
Securities
Law Series

1984

Tax Sheltered Investments Handbook

by Robert J. Haft
and Peter M. Fass

Clark Boardman Company, Ltd.

Securities Law Series

1984 Tax Sheltered Investments Handbook

Contributors:

Robert J. Haft

Peter M. Fass

Robert D. Howard

Linda A. Wertheimer

Clark Boardman Company, Ltd.
New York, New York 1983

Copyright © 1983 by Clark Boardman Company, Ltd.
All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

Second Printing, May 1984

ISSN 0731-5821
ISBN 0-87632-308-5

***1984 Tax Sheltered
Investments Handbook***

The Clark Boardman Securities Law Series

Going Public

(Volume 1)

by Gerald J. Robinson and Klaus Eppler

Private Placements and Restricted Securities

(Volumes 2 and 2A)

by Stuart Charles Goldberg

Securities and Federal Corporate Law

(Volumes 3, 3A and 3B)

by Harold S. Bloomenthal

Tax Sheltered Investments

(Volumes 4, 4A and 4B)

by Robert J. Haft and Peter M. Fass

Litigation and Practice Under Rule 10b-5

(Volumes 5, 5A, 5B and 5C)

by Arnold S. Jacobs

Securities Regulation Forms

(Volumes 6, 6A and 6B)

by Ronald M. Shapiro, Alan R. Sachs,
and Christopher D. Olander

Exempted Transactions Under the Securities Act of 1933

(Volumes 7, 7A and 7B)

by J. William Hicks

Opinion Letters in Securities Matters

(Volume 8)

by Arnold S. Jacobs

Manual of Corporate Forms for Securities Practice

(Volume 9)

by Arnold S. Jacobs

International Capital Markets and Securities Regulation

(Volumes 10, 10A and 10B)

by Harold S. Bloomenthal

Available from Clark Boardman Company, Ltd.

435 Hudson Street, New York, New York 10014

Preface

The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 changed—and complicated—the rules for tax sheltered investments . . . and the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act (TEFRA) of 1982, with its stiff penalties for “abusive” shelters and underpayments—penalties which unequivocally extend to investors’ attorneys as well as investors—sharply increased the risks of less than highly meticulous structuring and handling of such investments.

Because the 1981 Act created new liberalized depreciation rules for real estate and equipment, it is necessary that professionals counseling high-income clients fully understand the available methods of sheltering income in the top brackets, and the possibilities of converting such ordinary deductions into capital gains. Because the 1982 Act exposes taxpayers and their advisors to potential penalties for substantial underpayment and promoting “abusive tax shelter” investments, the definition of tax shelter and what constitutes “substantial authority” is relevant to every tax shelter investor and tax advisor. The compliance, enforcement, and penalty provisions and the IRS’s implementing rules and procedures present many difficult and potentially costly decisions for tax shelter investors and their advisors. The 1984 HANDBOOK reviews both Acts as they affect tax sheltered investments.

Up-to-date, authoritative information is provided on all aspects of the field. Covered in depth are the “trouble spots”—Regulation D and its coordination with the state Blue Sky laws; current IRS litigating positions and attacks on abusive shelters; relevant TEFRA provisions; new Blue Sky provisions affecting compensation and structuring of tax sheltered investments; and tax shelter opinions. Also included are an entirely new chapter on Subchapter S corporations and extensive new material on real estate shelters.

Consistent with other publications in the tax field, the HANDBOOK, prepared in late 1983, is dated 1984 and contains the pertinent material that will govern tax shelter operations during

Tax Sheltered Investments

calendar year 1984. This HANDBOOK replaces the *1983 Tax Sheltered Investments Handbook*.

TAX SHELTERED INVESTMENTS HANDBOOK has been designed and separately bound so that it may be conveniently carried in a briefcase or circulated among attorneys and accountants in an office. Litigators will find it a handy means of verifying points in the courtroom. New handbooks will be issued annually to present the latest trends and techniques.

The Publisher

The Contributors

Robert J. Haft

Georgetown University Law Center
Washington, D.C.

