

STATE OF CALIFORNIA **FRANCHISE TAX BOARD – Legal Department** PO Box 2229 Rancho Cordova, CA 95812-2229 Telephone (916) 845-3307 FAX (916) 845-3191

BETTY T. YEE Member

MICHAEL C. GENEST Member

July 17, 2007 Chief Counsel Ruling 2007-3

Re: Request for a Chief Counsel Ruling on Behalf of ******

Dear *****:

FACTS

A. Federal Procedural Background

under IRC sections 355 and 368 of the Code. A copy of this IRS PLR has been provided to the FTB in connection with this Chief Counsel Ruling.

¹ All "Treas. Reg." references are to the final regulations promulgated under the Code as enacted on January 1, 2005.

² All CR&TC references are to the California Revenue and Taxation Code in effect as of the date of this Chief Counsel Ruling.

B. Lack of Conformity with Recent Federal Legislation

IRC section 355(b) provides that, immediately after a *********, both the ******** corporation and the ******** corporation must be engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business. Such trade or business must have been actively conducted for the five-year period ending on the date of the ********* and must not have been acquired within such five-year period in a transaction in which gain or loss was recognized in whole or in part.⁴

C. Corporate Background and Capital Structure

⁴ See generally IRC §355(b).

1. ********

2. *** (*********)

********* was incorporated in the State of ***** on **** **, ****, as ********* **********************. After a series of name changes, on ***** **, ****, its name was changed to ***.

California franchise tax purposes,⁶ to meet the active trade or business requirement of IRC section 355(b).

⁷ In a transaction separate from and occurring prior to the Restructuring Transactions, *** of the ***** then outstanding preferred shares of ***** owned by ***** were redeemed in exchange for a cash payment of *******, leaving ***** outstanding preferred shares.

To accomplish the germane corporate business purposes of the ********** and to otherwise facilitate the **********, ********* has undertaken the following transactions *********'s other ********* and the transfer of the ***** **********; (ii) the ***** merger of *****, a ****** corporation, with and into ("********"), a ****** limited liability company that is wholly owned by ******** and a disregarded entity for federal income tax and California franchise tax purposes, and (iii) a merger of *****, a ******** corporation, with liability company that is wholly owned by ******** and a disregarded entity for federal income and California franchise tax purposes (the "***** *******"). The *** ********, the ********* ther businesses.

not to exceed a specified amount based on the

STEP 2: <u>******** Transactions</u>

- a. ***** *******. On ******************, pursuant to the ***** ******, ***** merged with and into *********, in a transaction intended to qualify as a "reorganization" under IRC section 368(a)(1)(A) (the "***** *****").

STEP 4: ***** *********

On ***********, ***** merged with and into ********* in a transaction that qualifies as a tax-free ******** pursuant to IRC sections 332 and 337.

¹³ The Internal Revenue Code as applicable for California purposes as of the "specified date" of January 1, 2005.

¹⁶ See ******* Overview (***********) (IRS Private Letter Ruling Request Exhibit *).

3. The *********

RULINGS REQUESTED

- 1. As a result of the ***** ********, ******** became directly engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business, and will thus satisfy the active trade or business requirement of IRC section 355(b) for California franchise tax purposes, as adopted in the CR&TC as of the date of this Chief Counsel Ruling.
- For California franchise tax purposes, the FTB will respect the form and substance of the Relevant Transactions as described in and ruled on by the Service in the IRS PLR, and will otherwise apply the CR&TC to the Relevant Transactions in a manner that is consistent with such characterization described in the IRS PLR.
- None of the Relevant Transactions will constitute a noneconomic substance transaction ("NEST") under CR&TC section 19774(c)(2), and thus, the NEST understatement penalty under CR&TC section 19774 will not apply to any of the Relevant Transactions.

REPRESENTATIONS

- A. General Representations
 - 1. ******** asserts that the identical issues in this ruling request are not in a prior California franchise tax return of the taxpayer or an affiliate for a previous year, and are not the subject of an existing California audit, protest, appeal or litigation concerning the taxpayer or an affiliate.

2. Immediately before the *********, items of income, gain, loss, and deduction will be taken into account as required by the applicable intercompany transaction regulations (as determined under Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 18, section 25106.5-1).

