7 T.C. 417 (1946)

In a tax-free corporate reorganization, where an insolvent company's assets are transferred to a new corporation in exchange for stock issued to the old company's creditors, the new corporation inherits the transferor's basis in the assets for depreciation purposes.

Summary

Montgomery Building, Inc. (the old company) was insolvent. Its assets were transferred to Montgomery Building Realty Company (the new company) in exchange for all of the new company's stock. This stock was issued to the old company's unsecured creditors. The Tax Court held that this transaction constituted a tax-free reorganization. Therefore, the new company had to use the old company's basis for depreciation of the building. This was required by Section 113(a)(7) of the 1934 Revenue Act. The court reasoned that because the old company was insolvent, the creditors effectively controlled it, and their equity ownership continued in the reorganized entity.

Facts

Montgomery Building, Inc., constructed an office building in 1925. The company's financial performance was poor, and it became insolvent. The company had outstanding a first mortgage bond issue and gold coupon notes, both individually guaranteed by the company's directors. By 1933, the directors had advanced significant funds to cover deficits. The company's stockholders approved a plan to sell the building to a new corporation. The new corporation would assume the existing mortgage debt. The new company, Montgomery Building Realty Company, was formed. All of its stock was issued to the seven directors of the old company in exchange for their cancellation of the advances they made to the old corporation.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the new company's income, declared value excess profits, and excess profits tax. The Commissioner argued that the new company was not entitled to use the old company's basis for depreciation. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transfer of assets from the old company to the new company constituted a tax-free reorganization under Section 112(b)(4) of the Revenue Act of 1934?
2. If the transfer was a reorganization, whether the new company was required to use the old company's basis for depreciation under Section 113(a)(7) of the Revenue Act of 1934?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the transfer met the definition of a reorganization under the 1934 Act, as the new company acquired substantially all of the old company's properties solely in exchange for all of its voting stock and the old company was insolvent allowing creditors to fulfill the continuity of interest.
2. Yes, because Section 113(a)(7) requires the new company to use the transferor's basis in a tax-free reorganization where control remains in the same persons, and here, the creditors of the insolvent old company effectively controlled it and received the stock of the new company.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the transfer of assets to the new company met the definition of a reorganization under the 1934 Act. The fact that the stock was issued to the old company's creditors, rather than directly to the old company, was immaterial due to the old company's insolvency. Citing *Helvering v. Alabama Asphaltic Limestone Co., 315 U.S. 179*, the court recognized that in insolvency cases, creditors effectively step into the shoes of the stockholders for purposes of the continuity of interest requirement. The court stated, "The conceded insolvency of the latter permits the continuity of interest requirement to be fulfilled by issuance of the new stock to the transferor's creditors."

The court further reasoned that because the transfer was a reorganization, Section 113(a)(7) applied, requiring the new company to use the old company's basis for depreciation. The court found that the creditors effectively controlled the old company due to its insolvency. Issuing all of the new company's stock to these creditors satisfied the requirement that control remain in the same persons. The court distinguished the situation from cases where secured creditors' rights remain unchanged. In those cases, only junior interests are altered.

Judge Turner dissented, stating, "To say that the unsecured creditors, immediately prior to the transfer and exchanges herein, were in control of the old corporation within the rule of *Helvering v. Alabama Asphaltic Limestone Co.*, is, in my opinion, contrary to the facts of this case and results in an erroneous application of the statute."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies how the tax basis of assets is determined after a corporate reorganization involving an insolvent company. It highlights that creditors of an insolvent company can be considered the equity owners for purposes of the continuity of interest requirement. This case provides a framework for analyzing reorganizations involving financially distressed companies and confirms that the new entity generally inherits the old entity's tax basis in its assets. The full priority rule from bankruptcy law, as articulated in *Northern Pacific R. Co. v. Boyd*,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

influences the tax analysis of corporate reorganizations. This case emphasizes that prior lien creditors who are not asked to surrender a portion of their secured interests are not significantly affected by the reorganization.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.