Morton Liftin et al. v. Commissioner, 36 T.C. 909 (1961)

When the ultimate recovery of a debt is uncertain, a taxpayer may recover their entire basis in the debt before being taxed on any gain, especially where multiple notes representing the debt do not represent distinct, separately marketable interests.

Summary

Taxpayers purchased a portion of a debt owed to American by Texas. To facilitate accounting, the debt was represented by a series of 20 notes for each purchaser. The Commissioner argued that as each note was canceled, a pro rata portion of the taxpayer's basis should be allocated to it and gain recognized accordingly. The Tax Court disagreed, holding that because the recovery of the debt was uncertain and the notes did not represent distinct interests, the taxpayers could recover their entire basis before recognizing any gain. The court emphasized the lack of a prearranged plan for note cancellation and the continued existence of an undivided interest in the debt.

Facts

- Taxpayers and others purchased stock in Texas.
- As part of the deal, they also acquired a debt owed by Texas to American.
- The purchasers understood that a $160,000 cash amount on Texas' balance sheet would be paid to American to reduce the debt principal.
- To facilitate accounting as payments were made on the debt, the note was divided into a series of 20 notes for each purchaser (an undivided interest in the original note).
- The debt was in default with a large amount of accumulated interest.
- There was no prearranged plan for which note would be canceled upon which payment.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency, arguing that as each note was canceled, a portion of the taxpayer's basis should be allocated and gain recognized. The Taxpayers contested the deficiency in Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $160,000 paid by Texas to American on behalf of the purchasers of Texas stock constitutes income to the purchasers.
2. Whether the basis of the purchased debt must be allocated pro rata among the 20 notes such that gain is recognized as each note is canceled, or whether the taxpayer can recover the entire basis before recognizing any gain.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the purchasers derived no benefit from the transfer; the payment merely reduced the principal of the note they purchased.
2. No, because the debt's ultimate recovery was uncertain, and the series of notes did not represent 20 distinct, separately marketable interests, thus the taxpayers can recover their entire basis before recognizing any gain.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the $160,000 payment was merely a change in form, not substance. The purchasers intended to buy a note with a reduced principal. Regarding the allocation of basis, the court distinguished the situation from one where each note represents a definite, separate interest with a readily determinable fair market value. Here, there was no prearranged plan for which note would be canceled upon a particular payment. Each individual owner of an interest in the debt chose at random from his notes the one to be canceled on any particular payment. "Thus, there was no way of determining the fair market value of each note in the series and no way, both fair and practical, of allocating the basis among the 20 separate notes." The court emphasized that the interest of each participant remained a single undivided interest. The Court stated:

"Only because the interest of each purchaser remained an undivided interest in the total indebtedness was it satisfactory to each to have one of the series of notes retired and canceled with each payment made by the debtor…The participants were not in position to dispose of an individual note to an outside party, since the payments did not have to be pro rata and since there was no prearranged plan for a particular payment to be on a particular note. The facts distinguish the divided interest of a bondholder from whatever interests these series of notes gave to these petitioners and demonstrate that these notes did not serve to divide the interests 20 ways and were not separately marketable."

The court cited *Burnet v. Logan, 283 U.S. 404*, and *Inaja Land Co., 9 T.C. 727* in support of allowing the taxpayer to recover their basis first.

Practical Implications

This case provides important guidance when dealing with the purchase of distressed debt, especially when represented by multiple notes. It stands for the principle that when the ultimate recovery of a debt is uncertain, and the notes representing the debt do not represent distinct, separately marketable interests, the taxpayer can recover their entire basis before recognizing any gain. The key inquiry is whether the multiple notes truly divide the debt into separate interests, or if they are merely for accounting convenience. If the debt is not effectively divided (e.g., no prearranged payment schedule, payments are not pro rata, and the notes are not easily sold separately), the taxpayer can likely recover their basis first. Tax advisors should carefully document the uncertainty surrounding the debt's recovery and the lack of separate marketability of the notes to support this position. This ruling

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

highlights the importance of considering the economic substance of the transaction over its mere form.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.