B. IRC Section 355(b) Representations

- 4. ******** continuously owned 100 percent of the stock of ***** for at least the fiveyear period ending on the ***** ********. ********* wholly owns *********.

- 9. Following the **********, ********* will continue the active conduct of its business independently and with its separate employees or employees of affiliated corporations.
- C. <u>CR&TC Section 19774 Representations</u>

<u>RULINGS</u>

- Based on the Taxpayer's receipt of the IRS PLR, and the facts and representations provided by the Taxpayer herein, the ********* will satisfy the active trade or business requirement of IRC section 355(b) for California franchise tax purposes, as adopted in the CR&TC as of the date of this Chief Counsel Ruling.
- For California franchise tax purposes, the FTB will respect the form and substance of the Relevant Transactions as described in and ruled on by the Service in the IRS PLR, and will otherwise apply the CR&TC to the Relevant Transactions in a manner that is consistent with such characterization described in the IRS PLR.
- 3. Based on the facts and representations as provided by the Taxpayer herein, none of the Relevant Transactions will constitute a noneconomic substance transaction under CR&TC section 19774(c)(2), and thus, the NEST understatement penalty under CR&TC section 19774 will not apply to any of the Relevant Transactions.

LAW AND ANALYSIS

California Adoption of "Subchapter C"

Pursuant to CR&TC sections 24451 and 17321, California specifically adopts by reference Subchapter C of Chapter 1 of Subtitle A of the Code, ¹⁸ without any modifications that are relevant to the legal analysis herein. These Subchapter C provisions include, but are not limited to, IRC sections 312, 332, 337, 351, 355, 358, 361 and 368. Furthermore, the related Treasury Regulations with respect to these federal statutes are also adopted by California pursuant to CR&TC sections 23051.5(d) and 17024.5(d). Therefore, all citations included herein to the aforementioned sections and related Treasury Regulations of California law.

¹⁸ California conforms to these provisions of the Internal Revenue Code as of the "specified date" of January 1, 2005.

Subchapter C Provisions Applicable to the **********

The IRS PLR provides that the ******** qualifies for nonrecognition treatment under IRC sections 355 and 368. California adopts by reference IRC sections 355 and 368 and the related regulations thereto through CR&TC sections 24451 and 23501.5(d) for corporate franchise tax purposes, and CR&TC sections 17321 and 17024.5(d) for personal income tax purposes. Additionally, as discussed in FTB Notice 89-277, California follows federal procedures and rulings where California law is in conformity to federal law as long as the FTB has not publicly indicated it will not follow the ruling or procedure.

IRC Section 355(b) "Active Trade or Business" Requirement

1. ********

As stated above, the Taxpayer has received an IRS PLR in which the Service has ruled that the ******** will constitute a tax-free reorganization under IRC sections 368(a)(1)(D) and 355; implicit in this IRS PLR is that the ********* will satisfy the "active trade or business" requirement of IRC section 355(b). As of the date of the *********, California has not adopted the amendments to IRC section 355(b) made by section 202 of TIPRA. Thus, ********* liquidated ***** in the ***********, described herein, in order to become directly engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business to satisfy the requirements of IRC section 355(b) as currently applicable for California franchise tax purposes.

active trade or business requirement notwithstanding the fact that during the relevant period it had no employees and that all of its business was conducted through the use of employees of affiliated corporations.²⁰

Active Trade or Business Formerly conducted by **	*** (and now by *********). *********
conducts the ***********************************	n consists of
***************************************	****************
***************************************	************

**************************************	es these business activities

²⁰ See Rev. Rul. 79-394, 1979-2 C.B. 141, as amplified by Rev. Rul. 80-181, 1980-2 C.B. 121; see also PLR 200634005 (May 25, 2006); PLR 200044017 (Nov. 3, 2000); PLR 9843033 (July 28, 1998); and PLR 9701060 (Oct. 9, 1996).

The ***** ******** has been undertaken to ensure that ******** is treated as engaged in an active trade or business immediately after the ********** for California and certain other states' franchise and income tax purposes.

Importantly, under both current IRC section 355(b)(2)(A) and former IRC section 355(b)(2)(A) (i.e., as in effect prior to TIPRA, and current California law), a corporation is treated as engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business if it is itself directly engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business.

