R.O.H. Hill, Inc. v. Commissioner, 9 T.C. 152 (1947)

Income is taxed to the entity that earns it, and a partnership lacking economic substance will be disregarded for tax purposes, with its income attributed to the entity that actually generated it.

Summary

R.O.H. Hill, Inc. created a partnership, R. Hill & Co., to handle "E" award printing jobs, assigning most of the income from these jobs to the partnership. The Tax Court found that the partnership contributed no capital or services and was merely a device to avoid taxes. The court held that the income was taxable to R.O.H. Hill, Inc. because it was the true earner of the income. However, the court allowed deductions for additional compensation paid by the partnership to R.O.H. Hill, Inc.'s employees, as those were legitimate business expenses of the corporation. The court also overturned the Commissioner's arbitrary disallowance of travel and entertainment expenses.

Facts

R.O.H. Hill, Inc. (petitioner) entered into a contract with R. Hill & Co., a partnership, to handle "E" award printing. The partnership's capital was only $150. The partnership solicited no business, bought no supplies, and did no actual work. Most of the work was subcontracted out by R.O.H. Hill, Inc. The partnership's function was primarily to receive income from R.O.H. Hill, Inc. The individuals who owned the partnership also owned all of the outstanding stock of the corporation. The corporation claimed it acted as an agent and only earned a 10% commission on these jobs.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the payments to the partnership constituted income to the corporation. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the partnership R. Hill & Co. should be recognized as a separate taxable entity, or whether its income should be attributed to R.O.H. Hill, Inc.
2. Whether expenditures made by the partnership can be considered deductible business expenses of R.O.H. Hill, Inc.
3. Whether the Commissioner's disallowance of a flat sum for travel and entertainment expenses was proper.

Holding

1. No, because the partnership lacked economic substance and served merely as a

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

conduit to divert income from the corporation.
2. Yes, in the case of additional compensation paid to R.O.H. Hill, Inc.'s employees, because those payments were reasonable and directly related to the corporation's business. No, for legal and accounting fees for the partnership, because they did not contribute to earning the income.
3. No, because the disallowance was arbitrary and unsupported by evidence that the expenses were not actually incurred for business purposes.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the partnership was a mere sham, contributing nothing of substance to the earning of income. The court cited the principle that "income is taxable to him who earns it." The court found that the partnership's capital was minimal and its activities were nonexistent, indicating that its purpose was solely to siphon off income from the corporation. Therefore, the court disregarded the partnership for tax purposes and attributed its income to the corporation. The court allowed the corporation to deduct additional compensation paid to its employees by the partnership, finding that these were legitimate business expenses. The court disallowed deductions for legal and accounting fees of the partnership as not ordinary and necessary expenses to the corporation. Regarding the travel and entertainment expenses, the court found no basis for the Commissioner's arbitrary disallowance, as the corporation's officers testified that the expenses were actually incurred for business purposes.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the principle that the IRS and courts will look beyond the form of a transaction to its substance when determining tax liability. It reinforces the importance of ensuring that partnerships and other business entities have real economic substance and are not merely created to avoid taxes. Attorneys advising clients on business structuring must ensure that the entities created serve a legitimate business purpose and conduct actual business activities. Later cases apply this ruling to disallow tax benefits from similar sham transactions. The case also highlights that arbitrary disallowances of expenses by the IRS can be overturned if the taxpayer can demonstrate that the expenses were actually incurred for business purposes, emphasizing the importance of maintaining adequate records to support expense deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.