12 T.C. 1095 (1949)

Payments made to a family trust as purported rent or royalties are not deductible business expenses if the underlying transfer of property to the trust and leaseback to the grantor are interdependent steps designed to allocate partnership income.

Summary

Earl and Helen Brown, a husband and wife partnership, sought to deduct rental and royalty payments made to trusts established for their children. The Browns transferred coal mining property and a railroad siding to a trust, which then leased the assets back to the partnership. The Tax Court disallowed the deductions, finding that the transfer and leaseback were a single, integrated transaction designed to shift partnership income to the children. The court held that the payments were not legitimate business expenses but rather disguised gifts of partnership income.

Facts

The Browns operated a contracting and coal-mining business as partners. In 1943, they acquired a coal-rich tract and a separate parcel containing a railroad siding essential for their operations. Seeking financial security for their minor children, the Browns, upon advice of counsel, established irrevocable trusts for each child, naming their attorney as trustee. They then transferred ownership of the coal tract and railroad siding to the trusts. Simultaneously, the trusts leased the properties back to the Brown partnership for specified royalty and rental payments.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the Brown partnership’s deductions for royalty and rental payments made to the trusts in 1944. The Browns petitioned the Tax Court for review, contesting the disallowance. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner’s decision, finding the payments were not legitimate business expenses.

Issue(s)

Whether royalty and rental payments made by a partnership to trusts established for the partners’ children are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code when the underlying transfer of property to the trust and leaseback to the partnership are part of an integrated transaction.

Holding

No, because the transfers to the trusts and leasebacks to the partnership were interdependent steps constituting a single transaction designed to shift partnership income. These payments were, in substance, gifts of partnership income and not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

deductible business expenses.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court emphasized that transactions within a family group are subject to close scrutiny to determine their true nature. The court reasoned that the "gift" of the property to the trust and the "lease" back to the partnership were not separate, independent transactions. Instead, they were integrated steps in a single plan. The court found that the Browns never intended to relinquish control over the mining operations or the use of the railroad siding; their primary objective was to provide financial security for their children while maintaining undisturbed control of the business. The court distinguished this case from situations where an independent trustee manages the property for the benefit of the beneficiaries without pre-arranged leaseback agreements. Because the transfer and leaseback were contingent upon each other, the court concluded that the payments to the trusts were essentially allocations of partnership income, not deductible rents or royalties. The court stated, "Petitioners never intended to and in fact never did part with their right to mine the coal from the acreage and load and ship the same from the siding, which they transferred to the trusts. They merely intended and made a gift of their partnership income in the amounts of the contested 'rents' and 'royalties' to the trusts for their children."

A dissenting opinion argued that the transfers to the trusts were unconditional and that the subsequent leases required reasonable payments, thus qualifying as deductible expenses. The dissent relied on *Skemp v. Commissioner*, 168 F.2d 598, which allowed such deductions where an independent trustee managed the property.

Practical Implications

The *Brown v. Commissioner* case highlights the IRS's and courts' scrutiny of intrafamily transactions, especially leaseback arrangements. Taxpayers should ensure that transfers to trusts are genuinely independent, with the trustee having true discretionary power over the assets. The terms of any leaseback should be commercially reasonable and at arm's length. This case suggests that contemporaneous documentation of the business purpose for the lease is crucial. The case suggests that if the lease is prearranged as a condition of the transfer, the deductions are unlikely to be allowed. Later cases have distinguished *Brown* where the trustee exercised independent judgment or where there was a valid business purpose beyond tax avoidance. Attorneys advising clients on estate planning must counsel them on the potential tax implications of such arrangements and the importance of establishing genuine economic substance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.