

Message from Our Managing Partner

In this issue we tackle tax issues, navigate holiday parties, and even consider the fate of the planet.

In tax matters, Annette Ahlers reviews how the IRS has reiterated its position on tax consequences to parties when a parent corporation (or taxpayer) pays employees of the parent's subsidiary. Also, Shel Schreiber will speak at the upcoming 16th Annual Tax Credit Developers Conference, on a panel dealing with incorporating HUD funds, what's new at HUD and compliance.

In a Pepper podcast, Amy McAndrew discusses labor and employment pitfalls of company holiday parties. It's more than just lampshades on heads – eat, drink and be wary, she advises, in matters such as gift-giving, holiday bonuses and more.

And Jane Luxton and Bill Walsh examine how the Second and Fifth Circuits recently issued surprising rulings that allow public nuisance tort lawsuits to go forward on theories related to climate change.

We also congratulate Jane on receiving the Gold Medal Award from the U.S. Department of Commerce, for her leadership in enacting the first extensive international management measures for tuna fisheries in the western and central Pacific Ocean.

David A. Wormser, Partner

The material in this publication was created as of the date set forth above and is based on laws, court decisions, administrative rulings and congressional materials that existed at that time, and should not be construed as legal advice or legal opinions on specific facts. The information in this publication is not intended to create, and the transmission and receipt of it does not constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. Please send address corrections to phinfo@pepperlaw.com. © 2009 Pepper Hamilton LLP. All Rights Reserved.

Jane Luxton Receives Gold Medal Award from U.S. Department of Commerce

Jane C. Luxton, partner in Pepper's Washington, D.C. office and a member of the firm's Environmental Practice Group, recently was honored with the U.S. Department of Commerce's Gold Medal Award. U.S. Secretary of Commerce Gary Locke presented the award to Ms. Luxton for her leadership in enacting the first extensive international management measures for tuna fisheries in the western and central Pacific Ocean, specifically the measure imposing catch limits on two highly migratory fish species, bigeye and yellowfin tuna.

The Gold Medal is the Commerce Department's highest honorary award, defined as "distinguished performance characterized by extraordinary, notable, or prestigious contributions that impact the mission of the Department and/or one or more operating units, which reflects favorably on the Department."

Ms. Luxton, a former commissioner of the Western and Central Fisheries Commission and head of the U.S. delegation in 2008, was one of a ten-person team so recognized for this accomplishment.

Ms. Luxton concentrates her practice on environmental matters and also is a member of the firm's Sustainability, CleanTech and Climate Change Team.

FOLLOW PEPPER'S TAX GROUP ON TWITTER

[HTTP://TWITTER.COM/PEPPERTAX](http://twitter.com/peppertax)

This publication may contain attorney advertising.

in this issue...

- 1 Jane Luxton Receives Gold Medal Award from U.S. Department of Commerce
- 2 Second and Fifth Circuits Open the Door to Climate Change Public Nuisance Lawsuits
- 3 Paying Liabilities of Another, Who Gets the Deduction?
- 3 Peppercast: Holiday Parties - Eat, Drink and Be Wary!
- 4 Shel Schreiber Is Speaking at the 16th Annual Tax Credit Developers Conference
- 5 To Be or Not to Be a Public Company

Second and Fifth Circuits Open the Door to Climate Change Public Nuisance Lawsuits

JANE C. LUXTON | LUXTONJ@PEPPERLAW.COM

WILLIAM J. WALSH | WALSHW@PEPPERLAW.COM

Catching many by surprise, in the last several weeks two federal appellate courts have ruled that public nuisance tort lawsuits may go forward on theories related to climate change. Both the Second¹ and Fifth² Circuits overturned lower court decisions that had rejected this kind of litigation as falling within the “political question” domain that the Constitution directs courts not to decide. There are big hurdles between allowing these lawsuits and reaching a litigated judgment that holds companies that emit greenhouse gases liable for monetary damages allegedly resulting from global warming. However, there is no question that these decisions have the potential to usher in a wave of nuisance suits for damages against virtually any emitter of greenhouse gases.

