Adda v. Commissioner, 10 T.C. 273 (1948)

A nonresident alien is not considered engaged in trade or business in the United States for tax purposes when commodity accounts are liquidated by brokers without the active participation or discretion of the alien's U.S.-based agent, even if the commodities were initially purchased through that agent's prior actions.

Summary

Fernand Adda, a nonresident alien, challenged a tax deficiency, arguing he wasn't engaged in trade or business in the U.S. in 1943. Previously, the Tax Court found Adda engaged in U.S. business in 1941 due to his brother's active commodity trading on his behalf. In 1943, Adda's commodity accounts were liquidated by brokers under government license due to wartime restrictions. Adda's brother, Joseph, refused to participate in the liquidations. The Tax Court held that because Joseph did not participate in the 1943 sales, Fernand was not engaged in trade or business in the U.S. that year. This decision turned on the lack of agency relationship and the absence of discretionary trading by Joseph in 1943.

Facts

Fernand Adda, an Egyptian national residing in France, traded commodities on U.S. exchanges before 1941. He authorized his brother, Joseph, to act on his behalf in the U.S. if war disrupted communications. In 1943, Adda's accounts with U.S. brokers were blocked under Executive Order 8389. Brokers applied for and received licenses to liquidate Adda's commodity holdings. These liquidations resulted in both short-term capital gains and losses for Adda.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency against Adda for the 1943 tax year. Adda previously contested a similar assessment for 1941, where the Tax Court ruled against him, finding he was engaged in trade or business in the U.S. In this case, Adda petitioned the Tax Court, claiming overpayment and arguing he was not engaged in trade or business in the U.S. in 1943.

Issue(s)

Whether a nonresident alien is engaged in trade or business in the United States when commodity accounts are liquidated by brokers under government license, without the participation of the alien's U.S.-based agent who had previously managed the accounts?

Holding

No, because the taxpayer's brother did not participate in the sales of the commodities in 1943. His prior activity was not determinative, as the key issue was

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

whether Adda was actively engaged in business in the U.S. during the tax year in question.

Court’s Reasoning

The court distinguished the 1943 transactions from those in 1941, where Joseph actively managed Adda’s commodity trades. In 1943, Joseph refused to participate in the liquidation of Adda’s accounts due to concerns about immigration consequences following the freezing order. The brokers acted on their own responsibility when liquidating the accounts, without direction or discretion from Joseph. The court emphasized Joseph’s testimony that he “refused to have anything to do with the sales in 1943,” indicating he was not acting as Adda’s agent. The court found the fact that gains from sales of property purchased in prior years constituted taxable income in the year of the sale (citing *Snyder v. Commissioner*, 295 U.S. 134) was not determinative of whether Adda was engaged in trade or business in the U.S. in 1943.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that mere liquidation of commodity holdings by a broker does not automatically constitute engaging in trade or business for a nonresident alien. The level of involvement and discretion exercised by the alien or their agent is crucial. Legal practitioners should carefully examine the activities and decision-making processes of the alien and their representatives during the tax year in question. The case emphasizes the importance of demonstrating a clear lack of agency or active participation in U.S. business activities to avoid taxation as being engaged in trade or business in the US. It highlights that past business activity does not necessarily equate to current business activity for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.