

section 1106(a)(4) of the CARES Act. In November 2020, pursuant to the terms of section 1106 of the CARES Act, A applied to the lender for forgiveness of the covered loan on the basis of the eligible expenses it paid during the covered period. At that time, eligible expenses, A satisfied all requirements under section 1106 of the CARES Act for forgiveness of the covered loan. The lender does not inform A whether the loan will be forgiven before the end of 2020.

Situation 2. During the covered period, Taxpayer B (B) paid the same types of eligible expenses that A paid in Situation 1. B, unlike A, did not apply for forgiveness of the covered loan before the end of 2020, although the eligible expenses during the covered period, B satisfied all other requirements under section 1106 of the CARES Act for forgiveness of the covered loan. B expects to apply to the lender for forgiveness of the covered loan in 2021.

LAW

Section 1102 and 1106 of the CARES Act, established the PPP as a new loan program administered by the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) as part of its section 7(a) Loan Program (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) that was designed to assist small businesses nationwide adversely impacted by the COVID 19 emergency to pay payroll costs and other covered expenses. See Business Loan Program Temporary Changes; Paycheck Protection Program, 85 FR 20811 (April 15, 2020). Under the PPP, the SBA is permitted to guarantee the full principal amount of a covered loan. Under section 1102(a)(2) of the CARES Act, a covered loan is a loan made under the PPP during the covered period. A covered loan may be forgiven under section 1106 of the CARES Act, based on certain eligible expenses being paid or incurred during the covered period.

The covered period for making loans was initially the period beginning on February

provide that no deduction is allowed for any amount otherwise allowable as a deduction to the extent the amount is allocable to one or more classes of income other than interest wholly exempt from the taxes imposed by subtitle A of the Code. See generally section 265(a)(1); §1.265-1. whether or not any amount of income of that class or classes is received or accrued Id.

means any class of income that is either wholly excluded from gross income under any provision of subtitle A of the Code or wholly exempt from the taxes imposed by subtitle A of the Code under the provisions of any other law. See §1.265-1(b)(1).

Notice 2020-32 also relied on authorities holding that deductions for otherwise deductible expenses are disallowed if the taxpayer receives reimbursement for such expenses. Authorities addressing reimbursement further hold that an otherwise allowable deduction is disallowed if there is a reasonable expectation of reimbursement. See *Burnett v. Commissioner*, 356 F. 2d 755 (5th Cir. 1966) cert. denied 385 U.S. 832 (1966); *Canelo v. Commissioner*, 53 TC 217, 225-226 (1969), ___ 447 F.2d 484 (9th Cir.1971); *Charles Baloian Co. v. Commissioner*, 68 T.C. 620 (1977); Rev. Rul. 80-348, 1980-2 C.B. 60; Rev. Rul. 79-263, 1979-2 C.B. 82.

In *Burnett*, a lawyer advanced expenses to clients that the clients were obligated to repay only claim. The taxpayer argued that the advances were deductible trade or business expenses under section 162 of the Code because there was no unconditional obligation on the part of the clients to repay the advances. The court noted that the taxpayer provided assistance only to clients with claims that were likely to be successful and that the advances were made to clients with the expectation, substantially realized, that

they would be recovered 356 F.2d at 758. On that basis, the court affirmed the Tax
in *Canelo v.*

Commissioner, 53 TC 217, 225-226 (1969), ____ 447 F.2d 484 (9th Cir.1971), a
personal injury law firm advanced litigation costs on behalf of its clients, and the clients
had no obligation to repay the costs unless their case was successful. The law firm
deducted the litigation costs in the year paid and included the reimbursed costs in
income in the year of reimbursement. The law firm screened clients to reduce the risk

The court determined that the law firm's advances operated as loans
to its clients for which the law firm had an expectation of reimbursement. Therefore,
deductions for the advances under section 162 were not allowed. See also *Herrick v.*
Commissioner, 63 T.C. 562 (1975) (similar effect); *Silverton v. Commissioner*, T.C.
Memo. 1977-198 (1977) (similar effect).

a taxpayer takes a proper deduction and, in a
later tax year, an event occurs that is fundamentally inconsistent with the premise on
which the previous deduction was based (for example, an unforeseen refund of
deducted expenses), the taxpayer must take the deducted amount into income. See
section 111 of the Code (providing that gross income does not include income
attributable to the recovery during a taxable year of any amount deducted in any prior
taxable year to the extent such amount did not reduce the amount of tax imposed by
chapter 1 of the Code). The Supreme Court applied the tax benefit rule in *Hillsboro*
National Bank v. Commissioner, 460 U.S. 370 (1983). In that case, the Court observed
basic purpose of the tax benefit rule is to achieve rough transactional parity in

tax and to protect the Government and the taxpayer from the adverse effects of reporting a transaction on the basis of assumptions that an event in a subsequent year proves to have been erroneous. Such an event, unforeseen at the time of an earlier deduction, may in many cases require the application of the tax benefit rule Id. at 383.

ANALYSIS

In both Situation 1 and Situation 2, A and B each have a reasonable expectation of reimbursement. At the end of 2020, the reimbursement eligible expenses, in the form of covered loan forgiveness, is reasonably expected to occur rather than being unforeseeable such that a deduction is inappropriate. Compare Canelo, 53 TC at 225-226 with *Hillsboro*, 460 U.S. at 383. Section 1106(b), (d), and (g) of the CARES Act, and the supporting loan forgiveness application procedures published by the SBA, provide covered loan recipients like A and B with clear and readily accessible guidance to apply for and receive covered loan forgiveness. See www.sba.gov/funding-programs/loans/coronavirus-relief-options/paycheck-protection-program. Under these procedures, each taxpayer calculates the amount of its covered loan forgiveness on the basis of the eligible expenses paid or accrued in the covered period and submits a completed form and supporting documentation to their covered loan lender. See PPP Loan Forgiveness Application Form 3508. Within 60 days of receipt of an application for forgiveness, their covered loan lenders must issue a decision regarding A and See

expenses otherwise allowable as a deduction under the Code, including section 161, to the extent the payment of such eligible expenses is allocable to tax-exempt income in the form of the reasonably expected covered loan forgiveness. The fact that the tax-exempt income may not have been accrued or received by the end of the taxable year does not change this result because the disallowance applies whether or not any amount of tax-exempt income in the form of covered loan forgiveness and to which the eligible expenses are allocable is received or accrued. See section 265(a)(1); §1.265-

2020