

The ESTATE PLANNER

JULY/AUGUST 2015



TRUST

CAN A BROKEN TRUST BE FIXED?

KEEP IT IN THE FAMILY

Use an intrafamily loan to cover estate taxes

TAX COURT: TRUST CAN MATERIALLY PARTICIPATE IN A BUSINESS

ESTATE PLANNING RED FLAG

You've included employees in your will or trust

Weston Hurd LLP
Attorneys at Law

Cleveland • Columbus • Beachwood

The Tower At Erievue
1301 East 9th Street, Suite 1900
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1862
tel 216.241.6602 • fax 216.621.8369

10 West Broad Street, Suite 2400
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3469
tel 614.280.0200 • fax 614.280.0204

24100 Chagrin Boulevard
Beachwood, Ohio 44122-5535
tel 216.241.6602 • fax 216.621.8369

www.westonhurd.com

CAN A BROKEN TRUST BE FIXED?

An irrevocable trust has long been a key component of many estate plans. But what if it no longer serves your purposes? Is it too late to change it? Depending on applicable state law, you may have several options for fixing a “broken” trust.

HOW TRUSTS BREAK

There are several reasons a trust can break, including:

Changing circumstances. A trust that works just fine when it’s established may no longer achieve its original goals if your family circumstances change. If you divorce, for example, a trust for the benefit of your spouse may no longer be desirable. If your children grow up to be financially independent, they may prefer that you leave your wealth to *their* children. Or perhaps you prefer not to share your wealth with a beneficiary who has developed a drug or alcohol problem or has proven to be profligate.

New tax laws. Many trusts were created when gift, estate and generation-skipping transfer (GST) tax exemption amounts were relatively low. Today, however, the exemptions have risen to \$5.43 million, so trusts designed to minimize gift, estate and GST taxes may no longer be necessary. And with transfer taxes out of the picture, the higher income taxes often associated with these

trusts — previously overshadowed by transfer tax concerns — become a more important factor.

Mistakes. Potential errors include naming the wrong beneficiary, omitting a critical clause from the trust document, including a clause that’s inconsistent with your intent, and failing to allocate your GST tax exemption properly.

If you have one or more trusts in need of repair, you may have several remedies at your disposal.

These are just a few examples of the many ways you might end up with a trust that fails to achieve your estate planning objectives.

HOW TO FIX THEM

If you have one or more trusts in need of repair, you may have several remedies at your disposal, depending on applicable law in the state where you live and, if different, in the state where the trust is located. Potential remedies include:

Reformation. The Uniform Trust Code (UTC), adopted in more than half the states, provides several remedies for broken trusts. Non-UTC states may provide similar remedies. Reformation allows you to ask a court to rewrite a trust’s terms to conform with the grantor’s intent. This remedy is available if the trust’s original terms were based on a legal or factual mistake.



Modification. This remedy may be available, also through court proceedings, if unanticipated circumstances require changes in order to achieve the trust's purposes. Some states permit modification — even if it's inconsistent with the trust's purposes — with the consent of the grantor and all the beneficiaries.

Division/consolidation. The UTC also permits a trustee to divide a trust into two or more trusts, or to consolidate two or more trusts, under certain circumstances. For example, if a trust is only partially exempt from GST taxes, it might be appropriate to divide it into two trusts — one fully exempt and one nonexempt — and use the exempt trust to benefit grandchildren or for other generation-skipping gifts.

Relocation. In some cases, it may be possible to fix a broken trust by changing its situs — that is, by moving it to a jurisdiction whose laws are more favorable. The UTC may allow a trustee to relocate a trust to an appropriate jurisdiction if doing so would be in the beneficiaries' best interests.

Decanting. Many states have decanting laws, which allow a trustee, according to his or her distribution powers, to “pour” funds from one trust into another with different terms and even in a different location. Depending on your circumstances and applicable state law, decanting may allow a trustee to correct errors, take advantage of new tax laws or another state's asset protection laws, add or eliminate beneficiaries, extend the trust term, and make other changes, often without court approval.

