Fifth Avenue-14th Street Corp. v. Commissioner, 147 F.2d 453 (2d Cir. 1945)

A corporation realizes taxable income when it repurchases its own bonds at a price less than their face value, unless it demonstrates that the transaction constitutes a gift or falls under a statutory exception.

Summary

Fifth Avenue-14th Street Corp. (Petitioner) sought to exclude from its gross income the difference between the face value of its bonds and the amount it paid to acquire them. The Petitioner argued the transaction was either a gift from the Gair Co., from whom the bonds were purchased, or that the "discount" should reduce its goodwill account under a specific provision of the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court held that the transaction was a business transaction that benefited both parties and that the petitioner failed to properly consent to the statutory adjustment. The Second Circuit affirmed, holding that the repurchase resulted in taxable income because there was no gratuitous forgiveness of debt and the petitioner did not comply with the requirements for excluding income based on debt discharge.

Facts

The Petitioner issued debenture bonds to the Gair Co. for goodwill and other capital assets. Later, the Petitioner reacquired some of these bonds from the Gair Co. at a price lower than their face value. The petitioner claimed the difference between the face value of the bonds and the purchase price constituted a gift, or, alternatively, should reduce the value of its goodwill account for tax purposes.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the difference between the face value of the bonds and the purchase price was taxable income. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination. The Fifth Avenue-14th Street Corp. appealed to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the acquisition of the petitioner's own debenture bonds at a discount resulted in taxable income, or whether the discount constituted a gift from the bondholder.
2. Whether the petitioner could exclude the income from the discharge of indebtedness by treating it as a reduction to its goodwill account, pursuant to section 22(b)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the transaction was a mutually beneficial business arrangement, not a gratuitous forgiveness of debt.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because the petitioner failed to provide the required consent to adjust the basis of its assets under section 22(b)(9).

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the transaction was an “even trade” that benefited both the Petitioner and the Gair Co., thereby negating any intention of a gift. The court emphasized that the Gair Co. officers stated the transaction benefited both parties, indicating ample consideration for the exchange. The court distinguished this case from situations involving gratuitous forgiveness of debt, as seen in cases like *American Dental Co. v. Helvering*. Regarding the attempt to utilize section 22(b)(9), the court found that the Petitioner explicitly denied consent to the required adjustment of its asset basis. The court stated, “A taxpayer can not make a direct denial and disclaimer of consent and at the same time receive the benefit of the statute predicated on that consent.” Furthermore, the court held that the general principle established in *Kirby Lumber Co.* applied, where a corporation purchasing its own bonds at a discount realizes taxable income.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that a repurchase of a corporation’s own debt at a discount generally results in taxable income, reinforcing the principle established in *Kirby Lumber Co.*. It underscores the importance of properly documenting the intent behind financial transactions to avoid unintended tax consequences, specifically differentiating between business transactions and gifts. It also highlights the necessity of strict compliance with statutory requirements when seeking to exclude income based on debt discharge, particularly the requirement to consent to basis adjustments. Later cases have cited this decision to emphasize the requirement of actual consent and adherence to statutory requirements for excluding income related to debt discharge.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.