7 T.C. 346 (1946)

A family partnership will not be recognized for federal income tax purposes if the children's capital contributions originate with their parents, the children lack managerial control, and their services are not vital to the business.

Summary

John G. Scherf and George H. Barnes, partners in S & B Manufacturing Co., attempted to shift income to their children by creating a family partnership. The Tax Court held that the partnership was not valid for federal income tax purposes. The children's capital originated from gifts from their fathers, they had no real control over the business (Scherf and Barnes remained managing partners), and their services were not vital. The court focused on whether the parties genuinely intended to conduct business as partners, finding that the children's limited involvement did not meet this standard.

Facts

Scherf and Barnes, equal partners in S & B Manufacturing Co., a work pants manufacturer, decided to bring their children into the business as partners. In May 1940, they executed instruments assigning a one-sixth interest each to their respective children (two sons of Scherf, two daughters of Barnes). A partnership agreement was signed, designating Scherf and Barnes as managing partners and the children as investing partners. The children's capital contribution consisted solely of the gifted interests. Prior to this, the children were not involved in the business. After the new partnership was formed, Scherf managed the office and finances, while Barnes supervised factory operations. The children's activities were minimal.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in income tax against Scherf and Barnes, arguing that all of the 1940 net income of S & B Manufacturing Co. was taxable to them as equal partners. Scherf and Barnes petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the Commissioner's determination. The cases were consolidated for review.

Issue(s)

Whether the partnership formed by Scherf, Barnes, and their children should be recognized for federal income tax purposes, such that the income allocable to the children's shares would be taxable to them rather than to Scherf and Barnes.

Holding

No, because the children contributed no capital originating with them, had no voice

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

in management or control, and contributed no vital services.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court emphasized that the key question is “Who earned the income?” The court stated, “The answer to that question depends upon whether the petitioners and their children really intended to carry on business as a partnership.” The court applied the principle that a family partnership will not be recognized if the children’s capital originates with their parents, they have no managerial control, and they contribute no vital services. Here, the children’s capital was a gift, the partnership agreement excluded them from management, and their services were negligible. The court noted that Scherf and Barnes retained exclusive control over the business operations. The court found the children’s limited involvement, particularly their lack of experience and the small amount of time they devoted to the business, demonstrated that they were not active partners in a meaningful sense.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the scrutiny that family partnerships face regarding income tax. To be recognized for tax purposes, family members must contribute capital originating from themselves, actively participate in management, and provide essential services. The ruling emphasizes that simply gifting partnership interests is insufficient to shift income tax liability. Later cases have cited Scherf for the proposition that a valid partnership requires genuine intent to conduct business as partners, with real contributions of capital or services by all partners. It serves as a cautionary tale for taxpayers attempting to use family partnerships solely for tax avoidance purposes. The case highlights the importance of demonstrating genuine economic substance in such arrangements.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.