17 T.C. 1458 (1952)

Gains from the sale of property are taxed as ordinary income, not capital gains, if the property was held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business.

Summary

McGah v. Commissioner concerns whether the profits from the sale of houses by a partnership should be taxed as ordinary income or capital gains. The Tax Court held that the houses were held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business, and thus the profits were ordinary income. The court emphasized that the partnership's actions, such as renting the houses on short-term leases and the frequency and continuity of sales, indicated an intent to sell rather than hold for investment. This decision highlights the importance of determining the taxpayer's primary purpose for holding property when classifying gains for tax purposes.

Facts

The McGah partnership constructed 169 houses. Initially, the partnership rented out the houses. During the fiscal years ending in 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946 and 1947, the partnership sold 74, 14, 31, 12 and 3 houses, respectively. The houses were rented on oral, month-to-month arrangements. The partnership needed to borrow a large amount to finance the project, and the ceiling rents did not yield enough above carrying charges.

Procedural History

The Tax Court initially ruled against the taxpayers. The taxpayers appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Ninth Circuit remanded the case to the Tax Court, directing it to make further findings of fact regarding when and how long the houses were held for sale prior to their sale. On remand, the Tax Court reaffirmed its original decision, supplementing its findings of fact and opinion.

Issue(s)

Whether the houses sold by the partnership during the fiscal year were held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of its business, thus making the gains ordinary income rather than capital gains.

Holding

Yes, because the partnership's actions indicated that the houses were held primarily for sale rather than for investment purposes. The Tax Court emphasized the short-term rentals, the frequency and continuity of sales, and the partnership's financial situation as evidence of their intent to sell.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the key question was the partnership’s primary purpose for holding the houses. It noted the high volume of sales over several years, the short-term nature of the rentals, and the partnership’s undercapitalization as evidence that the houses were held primarily for sale. The court found that the renting of the houses was merely incidental to the primary purpose of selling them. The court stated, “Frequency, continuity, and substantiality of sales is understood, usually, to indicate that the primary purpose of holding property is the sale of the property.” It also considered the fact that the partnership rented the houses on a month-to-month basis, inferring that this arrangement allowed the partnership to keep the properties easily available for sale. The court distinguished this case from situations involving the liquidation of capital assets, finding that the partnership’s intent to sell was present from the early part of 1943 or, at the latest, the middle of 1944.

Practical Implications

McGah v. Commissioner provides a framework for determining whether property is held primarily for sale in the ordinary course of business. The case emphasizes that courts will examine the taxpayer’s actions, such as the frequency and continuity of sales, the nature of rental arrangements, and the taxpayer’s financial situation, to determine their intent. This case is frequently cited in disputes over the characterization of gains from real estate sales. It highlights the importance of contemporaneous documentation that supports the taxpayer’s stated intent. Later cases have applied McGah to various factual scenarios, often focusing on the relative importance of sales versus rental activities and the taxpayer’s overall business strategy. This decision influences how real estate developers and investors structure their operations to achieve desired tax outcomes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.