

**§ 39.13 [Amended]**

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

**Airbus Industrie:** Docket 2000–NM–105–AD.

**Applicability:** All Model A300–600 series airplanes, certificated in any category.

**Note 1:** This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (e) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

**Compliance:** Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent cracking of the center section of the fuselage, which could result in rupture of the frame foot and reduced structural integrity of the airplane, accomplish the following:

**High Frequency Eddy Current (HFEC) or Rototest Inspection**

(a) Perform a HFEC or rototest inspection to detect cracking in the area surrounding the frame feet attachment holes between fuselage frames (FR) 41 and FR46 from stringers 24 to 28, left- and right-hand sides, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6122, dated February 9, 2000, at the time specified in paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2), as applicable.

(1) For airplanes on which Task 53–15–54 in Maintenance Review Board Document (MRBD), Revision 3, dated April 1998, has NOT been accomplished as of the effective date of this AD: Perform the inspection at the later of the times specified in paragraphs (a)(1)(i) and (a)(1)(ii) of this AD.

(i) Prior to the accumulation of the total flight-cycle or flight-hour threshold, whichever occurs first, specified in paragraph 1.E. (“Compliance”) of the service bulletin; or

(ii) Within the applicable grace period specified in paragraph 1.E. (“Compliance”) of the service bulletin.

(2) For airplanes on which Task 53–15–54 in Maintenance Review Board Document (MRBD), Revision 3, dated April 1998, has been accomplished as of the effective date of this AD: Perform the next repetitive inspection at the later of the times specified in paragraphs (a)(2)(i) and (a)(2)(ii) of this AD.

(i) Within the flight-cycle or flight-hour interval, whichever occurs first, specified in paragraph 1.E. (“Compliance”) of the service bulletin, following the latest inspection accomplished in accordance with the MRBD; or

(ii) Within the grace period specified in paragraph 1.E. (“Compliance”) of the service bulletin.

(b) For airplanes on which no cracking is detected during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, install new fasteners as applicable, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6122, dated February 9, 2000; and repeat the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed the applicable intervals specified in paragraph 1.E. (“Compliance”) of the service bulletin.

**Corrective Actions**

(c) For airplanes on which cracking is detected during any inspection required by this AD: Prior to further flight, except as required by paragraph (d) of this AD, accomplish corrective actions (e.g., performing rotating probe inspections, reaming out cracks, cold working fastener holes, and installing oversized fasteners) in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–6122, dated February 9, 2000. Repeat the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed the applicable intervals specified in paragraph 1.E. (“Compliance”) of the service bulletin.

(d) If cracking is detected during any inspection required by this AD, and the service bulletin specifies to contact the manufacturer for an appropriate corrective action: Prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate; or the Direction Generale de l’Aviation Civile (DGAC) (or its delegated agent).

**Alternative Methods of Compliance**

(e) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116.

**Note 2:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

**Special Flight Permits**

(f) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

**Note 3:** The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 2000–060–303(B), dated February 9, 2000.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 10, 2000.

**Donald L. Riggins,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 00–12248 Filed 5–15–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–U**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**

**Internal Revenue Service**

**26 CFR Part 1**

**[REG–106186–98]**

**RIN 1545–AW36**

**Certain Corporate Reorganizations Involving Disregarded Entities**

**AGENCY:** Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing.

**SUMMARY:** This document contains proposed regulations that provide guidance to corporations and their shareholders about whether certain transactions qualify as corporate reorganizations. The proposed regulations apply to certain mergers under state or Federal law between two entities, one of which is a corporation and the other of which, for Federal tax purposes, is disregarded as an entity separate from its owner (for example, a qualified REIT subsidiary, a qualified subchapter S subsidiary, or a limited liability company with a single corporate owner that does not elect to be treated as a separate corporation). This document also provides a notice of public hearing on these proposed regulations.

