#### **Internal Revenue Service**

Number: **200831002** Release Date: 8/1/2008

Index Number: 664.03-02

Department of the Treasury

Washington, DC 20224

Third Party Communication: None

Date of Communication: Not Applicable

Person To Contact:

, ID No.

Telephone Number:

Refer Reply To: CC:PSI:B01 PLR-100818-08

Date:

May 01, 2008

# **LEGEND**

Trust =

Trustee =

<u>A</u> =

<u>D1</u> =

D2 =

State =

<u>n</u> =

Court =

Dear :

This letter responds to a letter dated December 21, 2007, and subsequent correspondence, submitted on behalf of <u>Trustee</u>, requesting a ruling that the reformation of <u>Trust</u>, as described below, will not cause <u>Trust</u> to fail to meet the requirements of § 664(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

## <u>FACTS</u>

The information submitted states that  $\underline{A}$  created  $\underline{Trust}$  on  $\underline{D1}$  under the laws of  $\underline{State}$ .  $\underline{A}$  created  $\underline{Trust}$  with the intention that  $\underline{Trust}$  qualify as a charitable remainder unitrust (CRUT) under § 664(d)(2).  $\underline{Trustee}$  is the trustee and charitable remainder beneficiary of  $\underline{Trust}$ .  $\underline{Trustee}$  and  $\underline{A}$  represent that  $\underline{A}$ 's intention upon establishing  $\underline{Trust}$  was that the term of  $\underline{Trust}$  would extend until the later of (i) the date of death of the survivor of  $\underline{A}$  and  $\underline{A}$ 's spouse; or (ii) the earlier of the 20th anniversary of  $\underline{D1}$  or the date of death of the last surviving child of  $\underline{A}$ , with payments during that term being made to  $\underline{A}$ , then to  $\underline{A}$ 's spouse if surviving, then to  $\underline{A}$ 's issue by right of representation. The original  $\underline{Trust}$  agreement provides that the unitrust amount is payable to  $\underline{A}$  until  $\underline{A}$ 's death, and thereafter, to  $\underline{A}$ 's spouse until the death of  $\underline{A}$ 's spouse.

 $\underline{A}$  and  $\underline{Trustee}$  arranged the terms of  $\underline{Trust}$  in a series of telephone conversations.  $\underline{A}$  was assisted by certain family members, but no professional tax advisor assisted  $\underline{A}$  with the creation of  $\underline{Trust}$ .  $\underline{Trustee}$  and  $\underline{A}$  represent that several months after signing the  $\underline{Trust}$  agreement, but within the same taxable year of the donation, they discovered that  $\underline{Trust}$  did not accurately express  $\underline{A}$ 's intent as to the term of the payments and the ability of  $\underline{A}$ 's children to receive payments after the death of  $\underline{A}$  and  $\underline{A}$ 's spouse.

Because of the error, and because  $\underline{Trust}$  is irrevocable,  $\underline{Trustee}$  sought an order from  $\underline{Court}$  authorizing a reformation ab initio of  $\underline{Trust}$ . No parties objected to the proposed reformation. On  $\underline{D2}$ ,  $\underline{Court}$  issued a judgment approving the reformation of  $\underline{Trust}$ , ab initio, to reflect  $\underline{A}$ 's intention as described above. The reformed  $\underline{Trust}$  agreement provides that the term of  $\underline{Trust}$  extends until the later of (i) the date of death of the survivor of  $\underline{A}$  and  $\underline{A}$ 's spouse; or (ii) the earlier of the  $20^{th}$  anniversary of  $\underline{D1}$  or the date of death of the last surviving child of  $\underline{A}$ . The reformed  $\underline{Trust}$  agreement further provides that payments during  $\underline{Trust}$ 's term will be made to  $\underline{A}$ , then to  $\underline{A}$ 's spouse if surviving, then to  $\underline{A}$ 's issue by right of representation. The judgment states that  $\underline{Court}$  finds by clear and convincing evidence that, due to mistakes in the expression of  $\underline{A}$ 's intent,  $\underline{Trust}$  failed to accurately implement  $\underline{A}$ 's intent. The judgment is contingent on receipt of a favorable private letter ruling from the Internal Revenue Service.  $\underline{State}$  law permits the reformation of a trust to conform to the settlor's intent.

<u>Trustee</u> and <u>A</u> represent that they have not filed any income tax returns or other documents, taken any other action or received any payments inconsistent with <u>Trust</u>, including the proposed changes. <u>A</u>, <u>A</u>'s spouse, <u>Trustee</u>, and the attorney general of <u>State</u> all consent to the reformation of <u>Trust</u>.

#### LAW AND ANALYSIS

Section 664(d)(2) provides that for purposes of § 664, a charitable remainder unitrust is a trust (A) for which a fixed percentage (which is not less than 5 percent) of the net fair

market value of its assets, valued annually, is to be paid not less often than annually, to one or more persons (at least one of which is not an organization described in § 170(c) and, in the case if individuals, only to an individual who is living at the time of the creation of the trust) for a term of years (not in excess of 20 years) or for the life or lives of such individual or individuals, (B) from which no amount other than the payments described in § 664(d)(2)(A) may be paid to or for the use of any person other than an organization described in § 170(c), (C) following termination of the payments described in § 664(d)(2)(A), the remainder interest in the trust is to be transferred to, or for the use of, an organization described in § 170(c) or is to be retained by the trust for such a use, and (D) with respect to each contribution of property to the trust, the value (determined under § 7520) of such remainder interest in such property is at least 10 percent of the net fair market value of such property as of the date such property is contributed to the trust.

Section 1.664-3(a)(3)(ii) of the Income Tax Regulations provides that a trust is not a charitable remainder unitrust if any person has the power to alter the amount to be paid to any named person other than an organization described in § 170(c) if such power would cause any person to be treated as the owner of the trust, or any portion thereof, if Subpart E, Part 1, Subchapter J, Chapter 1, Subtitle A of the Code were applicable to such trust.

Section 1.664-3(a)(4) provides that a charitable remainder unitrust may not be subject to a power to invade, alter, amend, or revoke for the beneficial use of a person other than an organization described in § 170(c).

### CONCLUSION

Based solely on the information submitted and the representations made, we conclude that the judicial reformation of  $\underline{\text{Trust}}$ , ab initio, does not violate § 664. Accordingly, we conclude that the judicial reformation, ab initio, of  $\underline{\text{Trust}}$  does not adversely affect  $\underline{\text{Trust}}$ 's qualification as a charitable remainder unitrust under § 664(d)(2).

Except as expressly provided herein, no opinion is expressed or implied concerning the tax consequences of any aspect of any transaction or item discussed or referenced in this letter. Specifically, no opinion is expressed concerning whether <u>Trust</u> is or was a charitable remainder unitrust within the meaning of § 664(d)(2).

This ruling is directed only to the taxpayer requesting it. Section 6110(k)(3) provides that it may not be used or cited as precedent.

In accordance with the Power of Attorney on file with this office, a copy of this letter is being sent to <u>Trust</u>'s authorized representative.

Sincerely,

Audrey Ellis

Audrey Ellis Senior Counsel, Branch 1 (Passthroughs & Special Industries)

Enclosure (1)
Copy of letter for § 6110 purposes

CC: