4 T.C. 196 (1944)

r
r

“Carrying charges” representing the difference between the face value of purchased conditional sales contracts and the discounted price paid are not considered “interest” for the purpose of determining personal holding company income under tax law.

r
r

Summary

r

Elk Discount Corporation purchased conditional sales contracts and notes from auto dealers at a discount, collecting installment payments directly from car buyers. The IRS argued that the difference between the face value of these contracts and the discounted purchase price (“carrying charges”) constituted interest income, making Elk a personal holding company subject to surtax. The Tax Court disagreed, holding that these “carrying charges” were not interest income because Elk was not in the business of lending money; rather, it was purchasing contracts and collecting payments. The court emphasized the integrated nature of the transaction as a sale of goods rather than a loan and the inclusion of insurance costs within the “carrying charges.”r

r
r

Facts

r

r
Elk Discount Corporation bought conditional sales contracts and related notes from automobile dealers. These contracts arose from car sales where buyers financed their purchases. Elk supplied contract forms and rate charts to dealers, specifying the discounted amount Elk would pay for the contracts. Elk was not a party to the original sales contract between the dealer and the buyer. The notes were endorsed to Elk “without recourse.” Elk’s profit came from the difference between what it paid for the contracts and the total payments received from the car buyers, which it termed “carrying charges.” Elk also occasionally financed car purchases for dealers, receiving interest on these transactions. A portion of Elk’s profit was given back to dealers as a “kick-back” for doing business.r

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

r
r

Procedural History

r

r
The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Elk Discount Corporation's personal holding company surtax for 1938, 1939, and 1940. Elk petitioned the Tax Court for redetermination, contesting the IRS's assessment that its "carrying charges" constituted interest income. The Tax Court ruled in favor of Elk, finding that the "carrying charges" were not interest, and therefore Elk was not a personal holding company. r

r
r

Issue(s)

r

r
Whether the "carrying charges" earned by Elk Discount Corporation from purchasing conditional sales contracts at a discount constitute "interest" income for the purpose of determining whether it qualifies as a personal holding company under sections 403 of the Revenue Act of 1938 and 502 of the Internal Revenue Code.r

r
r

Holding

r

r
No, because the "carrying charges" represent the gross profit from purchasing conditional sales contracts, not amounts received for the use of money loaned; therefore, they do not constitute interest income under the relevant tax laws. The court found that Elk Discount Corporation's primary business was purchasing and collecting on sales contracts rather than directly lending money to car buyers.r

r
r

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

r

r

The court reasoned that Elk was not in the business of lending money but rather purchasing conditional sales contracts. The car buyer was focused on buying a car and paying in installments, not borrowing money from Elk. Elk only entered the picture after the sales contract was made between the dealer and buyer. Furthermore, the “carrying charge” included insurance costs and kickbacks to dealers, indicating that it was not solely for the use of money. The court distinguished this case from loan scenarios, pointing out that the “carrying charge” was akin to gross profit on merchandise sales. The court cited Western Acceptance Corporation, 46 B. T. A. 828, emphasizing that the income derived from purchasing and collecting on sales contracts is not interest. Quoting Elverson Corporation, 40 B. T. A. 615, the court stated,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.