9 T.C. 71 (1947)

A trust established to operate a business for profit, possessing corporate characteristics such as centralized management, continuity of life, and transferability of interests, is taxable as an association, even if it lacks some formal corporate attributes.

Summary

Berry Brothers Trust was established by Richard G. Berry, Sr., to transfer his screw products manufacturing business to his five sons as trustees and beneficiaries. The IRS determined the trust was an association taxable as a corporation. The Tax Court upheld the IRS determination, finding that the trust's purpose was to operate a business for profit, exhibiting characteristics like centralized management and continuity of life, thus resembling a corporation despite lacking some formal corporate attributes. The court emphasized the importance of the trust deed's intent and the actual operations of the trust in determining its tax status.

Facts

Richard G. Berry, Sr., created a trust in 1924, transferring his bolt and nut factory to his five sons as trustees. The trust deed designated the trustees as "Berry Brothers Trust" and granted them the power to manage and operate the business until only one son survived, unless they unanimously agreed to liquidate or incorporate sooner. Beneficial interests were represented by transferable certificates, though none were ever issued. The trust continued operating the business, with the sons actively involved in management and dividing the profits. There was no specific direction for liquidation in the trust deed.

Procedural History

The IRS determined that Berry Brothers Trust was an association taxable as a corporation for the years 1942, 1943, and 1944, and assessed deficiencies. The Trust challenged this determination in the Tax Court, arguing it was a liquidating trust. The Tax Court upheld the IRS's determination, finding the trust operated as a business and possessed corporate characteristics.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Berry Brothers Trust, established to operate a business, is taxable as an association (corporation) or as a trust for federal income tax purposes.

Holding

1. Yes, because the trust's purpose was to operate a business for profit and it possessed enough corporate characteristics (centralized management, continuity of life, transferability of interests) to be classified as an association

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

taxable as a corporation, regardless of the absence of some formal corporate attributes.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the trust deed indicated the grantor's intent to have his sons continue operating the business as a family enterprise, not merely to conserve assets. The court cited *Morrissey v. Commissioner*, emphasizing that business trusts are designed to conduct a business and share its gains, unlike traditional trusts focused on conserving specific property. The court found that the trustees acted together in carrying on the business for profit. The court stated, "In what are called 'business trusts' the object is not to hold and conserve particular property, with incidental powers, as in the traditional type of trusts, but to provide a medium for the conduct of a business and sharing its gains." The trust exhibited corporate characteristics like centralized management, continuity of life (until only one trustee survived), and transferability of interests. Although the trust lacked some formal corporate attributes, the court stated that the purpose and actual operations are more important than form in determining its tax classification. The court also noted that the trust differed from an ordinary partnership because the trustees did not voluntarily join together to form a partnership.

Practical Implications

The *Berry Brothers Trust* case highlights that the tax classification of a trust depends on its purpose and activities. If a trust is established to operate a business for profit and possesses corporate characteristics, it is likely to be taxed as a corporation, even if it is formally structured as a trust. Attorneys advising clients on forming trusts must carefully consider the intended business activities and structure the trust to avoid unintended corporate tax consequences. This case reinforces the principle that substance over form governs tax law, and that the actual operations of an entity are critical in determining its tax status. Subsequent cases may cite this when determining whether a trust should be taxed as a corporation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.