Olson v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1948-202

A taxpayer can deduct a loss for worthless stock or a bad debt in the year it becomes worthless, and a husband and wife can agree to treat separate property as community property for tax purposes.

Summary

E.C. Olson petitioned the Tax Court challenging deficiencies in his 1941 income tax. The key issues were whether Trask-Willamette Co. stock became worthless before 1941, whether a bad debt deduction related to a Trask-Willamette note was improperly disallowed, whether profit from a Keeler Creek logging contract was separate income, and whether income from a Priest River operation was separate or community income. The Tax Court held that the stock and debt became worthless in 1941, the Keeler Creek profit was separate income, but the Priest River income was community income due to an agreement between Olson and his wife.

Facts

Olson, residing in Washington, had been involved in the logging industry for years. In 1937, he married Marion Burr. Olson had a lumbering plant (Priest River) and other assets. In 1935, he invested in Trask-Willamette Co., formed to log timber. A fire damaged the timber and destroyed equipment. In 1940, the bank foreclosed on Trask-Willamette's equipment, leaving a deficiency. Olson sold his Trask-Willamette stock for $1 in 1941 and also had loaned the company money. In 1940, Olson bid on a timber contract (Keeler Creek) and formed a partnership with his sons and another individual. The partnership sold the contract at a profit. Olson and his wife agreed to treat income from the Priest River operation as community property.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Olson's 1941 income tax. Olson petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination, challenging several aspects of the Commissioner's assessment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Commissioner erred in determining that the Trask-Willamette Co. stock became worthless prior to 1941, precluding a capital loss deduction in 1941?

2. Whether the Commissioner erred in disallowing a bad debt deduction related to the Trask-Willamette note in 1941?

3. Whether the Commissioner erred in determining that the profit from the sale of the Keeler Creek logging contract was Olson's separate income?

4. Whether the Commissioner erred in determining that the income from the Priest

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

River operation was separate income, rather than community income?

Holding

1. No, the stock became worthless in 1941 because while it had some prospective value on January 1, 1941, within reasonable judgement it became worthless during 1941.

2. No, the bad debt became worthless in 1941 because based on the facts available to petitioner during 1941 and prior to the filing of his income tax return for 1941, the security of his claim against Trask-Willamette growing out of his loan to that Company became worthless in 1941 and his claim also became worthless during that year.

3. Yes, the Keeler Creek profit was separate income because the funds used to purchase the contract were borrowed on Olson's separate credit, making it his separate property.

4. No, the Priest River income was community property because Olson and his wife agreed to treat it as such, overriding its potential classification as separate property.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that despite the 1940 foreclosure, Olson reasonably believed the Trask-Willamette stock retained value into 1941, justifying the capital loss claim that year. Similarly, the security backing the Trask-Willamette debt was deemed worthless in 1941. For the Keeler Creek contract, the court found Olson's borrowing was based on his separate credit, making the resulting profit separate income. Regarding the Priest River income, the court emphasized the agreement between Olson and his wife. The court stated that "if such an agreement was entered into, regardless of the general nature of the income, it became community income by virtue of this agreement." The court accepted testimony and evidence, including advice from their attorney, that supported the existence of this agreement. The court acknowledged that personal property and income can be converted from community to separate property by an oral agreement.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the importance of demonstrating the timing of worthlessness for stock or debt loss deductions. It also highlights the ability of spouses in community property states to reclassify separate property as community property through agreement, impacting tax liabilities. Practitioners should advise clients to maintain records of such agreements. It shows the court's willingness to accept taxpayer testimony when corroborated by supporting evidence. Later cases might cite this as precedent for determining when assets become worthless and the validity of spousal agreements regarding property classification.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.