**DATES:** Written or electronic comments must be received by August 14, 2000. Requests to speak (with outlines of oral comments to be discussed) at the public hearing scheduled for August 8, 2000, must be received by July 18, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Send submissions to CC:DOM:CORP:R (REG–106186–98), room 5226, Internal Revenue Service, P.O. Box 7604, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044. Submissions may be hand delivered Monday through Friday between the hours of 8 am and 5 pm to: CC:DOM:CORP:R (REG–106186–98), Courier’s desk, Internal Revenue Service, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20044. Alternatively, taxpayers may submit comments electronically via the Internet by selecting the “Tax Regs” option on the IRS Home Page, or by submitting comments directly to the IRS Internet site at <http://www.irs.gov/taxregs/reglist.html>. The public hearing will be held in room 4718, Internal Revenue Building, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Concerning the proposed regulations, Reginald Mombrun, (202) 622–7750, concerning submissions of comments,

the hearing, and/or to be placed on the building access list to attend the hearing. Guy Traynor, (202) 622-7180 (not toll-free numbers).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

This document contains proposed amendments to the Income Tax Regulations (26 CFR Part 1) that provide guidance as to whether certain mergers under state or Federal law between two entities, one of which is a corporation and the other of which, for Federal tax purposes, is disregarded as an entity separate from its owner can be statutory mergers qualifying as reorganizations under section 368(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (Code). The Code provides general nonrecognition treatment for reorganizations specifically described in section 368(a). Section 368(a)(1)(A) provides that the term *reorganization* means "a statutory merger or consolidation." Section 1.368-2(b)(1) provides that a statutory merger must be accomplished under the "corporation laws of the United States or a State or territory or the District of Columbia." In addition to meeting the requirements of section 368(a), a merger transaction must meet other reorganization requirements such as the requirement that the persons engaged in the transaction each qualify as "a party to a reorganization" under section 368(b), the continuity of interest requirement of § 1.368-1(e), and the continuity of business enterprise requirement of § 1.368-1(d).

Certain entities that are respected under state law are disregarded for Federal tax purposes. These entities include a qualified REIT subsidiary, a qualified subchapter S subsidiary (QSub), and an entity that is disregarded under § 301.7701-3 as an entity separate from its owner. Section 856(i)(2) provides that a corporation that is wholly owned by a real estate investment trust (REIT) is a qualified REIT subsidiary. Section 1361(b)(3)(B) provides that a QSub is an eligible domestic corporation, wholly owned by an S corporation, for which the S corporation makes a QSub election. Under § 301.7701-3, a business entity that is not classified as a corporation per se (see § 301.7701-2(b)((1), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7) or (8); for example, a limited liability company) can elect to be treated as a corporation or, if it has a single owner, can choose to be disregarded. (These entities hereinafter are collectively referred to as Disregarded Entities, and the corporation that owns the Disregarded

Entity is referred to as the Owner.) For Federal tax purposes, all of the assets, liabilities, and items of income, deduction, and credit of a Disregarded Entity are treated as those of its Owner.

Because qualified REIT subsidiaries and QSubs are corporations under state law, state merger laws generally permit them to merge with other corporations. In addition, many state merger laws permit mergers between limited liability companies and corporations.

Commentators have raised questions as to whether the merger under state or Federal law of a Disregarded Entity into an acquiring corporation or of a target corporation into a Disregarded Entity can qualify as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A). These regulations address this issue.

##### Explanation of Provisions

The proposed regulations provide guidance on the tax treatment of the following two transactions: (1) the merger of a Disregarded Entity into an acquiring corporation, and (2) the merger of a target corporation into a Disregarded Entity. Under the Federal tax laws, the merger under state or Federal law of a Disregarded Entity into an acquiring corporation in which the Owner exchanges its interest in the Disregarded Entity for stock in the acquiring corporation and the Disregarded Entity ceases to exist as a result of the transaction by operation of the state or Federal merger law (hereinafter, the merger of a Disregarded Entity into an acquiring corporation) is treated as if the Owner transferred the assets of the Disregarded Entity to the acquiring corporation. Conversely, the merger under state or Federal law of a target corporation into a Disregarded Entity in which the shareholders of the target corporation exchange their target corporation stock for stock in the Owner and the Disregarded Entity does not lose its status as a Disregarded Entity as a result of the transaction (hereinafter, the merger of a target corporation into a Disregarded Entity) is treated as if the Owner acquired all of the assets of the target corporation.

The proposed regulations reflect Treasury's and the IRS' view that neither merger is a statutory merger qualifying as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A). Compliance with a corporate law merger statute does not by itself qualify a transaction as a "statutory merger" for purposes of section 368(a)(1)(A). See *Roebeling v. Commissioner*, 143 F.2d 810, 812 (3d Cir. 1944), cert. denied, 323 U.S. 773 (1944). The proposed regulations contain the requirements that must be satisfied for a state or Federal law

merger or consolidation to qualify as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A). In addition, the proposed regulations remove the word "corporation" from the requirement that, in order to qualify as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A), a merger or consolidation must be effected pursuant to the corporation law of the relevant jurisdiction. This change is necessary to conform the regulations to the IRS' long-standing position that a merger or consolidation may qualify as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A) even if it is undertaken pursuant to laws other than the corporation law of the relevant jurisdiction. See Rev. Rul. 84-104 (1984-2 C.B. 94) (a "consolidation" pursuant to the National Banking Act, 12 U.S.C. 215, is treated as a merger for Federal tax purposes).

##### *The Merger of a Disregarded Entity into an Acquiring Corporation*

Consistent with the views of all the commentators, Treasury and the IRS believe that the merger of a Disregarded Entity into an acquiring corporation is not a statutory merger qualifying as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A) because the Owner's assets (other than those held in the Disregarded Entity) are not transferred to the acquiring corporation and the Owner does not cease to exist as a result of the state or Federal law merger transaction. "A merger ordinarily is an absorption by one corporation of the properties and franchises of another whose stock it has acquired. The merged corporation ceases to exist, and the merging corporation alone survives." *Cortland Specialty Co. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 60 F. 2d 937, 939 (2d Cir. 1932), cert. denied, 288 U.S. 599 (1933). The merger of a Disregarded Entity into an acquiring corporation, in which the Owner's assets and liabilities are divided between the Owner and the acquiring corporation after the transaction, is a divisive transaction, not a transaction in which the assets of the Owner and the acquiring corporation are combined. Congress intended that section 355 be the sole means under which divisive transactions will be afforded tax-free status and, thus, specifically required the liquidation of the acquired corporation in reorganizations under both sections 368(a)(1)(C) and 368(a)(1)(D) in order to prevent these reorganizations from being used in divisive transactions that did not satisfy section 355. See S. Rep. No. 1622, 83rd Cong., 2d Sess. 274 (1954); S. Rpt. No. 169, 98th Cong., 2d

Sess. 204 (1984) and Rev. Rul. 2000-5 (2000-5 I.R.B. 436).

Accordingly, consistent with existing law, the proposed regulations provide that for a merger to qualify as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A), it must, by operation of the merger statute of the relevant jurisdiction, result in one corporation acquiring the assets of the merging corporation and the merging corporation ceasing to exist. Thus, the merger of a Disregarded Entity into an acquiring corporation cannot qualify as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A). However, the transaction may be treated as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(C), (D), or (F) if all applicable requirements are met (including the liquidation of the Owner). The transaction also may be described in section 351.

#### *The Merger of a Target Corporation into a Disregarded Entity*

There has been a split in views as to whether the merger of a target corporation into a Disregarded Entity is a statutory merger qualifying as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A). Some commentators argue that, because the Disregarded Entity is disregarded for Federal tax purposes, the transaction should be treated for Federal tax purposes as a merger into the Owner. Thus, they argue, as long as the Owner is a corporation, all other relevant reorganization requirements are satisfied, and the target corporation could have merged into the Owner in a transaction that qualifies as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A), the merger should qualify as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A). According to these commentators, treating such a merger as a statutory merger into the Owner qualifying as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A) does not inappropriately facilitate avoidance of any reorganization requirement under section 368. Accordingly, the commentators argue there is no sound policy for not permitting the merger of a target corporation into a Disregarded Entity to be treated as a statutory merger into the Owner qualifying as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A).

