ALSTON & BIRD

WWW.ALSTON.COM



Federal Tax ADVISORY -

AUGUST 1, 2019

Questioning Old Regulations

Old regulations got a boost recently as <u>SIH Partners v. Commissioner</u>, 923 F.3d 296 (3d Cir. 2019), upheld an old Section 956 regulation against attack. The circuit had to work fairly hard because like most old regulations there was little to no Treasury explanation contemporaneous with the time of adoption. But courts cannot be expected to work so hard at helping out Treasury in this time of heightened skepticism about the authority of tax regulations.

Therefore, taxpayers who may not even feel slighted by a regulation might take a second look at it and wonder how Treasury found the authority to adopt it. The first step in that analysis will be trying to figure out whether the regulation is interpretive or legislative. If it is interpretive, then the Treasury's interpretation will receive little deference in a court dispute. If it is legislative, it will receive more deference, but will have to run the gauntlet of proper adoption and of being within the zone of reasonableness and properly explained in a timely manner.

An interesting example of a questionable regulation is Reg. Section 1.951-1(e). It has long had a strange rule for finding the pro rata share of Subpart F income to be allocated to a holder of preferred stock and to the holders of the common stock. Since 1965, the regulation has directed that a distribution of all the current-year earnings and profits be hypothesized. Assume that produced a distribution of \$40 out of \$100 on the preferred as a class.

Now suppose the Subpart F income is \$50. The regulation applies the 40% share of the total current earnings to the Subpart F income and finds the pro rata share of the preferred to be \$20.

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.

What is odd about it is that even though an actual distribution of \$50 would have allocated \$10 to the common and \$40 to the preferred, the method of the regulation reduces the share of the preferred from \$40 to \$20.

That method is not suggested by Section 951 and was never explained in a Treasury decision. Some common shareholder who is allocated more than it would have actually received on a distribution of the Subpart F income amount might complain that the regulation's allocation method is (1) not interpretive and that (2) the statute can be interpreted otherwise, but (3) if not, as a legislative regulation it is arbitrary and capricious.

Alston & Bird's tax group regularly addresses the propriety of Treasury regulations and how to attack them in the filing, planning, and litigation contexts.

For more information, please contact <u>Jack Cummings</u> at 919.862.2302.

You can subscribe to future *Federal Tax* advisories and other Alston & Bird publications by completing our **publications subscription form**.

Click **here** for Alston & Bird's Tax Blog. Stay engaged with the aftereffects of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act with our new **resource page**.

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

Federal Tax Group

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

George B. Abney 404.881.7980 george.abney@alston.com

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

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

Seth M. Buchwald 404.881.7836 seth.buchwald@alston.com

James E. Croker, Jr. 202.239.3309 jim.croker@alston.com Jasper L. Cummings, Jr. 919.862.2302 jack.cummings@alston.com

Scott Harty 404.881.7867 scott.harty@alston.com

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

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

Stefanie Kavanagh 202.239.3914 stefanie.kavanagh@alston.com Sam K. Kaywood, Jr. 404.881.7481 sam.kaywood@alston.com

Ryan J. Kelly 202.239.3306 ryan.kelly@alston.com

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

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

Ashley B. Menser 919.862.2209 ashley.menser@alston.com Daniel M. Reach 704.444.1272 danny.reach@alston.com

Heather Ripley 212.210.9549 heather.ripley@alston.com

Michael Senger 404.881.4988 michael.senger@alston.com

Edward Tanenbaum 212.210.9425 edward.tanenbaum@alston.com

ALSTON & BIRD ____

WWW.ALSTON.COM

© ALSTON & BIRD LLP 2019

ATLANTA: One Atlantic Center

1201 West Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 30309-3424
404.881.7000
Fax: 404.881.7777
BEUJING: Hanwei Plaza West Wing
Suite 21B2
No. 7 Guanghua Road
Chaoyang District
Beijing, 100004 CN
+86 10 8592 7500
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: Chase Tower
2200 Ross Avenue
Suite 2300
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
RALEIGH: 555 Fayetteville Street
Suite 200
SAN FRANCISCO: 560 Mission Street
Suite 2100
San Francisco, California, USA, 94105-0912
415.243.1000
Fax: 415.243.1001
SILICON VALLEY: 950 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California, USA, 94304
650-838-2000
Fax: 650.838.2001
WASHINGTON, DC: The Atlantic Building
950 F Street, NW
Washington, DC, USA, 20004-1404
202.239.3300
Fax: 202.239.3333