1 T.C. 1000 (1943)

A corporation is generally treated as a separate taxable entity from its stockholders, and this distinction is disregarded only in exceptional circumstances where the corporation serves no legitimate business purpose or is a mere sham.

Summary

P.O'B. and Frances Montgomery created a corporation after P.O'B. secured a construction contract with the State of Texas. They assigned the contract to the corporation and gifted shares to their children. The corporation completed the work, paid taxes on its profits, and distributed dividends, which were also taxed. The Commissioner argued the corporation was a sham and the profits should be taxed to the Montgomerys. The Tax Court held the corporation was a legitimate entity, served a business purpose, and its income should be taxed accordingly, not to the Montgomerys individually.

Facts

P.O'B. Montgomery contracted with the State of Texas on December 30, 1935, to build a state building for $993,000.

On July 1, 1936, the Montgomerys formed P. O'B. Montgomery, Inc., a Texas corporation.

P.O'B. Montgomery assigned the construction contract to the corporation in exchange for the corporation assuming all losses and liabilities.

The Montgomerys gifted 32 shares of the corporation's stock to each of their three minor children.

The corporation completed the building project around September 1936 and earned a profit.

Dividends were paid to all shareholders, including the children, and taxes were paid on these dividends.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in the Montgomerys' income tax, arguing that the profits earned by the corporation after the contract assignment should be included in the Montgomerys' income.

The Montgomerys petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

Whether the construction contract was for personal services such that it was non-

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

assignable, thus requiring the profits to be taxed to the assignor (P.O'B. Montgomery)?

Whether the corporate entity should be disregarded, and the corporation's income attributed to the Montgomerys, because the corporation was merely a conduit or a sham?

Holding

No, because the contract was not for personal services that would make it non-assignable, and the assignment was expressly authorized by the contract terms. The profits are taxed to the assignee (the corporation).

No, because the corporation was a legitimate entity that served a business purpose and was not merely a conduit or sham for tax avoidance.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned the construction contract was not strictly for personal services rendering it non-assignable. The contract itself bound assignees to its covenants, implying assignability.

The income was earned by the corporation after a valid assignment for consideration, making it taxable to the corporation, not the individual.

The court emphasized the general rule that corporations are separate taxable entities, only to be disregarded in exceptional circumstances. The court stated, "The corporate entity may not be disregarded where the corporation serves legitimate business purposes, even including the reduction of tax liability."

The corporation was properly organized, had paid-in capital, issued shares of stock, and conducted business operations in a normal manner. It was more than a mere conduit, as payments were made to the corporation, and dividends were distributed to all shareholders, including the Montgomerys' children.

The court distinguished cases where the corporation was a mere agent or tool of the stockholder, finding that this corporation had real substance and business purpose.

The court acknowledged that taxpayers have the right to minimize their tax liability through legal means. "[A] taxpayer has a legal right to decrease or altogether avoid tax liability by any means which the law permits…" Since the corporation was legally formed and operated, its separate existence must be respected for tax purposes.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that a properly formed and operated corporation is generally recognized as a separate taxable entity, even if one of the motivations for

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

forming the corporation is tax reduction. The court focused on whether the corporation had real economic substance and served a legitimate business purpose.

Attorneys should advise clients that forming a corporation solely for tax avoidance purposes, without any real business activity, is likely to be disregarded by the IRS. To ensure recognition of the corporate entity, it is crucial to maintain proper corporate formalities (e.g., holding meetings, keeping minutes, issuing stock), capitalize the corporation adequately, and conduct actual business activities.

The case clarifies that assigning income-generating contracts to a legitimate corporation can shift the tax liability to the corporation, provided the assignment is valid and the corporation is not merely a sham.

Subsequent cases often cite Montgomery for its discussion of when corporate entities can be disregarded for tax purposes. It helps define the boundary between legitimate tax planning and impermissible tax avoidance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.