



Federal Tax ADVISORY ■

APRIL 1, 2015

A Simple Spinoff

LTR 201511001

This recent letter ruling is one of the few “significant issue” rulings issued by Chief Counsel (Corporate) after it stopped ruling generally on most nonrecognition transactions in Subchapter C. It should be simple, as spinoffs go, because it is all domestic and involves a pro rata spinoff to public shareholders, where the possibility of “device” is almost nonexistent. And yet, getting to “yes” required a lot of tax engineering.

Facts

D2 is the parent of a consolidated group that will spin off C to the public shareholders. D2’s direct subsidiary, D1, will organize C in a Section 368(a)(1)(D)/355 reorganization and distribute the C stock to D2. The businesses and assets that D1 will contribute to C will have flowed up to D1 in a series of subsidiary liquidations and upstream mergers. The taxpayer represents that three of the upstream mergers are Section 368(a)(1)(A) reorganizations, two upstream mergers are Section 332 liquidations and one upstream check the box liquidation is also subject to Section 332. The taxpayer states that after the spins, certain assets of the three liquidated subsidiaries may be transferred (by D1 and/or C) to new subsidiaries of D1 or C; the taxpayer represented that the value of assets transferred would not exceed X% per corporation liquidated.

Treatment of Mergers and Liquidations

The taxpayer presumably decided it could treat three statutory mergers as A reorganizations because assets or businesses of the merging corporations would remain in D1 sufficient to comprise a continuity of business enterprise. As a result, Reg. 1.368-2(k) could apply, which allows the taxpayer to ignore the effect of the contribution of assets by D1 to C, for purposes of satisfying the reorganization requirement.

On the other hand, as to the two mergers that the taxpayer treats as Section 332 liquidations, presumably a continuity of business enterprise will not be left in D1, meaning that the mergers cannot be A reorganizations and the cited regulation cannot apply. Assets or businesses satisfying the continuity of business enterprise (COBE) requirement

This advisory is published by Alston & Bird LLP to provide a summary of significant developments to our clients and friends. It is intended to be informational and does not constitute legal advice regarding any specific situation. This material may also be considered attorney advertising under court rules of certain jurisdictions.

could be transferred to C if D1 retained C, but because D1 will spin off C, the spun-off business cannot qualify D1 for the COBE requirement because the business must be in the qualified group headed by D1. Reg. 1.368-1(d)(4).

Nevertheless, those mergers, and the check the box liquidation of the remaining subsidiary, can satisfy the requirement for a complete liquidation for purposes of Section 332, despite the fact that assets are reincorporated into C. The theory (held within Chief Counsel (Corporate)) is that C stands in the same relationship to the shareholders as does D1, and so, in effect, there has been no reincorporation by D1 of the lower tier sub's assets. Of course here, C gets closer than D1 to the public shareholders through the spin by D2, but evidently that does not disturb the fiction.

How Would You Know This?

The foregoing analysis requires a working knowledge of the following rules:

1. Reg. 1.368-2(k) says you can ignore most nonrecognition dispositions of target assets by the acquiring corporation after a reorganization, so long as the reorganization otherwise qualifies as a reorganization, including satisfying the COBE requirement without regard to that regulation subsection.
2. Reg. 1.368-1(d)(4) requires the qualifying continuity of business to stay in the qualified group headed by the acquiring corporation.
3. Section 332 applies to upstream mergers, but does not mean that the upstream merger is not also a reorganization, which can qualify for Reg. 1.368-2(k).
4. Section 332 requires a "complete liquidation," which has been interpreted to preclude reincorporation of the liquidating corporation's assets before or after the liquidation.
5. Reincorporation does not include de minimis amounts, which Chief Counsel (Corporate) believes means less than 30 percent of gross value.
6. Reincorporation of any amount into a C that is spun off does not preclude complete liquidation.

Rule 1 is clear, so long as you focus on the brief reference to continuity of business in the regulation.

Similarly, Rule 2 is clear, so long as you realize that a spun-off C is no longer in D's qualified group.