Other commentators argue that, as a technical matter, the better interpretation of the applicable provisions of the Code and regulations is that the merger of a target corporation into a Disregarded Entity is not a statutory merger of the target corporation into the Owner qualifying as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A). Congress added the word

“statutory” in 1934 so that the definition “will conform more closely to the general requirements of [state or Federal] corporation law.” See H.R. Rep. No. 704, 73rd Cong., 2nd Sess. 14 (1934). Treasury and the IRS believe that it is inappropriate to treat the state or Federal law merger of a target corporation into a Disregarded Entity instead as a statutory merger of the target corporation into the Owner, because the Owner, the only potential party to a reorganization under section 368(b), is not a party to the state or Federal law merger transaction. A reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A) is a combination of the assets and liabilities of two corporations through a merger under state or Federal law. A merger of a target corporation into a Disregarded Entity differs from a merger of a target corporation into the Owner because the target corporation and the Owner have combined their assets and liabilities only under the Federal tax rules concerning Disregarded Entities, and not under state or Federal merger law, the law on which Congress relied in enacting section 368(a)(1)(A).

Accordingly, the proposed regulations provide that the merger of a target corporation into a Disregarded Entity is not a statutory merger of the target corporation into the Owner qualifying as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A). Such a transaction may qualify as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(C), section 368(a)(1)(D), or section 368(a)(1)(F) if all relevant requirements are met. Such a transaction also may qualify for nonrecognition of gain under section 351.

#### **Proposed Effective Date**

These regulations as proposed apply to any transaction occurring on or after the date these regulations are published as final regulations in the **Federal Register**.

#### **Comments Requested**

Several states permit the merger of a domestic corporation into a foreign corporation under state law. Treasury and the IRS are studying whether this transaction qualifies as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A) and request comments on this issue.

#### **Special Analysis**

It has been determined that this notice of proposed rulemaking is not a significant regulatory action as defined in Executive Order 12866. Therefore, a regulatory assessment is not required. It has also been determined that section 553(b) of the Administrative Procedure

Act (5 U.S.C chapter 5) does not apply to these regulations, and, because the regulations do not impose a collection of information on small entities, the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. chapter 6) does not apply. Pursuant to section 7805(f) of the Code, this notice of proposed rulemaking will be submitted to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration for comment on its impact on small business.

#### **Comments and Public Hearing**

Before these proposed regulations are adopted as final regulations, consideration will be given to any written comments (a signed original and eight copies) that are submitted timely to the IRS. Alternatively, taxpayers may submit comments electronically via the Internet by selecting the “Tax Regs” option on the IRS Home Page, or by submitting comments directly to the IRS Internet site at [http://www.irs.gov/tax\\_regs/reglist.html](http://www.irs.gov/tax_regs/reglist.html). The IRS and Treasury Department request comments on the clarity of the proposed rules and how they can be made easier to understand. All comments will be available for public inspection and copying.

A public hearing has been scheduled for August 8, 2000, beginning at 10:00 AM in Room 4718, Internal Revenue Building, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. Due to building security procedures, visitors must enter at the 10th Street entrance, located between Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues, NW. In addition, all visitors must present photo identification to enter the building. Because of access restrictions, visitors will not be admitted beyond the immediate entrance area more than 15 minutes before the hearing starts. For information about having your name placed on the building access list to attend the hearing, see the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** portion of this preamble.

The rules of 26 CFR 601.601(a)(3) apply to the hearing. Persons who wish to present oral comments must submit written comments and an outline of the topics to be discussed and the time to be devoted to each topic (a signed original and eight (8) copies) by July 18, 2000. A period of 10 minutes will be allotted to each person for making comments. An agenda showing the scheduling of the speakers will be prepared after the deadline for reviewing outlines has passed. Copies of the agenda will be available free of charge at the hearing.

Drafting Information: The principal author of these regulations is Reginald

Mombrun of the office of the Assistant Chief Counsel (Corporate), IRS. However, other personnel from the IRS and the Treasury Department participated in their development.

#### List of Subjects in 26 CFR Part 1

Income taxes, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

#### Proposed Amendments to the Regulations

Accordingly, 26 CFR Part 1 is proposed to be amended as follows:

