6 T.C. 1048 (1946)

A debtor who repurchases its own bonds at a discount may realize taxable income, unless the discount constitutes a gratuitous cancellation of debt akin to a gift.

Summary

Lewis F. Jacobson, the petitioner, acquired some of his own bonds at less than their face value. The Tax Court had to determine whether the difference between the face value of the bonds and the amount Jacobson paid constituted taxable income. The court distinguished between bonds acquired through direct negotiations with bondholders, which were considered non-taxable gifts under Helvering v. American Dental Co., and those acquired through intermediaries like a bondholders' committee secretary or security dealers, which were taxable under United States v. Kirby Lumber Co. The court also addressed deductions for entertainment and automobile expenses, allowing some and disallowing others based on business vs. personal use.

Facts

Jacobson owned a leasehold and buildings in Chicago. In 1925, he borrowed $90,000, issuing bonds secured by a mortgage trust deed. By January 1, 1938, $51,750 of these bonds remained outstanding. During 1938-1940, Jacobson repurchased some of these bonds at prices lower than their face value. Some purchases were made directly from bondholders after negotiations; others were made through the secretary of a bondholders' committee or through security houses. Jacobson was solvent during these years. He also claimed deductions for entertainment and automobile expenses related to his law practice.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Jacobson's income tax for 1938, 1939, and 1940. Jacobson contested these deficiencies, arguing that the discounted bond repurchases did not represent taxable income and that certain business expenses were improperly disallowed. The Tax Court heard the case to determine the proper tax treatment of the bond repurchases and the deductibility of the expenses.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the acquisition by the petitioner of his mortgage obligations, at a price lower than the face value thereof, represented taxable income to the petitioner during any of the years in question?

2. Whether the expenses of entertaining clients and paying for meals for employees, for which he was not reimbursed, are deductible business expenses?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

3. Whether the expenses of operating the petitioner’s automobile are fully deductible as business expenses?

Holding

1. No, in part, and Yes, in part, because bonds acquired through direct negotiation with bondholders were considered gifts, while those acquired through intermediaries resulted in taxable income under the Kirby Lumber doctrine.

2. Yes, in part, because the court allowed a deduction of $750 in each of the years 1939 and 1940 for entertainment expenses.

3. No, in part, because only one-half of the automobile expenses were deductible, representing the portion used for business purposes.

Court’s Reasoning

The court distinguished between bond repurchases based on the level of direct interaction with the bondholders. For bonds acquired through direct negotiations, the court applied the American Dental Co. doctrine, treating the discount as a gift. For bonds acquired through intermediaries, the court followed Kirby Lumber Co., holding that the difference between the face value and the purchase price constituted taxable income. The court emphasized the absence of a

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.