Elise W. Hill, 10 T.C. 1070 (1948)

A transfer of assets to another corporation constitutes a tax-free reorganization if the transfer is undertaken for reasons germane to the continuance of the corporate business and the transferor's stockholders control the transferee corporation immediately after the transfer, even if the primary motive is to avoid personal holding company surtax.

Summary

Elise W. Hill received a distribution from Timber company as part of a plan where Timber transferred approximately 44% of its assets to Bonners in exchange for all of Bonners stock, followed by Timber's liquidation. Hill sought to treat the distribution as a complete liquidation taxable at capital gain rates. The Tax Court held that the transaction constituted a tax-free reorganization under Section 112(g)(1)(C) of the Revenue Act of 1936 because the transfer was for business reasons and the same stockholders controlled both corporations. The distribution was taxable as a dividend to the extent of Hill's share of Timber's earnings and profits.

Facts

Timber company transferred approximately 44% of its assets to Bonners in exchange for all of Bonners stock.
The same individuals controlled and operated both Timber and Bonners.
Bonners continued to conduct business with the transferred assets or reinvestments of proceeds.
The transfer was motivated by a change in tax laws that adversely affected personal holding companies, with the aim of relieving the income from those assets from personal holding company surtax.
Elise W. Hill received a distribution as a result of this transaction and sought to treat it as a complete liquidation.

Procedural History

Elise W. Hill petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the Commissioner's determination that the distribution she received should be taxed as a dividend rather than as a capital gain from a complete liquidation.
The Tax Court reviewed the case and rendered its decision.

Issue(s)

Whether the transfer of assets from Timber to Bonners, followed by Timber's liquidation, constituted a tax-free reorganization under Section 112(g)(1)(C) of the Revenue Act of 1936, or a complete liquidation under Section 115(c).
If the transaction was a reorganization, whether the distribution received by Elise W. Hill should be taxed as a dividend to the extent of her share of Timber's earnings and profits.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

Yes, the transfer of assets and subsequent liquidation constituted a tax-free reorganization because the transfer was undertaken for business reasons germane to the continuance of the corporate business and the same stockholders controlled both corporations.
Yes, the distribution received by Hill should be taxed as a dividend to the extent of her share of Timber's earnings and profits because the distribution had the effect of a taxable dividend under Section 112(c)(2).

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the transaction fell within the definition of a reorganization under Section 112(g)(1)(C) of the Revenue Act of 1936, which defines a reorganization as "a transfer by a corporation of all or a part of its assets to another corporation if immediately after the transfer the transferor or its stockholders or both are in control of the corporation to which the assets are transferred."
The court found that the transfer was undertaken for reasons germane to the continuance of the corporate business and that the same persons controlled and operated both corporations.
The court distinguished this case from cases where the new company was merely used to complete the orderly liquidation of assets, noting that Bonners continued to carry on a part of the business formerly conducted by Timber.
The court also noted that the transaction was motivated by a change in tax laws, making it prudent to relieve certain income from the burden of personal holding company surtax.
The court stated that the motive behind the transaction is not determinative, but rather the inquiry is whether what was done is the type of thing with which the reorganization provisions of the statute were concerned, citing Gregory v. Helvering, 293 U. S. 465.
The court held that the distribution to Hill, to the extent of her pro rata share in corporate earnings and profits, is taxable as a dividend under Section 112(c)(2) because the distribution had the effect of a taxable dividend, citing Commissioner v. Bedford's Estate, 325 U. S. 283.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that a transfer of assets can qualify as a tax-free reorganization even if motivated by tax avoidance, provided there is a valid business purpose and continuity of control.
It highlights the importance of analyzing the substance of a transaction, rather than its form, to determine its tax consequences.
Tax advisors and attorneys can use this case to structure corporate transactions to achieve tax-efficient results while maintaining business continuity.
Subsequent cases may distinguish this ruling based on the presence or absence of a valid business purpose or continuity of control.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

This case serves as a reminder that the reorganization provisions are intended to permit flexibility in changing the mode of conducting corporate business, even if other methods could achieve similar results.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.