Example Corp. v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1942-063

A parent corporation cannot deduct interest payments made on a subsidiary's debt accrued before the subsidiary's liquidation, as such payments are considered capital adjustments rather than deductible interest expenses.

Summary

Example Corp., the parent company, sought to deduct interest payments it made on bonds issued by its wholly-owned subsidiary after liquidating the subsidiary and assuming its liabilities. The Tax Court disallowed the deduction for interest accrued before the liquidation. The court reasoned that upon liquidation, the subsidiary's assets transferred to the parent were net of liabilities. Therefore, the parent's subsequent payment of pre-liquidation interest was not a true interest expense but rather a capital adjustment, representing the satisfaction of obligations that reduced the assets received during liquidation. This case clarifies that assuming a subsidiary's debt in liquidation does not automatically convert pre-liquidation subsidiary interest into deductible parent company interest.

Facts

1. Example Corp. owned 100% of a subsidiary corporation.
2. The subsidiary had outstanding debenture bonds.
3. Example Corp. decided to liquidate the subsidiary and assume all of its liabilities, including the debenture bonds and accrued interest.
4. The subsidiary transferred all assets to Example Corp., and Example Corp. surrendered its subsidiary stock for cancellation.
5. Example Corp. assumed the subsidiary's liabilities as of June 17, 1938.
6. On December 21, 1938, Example Corp. paid interest on the debenture bonds, covering the period from January 1, 1931, to December 21, 1938.
7. Example Corp. deducted the entire interest payment on its tax return.
8. The Commissioner disallowed the deduction for interest accrued from January 1, 1931, to June 17, 1938 (pre-liquidation period).

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed a portion of Example Corp.'s interest deduction. Example Corp. petitioned the Tax Court to review the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Example Corp. is entitled to deduct interest payments made on its subsidiary's debenture bonds, specifically for the period prior to the subsidiary's liquidation, when Example Corp. assumed the subsidiary's liabilities upon liquidation.
2. Alternatively, if the pre-liquidation interest payment is not deductible as

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

interest, whether it should be considered a dividend paid for personal holding company surtax purposes.

Holding

1. No, because the payment of pre-liquidation interest by Example Corp. is considered a capital adjustment, not deductible interest expense.
2. No, because for the same reasons, the payment does not qualify as a dividend paid in this context.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that when Example Corp. liquidated its subsidiary, it was entitled to the subsidiary's assets only after satisfying the subsidiary's liabilities. Even though the bondholder was also the parent company's stockholder, the legal principle remains the same for all liquidations. The court stated:

"However, in the ordinary case where a wholly owned subsidiary is liquidated by a parent corporation, the latter is entitled by virtue of its stock ownership to only those assets of the subsidiary remaining after the payment of the subsidiary's obligation… the creditor of the subsidiary was nevertheless entitled at that time to their payment from the subsidiary's assets, and the later payment by petitioner of the obligations of the subsidiary existing and payable at the time of the latter's liquidation… was merely a convenient means of satisfying obligations to which the creditor of the subsidiary was entitled as a matter of law at the time when the subsidiary was liquidated."

Therefore, the assets received by Example Corp. were effectively net of the subsidiary's liabilities, including the accrued interest. Paying the pre-liquidation interest was essentially part of the cost of acquiring the subsidiary's net assets, a capital expenditure. The court concluded:

"Therefore it must be considered that the petitioner received as a result of the liquidation of its subsidiary only the amount of the assets of the subsidiary in excess of its then existing liabilities, and any payment of such liabilities made by petitioner after the liquidation was in the nature of a capital adjustment and was not to be charged against income."

Regarding the alternative argument that the payment should be treated as a dividend, the court summarily rejected it, applying the same rationale that the payment was a capital adjustment, not a distribution of profits.

Practical Implications

This case has practical implications for corporate tax planning during subsidiary liquidations. It clarifies that when a parent company assumes a subsidiary's debt in a liquidation, it cannot automatically deduct interest accrued on that debt prior to

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the liquidation as interest expense. Such payments are treated as part of the capital transaction of liquidation, effectively reducing the net assets acquired. Legal practitioners should advise clients that while interest accruing after the liquidation and assumption of debt may be deductible, pre-liquidation interest payments are likely to be considered capital adjustments. This ruling emphasizes the importance of properly characterizing payments made in the context of corporate liquidations and understanding the distinction between deductible interest expense and non-deductible capital expenditures. Later cases would likely cite this for the principle that assumption of liabilities in a liquidation context has specific tax consequences different from simply incurring debt.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.