Buffalo Meter Co. v. Commissioner, 10 T.C. 836 (1948)

A partnership formed by the stockholders of a corporation to handle a distinct part of the corporation's business will be recognized for tax purposes if it is a real economic entity, conducts business at arm's length with the corporation, and serves a legitimate business purpose.

Summary

Buffalo Meter Co. challenged the Commissioner's determination that a partnership formed by its stockholders should not be recognized for tax purposes, arguing that the partnership's income should be taxed to the corporation. The Tax Court held that the partnership was a separate and distinct economic entity, dealing at arm's length with the corporation, and served a legitimate business purpose. Therefore, the partnership should be recognized for tax purposes, and its income should not be attributed to the corporation. The court emphasized the stockholders' right to choose their business structure and the arm's-length nature of the transactions between the corporation and the partnership.

Facts

Buffalo Meter Co. was engaged in the business of manufacturing and selling water meters and related products. The company's stockholders formed a partnership to handle the manufacturing and selling division of the business. The corporation retained the foundry operations. The corporation sold its products to the partnership at market prices and bought materials from the partnership at market prices. The partnership rented floor space and machinery from the corporation at fair rental value. The Commissioner argued that the partnership should not be recognized for tax purposes and that its income should be taxed to the corporation.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in Buffalo Meter Co.'s income tax. Buffalo Meter Co. petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court reviewed the case and issued its opinion.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the partnership formed by the stockholders of Buffalo Meter Co. should be recognized for tax purposes, or whether its income should be attributed to the corporation under Section 22(a) or Section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, the partnership should be recognized for tax purposes because it was a real economic entity, conducted business at arm's length with the corporation,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

and served a legitimate business purpose.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the partnership was not a sham or unreal entity. There was a complete shift of economic interests from the corporation to the partners. The stockholders were under no obligation to continue the business in corporate form and were free to choose the form in which they carried on business. The division of the business between the corporation and the partnership was natural, as the foundry and manufacturing operations were not interdependent. All dealings between the corporation and the partnership were at arm’s length, with transactions occurring at market prices. The partnership got no more in the way of income benefits than it was entitled to as a return on its manufacturing operations. The court stated, “As has been said repeatedly, the tax laws do not undertake to deny taxpayers the right of free choice in the selection of the form in which they carry on business.” Since there was no shifting of income or expenses between the corporation and the partnership, Section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code was not applicable.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that a partnership formed by corporate stockholders can be recognized for tax purposes if it meets certain criteria. It emphasizes the importance of arm’s-length transactions between the corporation and the partnership. Attorneys can use this case to advise clients on structuring their businesses to achieve the desired tax outcomes while ensuring that the chosen structure has economic substance and a legitimate business purpose. This case also highlights the government’s limited ability to reallocate income between related entities when those entities operate independently and at fair market value. Later cases have distinguished this ruling by focusing on the degree of economic interdependence and the presence of tax avoidance motives.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.