17 T.C. 942 (1951)

A trust is classified as an association taxable as a corporation if it possesses substantial corporate characteristics and operates a business for profit.

Summary

The Main-Hammond Land Trust and Orpheum Theatre Land Trust cases were consolidated to determine if the trusts were taxable as trusts or as associations taxable as corporations. The Tax Court held that Main-Hammond was an association taxable as a corporation because it exhibited corporate characteristics and operated for profit. The petition for Orpheum Theatre Land Trust was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction because the trust had been terminated prior to filing the petition. The court emphasized the importance of analyzing the trust instrument to determine the trust's powers and operational purpose.

Facts

Stanley Cooper created two Ohio land trusts: Main-Hammond and Orpheum. The corpus of each trust was real estate conveyed to the Southern Ohio Savings Bank & Trust Co. Cooper purchased the properties for resale and marketed land trust certificates. Main-Hammond leased its property to I.E. Clayton. Orpheum leased its property to 941 East McMillan Street, Inc. Land trust certificates were sold to investors. The trustee collected rent, paid expenses, and distributed income to certificate holders.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies for both trusts, asserting they were associations taxable as corporations. The trusts petitioned the Tax Court for redetermination. During the proceedings, both trusts distributed their assets and claimed to have terminated. The Commissioner moved to dismiss both petitions, arguing the trusts were no longer proper parties. The Tax Court denied the motion for Main-Hammond but granted it for Orpheum.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Main-Hammond Land Trust was an association taxable as a corporation.
2. Whether the Orpheum Theatre Land Trust's petition should be dismissed because the trust terminated before the petition was filed.

Holding

1. Yes, because Main-Hammond exhibited corporate characteristics and operated as a business for profit.
2. Yes, because Orpheum had completely terminated prior to filing the petition

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

and was not the proper party to represent its former certificate holders.

Court's Reasoning

The court analyzed the trust agreement for Main-Hammond, noting features like transferable certificates, continuity of life, centralized management, and limited liability, all characteristic of corporations. The court distinguished *Cleveland Trust Co. v. Commissioner*, emphasizing that Main-Hammond had broader powers and a more corporate-minded structure. The court stated, "Each case must be adjudicated upon its own facts. We regard the powers vested in the trustee in the instrument under the present consideration far more extensive than those possessed by the Cleveland Trust Company – so extensive, indeed, as to differentiate the cases. In the present litigation, the intent underlying the creation of the trust was obviously more corporate-minded; and the entire set-up of the trust bore greater resemblance to corporate practice and procedure." For Orpheum, the court found that the trust had completely terminated and distributed all assets (except for indemnity funds deposited by Cooper) before the petition was filed, thus the court lacked jurisdiction. The court emphasized that "the burden of proving that this Court has jurisdiction of a proceeding is upon the petitioner," and Orpheum failed to meet this burden.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of carefully structuring business trusts to avoid corporate tax classification. Attorneys should draft trust agreements that minimize corporate characteristics and ensure the trust's activities are limited to passive investment or conservation rather than active business operations. The case underscores that a trust's powers, not just its actual activities, will be considered. The decision in Orpheum is a reminder that proper legal standing is required to petition the tax court; a defunct entity cannot pursue legal action. Later cases have cited *Main-Hammond* for the principle that the tax classification of a trust depends on its specific facts and circumstances, requiring a holistic analysis of the trust instrument and its operations. This case is a reminder that the line between trusts and associations is "so vague as to make them almost indistinguishable" and each case will turn on its own unique set of facts.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.