Series Q, Group Certificates, 2 T.C. 990 (1943)

Liquidating trusts formed to manage and liquidate assets for the benefit of certificate holders are taxable entities, and the undistributed income of such trusts is taxable to the trust, not the certificate holders, where the trust instrument requires the trustee to pay expenses and set up reserves.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed whether certain trusts, established to manage and liquidate assets of an insolvent title company for the benefit of certificate holders, were taxable entities. The court held that these trusts were indeed taxable and that the undistributed income held as reserves was taxable to the trust itself, not the certificate holders. The court also addressed the deductibility of certain expenses and depreciation. This case clarifies the tax treatment of liquidating trusts established under state law to resolve financial distress and provides guidelines on expense deductibility.

Facts

New York Title & Mortgage Company became insolvent and the Superintendent of Insurance became the statutory receiver. The Title Co. issued certificates against mortgages. Due to the large number of certificate holders, administering the collateral security was complex. Trusts were created under the Schackno Act to represent certificate holders and manage/liquidate assets. The trustees were authorized to enforce claims against the Title Co. The Series Q and F-1 trust agreements outlined distribution procedures for income and proceeds, with provisions for expenses and reserves.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the trusts were taxable entities and assessed deficiencies based on undistributed income. The trusts contested this determination in the Tax Court, arguing they were not taxable or that the income was taxable to the certificate holders, not the trust itself.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the trusts were taxable entities separate from the statutory receiver and the insolvent title company.
2. Whether, if taxable, the trusts' income should be taxed to the certificate holders as grantors because the trusts were revocable or the income was held for them.
3. Whether the undistributed income was taxable to the certificate holders because it was distributable "periodically".
4. Whether the trusts were entitled to deductions for attorney and accounting fees, assignment fees, and stationery and printing expenses, and for depreciation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, the trusts are separate taxable entities because the assets were entirely separated from the receivership, and the trustees were not in a subordinate relationship to the Superintendent.
2. No, because the certificate holders were not grantors within the meaning of sections 166 and 167, as the trusts were set up by the Superintendent, not through a private transfer.
3. No, because the certificate holders were only entitled to the net income after expenses and reserves, so the undistributed income for reserves was not currently distributable.
4. (a) Yes, because expenses were ordinary and necessary for the production, collection, management, conservation, or maintenance of income-producing property. (b) No, because the trust instruments did not authorize withholding amounts for depreciation.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the trusts were distinct from both the Superintendent of Insurance (as receiver) and the Title Co. because the assets had been transferred out of the receivership. The court found that the certificate holders were not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.