CONSULT YOUR ADVISOR

The rules regarding modification of irrevocable trusts are complex and vary dramatically from state to state. And there are risks associated with revising or moving a trust, including uncertainty over how the IRS will view the changes. (See “Beware of federal tax consequences” at right.) Before you make any changes, it's critical to consult your advisor to discuss the potential benefits and risks. ❁

Beware of federal tax consequences

One risk associated with making changes to a trust — particularly those designed to take advantage of tax benefits — is uncertainty over how the IRS will view these changes. For one thing, state court rulings aren't necessarily binding on the IRS, so the IRS may reach its own conclusions about whether a reformation or modification of a trust is effective for federal tax purposes and whether it should apply retroactively.

Also, in some cases, certain changes may have their own tax consequences. In a 2011 notice, the IRS sought public comment on the tax implications of decanting a trust. Among the issues raised were whether:

1. A beneficiary whose interest is reduced has made a taxable gift,
2. Including a decanting power in a trust jeopardizes its qualification for the marital deduction or requires it to be treated as a grantor trust,
3. Decanting triggers generation-skipping transfer tax liability, or
4. Decanting results in taxable gain or other income tax consequences to the trust or its beneficiaries.

Unfortunately, as of this writing, the IRS hasn't yet provided any guidance on these issues.



KEEP IT IN THE FAMILY

USE AN INTRAFAMILY LOAN TO COVER ESTATE TAXES

An intrafamily loan is one option if an estate doesn't have the liquidity to pay estate taxes or other expenses. While a life insurance policy can be used to cover these costs, a benefit of using an intrafamily loan is that, if it's properly structured, the estate can deduct the full amount of interest upfront. Doing so reduces the estate's size and, thus, its estate tax liability.

DEDUCTING THE INTEREST

An estate can deduct interest if it's a permitted expense under local probate law, actually and necessarily incurred in administration of the estate, and ascertainable with reasonable certainty, and will be paid. Under probate law in most jurisdictions, interest is a permitted expense. And, generally, interest on a loan used to avoid a forced sale or liquidation is considered "actually and necessarily incurred."

To ensure that interest is "ascertainable with reasonable certainty," the loan terms shouldn't allow prepayment and should provide that, in the event of default, all interest for the remainder of the loan's term will be accelerated.

To ensure that interest is "ascertainable with reasonable certainty," the loan terms shouldn't allow prepayment and should provide that, in the event of default, all interest for the remainder of the loan's term will be accelerated. Without these provisions,



the IRS or a court would likely conclude that future interest isn't ascertainable with reasonable certainty and would disallow the upfront deduction. Instead, the estate would deduct interest as it's accrued and recalculate its estate tax liability in future years.

The requirement that interest "will be paid" generally isn't an issue, unless there's some reason to believe that the estate won't be able to generate sufficient income to cover the interest payments.

ENSURING THE LOAN IS BONA FIDE

For the interest to be deductible, the loan also must be bona fide. A loan from a bank or other financial institution shouldn't have any trouble meeting this standard.

But if the loan is from a related party, such as a family-controlled trust or corporation, the IRS may question whether the transaction is bona fide.

So the parties should take steps to demonstrate that the transaction is a true loan.

Among other things, they should set a reasonable interest rate (based on current IRS rates), execute a promissory note, provide for collateral or other security to ensure the loan is repaid, pay the interest payments in a timely manner, and otherwise treat the loan as an arm's-length transaction. It's critical that the loan's terms be reasonable and that the parties be able to demonstrate a "genuine intention to create a debt with a reasonable expectation of repayment."

TAX COURT WEIGHS IN

In *Estate of Duncan*, the U.S. Tax Court affirmed the continued viability of this strategy. In that case, the deceased's revocable trust, which held illiquid oil and gas interests, paid estate taxes with a 15-year

loan from an irrevocable trust established by the deceased's father.

The court allowed the interest deduction, even though the two trusts had the same trustees and beneficiaries. The trustees' fiduciary duties under state law obligated them to maintain the trusts' individuality and to respect the terms of the loan. They weren't, as the IRS suggested, "free to shuffle money between these 'trusts' as they please."

FOOTING THE TAX BILL

If your estate is large and consists primarily of real estate, closely held business interests or other illiquid assets, your heirs may encounter difficulty paying estate taxes and other expenses after your death. An intrafamily loan may be an option for them to cover these costs. ❀

TAX COURT: TRUST CAN MATERIALLY PARTICIPATE IN A BUSINESS

In a landmark 2014 case, the U.S. Tax Court opened the door to significant tax savings for certain trusts. In *Frank Aragona Trust v. Commissioner*, the court held that a trust can materially participate in a trade or business and even qualify as a "real estate professional."

