4 T.C. 19 (1944)

A loss on a sale between a parent corporation and its wholly-owned subsidiary may be disallowed for tax purposes if the subsidiary is under the parent's complete domination and the transaction lacks a business purpose other than tax avoidance.

Summary

Crown Cork International Corporation sold stock to its wholly-owned subsidiary, Foreign Manufacturers Finance Corporation, and claimed a loss on the sale. The Tax Court disallowed the loss, finding that the subsidiary was under the complete control of the parent and the sale's primary purpose was tax avoidance, lacking a legitimate business purpose. This case highlights the importance of demonstrating a genuine business purpose and independence between related entities when claiming tax benefits from intercompany transactions.

Facts

Crown Cork International Corporation (petitioner) sold 12,000 shares of Societe du Bouchon Couronne, S.A. (Bouchon) stock to its wholly-owned subsidiary, Foreign Manufacturers Finance Corporation (Finance). The sale price was $60,000, while the stock had cost the petitioner $255,141.36. The fair market value of the shares was $2 per share, but the sale price was $5 per share, representing the net worth per share according to Bouchon's books. The minutes of the meetings indicated that the primary motivation for the sale was to achieve a tax saving.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the loss claimed by Crown Cork International Corporation on the sale of stock to its subsidiary. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

Whether the loss claimed by the petitioner on the sale of stock to its wholly-owned subsidiary should be disallowed for income tax purposes.

Holding

No, because the subsidiary was under the complete domination and control of the parent, and the transaction lacked a genuine business purpose other than tax avoidance.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court emphasized that while section 24 (b) (1), Internal Revenue Code does not explicitly disallow the loss (as it doesn't involve a personal holding company), it

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

doesn’t imply that such transactions are automatically valid. The court relied on the principle that transactions lacking “good faith and finality” should be disregarded for tax purposes. Drawing from Higgins v. Smith, <span normalizedcite="308 U.S. 473“>308 U.S. 473, the court noted that domination and control are obvious in a wholly-owned corporation, and the government can disregard the form if it’s a sham. The court found that Finance was under the complete domination and control of Crown Cork, and the transfer was merely a shifting of assets within the same entity. Quoting Gregory v. Helvering, the court stated that it would disregard “a transfer of assets without a business purpose but solely to reduce tax liability.” The court concluded that the transaction lacked a true business purpose and was solely for tax avoidance, making it a sham lacking in good faith and finality. As such, the claimed loss was disallowed.

Practical Implications

This case emphasizes the importance of demonstrating a legitimate business purpose, beyond mere tax avoidance, when conducting transactions between related entities. Attorneys advising corporations need to ensure that such transactions have economic substance and are not simply designed to reduce tax liabilities. The case reinforces the principle that the IRS and courts can look beyond the form of a transaction to its substance, especially when dealing with wholly-owned subsidiaries. Taxpayers must be prepared to provide evidence of the subsidiary’s independent decision-making and the business rationale for the transaction, or risk having the claimed tax benefits disallowed. Later cases have cited this ruling to support the disallowance of losses where transactions between related parties lack economic substance or a valid business purpose.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.