South Texas Syndicate v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1952-095

The determination of whether real estate sales constitute sales to customers in the ordinary course of business, thus precluding capital gains treatment, depends on the specific actions and intent of the seller, not merely the powers granted in the corporate charter.

Summary

South Texas Syndicate (STS) disputed the Commissioner's assessment that gains from its real estate sales should be taxed as ordinary income rather than capital gains. The Commissioner argued that STS held the real estate primarily for sale to customers in its ordinary course of business. The Tax Court disagreed, finding that STS's actions, such as the absence of a price list or sales staff, indicated that the real estate was not held for sale in the ordinary course of its trade or business, despite a clause in its charter permitting subdivision of real estate. The Court ruled that the gains were taxable as capital gains, not ordinary income but recomputed the tax liability to reflect that selling expenses could not be deducted as ordinary business expenses.

Facts

South Texas Syndicate (STS) was a corporation that sold unimproved real estate during 1945 and 1946. STS had a general purpose clause in its charter that empowered it to subdivide real estate. STS did not maintain a price list for the properties. STS did not employ any salespersons to conduct sales. Each purchase offer was considered individually by STS's board of directors. Only a few sales of unimproved real estate were made by STS during the taxable years.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the gains from STS's sales of unimproved real estate were taxable as ordinary income. STS petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination, arguing that the gains should be treated as capital gains. The Tax Court reviewed the facts and arguments presented by both sides.

Issue(s)

Whether the unimproved real estate sold by South Texas Syndicate was held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of its trade or business, thus subjecting the gains to ordinary income tax rates rather than capital gains rates.

Holding

No, because the actions of the corporation, such as not having a price list or salespersons, indicated that the real estate was not held for sale to customers in the ordinary course of its trade or business. The Court further held that because the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

petitioner was not engaged in the business of selling real estate, the selling expenses could not be deducted as ordinary and necessary business expenses.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court emphasized that the determination of whether property is held for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business depends on the actions of the taxpayer. The Court noted that the Commissioner pointed to the general purpose clause of STS's charter, which empowered STS to subdivide real estate, as evidence that the sales were in the ordinary course of business. However, the Court stated, "We do not believe that mere possession of a power to subdivide real estate is controlling in determining whether petitioner was actually engaged in the trade or business of selling real estate to its customers." The Court found the following factors persuasive: STS maintained no price list, employed no salespersons, and had no established office procedure. Instead, each purchase offer was considered by STS's board of directors. The Court concluded that these facts "strongly indicate that the real estate was not held by petitioner for sale to its customers in the ordinary course of its trade or business." Because the Court determined STS was not in the business of selling real estate, selling expenses could only be used to offset the selling price of the real estate when computing capital gain, and could not be deducted as ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Code.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates that the classification of real estate gains as ordinary income or capital gains hinges on a holistic assessment of the seller's activities and intent. The mere existence of a corporate power to subdivide real estate is not determinative. Attorneys advising clients on real estate transactions must focus on the practical aspects of the seller's business, such as marketing efforts, sales activities, and the frequency of sales, to determine whether the "ordinary course of business" test is met. This case emphasizes a fact-intensive inquiry, providing guidance for analyzing similar situations where the characterization of real estate gains is at issue. It is important in planning to document business activities that support a capital gains treatment, such as infrequent sales, lack of advertising, and the absence of a dedicated sales force. Later cases cite this case for the proposition that simply having the power to subdivide real estate is not sufficient to establish that the real estate was held for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.