WHY DOES IT MATTER?

Investors in passive activities are at a disadvantage. The passive activity loss (PAL) rules prohibit them from offsetting passive losses against nonpassive income, such as wages and investment income. In addition, high-income taxpayers are subject to a 3.8% net investment income tax (NIIT) on the

lesser of their net investment income, including income from passive activities, or the amount by which their modified adjusted gross income exceeds the applicable threshold. The MAGI threshold is \$200,000 per year (\$250,000 for married filing jointly and \$125,000 for married filing separately).

Passive activities include:

- ◆ Trade or business activities in which a taxpayer doesn't materially participate, and
- ◆ Rental real estate activities, regardless of the level of participation, unless the taxpayer is a qualified real estate professional.

Non-real estate professionals who materially participate may deduct up to \$25,000 in rental real estate losses, depending on their income.

Material participation means participation on a “regular, continuous and substantial” basis. The tax regulations provide several objective tests for determining whether a taxpayer materially participates in an activity.

For example, participation for 500 or more hours during a tax year is deemed to be material. Generally, to qualify as a real estate professional, you must 1) spend more than half of your working hours on real estate businesses in which you materially participate, and 2) spend at least 750 hours during a tax year on such real estate businesses.

The impact of the PAL rules and the NIIT on trusts is particularly harsh. A nongrantor trust is taxed at the highest rate (currently 39.6%) after its taxable income exceeds a low threshold (\$12,300 for 2015). In addition, a trust’s undistributed net investment income is subject to the 3.8% NIIT to the extent that its adjusted gross income exceeds the same threshold.

A trust that owns real estate or other passive business interests enjoys significant tax advantages if it’s deemed to materially participate.

HOW CAN A TRUST MATERIALLY PARTICIPATE?

A trust that owns real estate or other passive business interests enjoys significant tax advantages if it’s deemed to materially participate and, in the case of rental real estate, if it qualifies as a real estate professional. For years, the IRS has taken the position



that a trust can do neither of these things, but in *Aragona* the Tax Court rejected this position.

Aragona involved a trust with six trustees — one independent trustee plus the deceased grantor’s five children. Among the trust’s assets was a wholly owned limited liability company (LLC) that managed most of the trust’s rental real estate. Three of the five children worked for the LLC full time.

The IRS argued that the trust couldn’t offset its rental real estate losses against its income from nonrental real estate activities, because 1) a trust can’t perform personal services or materially participate, and 2) even if it can, services the trustees performed as employees shouldn’t count toward the material participation or real estate professional requirements.

The court held that a trust *can* materially participate and qualify as a real estate professional based on the activities of its trustees, including the activities of trustees who are also LLC employees. The trustees were legally obligated to act in the beneficiaries’ best interests, the court explained, and they “are not relieved of their duties of loyalty to beneficiaries by conducting activities through a corporation wholly owned by the trust.”

The court didn’t reach the question of whether the activities of the trust’s nontrustee employees should be considered.

EVALUATE YOUR TRUSTS

The court's ruling in *Aragona* was based on the specific facts of that case. It remains to be seen whether trusts will enjoy the same tax benefits under different circumstances. For example, it's possible that a trust may be deemed to materially participate in a business based on the activities of its nontrustee employees. Also, the court in *Aragona* emphasized that the trust held majority interests in all of the family's real estate businesses.

It's uncertain whether the outcome would be different for a trust holding minority interests.

If your estate plan includes trusts that own real estate or other passive business interests, find out whether they might qualify as material participants or real estate professionals. If they don't, consider naming one or more active participants in these businesses as trustees. And be sure to document the trustees' involvement with these businesses to support your tax position. ❁

ESTATE PLANNING RED FLAG

You've included employees in your will or trust

If you're an employer, you may think of your employees as family. But if you plan to provide for employees in your estate plan, watch out for unintended tax consequences.

Generally, money or other property received by gift or inheritance is excluded from the recipient's income for federal tax purposes. But there's an exception for gifts or bequests to employees: Under Internal Revenue Code Section 102(c), the exclusion doesn't apply to "any amount transferred by or for an employer to, or for the benefit of, an employee."

