Arrowsmith v. Commissioner, 344 U.S. 6 (1952)

A loss incurred in a subsequent year that is integrally related to a prior capital gain must be treated as a capital loss, not an ordinary loss.

Summary

The Supreme Court addressed whether a payment made to satisfy a judgment against a taxpayer, arising from a prior corporate liquidation reported as a capital gain, should be treated as an ordinary loss or a capital loss. The taxpayers, former shareholders, had liquidated a corporation and reported capital gains. Later, a judgment was entered against them related to that liquidation, which they paid. The Court held that because the liability directly stemmed from the earlier capital transaction, the subsequent payment constituted a capital loss, maintaining the transaction's overall character.

Facts

Taxpayers received distributions from a corporation's complete liquidation, which they reported as capital gains in prior years. Subsequently, a judgment was rendered against the taxpayers, as transferees of the corporation's assets, relating to their role as shareholders and arising from the liquidation. The taxpayers paid the judgment in a later tax year.

Procedural History

The Tax Court ruled against the taxpayers, determining the payment was a capital loss. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the Tax Court's decision. The Supreme Court granted certiorari to resolve conflicting interpretations among the circuits.

Issue(s)

Whether a payment made to satisfy a judgment stemming from a prior corporate liquidation, where the liquidation was treated as a capital gain, should be characterized as an ordinary loss or a capital loss in the year of payment.

Holding

No, because the later payment was directly connected to and derived its character from the earlier capital transaction (the corporate liquidation), it must be treated as a capital loss.

Court's Reasoning

The Court reasoned that the character of the payment (as either ordinary or capital) is determined by the origin of the liability. Because the taxpayers' liability arose

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

from their status as shareholders in a corporate liquidation (a capital transaction), the subsequent payment to satisfy the judgment was inextricably linked to that prior capital transaction. The Court emphasized a practical approach, stating that "a court must consider the origin of the claim from which the losses arose and its relation to the taxpayer's business." The Court rejected the argument that the annual accounting principle required treating the payment as an independent event. Allowing an ordinary loss deduction would, in effect, provide a windfall by allowing taxpayers to offset ordinary income with losses directly tied to capital gains. The decision creates a symmetry between gains and subsequent related losses. There were no dissenting opinions.

Practical Implications

The *Arrowsmith* doctrine has significant implications for tax law, establishing that subsequent events related to prior capital transactions retain the character of the original transaction. This ruling requires careful tracing of the origins of gains and losses to ensure proper tax treatment. It affects various scenarios, including lawsuits arising from the sale of property, indemnity payments related to prior capital gains, and adjustments to purchase prices. The doctrine prevents taxpayers from converting capital gains into ordinary losses through subsequent related payments, ensuring consistency in tax treatment. Later cases have refined and applied the *Arrowsmith* doctrine, focusing on the directness and integral relationship between the subsequent event and the prior capital transaction. This case is a cornerstone in determining the character of gains and losses in complex business transactions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.