



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Section of Real Property, Probate and Trust Law

321 N. Clark Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610-4714
FAX: (312) 988-5262
<http://www.abanet.org/rppt>
E-mail: rppt@abanet.org

CHAIR
Kevin L. Shepherd
2 Hopfire Plaza
Suite 1600
Baltimore, MD 21201-2930

CHAIR-ELECT
Christine L. Albright
Suite 4700
35 W. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60601-1695

VICE-CHAIR
REAL PROPERTY DIVISION
Kathleen M. Martin
Suite 1900
220 S. Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-4513

VICE-CHAIR
PROBATE AND TRUST DIVISION
Steve R. Akers
Ste. 600
300 Crescent Ct.
Dallas, TX 75201-1800

FINANCE AND CORPORATE
SPONSORSHIP OFFICER
Roger D. Winston
Bethesda, MD

SECRETARY
Tina Hestrom Fortuondo
Coral Gables, FL

SECTION DELEGATE TO
THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES
Neal J. Fink
Atlanta, GA

Leopold Z. Sher
New Orleans, LA

David K. Y. Tang
Seattle, WA

ABA BOARD OF GOVERNORS LIAISON
Michael A. Bedke
Tampa, FL

SECTION REPRESENTATIVE TO
ABA BOARD OF GOVERNORS
Raymond J. Werner
Chicago, IL

COUNCIL
Nancy J. Appleby
Washington, DC

Marc S. Bekerman
Mineola, NY

Elwood F. Cahill
New Orleans, LA

Robin Sloan Cromer*
Anderson, SC

David S. Dietrich
Billings, MT

Rich DiPreta*
Greenwich, CT

Jo Ann Engelhardt
Palm Beach, FL

Thomas M. Featherston, Jr.
Waco, TX

Michael D. Galer
Cleveland, OH

Michael J. Glazerman
Boston, MA

Linda B. Hirschson
New York, NY

Bernard V. Kearse
Atlanta, GA

William P. LaPiana
New York, NY

Martin P. Miner
New York, NY

Barry E. Nekritz
Chicago, IL

Andrew F. Palmieri
Alexandria, VA

John W. Porter
Houston, TX

Roseleen Parker-Rick
Richmond, VA

Alan F. Rothschild, Jr.
Columbus, GA

Gideon Rothschild
New York, NY

Sidney G. Saltz
Chicago, IL

Kenneth L. Samuelson
Washington, DC

Barbara Sloan
New York, NY

Susan G. Talley
New Orleans, LA

David A. Thomas
Provo, UT

Linda S. Whitton
Valparaiso, IN

*Young Lawyer Division Liaison

STAFF DIRECTOR
Robin K. Roy
(312) 988-5670

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
COMMITTEES, DIVERSITY AND CLE
Antoinette N. Smith
(312) 988-5260

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR TECHNOLOGY,
MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS
Robert W. King
(312) 988-5540

MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS
MANAGER
(312) 988-5590

MEETINGS & CLE MANAGER
(312) 988-5263

TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST
Jennifer S. Rodriguez
(312) 988-5624

COMMITTEE & MEETINGS ASSISTANT
Lora L. Lende
(312) 988-5651

October 13, 2005

Via E-Mail

Comments on the Tax Technical Corrections Act of 2005
Senate Finance Committee

Re: Proposed Technical Corrections re: S Corporation Family Attribution Rules

Dear Sir/Madame:

Attached are comments on Code Sec. 1361(c)(1)(A), which permits members of one family to be counted as one shareholder when determining whether an S corporation has more than 100 shareholders.


The following comments are being submitted on behalf of the American Bar Association Section of Real Property, Probate and Trust Law. They have not been approved by the House of Delegates nor the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and should not be construed as representing the position of the American Bar Association.

The comments were prepared by members of the Business Planning Group of the Probate and Trust Division of the Real Property, Probate and Trust Law Section of the American Bar Association. Principal responsibility was exercised by Douglas W. Stein, of Barris, Sott, Denn & Driker, PLLC, Detroit, Michigan, a member of the Group, and by Steven B. Gorin, of Thompson Coburn LLP, St. Louis, Missouri, Chair of the Group. Also participating in the preparation of the comments were W. Birch Douglass, III, of McGuireWoods LLP, Richmond, Virginia, and Sydney S. Traum, of counsel to Levey, Airan, Shevin, et al, Coral Gables, Florida. Reviewing these comments on behalf of the Section's Committee on Governmental Submissions was Louis A. Mezzullo of McGuireWoods LLP, Richmond, Virginia.

