Harlan v. Commissioner, 11 T.C. 86 (1948)

A family partnership will not be recognized for income tax purposes if the purported partners do not contribute capital or services and the partnership was not entered into with a present intent to conduct a bona fide business together.

Summary

The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination that the income from a family partnership should be taxed to the father, Harlan. The court found that the son, Harold, did not contribute capital or services to the partnership and that the agreement was entered into when Harold was already in military service, making it impossible for him to fulfill his duties. The court distinguished this case from others where family members actively contributed to the business, emphasizing the importance of a genuine intent to carry on a business together during the taxable year in question.

Facts

Harlan and his son, Harold, allegedly agreed in 1938 that if Harold completed his engineering degree, Harlan would take him into partnership. Harold graduated and, in 1942, Harlan transferred $9,000 to Harold, which Harold then contributed to the partnership. Harold entered military service six months before the partnership agreement was signed in December 1941. During 1943, the taxable year in question, Harold was in the military and provided no services to the partnership. The partnership agreement stated Harold would give his entire time and attention to the business, which was impossible due to his military service. Both Harlan and Harold initially reported the $9,000 transfer as a gift.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the income from the partnership should be taxed entirely to Harlan. Harlan petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

Whether a family partnership should be recognized for income tax purposes when one partner contributed no capital or services, and was in military service rendering performance of partnership duties impossible.

Holding

No, because Harold contributed no capital or services to the partnership during the tax year, and both parties knew at the time the agreement was signed that Harold's military service would prevent him from performing his duties.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court found that Harold did not contribute new capital of his own to the partnership, noting that the initial transfer of funds was reported as a gift. The court emphasized that Harold was in the military during the entire year of 1943 and rendered no services to the partnership. The court distinguished this case from *Culbertson v. Commissioner*, where the sons had actively worked on their father’s ranch for years prior to the partnership’s formation and contributed vital services. The court stated that the “intention” to form a bona fide partnership, as referenced in *Commissioner v. Tower*, pertains to the taxable year under consideration, not some indefinite future year. Because Harold’s military service made it impossible for him to fulfill his duties under the partnership agreement, the court concluded that the partnership should not be recognized for income tax purposes. The court noted, “When he signed that agreement, providing that he should give his “entire time and attention to said business,” both he and his father knew that the performance of the agreement would be impossible.”

Practical Implications

This case demonstrates the importance of actual contributions of capital or services by all partners in a family partnership seeking recognition for tax purposes. It underscores that a mere intent to form a partnership in the future is insufficient; the intent must be to conduct a bona fide business together during the taxable year. Tax advisors must carefully scrutinize family partnerships, especially where one partner’s involvement is limited or nonexistent. This case provides a cautionary tale against structuring partnerships solely for tax avoidance purposes without genuine economic substance. Later cases applying *Harlan* reinforce the necessity of demonstrable contributions and active participation by all partners for the partnership to be respected by the IRS.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.