9 T.C. 169 (1947)

A corporation does not realize taxable gains from the sale of its own stock when the transactions are made pursuant to an agreement to restrict ownership to those actively contributing to the company's success, rather than dealing in the stock as it would in the shares of another corporation.

Summary

Rollins Burdick Hunter Co., an insurance brokerage dependent on the personal efforts of its officers, sold treasury stock to key employees to align ownership with service contribution. The Tax Court addressed whether the company was dealing in its own stock as it might with another corporation's stock, thus realizing taxable gains. The court held that the company's actions, dictated by an agreement to keep stock within the active management, did not constitute dealing in stock for profit, and thus no taxable gain was realized. This decision underscores the importance of intent and purpose behind a corporation's transactions in its own stock.

Facts

Rollins Burdick Hunter Co. was an Illinois corporation engaged in insurance brokerage, heavily reliant on the skills of its principal officers. The company's stock was held by these individuals in proportion to their service contributions. The company maintained the right to reacquire stock upon an officer's death or retirement. In 1942 and 1943, the company sold treasury stock, acquired earlier at $50 per share, to key employees at approximately book value ($300 per share) to incentivize them by making them part owners. These sales were done to ensure the stock remained within the hands of active employees.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the company's income and excess profits taxes for 1942 and 1943, arguing that the sales of treasury stock resulted in taxable gains. The company petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the Commissioner's assessment. The Tax Court then reviewed the case to determine whether the gains from the stock sales were taxable income.

Issue(s)

Whether the petitioner was dealing in its own stock as it might in the stock of another corporation, and therefore realized taxable gains from sales of its own stock in the taxable years 1942 and 1943.

Holding

No, because the petitioner was not dealing in its own shares as it might in the shares of another corporation, but was instead implementing an agreement to

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

ensure that its stock remained solely in the hands of those responsible for its operation and success.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court emphasized that the company’s stock transactions were not driven by a profit motive. Instead, they were part of a long-standing agreement to keep ownership within the group of active officers. The court noted, “The petitioner had no profit motive in buying or selling, but was merely arranging that its shares should be held, and held only, by those who were its officers and principally responsible, through their personal services, for its success and should be held by them in proportion to their relative abilities to contribute personal services of value to the petitioner.” The court contrasted this with dealing in stock as a typical investment, stating that the company’s actions were aimed at maintaining control and incentivizing key personnel, which could not be accomplished by trading in another company’s stock. The court distinguished the situation from typical stock transactions, citing *Dr. Pepper Bottling Co. of Mississippi, 1 T.C. 80*; *Brockman Oil Well Cementing Co., 2 T.C. 168*; *Cluett, Peabody & Co., 3 T.C. 169*.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that not all transactions involving a company’s own stock are considered taxable events. The key is the purpose behind the transaction. If a company buys and sells its own stock as part of a plan to incentivize employees, maintain control within a specific group, or restructure capital without a profit motive, the resulting gains may not be taxable. This ruling informs how businesses structure stock ownership and compensation plans, especially in closely-held corporations where aligning ownership with management is crucial. Later cases applying this ruling would likely focus on discerning the true intent behind stock transactions to determine whether they are truly for operational purposes or disguised attempts to generate taxable gains. It highlights the importance of documenting the purpose and agreement behind such transactions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.