Of the two decisions, the Fifth Circuit decision in *Comer v. Murphy Oil* is the more sweeping. While the Second Circuit case seeks injunctive relief on behalf of several states and land trusts, the Fifth Circuit litigation was brought by private class action plaintiffs suing under state law for compensatory and punitive damages. The case involves claims by homeowners in Mississippi who argue their property damage from Hurricane Katrina was due to stronger hurricane intensity caused by greenhouse gas emissions from oil, gas, and coal companies, including a number of major oil companies. In allowing the lawsuit to go forward, the Fifth Circuit concluded that the plaintiffs’ theory was not materially different from that relied upon by the Supreme Court in *Massachusetts v. EPA*,³ the landmark decision that required the Environmental Protection Agency to consider whether carbon dioxide is a pollutant under the Clean Air Act: “Thus, the [Supreme] Court accepted a causal chain virtually identical in part to that alleged by plaintiffs, *viz.*, that defendants’ greenhouse gas emissions contributed to warming of the environment, including the ocean’s temperature, which damaged plaintiffs’ coastal Mississippi property via sea level rise and the increased intensity of Hurricane Katrina.”⁴

It is one thing to meet the threshold for establishing standing to maintain a lawsuit, and another thing entirely to win on the merits. As a first step, it is likely that defendants will seek rehearing, in an effort to subject these decisions to consideration by the full set of Second and Fifth Circuit judges; this will test whether

those full Courts of Appeals agree with opinions issued by, respectively, two- and three-judge panels.⁵ Beyond that, a major legal battle lies ahead for the plaintiffs in trying to prove their property losses were caused by the carbon dioxide emissions generated by the defendants, and distinguishing the responsibility those companies may bear for global warming from what is due to emissions contributed by so many other sources. Even if defendants prevail in the end, however, the transaction costs of defending these lawsuits are bound to be significant. And in the meanwhile, there is no analytical distinction between the defendants named in these two recent cases and any other carbon dioxide emitters that the next group of plaintiffs may choose to target. The implications for U.S. businesses are substantial.

ENDNOTES

- 1 *Connecticut v. American Electric Power Co.*, No. 05-5104, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 20873 (2d Cir., Sept. 21, 2009).
- 2 *Comer v. Murphy Oil Co.*, No. 07-60756, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 22774 (5th Cir., Oct. 16, 2009).
- 3 *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497 (2007). EPA is proceeding to develop a series of greenhouse gas regulatory requirements based on the Supreme Court’s mandate.
- 4 *Comer v. Murphy Oil Co.*, slip op. at 23.
- 5 Among other issues, defendants will surely point out that the Supreme Court’s 5-4 decision in *Massachusetts v. EPA* depended heavily on the fact that the plaintiffs in that case were states and had unique standing to raise climate change concerns. While this may make the Second Circuit’s decision in *Connecticut v. American Electric Power Co.*, more likely to be sustained on rehearing, (or on review by the Supreme Court), since *Connecticut* also involves state plaintiffs, it offers much less comfort to the Fifth Circuit’s application of this reasoning to accord standing to private plaintiffs in personal injury tort actions for compensatory and punitive damages.

Paying Liabilities of Another, Who Gets the Deduction?

ANNETTE M. AHLERS | AHLERSA@PEPPERLAW.COM

In Chief Counsel Advice 200942038 (June 26, 2009), the Internal Revenue Service (the Service) reiterated its position on the tax consequences to all the parties involved when a parent corporation (or taxpayer) pays employees of the parent's subsidiary corporation. In the CCA, a parent corporation lost control of its subsidiary when the creditors of the subsidiary obtained stock ownership in a bankruptcy proceeding. The Service addressed the following two issues:

“What is the proper character of a loss resulting from payments on nonqualified stock options by the parent to employees of the former subsidiary?”

“When stock option payments are made to employees of the former subsidiary, which entity may properly claim a compensation deduction for such payments?”

