4 T.C. 470 (1944)

Section 24(b) of the Internal Revenue Code disallows loss deductions on sales between family members, but this disallowance only applies to the portion of the loss attributable to the sale to a family member, not to sales to non-family members involved in the same transaction.

Summary

The Simisters sold a farm to their daughter and son-in-law, receiving a joint promissory note in return. The IRS disallowed a loss deduction claimed on the sale, arguing it was a transaction between family members. The Tax Court held that the daughter and son-in-law acquired the property as tenants in common, each owning one-half. Therefore, the loss attributable to the daughter's share was disallowed under Section 24(b), but the loss attributable to the son-in-law's share was deductible since he was not a member of the Simisters' family for tax purposes. This case illustrates the application of Section 24(b) in scenarios involving multiple purchasers, some of whom are family members.

Facts

Walter Simister, Jr. purchased a farm in 1939, taking title in his wife Bertha's name. In 1941, the Simisters sold the farm to their daughter, Elsie Jones, and her husband, Clay Jones, Jr., for $6,000. The buyers gave the Simisters a joint promissory note for the purchase price. The deed conveyed the property to "Clay Jones, Jr., and Elsie S. Jones." The Simisters claimed a loss on the sale, the cost basis being higher than the sale price.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the loss deduction claimed by the Simisters on their 1941 tax return. The Simisters petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination and the relevant provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Issue(s)

Whether the loss sustained on the sale of the farm is entirely disallowed under Section 24(b) of the Internal Revenue Code because the property was sold to the taxpayers' daughter and son-in-law; or whether only one-half of the loss is disallowed because the daughter and son-in-law held the property as tenants in common.

Holding

No, the entire loss is not disallowed. Only one-half of the loss is disallowed because the daughter and son-in-law held the property as tenants in common, and Section

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

24(b) only applies to sales between family members. The son-in-law is not considered a family member under the statute.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that under South Carolina law, a conveyance to a husband and wife creates a tenancy in common unless there is an expressed intention to convey the whole property to the survivor. Since the deed did not express such an intention, Clay Jones, Jr., and Elsie Jones held the property as tenants in common. Absent evidence to the contrary, tenants in common are presumed to hold equal shares. The court noted that both parties were equally obligated on the purchase note. Thus, one-half of the loss was attributable to the sale to the daughter (a family member), and the other half was attributable to the sale to the son-in-law (not a family member). The court applied Section 24(b), which disallows losses from sales between family members, to the daughter’s portion, but permitted deduction of the loss attributable to the son-in-law’s share. The court explicitly stated that the statute did not bar deduction of loss from sales to individuals outside the explicitly defined family relationship.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that Section 24(b)’s disallowance of loss deductions in sales between family members is narrowly construed. When property is sold to multiple parties, only some of whom are family members, the disallowance applies only to the portion of the loss attributable to the sale to the family member(s). Tax advisors must carefully examine the form of ownership and the relationship of the purchasers to the seller when advising clients on the deductibility of losses. Later cases have cited this case to underscore that statutory exceptions to tax rules are generally construed narrowly. This principle has implications for planning sales of assets, particularly where family relationships are involved, and highlights the importance of understanding property ownership laws.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.