Delaware Electric Corp. v. Commissioner, 1945 Tax Ct. Memo LEXIS 117 (1945)

When a parent corporation liquidates a subsidiary under Section 112(b)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code, and the parent also holds the subsidiary's bonds acquired at a discount, the parent recognizes taxable income to the extent of the discount when assets are transferred to satisfy the bond obligation.

Summary

Delaware Electric Corp. liquidated its subsidiaries, acquiring their assets. Delaware held the subsidiaries' bonds, which it had purchased at a discount. The Commissioner argued that the difference between the purchase price and face value of the bonds constituted taxable income to Delaware upon liquidation. The Tax Court agreed, holding that the transfer of assets equivalent to the bond's face value was a satisfaction of debt, not a distribution in liquidation of stock, and therefore taxable under the principle of Helvering v. American Chicle Co.

Facts

Delaware Electric Corp. (Delaware) liquidated several subsidiary companies in 1940.

Delaware had previously purchased the subsidiaries' bonds at a discount, meaning it paid less than the face value of the bonds.

Upon liquidation, each subsidiary transferred assets exceeding the face amount of the bonds to Delaware.

The bonds were secured by liens on the subsidiaries' assets and Delaware also assumed liability for the bonds.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that Delaware realized taxable income from the difference between the purchase price and the face value of the subsidiaries' bonds upon liquidation.

Delaware Electric Corp. petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether, under Section 112(b)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code, a parent corporation recognizes taxable income when it liquidates a subsidiary and receives assets in satisfaction of the subsidiary's bonds that the parent had purchased at a discount?

2. Whether Delaware is entitled to deduct in 1940 $475 representing the part of its

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

total capital stock tax for the year ended June 30,1940, which is attributable to a 10-cent increase in rate imposed by section 205, Revenue Act of 1940, approved June 25,1940?

Holding

1. Yes, because the assets transferred to Delaware up to the face value of the bonds were considered a satisfaction of the debt, not a distribution in liquidation of stock, and thus taxable income.

2. Yes, because the increase in rate to $1.10 was the subject of an amendment to the law enacted June 25,1940, liability for such increase had accrued, and deduction of the $475 in 1940 is therefore approved.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that while Section 112(b)(6) generally provides for non-recognition of gain or loss in complete liquidations of subsidiaries, it does not apply to the extent assets are used to satisfy debts. It cited H.G. Hill Stores, Inc., emphasizing that Section 112(b)(6) does not cover a transfer of assets to a creditor.

The court emphasized that Delaware received assets securing full payment of bonds which it itself owned and for which it itself was liable, putting it in the same position as a bond issuer acquiring its own bonds at a discount, which is a taxable event under Helvering v. American Chicle Co.

The court dismissed the argument that treating assets as partly in payment of bonds and partly as a liquidating distribution creates unwarranted difficulties, stating that Section 112(b)(6) applies only to distributions in liquidation and cannot include assets needed to discharge obligations.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that Section 112(b)(6) does not shield a parent corporation from recognizing income when it receives assets from a liquidating subsidiary in satisfaction of a debt, particularly when the parent acquired that debt at a discount.

In structuring subsidiary liquidations, corporations must account for intercompany debt and the potential for recognizing income if the parent holds debt acquired at a discount.

The ruling emphasizes the importance of analyzing the substance of transactions over their form; the court looked beyond the literal steps of the liquidation plan to determine that assets were essentially being used to satisfy the bond obligation.

Later cases applying this ruling focus on determining whether the transfer of assets truly represents a distribution in liquidation or a satisfaction of debt. Fact patterns

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

are crucial in applying this distinction.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.