Estate of Hardinge v. Commissioner, 11 T.C. 17 (1948)

For U.S. estate tax purposes, the character of an asset (real versus personal property) is determined by the law of the jurisdiction where the asset is located and how that law defines the decedent's interest at the time of death.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed whether shares of a Mexican corporation, which owned real estate in Mexico, should be included in the decedent's U.S. gross estate. The estate argued that because the corporation was allegedly dissolved under Mexican law and the decedent was the sole shareholder, the decedent effectively owned real property outside the U.S., which is excluded from the gross estate under Section 811 of the Internal Revenue Code. The court held that the corporation maintained its "juridical personality" until formal liquidation, so the decedent owned shares (personalty), not real estate, at the time of death. Therefore, the value of the shares was properly included in the gross estate.

Facts

The decedent owned 1,000 shares of Hard Guevara Co., a Mexican corporation whose assets consisted entirely of real estate in Mexico.

The estate contended the corporation was dissolved under Mexican law before the decedent's death because it lacked the minimum number of shareholders required by a 1934 amendment to the Mexican Commercial Code.

The corporation was not formally liquidated until 1944, after the decedent's death, and no record of dissolution was entered in the public registry before the decedent's death.

In a Mexican inheritance tax return, the executrix reported the shares, not real property, as an asset of the estate.

The Mexican probate court adjudicated the shares to the widow as sole heir.

Procedural History

The Commissioner included the value of the Hard Guevara Co. shares in the decedent's gross estate, resulting in a deficiency.

The estate petitioned the Tax Court, arguing that the value should be excluded because it represented real property situated outside the U.S.

Issue(s)

Whether the decedent's interest in the Mexican corporation, which held Mexican

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

real estate, should be characterized as real property situated outside the United States, and therefore excluded from the gross estate under Section 811 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because the corporation retained its “juridical personality” under Mexican law until formal liquidation, the decedent owned shares of stock (personalty) at the time of death, not real estate. The value of the shares was properly included in the gross estate.

Court’s Reasoning

The court relied heavily on the expert testimony of the Commissioner’s witness, who specialized in Mexican law. The court interpreted Mexican law as requiring formal liquidation and registration of dissolution in the public registry for a corporation to be fully dissolved.

Even assuming the 1934 amendment to the Commercial Code automatically dissolved the corporation, the court reasoned that dissolution would not automatically transfer ownership of the real estate to the shareholder. The assets would still need to be liquidated and distributed according to Mexican law.

The court stated, “If the ‘managing members’.(shareholders), as required by law, had promptly delivered the assets to a liquidator empowered to ‘represent the society’ and charged with a duty to sell its property, pay its obligations, and distribute the remainder among shareholders, even during this period of liquidation the corporation would have retained its ‘juridical personality’ and decedent could not be said to hold any such direct interest in the corporate lands as to constitute realty…”

Until liquidation occurred, the shareholder’s interest remained personalty, not realty.

The court also noted the estate’s treatment of the shares as personalty in Mexican tax filings and probate proceedings as further support for its conclusion.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of understanding the specific laws governing property ownership and corporate dissolution in the foreign jurisdiction where the assets are located when determining estate tax liabilities.

When dealing with foreign corporations, attorneys must investigate the process and requirements for dissolution and liquidation under local law to determine the nature of the decedent’s interest at the time of death.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The case illustrates that merely owning shares in a foreign corporation that owns real estate does not automatically qualify the asset as “real property situated outside of the United States” for estate tax exclusion purposes.

Later cases would cite this ruling regarding the importance of adhering to established process for dissolving a corporation and the characterization of shares during liquidation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.