19 T.C. 78 (1952)

When a purported sale of stock within a family does not result in a genuine shift of the economic benefits and control of ownership, the dividends from such stock are taxable to the seller, not the buyer.

Summary

Jeannette Fitz Gibbon purportedly sold stock to her children, with the purchase price to be paid primarily from dividends, but retained significant control and benefits. The Tax Court held that the dividends were taxable to Fitz Gibbon, the mother, not her children. The court reasoned that the arrangement lacked the characteristics of an arm's-length transaction and did not effectively transfer the economic benefits of stock ownership. This case highlights the heightened scrutiny given to intrafamily transactions and the requirement that such transactions genuinely transfer economic control to be recognized for tax purposes.

Facts

Jeannette Fitz Gibbon owned 1034 3/8 shares of Jennison-Wright Corporation stock. In 1946, she entered agreements with her son and daughter, purportedly selling half her stock to each. The purchase price was set at $150 per share, to be paid at $4,000 per year, primarily from dividends. Fitz Gibbon agreed to cover any increased income taxes her children incurred due to the dividends. The stock certificates were transferred to her name after a brief period in her children's name and were held as collateral. Fitz Gibbon retained the right to vote the stock. No down payment was made, and no interest was charged on the outstanding balance.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the dividends paid on the stock were includible in Fitz Gibbon's gross income for 1946 and 1947, resulting in tax deficiencies. Fitz Gibbon petitioned the Tax Court, arguing that the dividends were taxable to her children as the new owners of the stock.

Issue(s)

Whether dividends paid on stock purportedly sold by the petitioner to her children are includible in the petitioner's gross income, where the purchase price was to be paid primarily from dividends and the petitioner retained significant control over the stock.

Holding

No, because the purported sales agreements did not constitute bona fide, arm's-length transactions, and the petitioner retained substantial control and economic benefit from the stock.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court emphasized that transactions within a family group are subject to heightened scrutiny to determine if they are genuine. The court found the agreements were not bona fide sales because: (1) there was no down payment; (2) no interest was charged on the unpaid balance; (3) the petitioner agreed to pay the increased income taxes of her children; (4) the petitioner retained control over the stock, voting it as she had before the purported sales; and (5) the price was potentially below market value. The court distinguished cases cited by the petitioner, noting that those cases involved arm’s-length transactions between unrelated parties. The court stated that “where a taxpayer attempts to transfer property and the end result of such transfer does not effect a complete shift in the economic incidents of ownership of such property, the transaction will be disregarded for Federal income tax purposes.” The court concluded that the agreements did not shift the economic incidents of ownership, and therefore, the dividends were taxable to Fitz Gibbon.

Practical Implications

The case reinforces the principle that intrafamily transactions are subject to close scrutiny by tax authorities. To be respected for tax purposes, such transactions must be structured as arm’s-length transactions, with terms and conditions similar to those that would exist between unrelated parties. Taxpayers must demonstrate a genuine transfer of economic benefits and control to the new owner. This case serves as a warning that retaining significant control or benefits from assets purportedly transferred to family members can result in continued tax liability for the transferor. Later cases cite this case as an example of when a purported sale will be disregarded because of a lack of economic substance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.