344 U.S. 6 (1952)

A subsequent loss incurred in relation to a prior capital gain must be treated as a capital loss, even if the loss, standing alone, would be considered an ordinary loss.

Summary

Arrowsmith involved taxpayers who, in 1937, liquidated a corporation and reported capital gains. Several years later, in 1944, a judgment was rendered against the former corporation, and the taxpayers, as transferees of the corporate assets, were required to pay it. The taxpayers sought to deduct this payment as an ordinary loss. The Supreme Court held that because the liability arose from the earlier corporate liquidation, which was treated as a capital gain, the subsequent payment should be treated as a capital loss. This ensures consistent tax treatment of related transactions.

Facts

Taxpayers were former shareholders of a corporation who had received distributions in complete liquidation in 1937. They reported these distributions as capital gains in their tax returns for that year. In 1944, a judgment was obtained against the corporation. As transferees of the corporate assets, the taxpayers were liable for and paid the judgment.

Procedural History

The Tax Court ruled in favor of the taxpayers, allowing them to deduct the payment as an ordinary loss. The Court of Appeals reversed, holding that the loss was a capital loss. The Supreme Court granted certiorari to resolve the conflict.

Issue(s)

Whether a payment made by a transferee of corporate assets to satisfy a judgment against the corporation, arising from a prior corporate liquidation that resulted in capital gains, should be treated as an ordinary loss or a capital loss.

Holding

No, because the subsequent payment was directly related to the earlier liquidation distribution, which was treated as a capital gain, the payment must be treated as a capital loss.

Court’s Reasoning

The Supreme Court reasoned that the 1944 payment was inextricably linked to the 1937 liquidation. The Court stated, “It is not denied that had respondent corporation paid the judgment, its loss would have been fully deductible as an ordinary loss. But

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

respondent’s liquidation distribution was properly treated as a capital gain. And when they subsequently paid the judgment against the corporation, they did so because of their status as transferees of the corporation’s assets.” The Court emphasized the importance of considering the overall nature of the transaction. “The principle that income tax liability should depend on the nature of the transaction which gave rise to the income is familiar.” The Court concluded that to allow an ordinary loss deduction would be inconsistent with the capital gains treatment of the original liquidation, effectively creating a tax windfall for the taxpayers.

Practical Implications

The Arrowsmith doctrine establishes that subsequent events related to a prior capital transaction take on the character of that original transaction. This means attorneys must analyze the origin of a claim or liability to determine its tax treatment, even if the immediate transaction appears to be an ordinary gain or loss. This case is critical for tax planning in corporate liquidations, asset sales, and other situations where liabilities may arise after a transaction has closed. It prevents taxpayers from converting capital gains into ordinary losses by artificially separating related transactions. Later cases have consistently applied Arrowsmith to ensure that gains and losses are characterized consistently with their underlying transactions. The ruling impacts how legal professionals advise clients on structuring transactions and managing potential future liabilities.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.