

The Stones made mistakes, e.g., they used a "bill of sale" to make the gifts. However, there were strong favorable facts, e.g., Mr. and Mrs. Stone did not depend on distributions from the FLP; there was no commingling of partners' personal and partnership funds; and there was no discounting of limited partnership interests.

Mrs. Kelly, the focus of the second case, was incompetent, which is a bad way to begin a Tax Court case involving an FLP. However, there was a powerful non-tax motive: the children wanted to avoid litigation among themselves after their mother's death. Therefore, they established, with probate court approval, one limited partnership per child to facilitate an equal post-mortem division. The probate court order confirming the multiple FLP approach mentioned that it would "avoid undesirable tax consequences." However, the Tax Court did not believe that tax savings motivated the structure. Importantly, Mrs. Kelly retained sufficient non-partnership assets for her personal needs and the family observed partnership formalities. This one partnership per child approach had been the key to a taxpayer victory in *Estate of Eugene Stone v. Commissioner*, T.C. Memo 2003-309 (2003).

The third taxpayer victory involved the use of a formula clause to define the amount of the gift. Example: mom and dad give the number of limited partnership units equal in value to \$10,240,000 (their combined 2012 lifetime gift exclusion). At the time of the gift they believe that each unit is worth \$10,240, so the gift is of 1,000 units. The gift document provides that if the IRS later increases the unit value, any excess units will be transferred to charity. On audit the IRS decides that each unit is orth \$11,377.78. Therefore, the number of units needed for the gift to the children is only 900 (900 times \$11,377.78 equals \$10,240,000). As a result, the other 100 units is transferred to charity, giving mom and dad a (100 times \$11,377.78) \$1,137,778 income tax charitable deduction.

The IRS has traditionally fought this approach as being against public policy. One part of the IRS's rationale has been that by having the excess transfer to charity, the defined value gift takes away the IRS's incentive to conduct an income tax audit. In three recent (2006, 2009, and 2011) cases, taxpayers have prevailed. The question left open for practitioners was: will taxpayers prevail if the excess does not go to charity?

*Wandry v. Commissioner*, T.C. Memo 2012-88 (March 26, 2012) is the first case which approves a formula clause without a gift over to charity. The Tax Court indicated that the policy of encouraging charitable gifts, which was a factor in the earlier decisions, was not determinative to the result of the three earlier cases. In Wandry the excess units were simply returned to the parents. As a result, many more taxpayers will be using this structure.

Stone and Kelly confirm that FLPs are important tools to transfer valuable assets at significantly reduced gift (and estate) tax values. Wandry confirms the use of an important device to avoid creating a taxable gift. The three are a powerful incentive for taxpayers to use their \$5,120,000 gift exclusion before the end of 2012.

# OC lawyer gets 6-month sentence for tax offenses

An Orange County attorney who failed to file multiple income tax returns and helped create an offshore corporation later investigated by federal authorities now owes the government more than \$225,000 - plus prison time.

### Judges and Judiciary

**Two judges vie to be second-in-command of San Francisco County Superior Court** Two judges are about to face off in a race for San Francisco County Superior Court's assistant presiding judge seat.

### Litigation

# Saudi prince wins round in mansion battle against LA

State court judge rules in favor of Prince Abdul-Aziz ibn Abdul-Aziz al Saud, the third son of Saudi King Abdullah and Saudi Arabia's deputy foreign minister, in real estate spat.

## Mergers & Acquisitions

**Dealmakers** A roundup of recent mergers and acquisitions and financing transactions and the lawyers involved.

### Criminal

# In the spotlight: what is the legal definition of rape?

Examining the legal definition of rape - and how it differs from the public's concept of rape. By **Wendy Patrick** 

## Law Practice

Listening practice Better listening is the key to being heard. By Timothy Tosta of McKenna Long Aldridge LLP

### **Public Interest**

Lawyers' critical role in the war on poverty Access to the judicial branch ensures that the government, in the person of a judge, will hear grievances and respond. By David A. Lash of O'Melveny & Myers LLP

### Law Practice

## Who can enforce mortgages sold in the secondary market?

Courts and litigants are often confused about just who can enforce a mortgage that has been transferred in the secondary market. Here's the law. By **Mark Didak** 

Judicial Profile Tim P. Kam Superior Court Judge Solano County (Vallejo)

#### Intellectual Property Apple's patent win puts company on the offensive

Apple Inc.'s \$1 billion verdict from a San Jose federal jury for patent and trade dress infringement Friday is only likely to whet the company's appetite for more aggressive action in the worldwide smartphone wars, legal observers say.

HOME : MOBILE SITE : CLASSIFIEDS : EXPERTS/SERVICES : CLE : DIRECTORIES : SEARCH : LOGOUT