



Developments in Work-Product Doctrine and Privilege Issues

Shelley Leonard
David Blair





Three Types of Protections

- Attorney-Client Privilege
- Federally Authorized Tax Practitioner Privilege (I.R.C. § 7525)
- Work Product Doctrine





Attorney-Client Privilege

- Communication between client and counsel
 - Not underlying facts
 - May be summary, memorialization, or restatement of communication
- Intended to be and was in fact kept confidential
 - Possibility of waiver
- Made for the purpose of obtaining or providing legal advice
 - Not for business purpose





Federally Authorized Tax Practitioner Privilege (I.R.C. § 7525)

- Codified at IRC § 7525
 - Modeled on Attorney-Client Privilege, but covers tax advice given by federally authorized tax practitioners
 - Can be waived just like Attorney-Client Privilege
- Only applies to noncriminal matters involving IRS and DOJ
 - No protection against other Federal agencies (SEC, etc.), state tax authorities, or other parties in civil litigation
- Exception for written tax shelter promotional materials
- No protection if also independent auditor
- Courts have applied in very narrow terms





Privilege and Waiver

- Recent Cases
 - AD Investment Fund LLC v. Commissioner, 142 T.C. No. 13 (Apr. 16, 2014)
 - Eaton Corp. v. Commissioner, Dkt. No. 5576-2 (T.C. Apr. 6, 2015)
 - Salem Financial, Inc. v. United States, 102 Fed. Cl. 793 (2012)
 - Schaeffler v. United States, 113 A.F.T.R.2d 2246 (S.D.N.Y. May 28, 2014), appeal filed, 2d Cir. No. 14-1965
- IRS Policy of Restraint





Work Product Doctrine

- Protects materials prepared "in anticipation of litigation"
 - Serious contemplation, but not certainty
 - Different legal standards: primary/principle purpose v. "because of" test
 - Opposing party can still obtain on showing of substantial need and inability to obtain information elsewhere
- Applies regardless of who prepared materials
 - Not limited to attorneys
- Permits disclosure to third parties provided disclosure not inconsistent with adversarial process
 - Disclosure to independent auditor generally does not waive





Work Product Doctrine: Anticipation of Litigation

- United States v. Textron, 577 F.3d 21 (1st Cir. 2009)
 - Tax work papers not in anticipation of litigation
- Wells Fargo & Co. v. United States, 112 A.F.T.R.2d 2013-5380 (D. Minn. 2013)
 - FIN 48 analyses were protected work product
- Schaeffler v. United States, 113 A.F.T.R.2d 2246 (S.D.N.Y. May 28, 2014), appeal filed, 2d Cir. No. 14-1965
 - E&Y memo and analysis not in anticipation of litigation





Work Product Doctrine: Waiver

- United States v. Deloitte, 610 F.3d 129 (D.C. Cir. 2010)
 - No waiver by disclosure to auditor
- Salem Financial, Inc. v. United States, 102
 Fed. Cl. 793 (2012)
 - Broad waiver of tax reserve documents





Questions

Shelley Leonard (202) 624-2783 sleonard@crowell.com

David Blair (202) 624-2765 dblair@crowell.com





Managing Tax Audits and Appeals 2015

October 8-9, 2015 San Francisco