Bank of America Nat. Trust & Sav. Ass'n v. Commissioner, 15 T.C. 544 (1950)

A loss on the sale of property is not deductible for tax purposes if the seller maintains dominion and control over the property through a wholly-owned subsidiary to which the property was sold.

Summary

Bank of America sought to deduct losses from the transfer of legal title to bank properties. The bank first transferred properties to Capital Company, which then transferred them to Merchants, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Bank of America. The Tax Court disallowed the deduction, holding that the transfers to Capital were not bona fide sales due to a pre-existing agreement for reacquisition. The court further reasoned that the transfers to Merchants, the wholly-owned subsidiary, did not result in a real loss because the bank maintained ultimate control over the properties. The court emphasized that Merchants was essentially an alter ego of Bank of America, lacking independent economic substance.

Facts

Bank of America (petitioner) transferred legal title of eight banking properties. First, it transferred the title to Capital Company. Prior to this transfer, Bank of America had an agreement with Capital Company to receive the deeds back within 30 days. Capital Company agreed to execute and deliver deeds to Bank of America or its subsidiary, Merchants, at any time upon request. Merchants was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Bank of America. Bank of America intended a temporary vesting of title in Capital and was assured of recovering the properties.

Procedural History

Bank of America claimed a loss on the transfer of properties which was disallowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Bank of America then petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transfers of properties to Capital Company were bona fide sales resulting in deductible losses.
2. Whether the fact that Merchants was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Bank of America requires disallowance of the claimed deductions, even if the transactions are viewed as sales of the properties by Bank of America to Merchants.

Holding

1. No, because the transfers to Capital Company were part of a composite plan

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

including an agreement for reacquisition of the properties.
2. Yes, because Bank of America never relinquished dominion or control over the properties due to its complete control over its wholly-owned subsidiary, Merchants.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the transfers to Capital Company were not bona fide sales because of the agreement for reacquisition. Citing "where such sale is made as part of a plan whereby substantially identical property is to be reacquired and that plan is carried out, the realization of loss is not genuine and substantial; it is not real." With respect to the transfer to Merchants, the court relied on *Higgins v. Smith*, 308 U.S. 473, holding that “domination and control is so obvious in a wholly owned corporation as to require a peremptory instruction that no loss in the statutory sense could occur upon a sale by a taxpayer to such an entity.” The court found that Bank of America maintained dominion and control over the properties because Merchants had interlocking officers and directors with Bank of America, and its only business was the ownership of the property leased to Bank of America. The court emphasized that the lease agreements were not arms-length transactions, further demonstrating Bank of America’s control. The court concluded that the transfer was effectively an accounting entry reflecting the diminution in value of assets still controlled by the bank, and did not constitute a deductible loss.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that tax deductions for losses are disallowed when a taxpayer retains control over assets through a subsidiary. It serves as a reminder that for a sale to be considered bona fide for tax purposes, there must be a genuine transfer of ownership and control. Legal professionals should carefully scrutinize transactions involving related entities, particularly parent-subsidiary relationships, to ensure they have economic substance beyond tax avoidance. The case also illustrates the importance of documenting business purposes beyond tax savings when dealing with transactions between related parties to avoid IRS scrutiny. Later cases have applied this ruling to disallow losses where similar control is maintained over transferred assets through related entities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.