Peter M. Fass

Carro, Spanbock, Fass, Geller, Kaster & Cuiffo
New York City

Robert D. Howard

Carro, Spanbock, Fass, Geller, Kaster & Cuiffo
New York City

Linda A. Wertheimer

Jackson, Walker, Winstead, Cantwell & Miller
Dallas

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1

Selected Problems in the Creation, Operation, and Dissolution of the Limited Partnership Peter M. Fass

§ 1.01	General	1-1
§ 1.02	Checklist of Items to Be Considered Prior to Formation of the Limited Partnership	1-3
§ 1.03	Forming the Limited Partnership	1-10
§ 1.04	Drafting the Partnership Agreement	1-28
§ 1.05	Some Legislative History of the ULPA	1-84

CHAPTER 2

Current Issues Relating to Real Estate Tax Shelters

Peter M. Fass and Robert D. Howard

§ 2.01	The Basic Concepts of Real Estate as a Tax Shelter	2-1
§ 2.02	Limited Partnership as the Suitable Entity for a Real Estate Tax Shelter—Partnership vs. “Association”	2-4
§ 2.03	Tax Basis Issues	2-17
§ 2.04	Compensating the General Partner/Promoter ..	2-34
§ 2.05	Construction Period Interest and Taxes	2-45
§ 2.06	Financing Deductions	2-49
§ 2.07	Opening Expenses	2-65
§ 2.08	Real Estate and “At Risk”	2-76
§ 2.09	Section 183—Activities Not Engaged in for Profit	2-78
§ 2.10	Depreciation	2-80
§ 2.11	The Alternative Minimum Tax	2-89
§ 2.12	Other “Soft” Dollar Deductions	2-91
§ 2.13	Special Allocations—Statutory Provisions	2-101
§ 2.14	Applicable Cases, Rulings, and Regulations on Special Allocations	2-107
§ 2.15	Special Allocations—Certain Specific Issues ..	2-119
§ 2.16	Special Allocations—Contributed Property	2-131

Tax Sheltered Investments

§ 2.17	Retroactive Allocations	2-132
§ 2.18	IRS Audit Manual	2-137
§ 2.19	Exhibit A: ACRS Cost Recovery Tables for Real Property	2-140
§ 2.20	Exhibit B: Alternative Minimum Tax Computation	2-142

CHAPTER 3

Federal Securities Laws and Their Impact on Tax Sheltered Investments Robert J. Haft

§ 3.01	Introduction	3-1
§ 3.02	Investment Participations as “Securities”	3-1
§ 3.03	Transactional Exemptions from Registration Requirements of the 1933 Act	3-2
§ 3.04	Civil, Antifraud, and Criminal Liabilities	3-25
§ 3.05	Broker-Dealer Problems	3-27
§ 3.06	Investment Company Act of 1940	3-33
§ 3.07	Investment Advisers Act of 1940	3-35
§ 3.08	Rights for State Limited Partners	3-36

CHAPTER 4

Full Disclosure Robert J. Haft

§ 4.01	Introduction	4-1
§ 4.02	Special Disclosure Problems—Projections	4-3
§ 4.03	Special Disclosure Problems—Blind Pools	4-5
§ 4.04	Special Disclosure Problems—Fees and Compensation to the Sponsor/General Partner and Others	4-7
§ 4.05	Special Disclosure Problems—Track Record of Sponsor/General Partner	4-11
§ 4.06	SEC Guidelines	4-11

CHAPTER 5

Oil and Gas Tax Shelters

Peter M. Fass and Robert D. Howard

§ 5.01	Principal Types of Programs	5-1
§ 5.02	Forms of Investment	5-2

Table of Contents

§ 5.03	Tax Aspects (Assuming the Limited Partnership Format Is Used)	5-3
§ 5.04	Windfall Profit Tax	5-46
§ 5.05	Effect of Economic Recovery Tax Act on Oil and Gas Tax Shelters	5-49

CHAPTER 6

Equipment Leasing Peter M. Fass and Robert D. Howard

§ 6.01	Typical Format of an Equipment Leasing Transaction	6-1
§ 6.02	Non-Tax Considerations	6-3
§ 6.03	Principal Tax Benefits	6-3
§ 6.04	Other Tax Aspects	6-36
§ 6.05	Safe Harbor Leasing Provisions	6-44
§ 6.06	Schedule A—Recovery Percentages	6-52
§ 6.07	Schedule B—Comparison of Leasing Provisions	6-52

CHAPTER 7

Farming (Including Cattle Feeding, Breeding, and Agricultural Investments) and Timber Ventures Peter M. Fass

§ 7.01	Types of Farming Investments	7-1
§ 7.02	Farming Tax Shelters Prior to Tax Reform Act of 1976	7-3
§ 7.03	Provisions of the 1976 Act Relating to Farming ..	7-11
§ 7.04	Application of Provisions of 1976 Act and 1981 Act to Specific Devices of Farming Shelters ..	7-15
§ 7.05	What Is Still Available in Farming Tax Shelter Benefits	7-19
§ 7.06	Excerpts from IRS Tax Shelters—Examination Handbook—Farm Operations (Chapter 400) ...	7-26
§ 7.07	The Unique Advantages Available to Timber Ventures Survived the 1976 Act	7-28

