***Fox v. Commissioner*, 16 T.C. 863 (1951)**

Payments made by a guarantor on a nonbusiness debt are generally treated as nonbusiness bad debts, subject to the limitations of relevant tax code provisions, rather than as losses from transactions entered into for profit.

Summary

The petitioner, Mrs. Fox, sought to deduct $15,000 paid under a guaranty of her deceased husband's brokerage account as a loss from a transaction entered into for profit. She had previously loaned securities to her husband. The Tax Court held that the payment constituted a nonbusiness bad debt, not a loss from a transaction entered into for profit. The court reasoned that the guaranty created a debtor-creditor relationship, and the payment was to satisfy this debt. Since the debt was nonbusiness and worthless when it arose due to the husband's insolvency, it was deductible as a nonbusiness bad debt, subject to the limitations of the applicable tax code section.

Facts

Petitioner loaned securities to her husband.

Petitioner guaranteed her husband's brokerage account.

The husband died insolvent.

In 1944, the petitioner paid $15,000 under her guaranty of her husband's brokerage account.

Petitioner claimed a $15,000 deduction on her 1944 tax return, arguing it was a loss from a transaction entered into for profit.

The Commissioner disallowed the deduction, treating it as a nonbusiness bad debt subject to limitations.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in the petitioner's 1944 income tax.

Petitioner appealed to the Tax Court, contesting the deficiency and arguing the $15,000 deduction was proper.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $15,000 payment made by the petitioner under her guaranty of her husband's brokerage account is deductible as a loss incurred in a transaction entered into for profit under Section 23(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Alternatively, whether the payment is deductible as a nonbusiness bad debt under Section 23(k)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, the $15,000 payment is not deductible as a loss incurred in a transaction entered into for profit.

2. Yes, the payment is deductible as a nonbusiness bad debt, subject to the limitations of Section 23(k)(4).

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the petitioner's payment under the guaranty created a bad debt situation, not a loss from a transaction entered into for profit. The court emphasized the statutory framework, noting that Section 23(e) provides for general loss deductions, while Section 23(k) specifically addresses bad debts.

Citing *Spring City Foundry Co. v. Commissioner*, 292 U.S. 182, the court stated that loss and bad debt provisions are mutually exclusive. The court found that the petitioner's guaranty created an implied obligation for her husband to reimburse her for any payments she made. Upon payment, this obligation became a debt.

The court rejected the petitioner's argument that there was no debt because the husband was deceased and insolvent, stating, "The argument made goes to the worth and not to the existence of the debt or liability." The court found the debt worthless when it arose (at the time of payment) due to the husband's insolvency.

The court distinguished cases cited by the petitioner, such as *Abraham Greenspon*, 8 T.C. 431, noting factual differences and reinforcing that in this case, the payment was clearly in satisfaction of a debt arising from the guaranty, thus falling under bad debt provisions. The court stated, "We have already shown that the loss here was a bad debt loss and the petitioner herself makes no claim that the liability under her guaranty of her husband's account was a liability incurred in a trade or business…The debt was a nonbusiness debt and, being worthless when it arose…it was deductible by petitioner, subject to the limitations of section 23 (k) (4), supra."

Practical Implications

Fox v. Commissioner clarifies the distinction between bad debt deductions and loss deductions, particularly in the context of guaranty agreements. It establishes that payments made pursuant to a personal guaranty, especially in nonbusiness contexts, are generally treated as nonbusiness bad debts for tax purposes, not as general losses from transactions entered into for profit.

This distinction is crucial because nonbusiness bad debts are subject to capital loss limitations, which are less favorable than the full deductibility often available for

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

losses incurred in transactions for profit. Legal professionals must carefully analyze the nature of a loss arising from a guaranty to properly advise clients on its deductibility, especially considering the relationship between the guarantor and the primary obligor and the business or nonbusiness context of the debt.

Subsequent cases and tax regulations have continued to refine the application of bad debt versus loss deductions, but *Fox* remains a key case illustrating the fundamental principle that guaranty payments often fall under the bad debt framework.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.