Rule 3 is not obvious, but is the premise on which Reg. 1.368-2(k) is based.

Rule 4 is fairly clear, based on case law and a regulation.

Rule 5 is not knowable without closely following letter rulings and what Chief Counsel officials say at CLE programs.

Rule 6 is not knowable without closely following letter rulings and what Chief Counsel officials say at CLE programs.

Conclusion

Most of the rules above are taxpayer friendly, and yet they are fairly hard to find or confusing or counterintuitive. They just go to show that a simple spinoff is usually not a simple thing.

For additional information, call [Jack Cummings](#) at 919.862.2302.

If you would like to receive future *Federal Tax Advisories* electronically, please forward your contact information to **FederalTax.Advisory@alston.com**. Be sure to put “**subscribe**” in the subject line.

Click [here](#) for Alston & Bird’s Tax Blog.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact your Alston & Bird attorney or any of the following:

Federal Tax Group

Sam K. Kaywood, Jr.
Co-Chair
404.881.7481
sam.kaywood@alston.com

Edward Tanenbaum
Co-Chair
212.210.9425
edward.tanenbaum@alston.com

George Abney
404.881.7980
george.abney@alston.com

Brian D. Harvel
404.881.4491
brian.harvel@alston.com

Matthew Moseley
202.239.3828
matthew.moseley@alston.com

John F. Baron
704.444.1434
john.baron@alston.com

L. Andrew Immerman
404.881.7532
andy.immerman@alston.com

Danny Reach
704.444.1272
danny.reach@alston.com

Henry J. Birnkrant
202.239.3319
henry.birnkrant@alston.com

Brian E. Lebowitz
202.239.3394
brian.lebowitz@alston.com

Heather Ripley
212.210.9549
heather.ripley@alston.com

James E. Croker, Jr.
202.239.3309
jim.croker@alston.com

Clay A. Littlefield
704.444.1440
clay.littlefield@alston.com

Jasper L. Cummings, Jr.
919.862.2302
jack.cummings@alston.com

Ashley B. Menser
919.862.2209
ashley.menser@alston.com

ALSTON & BIRD

WWW.ALSTON.COM

© ALSTON & BIRD LLP 2015

ATLANTA: One Atlantic Center ■ 1201 West Peachtree Street ■ Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 30309-3424 ■ 404.881.7000 ■ Fax: 404.881.7777
BRUSSELS: Level 20 Bastion Tower ■ Place du Champ de Mars ■ B-1050 Brussels, BE ■ +32 2 550 3700 ■ Fax: +32 2 550 3719
CHARLOTTE: Bank of America Plaza ■ 101 South Tryon Street ■ Suite 4000 ■ Charlotte, North Carolina, USA, 28280-4000 ■ 704.444.1000 ■ Fax: 704.444.1111
DALLAS: 2828 North Harwood Street ■ 18th Floor ■ Dallas, Texas, USA, 75201 ■ 214.922.3400 ■ Fax: 214.922.3899
LOS ANGELES: 333 South Hope Street ■ 16th Floor ■ Los Angeles, California, USA, 90071-3004 ■ 213.576.1000 ■ Fax: 213.576.1100
NEW YORK: 90 Park Avenue ■ 15th Floor ■ New York, New York, USA, 10016-1387 ■ 212.210.9400 ■ Fax: 212.210.9444
RESEARCH TRIANGLE: 4721 Emperor Blvd. ■ Suite 400 ■ Durham, North Carolina, USA, 27703-85802 ■ 919.862.2200 ■ Fax: 919.862.2260
SILICON VALLEY: 1950 University Avenue ■ 5th Floor ■ East Palo Alto, California, USA, 94303-2282 ■ 650.838.2000 ■ Fax: 650.838.2001
WASHINGTON, DC: The Atlantic Building ■ 950 F Street, NW ■ Washington, DC, USA, 20004-1404 ■ 202.756.3300 ■ Fax: 202.756.3333