§ 54.4975–14  Election to pay an excise tax for certain pre-1975 prohibited transactions.

(a) In general. Section 2003(c)(1)(B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 978) provides an election to pay an excise tax by certain persons involved prior to 1975 in prohibited transactions within the meaning of section 503 (b) or (g).

(b) Effect of election. If a valid election is made under this section with respect to a particular transaction, any
loss of exemption under section 501(a) because of a prohibited transaction within the meaning of section 503 (b) or (g) shall not apply. Instead, the person who made the election referred to in this section shall be subject to the taxes which would have been imposed by section 4975 (a) or (b) as though section 4975 had imposed a tax in respect of the transaction. (However, section 4975(f)(1), relating to joint and several liability, shall not apply to any person who has not made an election under this section, and interest for late payment of tax shall not begin to accrue until after the date of the election.) Such an election is irrevocable. However, the making of the election does not affect the application of section 6501 for purposes of assessment and collection of tax and section 6511 for purposes of filing a claim for credit or refund with respect to taxpayers and to taxable years of taxpayers whose tax liability is or may be affected by reason of the nonapplication of a denial of exempt status.

(c) Method of election. A person shall make the election referred to in this section by filing the form issued for such purpose by the Internal Revenue Service, including therein the information required by such form and the instructions issued with respect thereto, and by paying the tax which the taxpayer indicates is due at the time the return is filed. To be valid the election must be made prior to the later of December 6, 1976, or 120 days after the date of notification referred to in §1.503(a)-1(b) of this chapter (Income Tax Regulations), relating to loss of exemption for certain prohibited transactions. If there has been no notification of loss of exemption, the election may be made at any time. However, these limitations do not preclude an agreement between the disqualified person and the district director to extend the time within which the election is permitted.

(d) Computation of section 4975 excise tax. To the extent applicable, and solely for purposes associated with the payment of a section 4975 excise tax under the election referred to in this section, §53.4941(e)-1 of this chapter (Foundation Excise Tax Regulations) is controlling.
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§ 54.4975–15 Other transitional rules.

(a)–(c) [Reserved]

(d) Provision of certain services until June 30, 1977—(1) In general. Section 2003(c)(2)(D) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (the Act) (88 Stat. 979) provides that section 4975 shall not apply to the provision of services before June 30, 1977, between a plan and a disqualified person if the three requirements contained in section 2003(c)(2)(D) of the Act are met. The first requirement is that such services must be provided either (in) under a binding contract in effect on July 1, 1974 (or pursuant to a renewal or modification of such contract); or (ii) by a disqualified person who ordinarily and customarily furnished such services on June 30, 1974. The second requirement is that the services be provided on terms that remain at least as favorable to the plan as an arm’s-length transaction with an unrelated party would be.

For this purpose, such services are provided on terms that remain at least as favorable to the plan as an arm’s-length transaction with an unrelated party would be if, at the time of execution (or renewal) of such binding contract, the contract (or renewal) is on terms at least as favorable to the plan as an arm’s-length transaction with an unrelated party would be. However, if in a normal commercial setting an unrelated party in the position of the plan could be expected to insist upon a renegotiation or termination of a binding contract, the plan must so act. Thus, for example, if a disqualified person provides services to a plan on a month-to-month basis, and a party in the position of the plan could be expected to renegotiate the price paid under such contract because of a decline in the fair market value of such services, the plan must so act in order to avoid participation in a prohibited transaction. The third requirement is that the provision of services must not be, or have