T.C. Memo. 1950-26

A partner's interest in a partnership, for tax purposes, is determined by the partners' true intent and contributions of capital and services, not solely by formal stock ownership records or disproportionate initial capital contributions.

Summary

Hill and Adah formed a company, with Hill contributing more capital initially. The company was later liquidated and succeeded by a partnership. The IRS argued that Hill owned 99% of the company and thus should be taxed on 99% of the partnership income, based on stock records. Hill argued he and Adah intended to be 50-50 owners. The Tax Court agreed with Hill, holding that the true intent of the partners, along with their contributions of capital and services, determined their partnership interests, not merely the formal stock ownership records or initial capital contributions.

Facts

- Hill and Adah decided to acquire a company and operate it as partners.
- Hill borrowed $12,500, and Adah borrowed $8,000, totaling $20,500, and deposited it into a joint account.
- $10,500 was used to purchase the company's stock, $3,500 was used for operations, and $6,500 was set aside for emergencies.
- Company stock records indicated that Hill owned 89 shares, Ungar 10 shares, and Adah 1 share.
- The company was liquidated and succeeded by a partnership.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that Hill had a 99% interest in the company and the subsequent partnership, leading to a deficiency assessment. Hill challenged this assessment in the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether Hill's interest in the company and the succeeding partnership should be determined based on the formal stock ownership records or on the true intent and contributions of the partners.

Holding

No, because the Tax Court found that Hill and Adah intended to acquire equal interests in the company and both contributed substantial capital and services to the partnership. The formal stock ownership records were not controlling in light of their clear intent.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the parties’ intent to operate on a 50-50 basis was evident despite the disproportionate initial capital contributions and the stock book entries. The court emphasized that the stock certificates were not properly issued (unsigned and without a corporate seal). Even if they had been issued, the court stated that Hill would have been deemed to hold stock in trust for Adah’s one-half interest. The court distinguished this case from cases where the partnership agreement lacked reality. The court explicitly stated, “As between petitioner and Adah, their understanding and agreement as to 50-50 ownership and participation is controlling, and not the stock book entries.” The court concluded that both Hill and Adah contributed substantial capital and services, reinforcing their intent to be equal partners. They wrote “Under these circumstances, we can find no element of lack of bona fides, and, therefore, we have concluded and hold that petitioner and Adah did in fact each acquire a one-half interest in the company.”

Practical Implications

This case illustrates that the IRS and courts will look beyond mere formalities when determining partnership interests for tax purposes. The true intent of the partners, their contributions of capital and services, and the overall economic reality of the arrangement are crucial factors. Attorneys advising clients on partnership agreements should ensure that the written agreements accurately reflect the partners’ intentions and contributions. This case serves as a reminder that substance often prevails over form in tax law. Later cases have cited *Hill v. Commissioner* for the principle that intent and economic reality are paramount in determining partnership interests, especially when capital contributions are disproportionate or the formal documentation is inconsistent with the parties’ understanding.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.