ISSUE ONE — CHARACTER OF THE LOSS

When the subsidiary corporation's stock was cancelled in the bankruptcy proceeding, the parent corporation claimed a capital loss for its investment in the subsidiary. When the subsidiary corporation was part of the parent's group, the subsidiary's employees were issued nonqualified stock options every year. These options generally had a 10-year window from the date of grant in which the recipient could exercise them. While the parent ceased issuing the options to the subsidiary after the bankruptcy, the employees of that subsidiary still held the options and

continued to exercise them under the terms of the options. Prior to the bankruptcy of the subsidiary, when one of the subsidiary employees exercised their parent options, the parent would sell newly issued shares to cover the payment option being exercised and the sales proceeds to pay the employee. The parent corporation would treat the cash payment as a capital contribution to the subsidiary. After the bankruptcy of the subsidiary, the parent treated the payments made to the subsidiary employees as capital losses. The parent then changed its position and filed an informal claim for refund that the payments made after the bankruptcy were ordinary losses to them, not capital losses.

In denying the parent's new position, the Service focused on the relation-back doctrine applied in Rev. Rul. 2002-1, 2002-1 C.B., 268, which focused on the exercise of stock options in a former parent (distributing) company by a spun-off company's (controlled's) employees. In the Rev. Rul., the Service treated the exercise of the distributing company's options by the controlled employees as if they happened prior to the distribution of the controlled stock, and allowed an ordinary deduction to the controlled corporation under Section 83(h) and 162, citing to Treas. Reg. Section 1.1032-3. Under this analysis, the parent company is treated as selling its stock on the market (a 1032 transaction), followed by a transfer of the proceeds to its subsidiary as a capital contribution.



Peppercast: Holiday Parties - Eat, Drink and Be Wary!

It's that time of year again. Even with many employers cutting back during these difficult economic times, most still want to find special ways to thank their employees and acknowledge the hard work they have put in over the last year.

In this podcast, **Amy McAndrew**, of counsel in the Berwyn office of Pepper Hamilton and a member of the firm's Labor and Employment practice, discusses issues employers should be aware of during the holiday season, including holiday parties, employee gift giving and holiday bonuses.

Listen today by visiting the Labor and Employment Law section of www.pepperpodcasts.com.

The taxpayer in the CCA argued that a recent tax court case, *Santa Fe Pacific Gold Company v. Commissioner*, 132 T.C. No. 12 (2009), changes the result discussed above and allows the parent to take an ordinary loss on the payment of the stock option to its former subsidiary's employee. The taxpayer stated that the payments to the former subsidiary's employees "produced no long term future benefit to [p]arent, and therefore [p]arent can deduct the payments as ordinary deductions." In the alternative, the parent stated that the payments were associated with an abandoned transaction and could be deducted under Section 165.

The Service would not be dissuaded from applying the relation-back doctrine and did not entertain application of the *Santa Fe* analysis. They stated that the *Santa Fe* case involved the payment of a termination fee in a hostile takeover bid and found no analogy or application to the clearly established relation-back doctrine for payments made under stock options that were issued when the subsidiary was a member of the parent corporation's group. Thus, the Service applied a strict origin-of-the-claim approach in deciding the character of the payment, and which taxpayer could take it into account.

ISSUE TWO — CAN THE PARENT CORPORATION TAKE THE SECTION 83(H) DEDUCTION FOR THE OPTION PAYMENT?

The Service cited to Treas. Regs. Sections 1.83-6(d) and 1.032-3 to conclude that when a parent corporation pays an employee of its subsidiary for the exercise of a stock option, the parent is

treated as making a capital contribution to the subsidiary and the subsidiary is entitled to the deduction for payment to its employee. This is the result, even if the subsidiary is no longer in existence, as was the case in the CCA where the Service stated that the successor to the subsidiary was the proper party to take the deduction for the payments made to the employee.