Certain gifts to employees aren't taxable, including "de minimis" fringe benefits, employee achievement awards and qualified disaster relief payments. Otherwise, the IRS generally views transfers to employees as "supplemental wages" subject to income and payroll taxes.

Despite Sec. 102(c), it may be possible to make a gift to an employee that avoids income taxes. According to the U.S. Supreme Court, such a gift must be made under a "detached and disinterested generosity" or "out of affection, respect, admiration, charity or like impulses." In contrast, if a gift is intended to reward an employee for past performance or serve as an incentive for future performance, it's considered compensation and is subject to income and payroll taxes. Unfortunately, the intent behind a gift can be difficult to prove.

Keep in mind that treating a gift or bequest as compensation isn't necessarily a bad thing. In some cases, the income and payroll taxes may be less severe than the gift, estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes that otherwise would apply. And you can always "gross up" the transferred amount to ensure that the recipient has enough cash to pay the taxes.





Angela G. Carlin is the Co-Chair of Weston Hurd’s Estate, Trust and Probate Practice Group. She focuses her practice on estate, trust and probate administration and litigation, and tax matters. Angela is the author of the Merrick-Rippner Probate Law publication which is the recognized authority in Ohio on probate law. She received the Nettie Cronise Lutes Award from the Ohio State Bar Association in 1996 as the Outstanding Woman Lawyer and for many years, she has been named as an *Ohio Super Lawyer* by *Law & Politics, Inc.* and a *Leading Lawyer* by *Inside Business Magazine*.



Karen A. Davey focuses her practice on estates, trust and probate administration. She also handles litigation in probate related matters, such as will contests, trust contests, and power-of-attorney disputes.



Jerrold L. Goldstein focuses his practice on estate planning, probate and corporate law. Jerry is also Co-Chair of Weston Hurd’s Estate, Trust and Probate Practice Group. He represents clients in a wide variety of matters involving probate administration, probate litigation, estate and income tax compliance, wills and trusts, business formation, contract negotiations, and commercial real estate.



Rema A. Ina is an Associate with Weston Hurd LLP. She focuses her practice on matters involving employment, estate planning, insurance coverage and defense, and workers’ compensation.



Gary W. Johnson advises clients on matters involving commercial litigation, business entities creation and maintenance, land use, construction law, zoning, estate planning and probate. Gary has been recognized as an *Ohio Super Lawyer* in the area of Business Litigation by *Law & Politics, Inc.*



Eugene (Gene) A. Kratus advises individuals in the areas of tax, business and estate planning and counsels privately-owned businesses and their owners on corporate, tax, mergers, acquisitions and business succession issues. His estate planning practice includes implementing various estate planning techniques, ranging from modest By-Pass Trusts to the implementation of sophisticated planning with family limited partnerships, family limited liability companies, charitable trusts and private foundations.



Ludgy A. LaRochelle is an Associate with Weston Hurd LLP. He counsels entrepreneurs, small businesses, and non-profit organizations, and individuals in matters involving commercial real estate, e-commerce and Internet law, employment, estate planning, intellectual property, mergers, acquisitions and divestitures, and regulatory compliance.



Samuel J. Lauricia III focuses his practice on tax planning, at both the Federal and state level, involving corporate, partnership, individual and gift tax issues, succession planning and general corporate transactions, contracts, mergers and acquisitions. Sam has been recognized as an *Ohio Rising Star* in the area of Taxation by *Law & Politics, Inc.*



Shawn W. Maestle is the Chair of Weston Hurd’s Appellate section and a member of the firm’s Litigation section. He focuses his practice in the areas of appellate, estate planning and probate litigation.



Teresa G. Santin is an Associate with Weston Hurd LLP. She focuses her practice on matters involving business, employment, estate planning, real estate, and white collar litigation.



