15 T.C. 128 (1950)

A partner is liable for income tax on their distributive share of partnership income, regardless of whether it's actually distributed, unless they can prove they were merely a tool for tax evasion; furthermore, a taxpayer on the cash basis does not realize taxable gain from a sale until they actually receive cash or its equivalent.

Summary

Lois Reynolds Atkins contested deficiencies assessed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, arguing she should not be taxed on undistributed partnership income due to her husband's domination and that she did not realize income from a property settlement in a divorce decree. The Tax Court held that Atkins was liable for her share of partnership income because she failed to prove she was merely a tool used by her husband for tax evasion. However, the court found that Atkins, who was on the cash basis, did not realize any gain from the property settlement in the tax year because she received neither cash nor a promissory note during that year.

Facts

Lois Reynolds Atkins managed Arcadia Roller Rink, owned by Arcadia Garden Corporation. She married Leo A. Seltzer, who controlled the corporation, in 1942. Shortly after the marriage, the corporation dissolved, and the rink continued operation as a partnership between Atkins and Fred Morelli. Atkins received a salary and had a concession at the rink. Seltzer later formed a new partnership in 1944 including himself and required Atkins to deposit her partnership income into their joint account. Upon divorce in December 1944, a property settlement stipulated Seltzer would pay Atkins $15,000 for her partnership interest, evidenced by a promissory note. Atkins did not receive the note or any payments in 1944.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed deficiencies against Atkins for the tax years 1942, 1943, and 1944. Atkins petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the Commissioner's determination. The Tax Court considered the issues of partnership income and the property settlement.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Atkins was taxable on her distributive share of the partnership income from Arcadia Roller Rink for the years 1942, 1943, and 1944, despite her claim that she did not receive the income and was dominated by her husband.
2. Whether Atkins realized taxable income in 1944 from the property settlement agreement incorporated in her divorce decree, specifically from the sale of her partnership interest.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because Atkins failed to prove she was merely a tool used by her husband to evade taxes and the evidence did not show she did not contribute valuable services to the operation of the rink after her marriage.
2. No, because Atkins was on a cash basis and did not receive the promissory note or any payment for her partnership interest in 1944.

Court's Reasoning

Regarding the partnership income, the court relied on Section 182 of the Internal Revenue Code, stating that a partner's net income includes their distributive share of partnership income, whether or not it is actually distributed. The court found that Atkins failed to provide sufficient evidence that she was merely a tool dominated by her husband to evade taxes. The court noted that she acted dishonestly with respect to income tax liability. Regarding the property settlement, the court emphasized that Atkins was a cash basis taxpayer. Since she did not receive any cash or the promissory note representing the payment for her partnership interest in 1944, she did not realize any taxable gain in that year. The court stated, "…since she was on a cash basis she would not, on any theory, be required to report any gain in 1944 based upon her husband's promise or obligation to pay her $15,000 at some future time."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the tax responsibilities of partners and the timing of income recognition for cash basis taxpayers in the context of property settlements. It highlights that simply claiming to be a passive participant in a partnership controlled by another is insufficient to avoid tax liability on partnership income. Taxpayers must provide strong evidence of being used as a mere tool for tax evasion. For cash basis taxpayers, this case reinforces the principle that income is recognized only when actually or constructively received, which is crucial in structuring property settlements and other transactions involving deferred payments. This case informs how similar cases should be analyzed and informs structuring transactions where the timing of income recognition is critical.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.