but also as to the details and means by which that result is accomplished. Successor liability is determined by state law, and under Texas law, an acquiring entity is not a successor in interest unless it expressly agrees to assume the liabilities of the other party in the transaction. Tex. Bus. Orgs. Code Ann. sec. 10. 254(b).

Holding

The Tax Court held that TFT Galveston Portfolio's workers were employees for the fourth quarter of 2004, and thus TFT Galveston Portfolio is liable for the employment taxes determined for that period. The court further held that TFT Galveston Portfolio was not a successor in interest to the other partnerships under Texas law and therefore not liable for the employment taxes, additions to tax, and penalties determined with respect to those partnerships. TFT Galveston Portfolio is liable for the additions to tax under section 6651(a)(1) for failure to file returns and under section 6651(a)(2) for failure to pay the amount of tax shown on the substitute returns, as well as penalties under section 6656 for failure to deposit employment taxes.

Reasoning

The court applied the common law test to determine the worker classification, considering factors such as the degree of control exercised by TFT Galveston Portfolio, investment in work facilities, opportunity for profit or loss, right to discharge, whether the work was part of the principal's regular business, permanency of the relationship, and the parties' perception of the relationship. The court found that TFT Galveston Portfolio had significant control over the workers' duties and hours, and the workers had no opportunity for profit or loss, indicating an employee relationship. On the issue of successor liability, the court rejected the IRS's argument to apply federal common law, citing the lack of a significant conflict between federal policy and state law. The court applied Texas law, which requires an express assumption of liabilities for successor liability to apply, and found that TFT Galveston Portfolio did not expressly assume the liabilities of the other

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

partnerships. The court also considered the IRS's burden of production for the additions to tax and penalties, finding that TFT Galveston Portfolio failed to demonstrate reasonable cause for its failure to file and pay taxes.

Disposition

Decisions were entered for TFT Galveston Portfolio in docket Nos. 29995-11, 30001-11, 682-12, 1175-12, 1180-12, and 1533-12 regarding successor liability. A decision was entered under Rule 155 in docket No. 1082-12 regarding the worker classification and employment tax liabilities for the fourth quarter of 2004.

Significance/Impact

This case reinforces the application of state law in determining successor liability in employment tax cases, rejecting the IRS's attempt to establish a federal common law standard. It also provides guidance on the classification of workers for employment tax purposes, emphasizing the importance of control and financial risk factors. The decision impacts how companies structure their business operations and acquisitions to avoid unintended tax liabilities and highlights the importance of proper worker classification for tax compliance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.