Joseph B. Swartz focuses his practice on estate planning, estate administration, trust administration, and income tax for individuals, estates and trusts. Joe served as chair of the Ohio State Bar Association’s Labor and Employment Law section for 2010-2012 and he has been recognized as an *Ohio Super Lawyer* for Labor and Employment by *Law & Politics, Inc.*

In *Sanders v. Riley*, No. S14A1314, decided March 16, 2015, the Georgia Supreme Court upheld the equitable doctrine of virtual adoption when it reversed a trial court’s judgment in favor of Curtis Riley (“Curtis”), who contended that his half-sister, Shalanda Sanders (“Shalanda”), had failed to prove an inheritance claim from their father, Clifford Riley (“Clifford”), under the equitable doctrine of “virtual adoption.”

This is another case where disputes among family members may be avoided by an individual, here father Clifford Riley, if he had the basic estate planning documents: a Will, a Trust, if proper, a Durable Power of Attorney, a Health Care Power of Attorney, and a Living Will. Unfortunately, Clifford died without a Will or a Trust identifying his beneficiaries. This case also illustrates that once a child, Shalanda, has been “virtually adopted” by her adopting father, Clifford, a later relationship between the child and the child’s natural or biological father does not sever the previous virtual adoption by another person.

Clifford had three children born during his marriage to Corine Riley (“Corine”): Ernestine, Curtis and Shalanda. When Shalanda was born, Curtis had not resided in the marital home for three years, during which time Corine had an affair with Roy Warren (“Roy”). The Rileys knew that Corine was pregnant with Roy’s child.

After a discussion, Roy, Corine and Clifford agreed that Clifford should be Shalanda’s father and Clifford put his name on Shalanda’s birth certificate. There was no written agreement. A legal adoption is provided in the Georgia Code in Title 19, Chapter 8, but Clifford never attempted a statutory adoption of Shalanda.

Unfortunately, Clifford was killed by Corine who then killed herself. While Corine had a Will, Clifford had no Will, but both of them had several insurance policies. Since Ernestine had predeceased her parents, only Curtis and Shalanda collected the insurance proceeds with both signing affidavits that they were the only children and heirs of Clifford. After the affidavits were given to the insurance companies, Curtis disputed Shalanda’s claim to inherit from Clifford.

Shalanda claimed her right to inherit from Clifford as a child born during his marriage to Corine, which claim would agree with Ohio law, and alternatively, under the equitable remedy of virtual adoption. However, Curtis filed a motion for partial summary judgment on this issue of virtual adoption, claiming there was insufficient evidence of an agreement by Clifford to adopt Shalanda and the required partial performance of that agreement.

The trial court granted Curtis’ motion for partial summary judgment which Shalanda appealed to the Georgia Supreme Court, which reversed said decision concluding that the trial court: 1) did not view the evidence and draw reasonable inferences therefrom most favorable to Shalanda who opposed the motion; 2) misinterpreted the requirement of partial performance of the agreement to adopt; and 3) concluded erroneously that a virtual adoption by Clifford of Shalanda could be undone when Shalanda formed a relationship with her biological father, Roy, after she learned of Roy’s existence.

When Shalanda turned 14, Corine introduced Shalanda to Roy and described him as her natural father explaining that it was Clifford’s idea to name himself as her father on her birth certificate and for her to carry his surname. Roy began to visit Shalanda once or twice a year. In December 2011 Shalanda filed an action for determination of heirs in Clifford’s estate, asserting she was a child born of the marriage of Clifford and Corine, or alternately, based on Clifford’s agreement to be her legal father.

The Georgia Supreme Court held that virtual adoption has been a valid equitable remedy in Georgia for more than a century that may enforce a parol obligation by a person to adopt a child of another as his own, accompanied by a virtual, though not a statutory adoption; acted upon by all concerned parties for many years; and which may be enforced in equity after the obligor’s death by decreeing that the child is entitled to the obligor’s property undisposed of by Will. The Supreme Court of Georgia cited *Rhodes v. Quantrell*, 227 Ga. 761 (1971), holding that before a recovery based upon an oral contract to adopt is decreed: (1) proof of the contract must be clear, strong and satisfactorily leave no doubt as to the contract; (2) the word “adopt” is not necessary for the parties to use in their contract or agreement pertaining to the subject child; and (3) there must be proof of partial performance by the parties to the contract. The Supreme Court warned that “virtual adoption” does not result in a legal adoption or the creation of a legal parent-child relationship, and the equitable remedy may be invoked by the “virtually adopted” child only after the “virtually adopting parent” is deceased.