Burrell Groves, Inc. v. Commissioner, 16 T.C. 1163 (1951)

A corporation does not realize taxable gain when it distributes property, including growing crops, to its stockholders as a dividend or in liquidation, even if the property's value exceeds the stated consideration received from the stockholders.

Summary

Burrell Groves transferred its properties, including a citrus grove with growing fruit, to its stockholders. The IRS argued that the corporation should be taxed on the fair market value of the fruit at the time of transfer, claiming it was ordinary income. The Tax Court held that the transfer was either a bona fide sale, a dividend in kind, or a distribution in liquidation. In any case, the corporation did not realize additional taxable income beyond what it reported from the sale. Distributions to stockholders do not create taxable gain for the corporation.

Facts

Burrell Groves, Inc. transferred its citrus grove, including the growing fruit, to its stockholders on August 31, 1943. The corporation reported the transaction as an installment sale. The IRS determined that the fruit on the trees had a fair market value of $87,918.75 at the time of the transfer and should be included as ordinary taxable income to the corporation.

Procedural History

Burrell Groves, Inc. filed an income tax return reporting the transfer as an installment sale. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency, arguing that the fair market value of the fruit should be taxed as ordinary income. Burrell Groves, Inc. petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transfer of properties, including growing crops, from a corporation to its stockholders resulted in additional taxable income to the corporation, representing the fair market value of the crops at the time of transfer.

Holding

1. No, because the transfer was either a sale, a dividend in kind, or a distribution in liquidation, none of which creates taxable gain for the corporation beyond what was already reported from the sale.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the corporation made a complete and final disposition

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

of its properties, including the growing crops, to its stockholders. Whether the stockholders acquired the properties through a bona fide purchase or as a distribution in liquidation is not relevant. The court cited United States v. Cumberland Public Service Co., 338 U.S. 451, and General Utilities Operating Co. v. Helvering, 296 U.S. 200, for the principle that distributions by a corporation to its stockholders do not result in a realization of gain by the corporation. The court distinguished Ernest A. Watson, 15 T.C. 800, because that case involved allocating a portion of the selling price to the growing crop to determine whether it was ordinary income or long-term capital gains. Here, the IRS was attempting to tax the corporation on an amount over and above the selling price of the grove.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the principle that corporations generally do not recognize gain or loss on distributions of property to their shareholders. It emphasizes that the IRS cannot arbitrarily allocate income to a corporation based on the value of distributed assets, absent a clear statutory or contractual basis. Attorneys should advise corporations that distributions of appreciated property to shareholders may have tax consequences for the shareholders, but generally not for the corporation itself. This ruling informs tax planning for corporate liquidations and dividend distributions. It’s a reminder that while Section 45 allows the IRS to allocate income among related entities, that allocation must be properly pleaded and supported by the record.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.