12 T.C. 42 (1949)

When an insolvent subsidiary transfers assets to its parent company to satisfy a debt, and the debt is not fully extinguished by the transfer, the subsidiary can deduct a loss on the assets transferred, provided the assets are credited at their fair market value against the debt.

Summary

Northern Coal & Dock Co. (Northern) transferred all its assets to its parent company, Youghiogheny & Ohio Coal Co. (Y&O), to reduce its debt. Northern claimed a deductible loss on the transferred assets. The Commissioner argued the transfer was a liquidation, precluding a loss deduction under Section 112(b)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court held that because the transfer was to satisfy a debt and not a distribution to a shareholder, and because the debt was not fully extinguished, Northern could deduct the loss. This case clarifies the distinction between liquidating distributions and debt satisfaction in the context of subsidiary-parent transactions.

Facts

Northern, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Y&O, sold coal. Northern became insolvent, owing Y&O significant amounts for coal purchases and debenture notes.
Y&O demanded payment of the debenture notes. Northern couldn’t pay, so it agreed to transfer its assets to Y&O, which would credit the assets against the debt.
The assets were credited at book value, except for dock properties and equipment, which were appraised independently. After the transfer, a significant debt balance remained, which Y&O wrote off as uncollectible.

Procedural History

Northern claimed a loss on its tax return from the transfer of assets.
The Commissioner disallowed the loss, arguing it was a liquidation under Section 112(b)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code.
Northern appealed to the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether the transfer of assets from Northern to Y&O constituted a distribution in complete liquidation under Section 112(b)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code, precluding a loss deduction for Northern.

Holding

No, because the transfer was primarily to satisfy a debt, not a distribution to a shareholder in liquidation, and because the debt was not fully extinguished by the transfer. Section 112(b)(6) does not apply to transfers made to creditors to satisfy

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

indebtedness.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that Section 112(b)(6) applies to the receipt of assets by a parent corporation in a complete liquidation of its subsidiary, not to the transfer of assets by the subsidiary.
The court emphasized that the term “distribution in liquidation” refers to distributions to stockholders in cancellation and redemption of stock, representing a return of capital investment. It does not include transfers to creditors to satisfy debts.
The court cited precedent, including *H.G. Hill Stores, Inc.*, 44 B.T.A. 1182, emphasizing that a distribution made to a creditor against an indebtedness does not fall under Section 112(b)(6).
The court noted that all of Northern’s assets were consumed by the debt, leaving nothing for Y&O to receive as a distribution on its stock. As the court stated, “It is the excess of the assets’ value above indebtedness that constitutes a liquidating distribution.”
The court found that the indebtedness was genuine and that the values assigned to the transferred assets were reasonable and reflected fair market value.

Practical Implications

This case provides a clear distinction between a liquidating distribution and a transfer of assets to satisfy debt, particularly in the context of parent-subsidiary relationships. It establishes that a subsidiary can recognize a loss when transferring assets to its parent to satisfy a debt, as long as the transfer is genuinely for debt satisfaction and the assets are valued at fair market value.
Practitioners should carefully analyze the purpose of the transfer. If the primary purpose is debt satisfaction, and a portion of the debt remains outstanding, the subsidiary can likely claim a loss.
This ruling impacts tax planning for corporations with subsidiaries in financial distress. It provides an opportunity to recognize losses that would otherwise be disallowed under the liquidation rules. Subsequent cases have cited Northern Coal for the principle that transfers to creditors are distinct from liquidating distributions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.