17 T.C. 1435 (1952)

A taxpayer cannot deduct payments made on a promissory note as a loss or bad debt if they are primarily liable on the note, and the burden of proving accommodation maker status rests with the taxpayer.

Summary

Ernest Schwehm sought to deduct payments made on a promissory note as a loss or bad debt, arguing he was an accommodation maker for the benefit of mortgagors (Kornfeld, Sundheim, and Needles). Schwehm had borrowed money from a bank, pledging mortgages as security. When the mortgagors failed to pay, they endorsed Schwehm's renewal notes. The Tax Court denied the deduction, holding Schwehm failed to prove he was merely an accommodation maker. The court reasoned that the original loan was Schwehm's debt, and the subsequent notes, despite endorsements, remained his primary obligation. Therefore, payments made were repayments of his own debt, not deductible as a loss or bad debt.

Facts

In 1927, Ernest Schwehm borrowed $125,000 from Broad Street Trust Company (Bank) and pledged mortgages worth $180,000 as security.

These mortgages were from a previous sale of property by Schwehm to Kornfeld, secured by bonds and mortgages.

When Kornfeld, Sundheim, and Needles, who held interests in the property, failed to pay the mortgages, Schwehm considered foreclosure.

Instead of foreclosing, Schwehm renewed the loan, reducing it to $85,000 after a $40,000 payment partly funded by the mortgagors.

The renewal note was endorsed by Kornfeld, Sundheim, and Needles, and Schwehm remained the maker.

Subsequent notes were executed, with Schwehm as maker and endorsements from some or all of Kornfeld, Sundheim, and Needles.

The mortgages were eventually lost to foreclosure by the first mortgagee.

Schwehm made payments on the note from 1933 to 1945 and sought to deduct these payments as a loss or bad debt.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Schwehm's income tax for 1945, disallowing the claimed deduction.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Schwehm petitioned the Tax Court to contest the deficiency.

The Tax Court heard the case and ruled in favor of the Commissioner, denying the deduction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Ernest Schwehm was an accommodation maker on the promissory note to the Bank.

2. Whether payments made by Schwehm on the note are deductible as a loss under Section 23(e)(1) or (2) or as a bad debt under Section 23(k)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the petitioners failed to prove that Schwehm was merely an accommodation maker; the evidence indicated he was the primary obligor.

2. No, because a taxpayer cannot deduct payments made on their own indebtedness as either a loss or a bad debt.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Pennsylvania law, citing 56 Pa. Stat. § 66, which defines an accommodation party as one who signs an instrument without receiving value and to lend their name to another person.

The court emphasized that determining who is the accommodated party is a question of fact, and the taxpayer bears the burden of proof.

The court found that the original $125,000 loan was undeniably Schwehm's debt. The notes consistently identified Schwehm as the maker, and the bank treated him as the primary obligor, holding his mortgages as collateral.

While Schwehm argued he refrained from foreclosure based on promises from Kornfeld, Sundheim, and Needles to pay off the debt, the court interpreted these promises as relating to the mortgages, not necessarily substituting their liability for Schwehm's note.

The court noted the bank's records and actions indicated continued recognition of Schwehm's primary liability.

The court concluded that the evidence did not establish a substitution of primary liability, and Schwehm remained the primary obligor. Therefore, his payments were on his own debt and not deductible.

Practical Implications

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Schwehm v. Commissioner clarifies the difficulty in establishing accommodation maker status for tax deduction purposes, particularly when the initial debt is clearly the taxpayer's own.

Legal professionals must demonstrate a clear and convincing shift in primary liability from the maker to the alleged accommodated party to successfully claim deductions for payments on such notes.

This case highlights the importance of documenting the intent and substance of transactions to reflect accommodation arrangements clearly, especially in dealings with banks and related parties.

It reinforces the principle that payments on one's own debt are not deductible as losses or bad debts, emphasizing the need to differentiate between primary and secondary liability in debt instruments for tax purposes.

Later cases would likely cite *Schwehm* to emphasize the taxpayer's burden of proof in accommodation maker claims and to scrutinize the underlying nature of the debt and the parties' relationships.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.