W.H. Armston Co. v. Commissioner, 12 T.C. 539 (1949)

A sale-leaseback arrangement between a corporation and a partnership composed of its shareholders may be disregarded for tax purposes if the corporation retains effective control over the leased property, preventing the deduction of rental payments as ordinary and necessary business expenses.

Summary

W.H. Armston Co. sought to deduct rental payments made to a partnership composed of its sole stockholders for equipment that the company had sold to the partnership and then leased back. The Tax Court disallowed the deduction, finding that the sale-leaseback lacked economic substance because the company retained control over the equipment. The court reasoned that the arrangement was a tax avoidance scheme and that the rental payments were essentially distributions of profits to the shareholders.

Facts

W.H. Armston Co. (the petitioner) sold equipment to a partnership composed of its sole stockholders. The partnership then leased the equipment back to the company. The partnership's office was the same as the company's, and its policies were established by the same individuals. The partnership financed the equipment purchases primarily through bank loans repaid by the company's rental payments. The company paid "rent" to the partnership, which constituted the primary source of income for the partnership, from which partnership profits were distributed to the partners. The company paid no dividends during the tax years in question.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the company's deduction of rental expenses. The company petitioned the Tax Court for review of the Commissioner's determination. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's decision, disallowing the rental expense deductions.

Issue(s)

Whether the amounts paid as "rent" by the petitioner to a partnership composed of its sole stockholders, under certain "Sale and Lease Agreements," are proper deductions in the computation of excess profits tax under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because the "sale and lease agreement" was not a transaction recognizable for tax purposes as the company retained effective control over the equipment, and therefore, the amounts paid as rent are not deductible under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the Code.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the transaction lacked economic substance. The court noted several factors indicating that the company retained control over the equipment: the close relationship between the company and the partnership, the partnership’s dependence on the company’s rental payments to finance the equipment purchases, and the fact that the company had full control over the equipment’s use. The court emphasized that “in determining tax consequences we must consider the substance rather than the form of the transaction.” The court cited *Higgins v. Smith*, 308 U.S. 473 (1940), stating: “It is command of income and its benefits which marks the real owner of property.” The court found that the arrangement was designed to allow the company to distribute profits to its shareholders in the form of deductible rental payments, effectively avoiding dividend taxation. Because the company maintained control and benefit of the equipment, the court treated the arrangement as a sham, disallowing the rental deduction. The court distinguished *Skemp v. Commissioner*, 168 F.2d 598 (7th Cir. 1948), because in *Skemp*, the donor relinquished all control to an independent trustee.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the importance of economic substance in tax law. A transaction, even if formally valid, may be disregarded for tax purposes if it lacks a genuine business purpose and is primarily motivated by tax avoidance. Sale-leaseback arrangements, particularly those involving related parties, are subject to close scrutiny by the IRS. Taxpayers entering into such arrangements must demonstrate that the transaction has economic reality and that the lessor has genuine control and ownership of the leased property. The case also highlights the risk that payments labeled as rent may be recharacterized as dividends if the arrangement is deemed a tax avoidance scheme.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.