T.C. Memo. 1948-175

A corporate distribution to a shareholder is treated as a loan, not a dividend, if both the shareholder and the corporation intend it to be a loan at the time of the distribution, and the shareholder takes steps to repay it.

Summary

The petitioner, White, was a minority shareholder and president of a lumber company. He frequently withdrew funds from the company exceeding his salary, bonus, and travel expenses. The Commissioner argued these withdrawals were constructive dividends, taxable as income. The Tax Court held that the withdrawals were loans, not dividends, because both White and another key shareholder, Vaughters, intended them to be loans, and White consistently applied his compensation towards repaying the withdrawals. The court emphasized that subsequent actions corroborated this intent, including the company ultimately securing White's stock as collateral for the debt.

Facts

Petitioner, White, owned 40% of a lumber company's stock and served as its president. Vaughters, another shareholder, also owned 40% of the stock and managed the office operations. White regularly withdrew funds from the company exceeding his salary, bonus, and travel expenses. Vaughters repeatedly objected to these excessive withdrawals and secured promises from White to curtail them, but White often broke these promises. White consistently applied his salary, bonus, and expense reimbursements toward reducing his outstanding balance.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency against White, arguing his withdrawals constituted taxable dividends. White petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination. The Tax Court reviewed the evidence and determined the withdrawals were loans and not dividends, thus ruling in favor of White.

Issue(s)

1. Whether White's withdrawals from the lumber company constituted taxable dividends or loans.
2. Whether the Commissioner's determination regarding capital gains was correct.

Holding

1. No, because both White and the company, particularly Vaughters, intended the withdrawals to be loans at the time they were made, and White made consistent efforts to repay the amounts.
2. The court did not rule on the capital gains issue because it was dependent on the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

determination of the first issue.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the crucial factor was the intent of White and the company at the time of the withdrawals. It emphasized that despite Vaughters’ objections, the withdrawals were consistently treated as loans on the company’s books. White’s regular application of his earnings toward reducing his debit balance further supported the intent to repay. The court distinguished this case from others where withdrawals were authorized by all shareholders or were subsequently canceled out, implying they were never intended as loans. The court noted, “The important fact is not petitioner’s measure of control over the company, but whether the withdrawals were in fact loans at the time they were paid out.” The court also considered the subsequent events where the company acquired White’s stock as collateral, obtaining a judgment against him for the debt, demonstrating a clear intention and action to treat the withdrawals as a loan.

Practical Implications

This case provides a practical framework for analyzing whether corporate withdrawals are loans or dividends. It highlights the importance of contemporaneous intent and consistent treatment of the withdrawals. Factors like book entries, repayment efforts, and the presence or absence of formal loan documentation are all relevant. The case suggests that even without notes or interest charges, withdrawals can be considered loans if there is clear evidence of an intent to repay. It serves as a reminder for closely held corporations to maintain proper documentation and consistent accounting practices to avoid recharacterization of withdrawals as taxable dividends. Later cases cite White for the principle that intent at the time of the withdrawal is paramount and that subsequent actions can provide strong corroborating evidence of that intent. This case is particularly relevant to tax practitioners advising small business owners on best practices for handling corporate funds.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.