Zacek v. Commissioner, 11 T.C. 333 (1948)

A family partnership will not be recognized for income tax purposes where the wives of the original partners contribute neither essential capital nor services to the partnership, and the primary motive for forming the partnership is tax avoidance.

Summary

The Tax Court held that wives of partners in the Troy Tool & Gage Co. could not be recognized as partners for income tax purposes because they contributed neither essential capital nor services to the business. The original partnership consisted of three men. They attempted to create a new limited partnership by adding their wives as limited partners. The court, relying on *Commissioner v. Tower*, found that the wives' contributions were merely formal and did not reflect a real change in the business's operation or capital structure, therefore the income was taxable to the original partners.

Facts

Three men were partners in Troy Tool & Gage Co. In late 1941, they made formal arrangements to establish a new limited partnership, admitting their wives as limited partners. The company did not need additional capital, and no significant capital was contributed by the wives. The arrangement was made when the earnings of the company greatly increased and were still increasing. The partners retained control over distributions of earnings to partners, including the ability to determine their own salaries and direct the firm's earnings.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the income of Troy Tool & Gage Co. for the period October 1 to December 31, 1941, was taxable in equal shares to the three original partners. The taxpayers petitioned the Tax Court for review. The Tax Court sustained the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

Whether the wives of the original partners in Troy Tool & Gage Co. could be recognized as partners for income tax purposes, where they contributed neither essential capital nor services to the partnership, and the primary motive for forming the partnership was tax avoidance.

Holding

No, because the wives did not contribute essential capital or services to the business, and the arrangement appeared to be primarily an attempt to reallocate income within each family unit.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court relied heavily on *Commissioner v. Tower*, emphasizing that substance is more important than form. The court found that despite the formal documentation, there was no real change in the existing partnership consisting of only the three original partners. The wives did not contribute services or capital that originated with them to the business. The business did not need additional capital and did not receive any from the wives. The court also noted that the partners retained control over the distributions of earnings and admitted that tax savings was a primary reason for the new arrangement. The court concluded that the arrangement was merely an attempt to reallocate income within each family unit. The court found, “It is difficult to find here anything more than an attempt by petitioners to reallocate their income within each family unit.”

Practical Implications

This case, along with *Commissioner v. Tower*, illustrates the importance of substance over form in determining the validity of family partnerships for income tax purposes. To establish a valid family partnership, family members must genuinely contribute capital or services to the partnership. Arrangements primarily motivated by tax avoidance and lacking in real economic substance will likely be disregarded by the IRS and the courts. Later cases have further refined the factors considered in evaluating family partnerships, focusing on whether the family members actively participate in the management and control of the business and whether the partnership is conducted in a manner consistent with normal business practices.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.