Haley v. Commissioner, 16 T.C. 1509 (1951)

A taxpayer using the cash receipts and disbursements method of accounting cannot deduct business operating losses to the extent those losses are financed by loans or advances that the taxpayer has not yet repaid in cash or property.

Summary

D.G. Haley, a lawyer using the cash basis accounting method, sought to deduct losses from a gladioli farming operation. Haley entered into agreements with River Farm and Nurseries, Inc. (River), where River would finance the farm, and Haley would manage it. Although Haley signed promissory notes for half of the funds advanced by River to cover operating losses, he made no cash payments on these notes during the tax years in question. The Tax Court denied Haley's loss deductions, holding that under the cash basis method, a deduction requires an actual cash outlay, which had not occurred. The court also addressed issues related to the incorporation of the farm and depreciation deductions, finding no taxable gain from incorporation under the specific circumstances and allowing a partial depreciation deduction.

Facts

In 1943, Haley agreed with William Greve (River's owner) to develop land for gladioli farming. River purchased the land. Haley and River entered into two agreements: a lease agreement where Haley would operate the farm (Terra Ceia Bay Farms) and a financing agreement. Under the financing agreement, River would advance funds for farm operations, and Haley would give promissory notes for 50% of the advances, payable with interest. Haley was to receive 25% of net income and River 75%. River advanced $189,052.49, and Haley provided notes totaling $94,526. The farm incurred losses for fiscal years 1944 and 1945 and the last half of 1945. Haley, using the cash basis, claimed these losses on his tax returns, despite not making cash payments on his notes. In late 1945, the business was incorporated as Terra Ceia Bay Farms, Inc. Haley received stock and a corporate note, which he immediately endorsed and pledged back to River in exchange for cancellation of his personal notes.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Haley's income tax for 1944, 1945, and 1946, disallowing the claimed operating loss deductions and asserting a capital gain from the incorporation. Haley petitioned the Tax Court to contest these deficiencies.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a cash basis taxpayer can deduct operating losses of a business when the losses were financed by advances from an associate, and the taxpayer gave

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

promissory notes but made no cash payments on those notes during the tax years in question.
2. Whether the incorporation of Terra Ceia Bay Farms resulted in a taxable capital gain for Haley when he received corporate stock and a note, but immediately endorsed and pledged these back to River.
3. What is the allowable depreciation deduction for a rental cottage owned by Haley's wife in 1946.

Holding

1. No, because a cash basis taxpayer can only deduct expenses when they are actually paid in cash or its equivalent, and Haley made no cash payments on the promissory notes during the relevant tax years.
2. No, because the stock Haley received was worthless, and the corporate note was immediately endorsed and pledged back to River, resulting in no realized economic gain for Haley.
3. The Tax Court determined a depreciation deduction of $255 for the rental cottage for 1946, equal to the rental income received.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that as a cash basis taxpayer, Haley could only deduct expenses when actually paid. The court emphasized that Haley had not made any cash outlay for the operating losses. The promissory notes represented a promise to pay in the future, not an actual cash disbursement in the present tax years. The court stated, "*A taxpayer, using the cash receipts and disbursements basis, has no right to deduct on his own return an operating loss of a business under such circumstances until he is actually out of pocket by making payments on the notes which he gave to his associate in the business to evidence his promise to reimburse that associate for one-half of the money advanced and lost in the unsuccessful operation of the business.*" Regarding the incorporation, the court found Haley realized no gain because the stock was worthless, and the note was immediately passed back to River, effectively negating any economic benefit to Haley. The court noted, "*It thus appears that River let go of nothing by the transaction and the petitioner gained nothing.*" For depreciation, the court found the Commissioner's complete disallowance was wrong as the property was rented and depreciable. Although precise basis was not proven, the court allowed depreciation equal to the rental income as a reasonable estimate.

Practical Implications

Haley v. Commissioner is a foundational case illustrating the fundamental principles of cash basis accounting for tax deductions. It underscores that for cash basis taxpayers, a mere promise to pay (like issuing a promissory note) is insufficient to create a deductible expense. Actual cash or property must be disbursed. This case is frequently cited in tax law for the proposition that incurring debt, even if personally

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

liable, does not equate to payment for deduction purposes under the cash method. It clarifies that taxpayers cannot deduct losses they have not economically borne through actual out-of-pocket expenditures. The case also provides insight into the tax consequences of incorporating a business, particularly when the incorporation is part of a series of transactions that negate any real economic gain at the time of incorporation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.