PEPPER PERSPECTIVE

In this CCA the Service reiterated several key legal concepts that have broad application to many transactions, including mergers, spin-offs, sales of subsidiaries, and workout situations. For example, the Service is readily supportive of a relation-back approach to determine proper tax treatment for multi-party, multi-year transactions. Additionally, a successor entity can take into account tax consequences of the settlement of pre-existing obligations of the selling or distributing group long after the transaction has closed and the subsidiary is no longer part of that group. As a result, careful attention should be paid in drafting transaction documents to address payments to employees under pre-existing compensation and benefit plans. Because these amounts are typically significant, clear instructions and tax allocations should be provided for in the transaction documents to obtain the best financial results for all relevant parties.

Shel Schreiber Is Speaking at the 16th Annual Tax Credit Developers Conference

Pepper partner **Shel Schreiber** is speaking at the 16th Annual Tax Credit Developers Conference on January 14, 2010 in Miami, FL.

The conference gathers the most prominent players in the affordable housing and community development industries to conduct training workshops, deliver educational sessions and forecast legislative and industry changes. The conference attracts developers, investors and sponsors active in the affordable housing and community development industries.

Mr. Schreiber will be speaking on the panel, "Partnering with HUD," which will discuss incorporating HUD funds, what's new at HUD and compliance issues.

Visit <http://www.novoco.com/events/conferences/2010/miami/index.php> for more information.

To Be or Not to Be a Public Company

VALÉRIE DEMONT | DEMONTV@PEPPERLAW.COM

THIS ARTICLE WAS PUBLISHED IN THE DECEMBER 9, 2009 ISSUE OF *THE DEAL MAGAZINE*, AND IS REPRINTED HERE WITH PERMISSION.

A flurry of initial public offering activity, which had been unseen since the beginning of the credit crisis, indicates a further sign of revival of the U.S. capital markets. The new IPOs should be good news to many companies that had been effectively shut out of various financing sources — debt and equity — over the past year. This year, more than 55 companies have filed IPO registration statements with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Most are U.S. companies, joined by a few foreign companies, especially from China. Many of them are REITs and technology-based services providers, with a few in the financial services, power, retail and other sectors. About 23 companies effectively completed their IPOs this year, a far cry from 2007's 282 IPOs or even 2008's 51 IPOs, but the recent increase in the number of IPO filings over the past few weeks is cause for optimism.

An IPO is a transformational event for a company, its management, employees and promoters, and the decision to go public is one that needs to be carefully weighed.

For promoters, an IPO may allow them to monetize their investment by selling down a portion of their holdings in the company at the time of the IPO, yet at the same time retain control of the company. Once the company is public, promoters may also find it easier to sell portions of their ownership over time in additional sales into the public markets.

For companies, an IPO allows them to access, in at times significant amounts, additional capital; raise their profile in the industry and with their clients; facilitate acquisitions and other M&A activity (publicly traded stock can be an attractive alternative to cash); in certain cases, obtain better loan terms from lenders; and give them additional incentives to attract and retain top talent. Once public, the company may also regularly tap the public capital markets to raise additional funds on an ongoing basis as its business and funding needs evolve.

These considerations must be carefully weighed against the challenges and costs of going public and ongoing compliance and regulatory burdens applicable to public companies, their direc-

tors, officers and principal stockholders. Some of these challenges and requirements include:

Independent Board. Unless more than 50 percent of the voting power of the company is held by a shareholder following the IPO, a majority of the board of directors will generally need to be independent. The company will also be required to have a fully independent compensation committee and nominating/corporate governance committee (subject to phase-in periods). With the growing demands on independent directors, finding the right independent directors may be a difficult task, and the company will also need to procure director and officer liability insurance to attract new independent directors.

Audit Committees. Public companies are required to have fully independent audit committees, with audit committee members who meet certain financial literacy requirements.

