5 T.C. 583 (1945)

When a corporation sells multiple securities to a majority shareholder, losses on some securities cannot be deducted even if gains are realized on others in the same transaction, and a personal holding company is subject to surtaxes even with a deficit.

Summary

Morris Investment Corporation, a personal holding company, sold several corporate stocks to Mrs. Morris, who owned over 50% of its stock. The Tax Court addressed whether the Commissioner properly disallowed losses on some stocks while taxing gains on others under Section 24(b)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court held that the stock sale was not an indivisible transaction and upheld the Commissioner's decision. Additionally, the court ruled that the corporation was subject to personal holding company surtaxes despite having a deficit at the beginning and end of the tax year, finding no statutory basis for an exception.

Facts

Morris Investment Corporation (petitioner) was a personal holding company. Mrs. Katherine Clark Morris owned 91.87% of the petitioner's outstanding stock and served as its president. In 1941, Mrs. Morris offered to purchase several blocks of stock owned by the corporation for $131,368.75, a price based on the market prices of the stocks on September 15, 1941. The petitioner's board of directors approved the sale, and Mrs. Morris paid with a promissory note. The purchased stocks were then transferred into trusts benefiting Mrs. Morris's daughter and grandchildren. The petitioner kept separate accounts for each stock certificate, facilitating the calculation of adjusted costs. The corporation had deficits at the beginning and end of the tax year.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency against the petitioner for income tax and personal holding company surtax for the 1941 calendar year. The petitioner appealed to the United States Tax Court, contesting the Commissioner's application of Section 24(b)(1)(B) and the assessment of personal holding company surtax.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Commissioner erred in applying Section 24(b)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code to disallow losses on some stocks while taxing gains on other stocks sold in the same transaction between the corporation and its majority shareholder.

2. Whether the petitioner is subject to personal holding company surtax despite having a deficit at the beginning and end of the taxable year.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the stock sale was not an indivisible transaction; each stock's gain or loss could be determined separately.

2. Yes, because the applicable statute does not provide an exception for companies with deficits.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied on precedent, particularly *Lakeside Irrigation Co. v. Commissioner*, which held that Section 24(b)(1)(B) applies to sales of various securities between a corporation and a majority shareholder. The court rejected the petitioner's argument that the sale was an indivisible transaction, noting that the board resolution set separate prices for some stocks, and the petitioner maintained separate accounts for each stock certificate. The court highlighted that the petitioner itself reported the sale on its tax return, stating "the prices being the market prices for said stocks at the close of September 15, 1941" and characterized the transactions as "these sales." The court stated: "Failing to find here any more separation of the various stocks than in the cited cases, we conclude that section 24 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code applies and that the Commissioner did not err in adding the gains to income while denying deduction of the losses." Regarding the personal holding company surtax, the court acknowledged the petitioner's argument that it could not have avoided the surtax due to its deficit and the inability to receive credit for dividends paid. However, the court found no statutory basis for an exception, stating, "This, however, is asking us to legislate. The applicable act, section 500 of the Internal Revenue Code, does not set up the exception asked for by the petitioner. We are not convinced that we should interpret an exception into it."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that sales of multiple assets between a corporation and a controlling shareholder are generally treated as separate transactions for tax purposes. Taxpayers cannot offset losses on some assets against gains on others when Section 24(b)(1)(B) applies. It underscores the importance of maintaining clear records for each asset and accurately reporting gains and losses. The case also confirms that personal holding company surtaxes apply even to companies with deficits, highlighting the strict application of tax statutes and the limited role of courts in creating exceptions based on perceived unfairness. Later cases applying this ruling would likely focus on determining whether a transaction truly constitutes an indivisible sale, or whether separate pricing and accounting practices indicate separate sales subject to Section 24(b)(1)(B).

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.