THE JOURNEY TO CHAOS: SECA TAXES, LIMITED PARTNER EXCEPTION, **EVOLUTION, AND CURRENT DISPUTES** 



#### Hale E. Sheppard, Esq.

Chamberlain, Hrdlicka, White, Williams & Aughtry 191 Peachtree Street, N.E. 46th Floor Atlanta, GA 30303 404-658-5441 hale.sheppard@chamberlainlaw.com

#### INTRODUCTION

#### INTRODUCTION

- What have partnerships done wrong?
- IRS says not limited partners
- Taxpayer positions based on 1977 law
- Gov. inaction for five decades chaos

#### **OVERVIEW OF SECA TAXES**



#### **OVERVIEW OF SECA TAXES**

- Components and magnitude
- FICA / SECA
- 15.3% of "net earnings from self-employment"
- Section 1403(a)(13) excludes distributive share

loyment" ve share

#### LONG ROAD TO UNCERTAINTY



### LONG ROAD TO UNCERTAINTY

- SECA taxes start in 1950
- Limited partner exception in 1977
  - Text
  - Legislative rationale
  - Broad solution

- First proposed regulations in 1994
  - Rules for partnerships and LLCs
  - Definition of limited partner
  - IRS goals



- Second proposed regulations in 1997
  - Rules for *all* entities
  - New definition of limited partner
  - Service partners
  - Example
  - IRS goals "functional test"



- Congressional moratorium in 1997
- "Sense of the Senate"
- Legislative vs. Executive Branch
- Ended July 1, 1998



- Various groups offer proposals
  - Material participation standard
  - Reasonable compensation standard
  - Safe harbor formula



- IRS gives taxpayers hope in 2003
  - Respect for second proposed regulations

- IRS rulings
  - Taxpayers in informal partnerships
  - LPs issuing bifurcated amounts
  - LLCs instead of LPs
- CCAs are not precedential



- Most famous case Renkemeyer
  - Key facts
  - Taxpayer position
  - IRS position
  - Tax Court rulings



- IRS gives taxpayer more hope in 2011
  - Respect for second proposed regulations
  - This, despite Renkemeyer

- IRS compliance campaign in 2018
  - LPs, LLPs, LLCs and more
  - Focus on service partners



- IRS concept unit in 2019
  - No limited partner definition exists
  - Unit applies to all types of entities
  - Material participation rules irrelevant
  - Respect for second proposed regulations





- IRS removes from priority list in 2019
  - Finalizing regulations not a focus



- Green Book presidential proposals in 2021
  - Need to "rationalize" conflicting rules
  - Proposes material participation std.

- IRS threatens more litigation in 2021
  - More audits and trials



• Summary from 1977 to present



#### **KEY RULINGS AND CASES**



### **KEY RULINGS AND CASES**

- Johnson v. Commissioner working interest
- Perry v. Commissioner working interest
- Three PLRs about entity conversions

terest est

### KEY RULINGS AND CASES (cont.)

- Norwood v. Commissioner
- Renkemeyer et al v. Commissioner
- Riether v. United States
- Howell v. Commissioner
- CCA 201436409

#### KEY RULINGS AND CASES (cont.)

- CCA 201640014
- Hardy v. Commissioner
- Castigliola v. Commissioner
- Joseph v. Commissioner

#### HEADS THE IRS WINS, TAILS THE TAXPAYER LOSES

#### HEADS OR TAILS

- Setting the scene
- Conflicting positions by IRS
- Broad LP meaning Section 469
- Narrow LP meaning Section 1402
- Compare and contrast

### HEADS OR TAILS (cont.)

- IRS position in Section 469 cases
- Seven tests for material participation
- Special rules for limited partners
- Legislative history targeting LPs

### HEADS OR TAILS (cont.)

- Recurrent IRS loses in Section 469 cases
  - Gregg v. United States
  - Garnett v. Commissioner
  - Thompson v. United States
  - Hegarty v. Commissioner
  - Newell v. Commissioner

#### HEADS OR TAILS (cont.)

- IRS changes tune after five losses
- Proposed regulations in 2011
- Limited liability not determinative

#### MOST RECENT TAX COURT CASES

### MOST RECENT TAX COURT CASES

- Sirius Solutions, LLLP v. Commissioner
  - Review of key facts
  - Summary Judgment Motion
  - Main positions by taxpayer
  - Main positions by IRS
  - Holding by Tax Court

# MOST RECENT TAX COURT CASES

- Soroban Capital Partners, LP v. Commissioner
  - Review of key facts
  - Questioning IRS motivations
  - Four observations about bifurcation
  - Not a service partnership
  - Likely IRS position

# Thank You

Hale E. Sheppard 404-658-5441 Hale.Sheppard@chamberlainlaw.Com www.ProseByTaxPros.com







