Greenspon v. Commissioner, 8 T.C. 431 (1947)

Payments made by taxpayers to satisfy oral guarantees of a corporation's debts are deductible as losses incurred in transactions entered into for profit, even if the guarantees were potentially unenforceable under the statute of frauds.

Summary

Abraham and Louis Greenspon, partners, sought to deduct payments made to creditors of their former corporation, Jos. Greenspon's Sons Iron & Steel Co. The IRS disallowed the deductions, arguing that the oral guarantees were unenforceable under the Missouri statute of frauds and the statute of limitations had run. The Tax Court held that the payments were deductible as losses incurred in transactions entered into for profit. The court reasoned that the statute of frauds provided a personal defense that the taxpayers could waive, and their payments were not voluntary but stemmed from their profit-motivated business dealings.

Facts

Abraham and Louis Greenspon were partners who had previously operated a corporation, Jos. Greenspon's Sons Iron & Steel Co. After the corporation was liquidated in 1938, Abraham and Louis made payments to creditors of the former corporation, specifically Kronick and Missouri Bag Co., based on oral guarantees they had made. Abraham also paid a settlement to Cross Refining Co. The IRS disallowed these payments as deductions on their individual income tax returns. Louis' payment to Missouri Bag Co. was originally allowed by the IRS, due to his endorsement on the note, but the IRS challenged Abraham's payments.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deductions claimed by Abraham and Louis Greenspon. The Greenspons petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies. The Tax Court reviewed the evidence and arguments presented by both parties.

Issue(s)

1. Whether payments made by the Greenspons to creditors of their former corporation, based on oral guarantees, are deductible as bad debts under Section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code.

2. Whether such payments are deductible as losses under Section 23(e) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because when the petitioners paid out these sums the old corporation had

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

ceased to exist, having been completely liquidated in 1938, and so no debt from the old corporation to the petitioners could then arise.

2. Yes, because the payments represented losses to the taxpayers that were the proximate result of transactions entered into for profit.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that while the Missouri statute of frauds and statute of limitations could have provided a defense against the guarantees, these were personal defenses that the taxpayers could waive. The court cited several Missouri cases to support the principle that these statutes do not make the underlying obligation void but merely voidable, providing a personal defense. As the court stated, "[I]f a taxpayer chooses to waive his personal defenses and perform a contract, the Commissioner can not object." Furthermore, even a discharge in bankruptcy represents a personal defense that can be waived. The court distinguished between bad debts and losses. While the taxpayers could not claim a bad debt deduction because the corporation had been liquidated and there was no debt to recover, they could deduct the payments as losses incurred in transactions entered into for profit. The court emphasized that the payments were not voluntary but arose from their business dealings and were thus deductible under Section 23(e) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court also extended this reasoning to Abraham's payments to Missouri Bag Co., finding no basis to disallow his deduction when Louis' was allowed.

Practical Implications

This case establishes that taxpayers can deduct payments made on otherwise unenforceable guarantees if those guarantees arose from a transaction entered into for profit. This ruling clarifies that the existence of a legal defense, such as the statute of frauds or statute of limitations, does not automatically preclude a deduction if the taxpayer chooses to honor the obligation. It highlights the importance of demonstrating a business or profit motive behind the guarantee. Attorneys should advise clients that payments made on guarantees related to business ventures are more likely to be deductible, even if a legal challenge could have been successful. This case is frequently cited in disputes involving the deductibility of payments made on behalf of related entities or in situations where the legal enforceability of the underlying obligation is questionable. It also influences how tax practitioners evaluate the deductibility of expenses arising from business dealings, emphasizing the substance of the transaction over its strict legal form. The principles outlined in Greenspon are relevant in modern contexts such as loan guarantees for small businesses or investments in start-up companies.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.