Stock Yards Bank of Louisville v. Commissioner, 1942 WL 46 (T.C. 1942)

When a corporation acquires property as part of a reorganization, the basis of the property is the same as it would be in the hands of the transferor, provided certain continuity of interest requirements are met.

Summary

Stock Yards Bank of Louisville acquired assets from a joint stock land bank through a series of transactions. The Commissioner argued that the bank's basis in these assets should be the fair market value at the time of acquisition. The Tax Court held that the acquisition was part of a tax-free reorganization, and therefore the bank's basis was the same as the transferor's basis. This decision hinged on the determination that the joint stock land bank was not a government instrumentality and that the continuity of interest requirements for a reorganization were satisfied.

Facts

A joint stock land bank transferred its assets to Stock Yards Bank of Louisville. Prior to the transfer, Stock Yards Bank owned 98.87% of the joint stock land bank's outstanding bonds. After the transfer, Stock Yards Bank owned 100% of the assets. The Commissioner determined a deficiency in the bank's income tax, arguing the basis of the acquired assets was the fair market value at the time of acquisition. Stock Yards Bank argued it was a tax-free reorganization, entitling them to the transferor's basis.

Procedural History

The Commissioner assessed a deficiency against Stock Yards Bank. Stock Yards Bank petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination. The Tax Court reviewed the facts and applicable law to determine the correct basis of the assets acquired by Stock Yards Bank.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transfer of assets from the joint stock land bank to Stock Yards Bank constituted a reorganization under Section 112(i) of the Revenue Act of 1932.
2. Whether the joint stock land bank should be considered a government instrumentality, thus precluding it from being a party to a reorganization.
3. Whether the 50% continuity of interest requirement of Section 113(a)(7) of the Revenue Act of 1932 was met.

Holding

1. Yes, because the transaction met the requirements for a reorganization under Section 112(i) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as it was similar to the fact pattern

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

in *Palm Springs Holding Corporation v. Commissioner*.
2. No, because joint stock land banks are privately owned corporations, not government instrumentalities as stated in *Federal Land Bank v. Priddy*.
3. Yes, because Stock Yards Bank owned a sufficient percentage of the joint stock land bank's bonds prior to the transfer to satisfy the continuity of interest requirement.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court relied heavily on *Palm Springs Holding Corporation v. Commissioner*, finding the facts to be substantially similar. The court emphasized that joint stock land banks are privately owned corporations organized for profit, and therefore not government instrumentalities. Citing *Federal Land Bank v. Priddy, 295 U. S. 229*, the court noted, "Joint stock land banks are privately owned corporations, organized for profit to their stockholders through the business of making loans on farm mortgages. § 16. There is nothing in their organization and powers to suggest that they are government instrumentalities." The court also determined that the continuity of interest requirement was met because Stock Yards Bank owned a substantial portion of the joint stock land bank's bonds prior to the transfer. Finally, in light of *Magruder v. Realty Corporation*, the court found that the Stock Yards Bank continued in the business of liquidating assets, which was the purpose for which it was organized.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that the tax basis of assets acquired in a reorganization remains the same as the transferor's basis, provided the transaction qualifies as a reorganization under the relevant tax code provisions. It clarifies that privately owned joint stock land banks are not government instrumentalities for tax purposes. The decision also highlights the importance of the continuity of interest doctrine in determining whether a transaction qualifies as a tax-free reorganization. This case is particularly relevant for attorneys advising corporations on mergers, acquisitions, and other restructuring transactions. It demonstrates how the Tax Court analyzes these transactions to determine the appropriate tax treatment. Later cases would continue to refine the definition of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.