Although members of the Business Planning Group of the Real Property, Probate and Trust Law Section of the American Bar Association who participated in preparing these comments and recommendations have clients who are affected by the federal tax principles addressed, or have advised clients on the application of such principles, no such member (or the firm or organization to which such member belongs) has been engaged by a client to make a governmental submission with Although members of the Business Planning Group of the Real Property, Probate and Trust Law Section of the American Bar Association who participated in preparing these comments and recommendations have clients who are affected by the federal tax principles addressed, or have advised clients on the application of such principles, no such member (or the firm or organization to which such member belongs) has been engaged by a client to make a governmental submission with respect to, or otherwise influence the development or outcome of, the specific subject matter of these comments.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Steven B. Gorin, chair of the Section's Business Planning Group, at phone 314-552-6151, fax 314-552-7151, email sgorin@thompsoncoburn.com.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kevin L. Shepherd". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'K'.

Kevin L. Shepherd
Section Chair

Enclosure

cc: Steve R. Akers
Christine L. Albright
David J. Dietrich
Steven B. Gorin

Comments for Technical Corrections to Internal Revenue Code Section 1361

The following comments are being submitted on behalf of the American Bar Association Section of Real Property, Probate and Trust Law. They have not been approved by the House of Delegates nor the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and should not be construed as representing the position of the American Bar Association.

The comments were prepared by members of the Business Planning Group of the Probate and Trust Division of the Real Property, Probate and Trust Law Section of the American Bar Association. Principal responsibility was exercised by Douglas W. Stein, of Barris, Sott, Denn & Driker, PLLC, Detroit, Michigan, a member of the Group, and by Steven B. Gorin, of Thompson Coburn LLP, St. Louis, Missouri, Chair of the Group. Also participating in the preparation of the comments were W. Birch Douglass, III, of McGuireWoods LLP, Richmond, Virginia, and Sydney S. Traum, of counsel to Levey, Airan, Shevin, et al, Coral Gables, Florida. Reviewing these comments on behalf of the Section's Committee on Governmental Submissions was Louis A. Mezzullo of McGuireWoods LLP, Richmond, Virginia.

Although members of the Business Planning Group of the Real Property, Probate and Trust Law Section of the American Bar Association who participated in preparing these comments and recommendations have clients who are affected by the federal tax principles addressed, or have advised clients on the application of such principles, no such member (or the firm or organization to which such member belongs) has been engaged by a client to make a governmental submission with respect to, or otherwise influence the development or outcome of, the specific subject matter of these comments.

In 2004 Congress modified Code Sec. 1361(b)(1)(A) by increasing the number of shareholders an S corporation may have to one hundred (100). In addition, Code Sec. 1361 (c)(1)(A)(ii) was modified to permit any family member to elect for all family members to be treated as one shareholder whether or not the electing family member owns stock in the company either directly or is deemed to hold the stock by reason of being a beneficiary of a qualified Subchapter S trust or an electing small business trust.

Code Sec. 1361(c)(1)(B)(i) defines family members to include the common ancestor, lineal descendants of the common ancestor, and the spouses (or former spouses) of the lineal descendants or common ancestor. Code Sec. 1361(c)(1)(B)(ii) states an individual is not a common ancestor if, when the election to treat family members as one shareholder becomes effective, the individual is more than six (6) generations removed from the youngest generation of shareholders who are family members.

Election

The statutory language does not limit the number of families that can make the election. This is contrasted with other versions of S corporation reform, such as the

Subchapter S Modernization Bill of 2003 which limited this election to one family. Since only one family could elect S status in the Subchapter S Modernization Bill of 2003, the election was necessary. Congress clearly chose to expand the one family rule by allowing all families which are S corporation shareholders to make the election, thus rendering the election unnecessary. The election requirement should be removed and all descendants of a common ancestor should be treated as one person.

Congress sought to simplify the use and administration of S corporations. The retention of the election adds a level of complexity that is unwarranted in light of the broad definition of a family member and the ability of allowing any member of the family to make the election.

If Congress does not remove the election requirement, then the statute should be clarified to indicate which family member can make the election. As currently written, it appears that any family member, even a non-shareholder family member can make the election. Congress should make clear that only a shareholder family member can make the election under Code Sec. 1361.