CHAPTER 8

Current Federal and State Securities Law Developments Affecting Partnership Offerings Linda A. Wertheimer

Tax Sheltered Investments

§ 8.01	Applicability of Federal and State Securities Laws to Partnership Interests	8-1
§ 8.02	Regulation D	8-9
§ 8.03	Federal-State Coordination	8-43
§ 8.04	Section 4(6)	8-51
§ 8.05	Regulation A	8-52
§ 8.06	Intrastate Offering Exemption: Section 3(a)(11) and Rule 147	8-54
§ 8.07	The Trouble Spots: Integration, Installment Payments and Assessments as New Securities, and Extension of Credit	8-61
§ 8.08	Developments Affecting Broker-Dealer Registration Requirements	8-72
§ 8.09	Inadvertent Investment Companies	8-76
§ 8.10	Recent Developments Affecting or Potentially Affecting Partnership Securities	8-78
§ 8.11	“Due Diligence” in the Context of Preserving the Private Placement Exemption	8-87
§ 8.12	Practical Due Diligence of Partnership Offerings	8-92

CHAPTER 9

“At Risk” Limitation on Availability of Losses

Robert D. Howard and Peter M. Fass

§ 9.01	The Law Prior to the Tax Reform Act of 1976	9-1
§ 9.02	The Tax Reform Act of 1976	9-1
§ 9.03	The Revenue Act of 1978	9-14
§ 9.04	Technical Corrections Act of 1979	9-19
§ 9.05	Consolidated Return Regulations	9-19
§ 9.06	The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981	9-20

CHAPTER 10

Miscellaneous Tax Shelters

Robert D. Howard and Peter M. Fass

§10.01	Effect of Recent Legislation	10-1
§10.02	“Amortization” Shelters: Movies, Books, Records, Art, Computer Tapes, Equipment Leasing	10-3

Table of Contents

§10.03	Miscellaneous Shelters	10-16
§10.04	Recent IRS Tax Shelter Audit Guidelines	10-27
§10.05	Attacks on Abusive Tax Shelters	10-28

CHAPTER 11

Research and Development Programs and Partnerships

Peter M. Fass

§11.01	Introduction	11-1
§11.02	Advantages of R&D Partnerships	11-1
§11.03	Structure of the Typical R&D Partnership	11-6
§11.04	Research and Development Tax Credit	11-13
§11.05	Conclusion	11-18

CHAPTER 12

The New “S Corporation”—Its Potential as an Investment Vehicle

Peter M. Fass

§12.01	Introduction	12-1
§12.02	The Subchapter S Corporation	12-1
§12.03	The Subchapter S Act—Its Principal Provisions	12-2
§12.04	Comparisons of Partnerships and S Corporations	12-6
§12.05	Summary	12-10

Selected No-Action Letters Robert J. Haft

(1)	Cablevision Associates V	NA-1
(2)	Richard S. Appel	NA-6
(3)	Minnesota Cablesystems-Southwest	NA-7
(4)	Snyder Oil Company	NA-11
(5)	Intuit Telecom, Inc.	NA-15
(6)	Winthrop Financial Co., Inc.	NA-18
(7)	Video, 1982 (Film Festival '82)	NA-24

CHAPTER 1

Selected Problems in the Creation, Operation, and Dissolution of the Limited Partnership

PETER M. FASS

§ 1.01 General

[1] A key step in the development of any tax sheltered investment is the choice of appropriate legal structure or organization form to be used by the participants in owning the investment. Such an organization should have the operating and market advantages of a corporation, yet enable the participants to enjoy the same tax benefits available to an individual investor—primarily the ability to pass through paper tax losses created by depreciation to reduce his other taxable income.

[a] Tax shelter syndications are usually in the form of limited partnerships, principally because the income and expenses of the enterprise “pass through” to the investors for tax purposes, allowing them to claim allocable deductions on their personal income tax returns. Corporations and business trusts, on the other hand, because they are separate tax-paying entities, do not offer this benefit. The property could be held directly by the investor or in a general partnership, but under these arrangements the investor’s liability (i.e., for contract claims, personal injury) would not be limited to his investment. A second reason for structuring the syndication as a limited partnership, therefore, is that it permits the investor to limit his economic risk to his investment in the activity. Properly constituted, a limited partnership does not subject a passive investor to the debts and liabilities of the enterprise.

