8 T.C. 1056 (1947)

Section 24(b)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code disallows the deduction of losses from sales or exchanges of property, directly or indirectly, between members of a family, even in the case of an involuntary foreclosure sale.

Summary

Thomas Zacek claimed a deduction for a loss incurred from the foreclosure sale of a farm to his siblings. The Commissioner disallowed the deduction, arguing that the sale was effectively between family members, which is prohibited under Section 24(b)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's decision, finding that the involuntary nature of the sale (foreclosure) did not remove it from the scope of the statute, which broadly disallows losses from sales between family members, even bona fide transactions.

Facts

The petitioner, Thomas Zacek, inherited a portion of a farm from his father. Two of Zacek's siblings provided funds to the estate, secured by a mortgage on the farm. Due to drought and grasshopper damage, the farm's mortgage interest and taxes became delinquent. The mortgagee siblings initiated foreclosure proceedings. The farm was sold at a sheriff's sale to the mortgagee siblings for $5,509, covering only the mortgage principal, interest, taxes, and costs. Zacek claimed a deduction for his share of the loss from the sale.

Procedural History

Zacek filed a joint income tax return with his wife, claiming a deduction for the loss incurred from the farm's foreclosure sale. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deduction. Zacek petitioned the Tax Court to review the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

Whether the loss from an involuntary foreclosure sale of property to members of the taxpayer's family is deductible, or whether it is disallowed under Section 24(b)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code as a loss from a sale between family members.

Holding

No, because Section 24(b)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code broadly disallows deductions for losses from sales or exchanges of property, directly or indirectly, between family members, and this includes involuntary sales such as foreclosure sales.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The Tax Court emphasized the broad language of Section 24(b)(1)(A), stating that it "includes bona fide transactions, without regard to hardship in particular cases." The court found that a judicial sale, as in a foreclosure, constitutes a "sale" for tax purposes, citing *Helvering v. Hammel, 311 U.S. 504*. It determined that Zacek retained legal title to the property until the sheriff's deed transferred it to his siblings. The court stated, "We think there was a sale of property indirectly between members of a family within the meaning of section 24 (b) (1) (A)." The dissenting judge argued that the sheriff, not Zacek, made the sale, and the statute was not intended to cover such involuntary transactions.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that the disallowance of losses on sales between related parties extends to involuntary sales like foreclosures. Tax advisors must carefully analyze whether a property transfer, even if compelled by legal proceedings, ultimately results in a transfer to a related party. This ruling prevents taxpayers from circumventing the related-party loss disallowance rules through foreclosure or other involuntary sale mechanisms. Later cases would need to distinguish the level of control the taxpayer had over the process. If the foreclosure was genuinely at arm's length to an unrelated third party, the loss may be allowed, even if a family member subsequently purchases the property from the third party. The key is the initial sale from the taxpayer.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.