Ambiguity

Due to the way the statute was drafted there are several ambiguities. For example, it is unclear whether all descendants of a common ancestor, no matter how far removed, can be treated as a single shareholder or if only those descendants who are no more than six (6) generations removed from a common ancestor are to be treated as a single shareholder. This ambiguity exists due to the use of the phrase “For purposes of this paragraph” as opposed to “For purposes of determining a common ancestor under subsection (C)(1)(B)(i)” in Code Sec. 1361(c)(1)(B)(ii). Congress should make the definition clear and implement congressional intent to treat all descendants of a common ancestor, no matter how far removed, as a single shareholder by revising Code Sec. 1361(c)(1)(B) to read as indicated below.

Under Code Sec. 1361(c)(1)(B)(ii) the date for identifying the common ancestor is tied to the latter of “the effective date of this paragraph” or the time of the S election. If the effective date language refers to the effective date of the legislation, the quoted language does not cover future shareholder families that first acquire stock after the S election is in place. The statute should refer to the date the family becomes subject to Code Sec. 1361(c)(1)(A)(ii).

The statute also fails to address whether trusts, which are ignored for income tax purposes (i.e., grantor trusts) or a trust in which the beneficiaries are members of the family can be treated as a member of the family. The legislative history makes this clear but the statute is silent on the matter. It is suggested that, for purposes of determining how many shareholders there are, a trust should be “looked through” and a determination should be made at the beneficiary level and not at the trust level. Thus, a trust in which all the beneficiaries who can benefit from the S corporation are members of the family will allow the trust to qualify as a member of the family. However, a trust in which some of the beneficiaries are not family members will not be treated as a member of the family.

Proposed Statute

We respectfully suggest that the statute be revised as described below.

Eliminate Election

If our suggestion to eliminate the election is adopted, we suggest that the statute read as follows:

“(c) Special rules for applying subsection (b):

(1) Members of family treated as 1 shareholder.

(A) In general. For purpose of subsection (b)(1)(A) all members of a family shall be treated as 1 shareholder.

(B) Members of the family. For purpose of subparagraph (A) -

(i) In general. The term “members of the family” means the common ancestor, all lineal descendants of the common ancestor, and the spouses (or former spouses) of such lineal descendants or common ancestor. Trusts in which all of beneficiaries, without regard to an unexercised power of appointment, are members of the family shall be treated as a member of the family.

(ii) Common ancestor. For purposes of determining a common ancestor under subsection (c)(1)(B)(i), an individual shall not be considered a common ancestor if, as of the date the individual’s family becomes subject to subsection (c)(1)(A), the individual is more than 6 generations removed from the youngest generation of shareholders who would (but for this clause) be members of the family. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a spouse (or former spouse) shall be treated as being of the same generation as the individual to which such spouse is (or was) married.

(C) Effect of adoption, etc. In determining whether any relationship specified in subparagraph (B) exists, the rules of section 152(b)(2) shall apply.”

With Election

If our suggestion to eliminate the election is not adopted, we suggest that the statute read as follows:

“(c) Special rules for applying subsection (b):

(1) Members of family treated as 1 shareholder.

(A) In general. For purpose of subsection (b)(1)(A)-

(i) unless an election is made under clause (ii), a husband and wife (and their trusts and estates) shall be treated as 1 shareholder, and

(ii) all members of the family shall be treated as 1 shareholder.

(B) Members of the family. For purpose of subparagraph (A)(ii) -

(i) In general. The term “members of the family” means the common ancestor, all lineal descendants of the common ancestor, and the spouses (or former spouses) of such lineal descendants or common ancestor. Trusts in which all of beneficiaries, without regard to an unexercised power of appointment, are members of the family shall be treated as a member of the family.

(ii) Common ancestor. For purposes of determining a common ancestor under subsection (C)(1)(B)(i), an individual shall not be considered a common ancestor if, as of the date the individual’s family becomes subject to subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii), the individual is more than 6 generations removed from the youngest generation of shareholders who would (but for this clause) be members of the family. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a spouse (or former spouse) shall be treated as being of the same generation as the individual to which such spouse is (or was) married.

(C) Effect of adoption, etc. In determining whether any relationship specified in subparagraph (B) exists, the rules of section 152(b)(2) shall apply.”

(D) Election. An election under subparagraph (A)(ii) -

(i) may, except as otherwise provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary, be made by any member of the family who is a shareholder at the time, and

(ii) shall remain in effect until terminated as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary.