7 T.C. 1195 (1946)

The IRS can reallocate gross income between related entities under Section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code if necessary to clearly reflect income and prevent tax evasion, especially where one entity performs the work but the income is diverted to another.

Summary

Forcum-James Company ("F-J Co.") bid on a defense plant excavation project and associated with other entities, including a partnership (Forcum-James Construction Co. or "F-J Construction") controlled by F-J Co.'s shareholders. After the associates withdrew, F-J Co. completed the project. The IRS reallocated $500,000 of income from F-J Construction to F-J Co. and included $313,195.98 in F-J Co.'s income, arguing the venture's end constituted a completed transaction. The Tax Court upheld the IRS, finding the reallocation necessary to accurately reflect income, as F-J Co. performed the work, and the distribution was essentially a dividend to F-J Co.'s controlling shareholders.

Facts

- F-J Co. bid for excavation work on a defense plant for E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co. ("DuPont").
- DuPont issued a purchase order to F-J Co. for approximately $130,000 – $150,000.
- F-J Co. associated with Pioneer Contracting Co., Forcum-James Construction Co., and Clark, Kearney & Stark in the venture. F-J Co. acted as the agent, handling negotiations and records.
- The partnership, F-J Construction, was owned and controlled by the same interests as F-J Co.
- F-J Construction had no employees or equipment of its own; these were provided by F-J Co.
- In November 1941, the associated entities withdrew from the project, receiving payments from F-J Co.
- F-J Co. continued the work alone.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in F-J Co.'s income and excess profits taxes. F-J Co. petitioned the Tax Court for redetermination. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's reallocation of income and other adjustments, with some modifications regarding deductions for pension plan contributions and accounting fees.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the withdrawal of the joint venture participants constituted a closed

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

transaction, requiring inclusion of $313,195.98 in F-J Co.’s income.
2. Whether the $500,000 paid to F-J Construction was properly allocated to F-J Co. under Section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. Yes, because the withdrawal of the joint venture participants constituted a closed transaction, making the deferred income taxable to F-J Co. in that period.
2. Yes, because Section 45 permits reallocation when necessary to clearly reflect income, and F-J Co. performed the work that generated the income.

Court’s Reasoning

- The court found the venture’s termination was a closed transaction, triggering recognition of deferred income.
- The court emphasized F-J Co.’s direct contractual relationship with DuPont, not as an agent for the other entities.
- Applying Section 45, the court highlighted that F-J Co. possessed the equipment and employees, while F-J Construction had none. F-J Co.’s resources and efforts were essential to generating the income.
- The court stated, "[I]t is obvious that the $500,000 was not earned through any work performed by the partnership, but, on the contrary, it is clearly indicated that the work was performed and the income earned by petitioner."
- The court determined that the same interests controlled both F-J Co. and F-J Construction, satisfying another requirement of Section 45. The shared ownership and management justified the reallocation.
- The court noted that the payment to F-J Construction was essentially a dividend distribution to F-J Co.’s controlling shareholders.

Practical Implications

- This case provides a clear example of when and how the IRS can use Section 45 to reallocate income between related entities. It underscores the importance of reflecting economic reality in tax reporting.
- Legal practitioners must advise clients that simply shifting income to a related entity does not avoid tax liability if the entity receiving the income did not perform the work or provide the resources to earn it.
- The case highlights that the IRS will scrutinize transactions between closely held corporations and partnerships, especially when the same individuals control both entities. Transfers that lack economic substance are vulnerable to reallocation.
- This ruling emphasizes that the absence of formal dividend declarations, or the disproportionate nature of a distribution, does not prevent the IRS from treating a payment to shareholders as a dividend.
- Taxpayers must maintain detailed records demonstrating which entity

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

performed the work and provided the resources to earn the income to withstand a Section 45 reallocation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.