§ 1.01 / Tax Sheltered Investments

[2] The limited partnership comes closest to combining the benefits of corporate organization with individual tax treatment. The limited partner's liability is limited to his investment in the partnership while the general partner of a limited partnership has unlimited exposure. The partnership has substantial continuity since the death or bankruptcy of a limited partner, the assignment of his interest, or his withdrawal does not terminate the partnership. While in theory the death, bankruptcy or resignation of the general partner may terminate the partnership, most partnership agreements provide a ready means for re-forming the partnership upon agreement of the limited partners to do so. The partnership management is centralized in the hands of the general partner. Unlike the corporate form, however, there is no true accountability of management to investors since, unlike corporate directors, the general partner does not come up for reelection. And even though in some states the limited partners are permitted by the partnership law to remove and replace the general partner, essentially the limited partner's role is passive.

[3] There were no limited partnerships under common law, and each state which recognizes limited partnerships has enacted a law setting forth the detailed requirements for attaining this classification. Thus, if a passive investor in a partnership is to receive the benefit of limited liability, there must be substantial compliance with the relevant state limited partnership statute. All states (except Louisiana), including the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, have enacted, in one form or another, the provisions contained in the 1916 version of the Uniform Limited Partnership Act ("ULPA").

[a] The origin of limited partnerships is not found in English or American common law. Limited partnerships were first known and recognized in the Italian commercial centers of Pisa and Florence in the twelfth century, as a means for the owners of wealth, primarily the nobles and clergy, to invest their capital without being known or named. The system was carried to France at an early date and has always been there a major form of business organization. The system of limited partnership was first brought to America by the French in Louisiana and Florida. In Louisiana it has been known as "partnership in commendam." Beginning in 1822 in New York, various statutes were enacted by

different states providing for limited partnership, and patterned after the French Code.

[b] Underlying the ULPA is the theory that a willing investor should be able to put his money in a limited partnership and depend on others for investment skills without incurring any liability in the process. "The act proceeds on the assumption that no public policy requires a person who contributes to the capital of a business, acquires an interest in the profits, and some degree of control over the conduct of the business, to become bound for the obligations of the business, provided creditors have no reason to believe at the times their credits were extended that such person was bound." See ULPA, sec. 1 Comment. Further, the ULPA reflects a desire to provide reasonable protection of commercial expectations through a uniform system of regulation of limited partnerships. *Rathke v. Griffith*, 35 Wash.2d 394, 218 P2d 757 (1950).

[c] In August, 1976, The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws at their annual meeting approved and recommended for enactment in all states a Revised Uniform Limited Partnership Act ("RULPA").

[i] Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming have adopted RULPA (with various modifications), and several other states are considering its adoption.

[ii] Since the RULPA can be reasonably expected to be adopted in an increasing number of states in the near future, its impact upon the problems discussed herein will be considered where appropriate.

§ 1.02 Checklist of Items to Be Considered Prior to Formation of the Limited Partnership

[1] Partnership name, including consideration of which partners' surnames should be included in partnership name. (See Section 5 of ULPA.) Section 5(2) provides that "a limited partner whose name appears in a partnership name contrary to the provisions of paragraph one is liable as a general partner to partnership creditors

§ 1.02 / Tax Sheltered Investments

who extend credit to the partnership *without actual knowledge that he is not a general partner.*”

Note that the limited partner has “general partner” liability unless he is relieved of that liability under a very stringent test—he must show that the partnership creditor had actual knowledge that he was not a general partner. It makes no defense that the creditor could have found out his status by inquiry or by examining the recorded certificate, or that the creditor may not have relied on the ostensible status of the individual.

[2] Principal place of business. If doing business in several states, see § 1.03 [10], below.

[3] Term of the partnership and what law will govern (see § 1.03 [10], below.)

[4] Who will be the general partner-individual or corporation (see *Rev. Proc.* 72-13, 1972-1. C.B. 735).

[5] Limited partners—How will they be selected and how many will be admitted to the partnership?

[a] Federal and State Securities Act considerations.

[b] Will transfer of limited partners’ interest be allowed or restricted?

[i] If transfer is allowed, what procedures will be followed and standards applied for assignment and/or substitution or assignee? (See Sections 18 and 19 of the ULPA.)

[6] Termination of the partnership—determine if death, retirement, insanity, resignation, expulsion or bankruptcy of the general partner will cause dissolution of the limited partnership unless the business is continued by the remaining general partners under a right to do so stated in the certificate or with the consent of all members (see ULPA sec. 20).

[a] The Federal Bankruptcy Act was enacted and became effective on October 1, 1979. Section 365(e)(1)(A) of that Act provides that a contractual provision mandating termination or modification of an executory contract upon the insolvency of a debtor is unenforceable during the administration of the debtor’s bankruptcy proceeding. Clauses requiring the withdrawal of a