

***Railroad Holdings, LLC v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, T. C. Memo. 2020-22*** (U. S. Tax Court, 2020)

The U. S. Tax Court ruled that Railroad Holdings, LLC could not claim a \$16 million charitable contribution deduction for a conservation easement because the deed failed to ensure the conservation purpose was protected in perpetuity. The court found the deed's extinguishment provision, which guaranteed a fixed dollar amount rather than a proportional share of any future proceeds, did not comply with IRS regulations requiring perpetual protection of the conservation purpose. This decision underscores the strict requirements for claiming conservation easement deductions and highlights the need for precise drafting of easement deeds to meet legal standards.

### **Parties**

Railroad Holdings, LLC, as the petitioner, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the respondent, were the primary parties in this case. Railroad Land Manager, LLC served as the tax matters partner for Railroad Holdings, LLC throughout the proceedings.

### **Facts**

In 2012, Railroad Holdings, LLC executed a conservation easement deed in favor of the Southeast Regional Land Conservancy, Inc. (SERLC), a charitable organization, for a 452-acre property in South Carolina. The deed included an extinguishment provision stating that, in the event of judicial extinguishment and subsequent sale of the property, SERLC would be entitled to a portion of the proceeds at least equal to the fair market value of the conservation easement at the time of the deed's execution, rather than a proportionate share of the proceeds from the sale. Railroad Holdings claimed a \$16 million charitable contribution deduction for this easement on its 2012 tax return. The IRS disallowed the deduction, asserting that the conservation purpose was not protected in perpetuity as required by I. R. C. sec. 170(h)(5)(A).

### **Procedural History**

The IRS issued a notice of final partnership administrative adjustment (FPAA) on March 15, 2016, disallowing Railroad Holdings' claimed deduction. Railroad Holdings timely filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court on May 17, 2016. The Commissioner moved for partial summary judgment, arguing that the conservation easement did not meet the perpetuity requirement of I. R. C. sec. 170(h)(5)(A). The court granted the Commissioner's motion, finding that the deed's extinguishment provision failed to comply with the applicable regulations.

### **Issue(s)**

Whether the conservation easement deed executed by Railroad Holdings, LLC, with

an extinguishment provision guaranteeing a fixed dollar amount to SERLC, satisfied the requirement under I. R. C. sec. 170(h)(5)(A) that the conservation purpose be protected in perpetuity?

### **Rule(s) of Law**

I. R. C. sec. 170(h)(5)(A) requires that a contribution be treated as exclusively for conservation purposes only if the conservation purpose is protected in perpetuity. 26 C. F. R. sec. 1. 170A-14(g)(6)(ii) stipulates that, in the event of an easement's extinguishment, the donee organization must be entitled to a portion of the proceeds at least equal to the proportionate value of the perpetual conservation restriction at the time of the gift.

### **Holding**

The U. S. Tax Court held that Railroad Holdings, LLC was not entitled to the charitable contribution deduction because the conservation easement deed's extinguishment provision did not protect the conservation purpose in perpetuity, as required by I. R. C. sec. 170(h)(5)(A).

### **Reasoning**

The court's reasoning focused on the interpretation of the deed's extinguishment provision and its compliance with the perpetuity requirement under I. R. C. sec. 170(h)(5)(A). The court noted that the deed provided SERLC with a fixed dollar amount rather than a proportionate share of any future sale proceeds, which did not meet the regulatory requirement set forth in 26 C. F. R. sec. 1. 170A-14(g)(6)(ii). The court emphasized that the donee's entitlement to a proportionate share of extinguishment proceeds must be absolute and not subject to diminution over time due to property appreciation. The court rejected Railroad Holdings' arguments regarding the use of the phrase "at least" in the deed, the intent of SERLC as expressed in a declaration, and the deed's construction of terms provision, finding none sufficient to overcome the clear deficiency in the deed's allocation formula. The court's decision reinforced the strict interpretation of the perpetuity requirement and the necessity for precise drafting to ensure compliance with tax regulations.

### **Disposition**

The U. S. Tax Court granted the Commissioner's motion for partial summary judgment, denying Railroad Holdings, LLC the claimed charitable contribution deduction.

### **Significance/Impact**

This case is significant for its clarification of the perpetuity requirement under I. R. C. sec. 170(h)(5)(A) and its implications for conservation easement deductions. It

underscores the importance of drafting easement deeds to comply strictly with IRS regulations, particularly regarding the allocation of proceeds in the event of extinguishment. The decision may impact future conservation easement transactions by prompting donors and donees to review and revise their deeds to ensure compliance with the perpetuity requirement. Additionally, this case may influence how courts and the IRS interpret similar provisions in other conservation easement deeds, potentially affecting the deductibility of such contributions.