Independent Auditors. The independent auditors of the company will need to be registered with the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, or PCAOB. This may require the company to change its auditors and get new audited financials in connection with its IPO. The relationship of the independent auditor with management and the company is regulated, and audit committee preapproval of audit and nonaudit services provided by the independent auditors will be required.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting. Public companies are required to maintain "internal control over financial reporting." Management must carry out an annual assessment of the company's internal control over financial reporting, which, in certain cases, will also need to be passed upon by the company's independent auditors. Those requirements are complex, time-consuming and costly.

Disclosure Controls and Procedures. Public companies must maintain "disclosure controls and procedures" that ensure internal procedures are in place to timely and adequately dispense information to the public. As with internal controls, these disclosure controls are also subject to effectiveness assessments.

Financial Statements. The IPO prospectus will need to contain audited and unaudited consolidated financial statements of the company for the past three years (and any interim quarterly

unaudited financial statements) and selected annual consolidated financial data for the past five years (of which the oldest two years may be unaudited).

Public Scrutiny. Public companies are subject to extensive ongoing reporting, disclosure and other compliance obligations. Among other requirements, the company must make annual and quarterly disclosures as well as ongoing periodic disclosures upon the occurrence of specific events. Those requirements can be difficult when the company is experiencing financial or business difficulties, contemplating a significant transaction, or entering into strategic agreements that it may have to disclose. The company also will become subject to rules regarding shareholders' meetings and proxy statements. In addition, it will need to file its material agreements with the SEC. The SEC standards for confidentiality of competitive and other sensitive information are difficult to meet.

Certifications. The CEO and CFO of the company will need to certify the company's periodic filings. A knowingly false certification could lead to criminal liability.

Loans to Executive Officers and Directors. Any loan or advance extended to directors and executive officers will need to be repaid, forgiven or otherwise unwound as soon as possible prior to the filing of the IPO.

Stockholder Reporting Obligations. Executive officers and directors, as well as 10 percent stockholders, must publicly disclose their securities holdings in the company (including derivative securities). In addition, they must publicly disclose any trades that they make in the company's securities and will be subject to liability for "short-swing" profits they make on any sales and purchases of the company's securities occurring within a six-month period. Separately, any person beneficially owning more than 5 percent of the company's securities must publicly file statements disclosing his or her identity and stock ownership. Violation of these obligations could result in profit disgorgement and other penalties.

Hostile Takeover and Shareholder Activism. Public companies are subject to hostile takeover activity and shareholder activism, both of which are on the rise. Anti-takeover defenses will need to be put in place to protect the continued growth of the business while balancing those needs against a successful marketing of the IPO, the requirements of investors and the positions taken by proxy advisory firms on corporate governance and takeover defenses. For example, opposition is growing against certain forms

of takeover defenses, including poison pills, staggered boards and plurality voting.

Employment and Benefit Plans. Employment agreements for senior management and key employees and employee benefit plans (for example, incentive plans, stock purchase plans and director stock option plans) should be put in place at the time of the IPO for retention purposes, IPO marketing reasons and because it is more difficult to put those plans in place once the company has gone public. These arrangements should comply with the new corporate governance environment on say-on-pay and executive compensation.

Investor Relations. Public companies need to release earnings on a quarterly basis and comply with complex rules on communications. An officer in charge of investor relations and an investor relations firm will need to be hired for that purpose.

Costs. An IPO is an expensive process with underwriter commissions of about 7 percent of the IPO proceeds and legal, accounting, stock exchange and other fees and expenses on top of that. Post-IPO, ongoing compliance and reporting costs can be burdensome, especially for smaller public companies.

Although taking a company public requires much consideration, it can be a very beneficial experience when done correctly. By carefully planning and scrutinizing each step of the process, management and stockholders can ensure that the best interests of the company and its stockholders are being served.

RSS on www.pepperlaw.com

SUBSCRIBE TO THE LATEST PEPPER ARTICLES
VIA RSS FEEDS. VISIT WWW.PEPPERLAW.COM
TODAY AND CLICK ON THE RSS BUTTON TO
SUBSCRIBE TO OUR LATEST ARTICLES IN YOUR
NEWS READER.