Dyersburg Cotton Mills, Inc. v. Commissioner, 1943 Tax Ct. Memo 154 (1943)

A civic organization is not tax-exempt if any part of its net earnings inures to the benefit of private shareholders or individuals, or if it operates in a manner that is considered a business for profit.

Summary

Dyersburg Cotton Mills, Inc. sought tax-exempt status as a civic organization. The company was formed to attract industry to Dyersburg, Tennessee. It acquired land, sold interests in it, and built houses to rent to employees of a new mill. Investors received certificates entitling them to a 6% return. The Tax Court denied the exemption, holding that the payments to investors constituted a benefit to private shareholders from the company's earnings and that operating rental property constituted a business for profit. While the organization was initially formed for a civic purpose, its activities disqualified it from tax-exempt status. However, the court found the company was not "doing business" during certain tax years and thus was not subject to excess profits tax.

Facts

Dyersburg Cotton Mills, Inc. was created to attract industry to Dyersburg, TN. To fund this, it acquired land and sold undivided interests. To provide housing for mill employees, investors pooled their interests, authorizing the company to build houses on their lots. These houses were then leased to the milling company, which subleased them to its employees. The investors received certificates that entitled them to a 6% return on their investment. The lease included an option for the lessee to purchase the houses and lots by paying off the mortgage and the certificate holders.

Procedural History

Dyersburg Cotton Mills, Inc. petitioned the Tax Court for a determination that it was exempt from federal income tax under Section 101(7) or (8) of the Revenue Act of 1936 and corresponding provisions of the 1932 and 1934 Acts. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied the exemption. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Dyersburg Cotton Mills, Inc. qualifies for tax exemption as a civic organization under Section 101(7) or (8) of the Revenue Act of 1936.

2. Whether Dyersburg Cotton Mills, Inc. was "carrying on or doing business" during the years 1933 to 1936 and therefore subject to excess profits tax.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

3. Whether payments to holders of certificates could be deducted as interest paid.

Holding

1. No, because the company's net earnings inured to the benefit of private shareholders and it operated a business for profit.

2. No, because the company's primary aim had been accomplished and it was not actively engaged in any corporate business during those years.

3. No, because the certificates were not evidences of indebtedness.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that for an organization to be tax-exempt under either subsection (7) or (8) of section 101, it must not have been organized for profit, and if under (7) no part of the net earnings can inure to the benefit of any private shareholder. The court found that while the organization was initially formed for a civic purpose, its actions, specifically renting houses for profit with returns paid to investors, disqualified it. The court stated that "when petitioner thus subdivided some of its property and erected houses thereon with a view to renting them, it projected itself into a business of a kind that is ordinarily carried on privately for profit. It entered a competitive field. In these circumstances, to enjoy the advantage of tax exemption it must demonstrate that it falls strictly within one of the favored classifications." The court found that payments to investors constituted a benefit to private shareholders. Further, the court reasoned that operating rental property constituted a business for profit. The court distinguished the case from situations where certificate holders were merely creditors, stating the facts more closely aligned with an investor relationship. Regarding the excess profits tax, the court found the company was not actively engaged in business because its primary aim had been accomplished, the properties were being managed by the lessee, and the rental payments were directly paid to creditors/certificate holders. Finally, since the certificates were not evidence of debt the payments to certificate holders could not be deducted as interest payments.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the requirements for tax-exempt status for civic organizations. It emphasizes that even if an organization is formed with a charitable purpose, it can lose its tax-exempt status if it engages in activities that benefit private individuals or operate as a business for profit. Legal practitioners should analyze both the organization's stated purpose and its actual activities to determine eligibility for tax exemption. It highlights the importance of ensuring that no part of the organization's earnings inures to the benefit of private individuals. Later cases have cited this decision to reinforce the principle that engaging in ordinary business activities can disqualify an organization from tax-exempt status, even if those

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

activities are related to its overall charitable goals.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.