District Bond Corp. v. Commissioner, 1 T.C. 837 (1943)

Proceeds from the sale of detached, discounted municipal bond coupons, representing the right to collect future interest, are treated as proceeds from the sale of property, not as tax-exempt interest income, and are therefore included in gross income.

Summary

District Bond Corp., a partner in a syndicate, sold municipal bonds with detached B coupons at a discount. The Tax Court addressed whether the proceeds from the discounted B coupons constituted tax-exempt interest under Section 22(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code, or taxable income. The court held that the proceeds were not tax-exempt interest but were part of the overall profit from dealing in property. The syndicate sold the right to collect future interest, and those proceeds must be treated the same as proceeds from the sale of bonds themselves.

Facts

A syndicate, of which the petitioner was a partner, purchased old municipal bonds and exchanged them for new refunding bonds with A and B coupons attached. The syndicate detached the B coupons and sold the new refunding bonds with A coupons at a loss. Subsequently, the syndicate sold $666,896.65 face value of the detached B coupons at a discount of approximately 3 percent, receiving $647,630.38. The B coupons matured at various dates from January 1, 1942, to August 1, 1947. The syndicate also held $15,314.22 face value of B coupons until maturity and collected the full face value.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in the petitioner’s income tax. The petitioner challenged the Commissioner’s determination, arguing that the proceeds from the discounted B coupons were tax-exempt interest. The Tax Court heard the case to determine the taxability of these proceeds.

Issue(s)

Whether the proceeds from the sale of detached B coupons at a discount constitute tax-exempt interest under Section 22(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code, or whether such proceeds should be included in the gross income of the syndicate as proceeds from the sale of property.

Holding

No, because the syndicate was dealing in property, selling the right to collect future interest, and the proceeds from such sales must be treated the same as proceeds from the sales of the bonds themselves. The court stated, “We do not think it is

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

permissible to set apart the amount received for the detached B coupons as exempt interest."

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the term "interest" typically refers to compensation for the use of borrowed money, citing *Old Colony Railroad Co. v. Commissioner*, 284 U.S. 552 and *Deputy v. DuPont*, 308 U.S. 488. The court found that the $647,630.88 received by the syndicate was not for the use of money it had loaned, as the syndicate was no longer a creditor after selling the new refunding bonds. The court emphasized that in selling the B coupons, the syndicate sold the right to collect future interest. Thus, the sale price was part of the overall gain from dealing in property. The court distinguished this case from scenarios where bonds are issued at a discount by the municipality itself and referred to G.C.M. 21890 and G.C.M. 10452 as inapplicable to the facts at hand. The court emphasized that exemptions from tax must be "plainly and unmistakably granted," and Section 22(b)(4) exempts "only interest," citing *Chicago Theological Seminary v. Illinois*, 188 U.S. 662 and *United States v. Stewart*, 311 U.S. 60.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that simply labeling proceeds as related to municipal bonds does not automatically qualify them for tax-exempt status. Legal professionals should analyze the nature of the transaction and the economic substance of the rights being transferred. This case informs how similar transactions involving the sale of rights to future income streams should be analyzed for tax purposes. Later cases would likely distinguish *District Bond Corp.* if the taxpayer actually held the bonds to maturity, or if the municipality issued the bonds at a discount originally. The court's emphasis on the principle that tax exemptions must be "plainly and unmistakably granted" serves as a reminder that taxpayers must meet a high burden to claim such exemptions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.