Absent the ***** ********, at the time of the *********, ******** would not be engaged directly in the active conduct of a trade or business, nor would it satisfy the "holding

²³ IRC §355(b)(3).

company" test of IRC section 355(b)(2)(A) as in effect prior to TIPRA. As a result, while ******** would be treated for federal income tax purposes as satisfying the "active trade or business" requirement of IRC section 355(b)(2)(A), by reason of IRC section 355(b)(3), ******** would not satisfy the active trade or business requirement of IRC section 355(b)(2)(A) as in effect prior to TIPRA, and therefore would not be so treated for California franchise tax purposes.

As a result of the ***** *********, the trade or business assets and activities of ***** are treated as directly held by ******** for federal income tax and California franchise tax purposes such that ********* is treated as engaged directly in the active conduct of a trade or business, thereby simultaneously satisfying the active trade or business requirement of IRC section 355(b)(2)(A) for federal income tax and California franchise tax purposes.

2. *** (*********)

******* is engaged in the business of operating the ***** ****** (the "***** ****** ********"). The ***** ****** is one of the ***** *****

²⁴ The term "************" refers to	

²⁵ In addition to the ******* ******** *********, ******* provides	
*** ***********************************	

****** ********************************	

**** **********************************	
** ******** ***************************	
****** **** ********* *****************	

acquisition of ****** in **********),²⁶ nor has it been a party to a *********, merger or any other type of taxable or tax-free reorganization.

Noneconomic Substance Transactions (NEST) Under CR&TC Section 19774

For tax years beginning on or after January 1, 2005, pursuant to CR&TC section 19774, if a taxpayer has a noneconomic substance transaction understatement, a penalty is imposed for an understatement attributable to any noneconomic substance transaction. The penalty is 40 percent of the understatement of tax.²⁷ If the transaction is adequately disclosed by a taxpayer in a return (or a statement attached to the return) the penalty is decreased to 20 percent of the understatement of tax.²⁸

A noneconomic substance transaction includes the disallowance of any loss, deduction or credit, or addition to income attributable to a determination that the disallowance or addition is attributable to a transaction or arrangement that lacks economic substance, including a transaction or arrangement in which an entity is disregarded as lacking economic substance.²⁹ A transaction is treated as lacking economic substance if the taxpayer does not have a valid nontax California business purpose in entering into the transaction.³⁰

²⁶ In *****, ***** acquired the *****************, which

²⁷ CR&TC §19774(a).

²⁸ CR&TC §19774(b)(1).

²⁹ CR&TC §19774(c)(2).

³⁰ Id.

³¹ See PLR 200532011 (April 29, 2005) (ruling that a number of internal Proposed Restructuring transactions that were carried out to facilitate a tax-free spin-off under §355 were tax-free reorganizations under IRC §368); see also, Sheryl Stratton, *Korb Holds Forth on Economic Substance Doctrine*, Tax Analysts, Jan. 24, 2007 (quoting IRS Chief Counsel, Donald Korb in a speech given at the 2007 University of Southern California Tax Institute in Los Angeles, stating that, "The economic substance doctrine will not be asserted to challenge routine business restructurings...[such as] when a subsidiary is formed solely for the purpose of facilitating a state law merger, and as part of the plan of reorganization, the subsidiary is required to go out of

SCOPE OF RULING

Please be advised that the California franchise tax consequences expressed in this Chief Counsel Ruling are applicable only to the named taxpayer and are based upon and limited to the facts and representations you have submitted to the FTB. In the event of a change in relevant legislation, judicial or administrative case law, a change in federal interpretation of federal law, or a change in the material facts or circumstances relating to and on which this ruling is based, this ruling may no longer be applicable. It is your responsibility to be aware of and promptly notify the FTB should any of these circumstances occur.

This letter is a legal ruling by the Franchise Tax Board's Chief Counsel within the meaning of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of CR&TC section 21012. Please attach a copy of this letter and your request to the appropriate returns when filed or in response to any notices or inquiries which might be issued.

Very truly yours,

existence by merging into the target corporation...[The IRS will] continue to recognize that the tax law has long allowed a corporation to reduce its ownership in a closely held corporation below 80 percent, even if the reduction is solely for the purpose of avoiding IRC §332, in order for the taxpayer to recognize a loss on the subsequent liquidation of that subsidiary...".

Debra S. Petersen Tax Counsel IV

Michael C. Hamersley Tax Specialist III