Berland's, Inc. v. Commissioner, 16 T.C. 182 (1951)

Section 269 (formerly Section 129) of the Internal Revenue Code does not apply to disallow a tax benefit unless the principal purpose of an acquisition was the evasion or avoidance of federal income or excess profits tax; mere consideration of tax consequences does not automatically equate to tax avoidance as the primary motive.

Summary

Berland's, Inc. created 22 subsidiary corporations to hold store leases, believing that individual corporations would be in a stronger position to negotiate rent reductions. The Commissioner argued this was primarily for tax avoidance under Section 129 (now 269) of the Internal Revenue Code, seeking to deny Berland's a specific exemption. The Tax Court held that while tax consequences were considered, the principal purpose was to realign lease liabilities and improve negotiating power with landlords, not tax avoidance. Thus, the exemption was allowed.

Facts

- Berland's, Inc. operated a chain of retail stores.
- During the Depression, Berland's found it difficult to negotiate rental reductions on its store leases.
- Berland's president believed that having separate corporations own each store would improve their negotiating position with landlords.
- In 1944, facing rising rents, Berland's created 22 subsidiary corporations, each holding the lease to one of its stores.
- The stated purpose was to establish a precedent, limiting liability on future leases to the individual subsidiary lessee.
- Berland's considered the tax implications of this reorganization.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed deficiencies against Berland's, arguing that the creation of the subsidiaries was primarily for tax avoidance and disallowed the specific exemption under Section 710(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code. Berland's petitioned the Tax Court for review. The Tax Court ruled in favor of Berland's.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the principal purpose of Berland's organization of subsidiary corporations was the evasion or avoidance of federal income or excess profits tax within the meaning of Section 129 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because Berland's principal purpose in creating the subsidiaries was to

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

realign lease liabilities and improve negotiating leverage with landlords, not to evade or avoid taxes.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that while Berland’s considered the tax consequences of its reorganization, this consideration alone did not establish tax avoidance as the principal purpose. The court emphasized that Berland’s had a valid business purpose for the reorganization: to improve its negotiating position with landlords and limit its lease liabilities. The court stated, “The consideration of the tax aspects of the plan was no more than should be expected of any business bent on survival under the tax rates then current. Such consideration is only the part of ordinary business prudence. It does not follow automatically from the fact that tax consequences were considered, that tax avoidance was the principal purpose of Berlands’ organization of the petitioning corporations.” The court found that the primary motivation was a business-driven realignment of lease liability, not tax evasion.

Practical Implications

Berland’s, Inc. clarifies that Section 269 (formerly Section 129) requires the "principal purpose" of an acquisition to be tax avoidance for the disallowance provisions to apply. Consideration of tax consequences is normal business practice and does not automatically trigger the application of Section 269. This case provides guidance on how to analyze cases involving potential tax avoidance motives, emphasizing the need to examine the totality of the circumstances and determine the primary, dominant reason for the transaction. This case is often cited when taxpayers argue that their primary motivation was a valid business purpose, even if tax benefits also resulted. Subsequent cases distinguish *Berland’s* based on the specific facts and the weight of evidence indicating a primary tax avoidance motive.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.