PERSPECTIVE

Los Angeles Daily Journal

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2016

On The Hook For *Someone Else's* Taxes?

By Robert W. Wood

It is bad enough that you have to pay your *own* taxes, let alone someone else's! Yet sometimes, the Internal Revenue Service can actually come after one taxpayer to collect the tax liability of *someone else*. It can leave you with your pockets turned out, although usually it starts with you accepting money or property from someone else in what seems like a very good deal.

It happens more frequently than you might think. What's more, a recent case suggests that the IRS may soon get bolder still. How is this possible? The answer is transferee liability.

The concept is embodied in Section 6901 of the tax code, but it has deep roots in legal history. In fact, it is a creditor protection device going back hundreds of years. Essentially, the IRS can pursue a transferee — someone who received assets or money for less than full and fair value from the taxpayer.

Think of it as kind of a stolen property rule. Suppose that your Uncle Johnny, a deadbeat when it comes to taxes, gives you his Mercedes. You might assume a gift is a gift, and that you can safely enjoy driving it. You may have no idea that Uncle Johnny owes the IRS.

Even so, the IRS can repossess it. The IRS claim on the Mercedes trumps yours, even if you didn't know anything about the taxes that might be due. The result is the same if you paid Johnny $5,000 for it but the car is really worth $20,000.

Of course, this is a simple example. And as with everything else in the tax code, applying these rules isn't simple. For one thing, procedure and timing are important. The person owing taxes is the "transferor," and the person being pursued the "transferee."

There are two bases of transferee liability: at law and in equity. You are liable as a transferee at law when you are responsible for the transferor's tax liability by contract. This happens, but probably not to most of us. The IRS must prove the tax liability was within the terms of the contract.

In some cases, this arises by statute, such as in corporate mergers. But the vast bulk of transferee liability cases involve equity. You are liable as a transferee in equity when you receive the transferor's assets for less than full, fair and adequate consideration, and when you leave the transferor insolvent and unable to pay the tax liability.

Fortunately, your liability is limited to the value of the assets you received. And the IRS must generally prove five elements: (1) The transferor became insolvent when the transfer occurred or because of a series of asset transfers; (2) the transfer was for less than adequate consideration; (3) the transfer was made after the tax liability accrued. The tax liability need not have been assessed at the time of the transfer, as long as the tax debt had accrued; (4) the transferor was liable for the tax; and (5), the IRS made reasonable attempts to collect from the transferor or it would be futile. An example of the latter would be a dissolved corporation.

Section 6901(a)(1) of the tax code authorizes the IRS to assess and collect unpaid taxes from a transferee of a taxpayer's property. The IRS can even use all the same administrative procedures that it can use against the taxpayer. So if you've been through the IRS coming after you for a personal tax debt, you have some idea what the IRS can throw at you.

But there are some safeguards in the case law, including from the U.S. Supreme Court. In *Commissioner v. Stern*, 347 U.S. 39 (1958), the Supreme Court said that the IRS must first satisfy a two-pronged test: (1) the person in question must be a "transferee" within the meaning of Section 6901(h); and (2) the transferee must be substantively liable for the transfer under applicable state law.

The principal source of substantive liability to satisfy the second prong of the *Stern* test is state fraudulent conveyance law. These days, this generally means the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act. Under the UFTA, creditors can invalidate a property transfer by their debtor if: (1) the debtor did not receive reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the transfer; and (2) the debtor was insolvent at the time of the transfer or was left in a notably perilous financial condition.

For almost a decade, the IRS has been fighting to impose transferee liability on shareholders who participated in certain types of corporate deals. For example, so-called midco involve an intermediary company that comes in between the buyer and seller of a business and is meant to sop up the corporate tax liabilities. The midco entity usually disappears, so the IRS is left holding the bag.

The IRS has usually chased the seller who benefits. Of course, the seller usually says they had no idea the midco deal was not real. To win, the IRS generally needs to persuade the court to collapse the several steps in a midco transaction into something simpler, usually a corporate asset sale followed by a liquidating distribution.

The problem is that the courts have not been kind to the IRS. The 1st, 2nd, 4th and 9th U.S. Circuit Courts of Appeals have refused to permit this unless the IRS demonstrates that the shareholders *knew*, either actually or constructively, that the tax due on the corporate asset sale would be left unpaid. That's a major hurdle for the IRS.

The IRS must undertake an exhaustive factual inquiry into what shareholders knew or should have known about a transaction that closed five or ten years before. It isn't easy, not even for the IRS. So whenever a midco case comes up in a new circuit, the IRS may lose.

Sure, the IRS doggedly argues that it should be allowed to recharacterize the transaction without worrying about what was going on inside the shareholders' heads. The IRS's persistence finally paid off in *Feldman v. Commissioner*, 779 F.3d 448 (7th Cir. 2015). In *Feldman*, the 7th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals permitted the IRS to re-characterize a midco transaction as a liquidation without regard to what the selling shareholders knew or should have known.

According to the court of appeals, the shareholders' "due diligence and lack of knowledge of illegality [are] simply beside the point." So far, the Seventh Circuit's decision has not attracted much comment. But the Tax Court has already followed *Feldman* in two cases. *See Shockley v. Commissioner*, T.C. Memo. 2015-113; *Weintraut v. Commissioner*, T.C. Memo. 2016-142. The elimination of the shareholder-knowledge requirement is a dream come true for the IRS.

Does that mean the IRS will win more transferee liability cases? Probably. Will that meant that the IRS will argue transferee liability in more cases when it isn't paid and can follow the money? What's your guess?

Robert W. Wood *is a tax lawyer with www.WoodLLP.com, and the author of "Taxation of Damage Awards & Settlement Payments" (www.TaxInstitute.com). This is not legal advice.*