#### PART 1—INCOME TAXES

**Paragraph 1.** The authority citation for part 1 continues to read in part as follows:

**Authority:** 26 U.S.C. 7805 \* \* \*.

**Par. 2.** Section 1.368-2 is amended by revising paragraph (b)(1) to read as follows:

#### § 1.368-2 Definition of terms.

(b)(1) In order to qualify as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A), the transaction must be a merger or consolidation involving two corporations effected pursuant to the laws of the United States or a State or territory, or the District of Columbia. In addition, by operation of such a merger law, the transaction must result in one corporation acquiring the assets of the merging corporation and the merging corporation ceasing to exist. Similarly, by operation of such a consolidation law, the transaction must result in one newly formed corporation acquiring the assets of both consolidating corporations, and both consolidating corporations ceasing to exist. Thus, the merger under state or Federal law of an entity that is disregarded as an entity separate from its owner for Federal tax purposes into an acquiring corporation in which the owner exchanges its interest in the disregarded entity for stock in the acquiring corporation and the disregarded entity ceases to exist as a result of the transaction by operation of the state or Federal merger law is not a statutory merger qualifying as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A). Moreover, the merger of a target corporation into an entity that is disregarded as an entity separate from its owner for Federal tax purposes that does not lose its status as a disregarded entity as a result of the transaction is not a statutory merger qualifying as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(A). Examples of entities that are disregarded as entities separate from their owners include a qualified REIT subsidiary (within the meaning of

section 856(i)(2)), a qualified subchapter S subsidiary (within the meaning of section 1361(b)(3)(B)), and a business entity that is not classified as a corporation and that has a single owner (as provided in § 301.7701-2(c)(2) of this chapter). The preceding five sentences apply to any transaction occurring on or after [Date These Regulations Are Published As Final Regulations In The **Federal Register**].

\* \* \* \* \*

**Robert E. Wenzel,**

*Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue.*

[FR Doc. 00-11902 Filed 5-11-00; 2:30 pm]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

#### Internal Revenue Service

#### 26 CFR Part 1

[REG-100163-00]

RIN 1545-AX73

#### Applying Section 197 to Partnerships; Hearing Cancellation

**AGENCY:** Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

**ACTION:** Cancellation of notice of public hearing on proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This document provides notice of cancellation of a public hearing on proposed regulations relating to the application of section 197 to partnerships.

**DATES:** The public hearing originally scheduled for Wednesday, May 24, 2000, at 10 a.m., is canceled.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Guy R. Traynor of the Regulations Unit, Assistant Chief Counsel (Corporate), at (202) 622-7180 (not a toll-free number).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing that appeared in the **Federal Register** on January 25, 2000, (65 FR 3903), announced that a public hearing was scheduled for May 24, 2000, at 10 a.m., in room 2615, Internal Revenue Building, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC. The subject of the public hearing is proposed regulations under section 197 of the Internal Revenue Code. The deadline for requests to speak and outlines of oral comments expired on May 3, 2000.

The notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing, instructed those interested in testifying at the public hearing to submit a request to speak and an outline of the topics to be addressed. As of May 9, 2000, no one has requested to speak. Therefore, the

public hearing scheduled for May 24, 2000, is canceled.

**Cynthia E. Grigsby,**

*Chief, Regulations Unit, Assistant Chief Counsel (Corporate).*

[FR Doc. 00-12201 Filed 5-15-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-P

#### POSTAL SERVICE

#### 39 CFR Part 111

#### Sack Preparation Changes for Periodicals Nonletter-Size Pieces and Periodicals Prepared on Pallets

**AGENCY:** Postal Service.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This proposed rule would revise the standards for the preparation of nonautomation nonletter-size carrier route Periodicals prepared in sacks and the preparation of Periodicals packages and bundles on pallets. For Periodicals carrier route mail in sacks, the proposed standards would require carrier route sacks to contain a minimum of 24 pieces and would make 5-digit scheme carrier route sacks a required sack sortation level. All other sack sortation criteria would remain unchanged. For Periodicals prepared in packages and bundles on pallets, the proposal would require preparation of 5-digit scheme pallets.

**DATES:** Comments on the proposed standards must be received on or before June 15, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be mailed or delivered to the Manager, Mail Preparation and Standards, U.S. Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW, Room 6800, Washington, DC 20260-2405. Copies of all written comments will be available for inspection and photocopying at USPS Headquarters Library, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW, 11th Floor N, Washington, DC between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copies of comments also may be requested via fax or email.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joel Walker, 202-268-3340; jwalke13@email.usps.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Postal Service and the Periodicals industry are concerned over recent upward trends in the costs associated with processing Periodicals mail and have been studying ways to reverse these trends. Several ideas have come out of mutual discussions that were based on joint representation from the Postal Service and the Periodicals industry. Cost models suggest that we can reduce