Greer Building Materials, Inc., 16 T.C. 921 (1951)

When a corporation’s debt to its stockholders is gratuitously forgiven, the transaction is treated as a contribution to capital, and the corporation’s basis in the property related to the debt is affected accordingly.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed the issue of whether a corporation’s basis in houses it constructed should be reduced due to the cancellation of a debt owed to its principal stockholders for building materials. The court held that the cancellation of the debt constituted a contribution to capital, and the corporation’s basis in the houses was zero because the supplying partnership had already recovered its costs, meaning the contributed materials had no basis. The court also considered the corporation’s liquidating dividend and determined that the forgiven debt did not increase the stockholders’ basis in their shares.

Facts

Brazoria, a corporation, built houses and obtained materials from Greer Building Materials Company, a partnership consisting of Brazoria’s principal stockholders. Greer supplied materials on credit. The partnership, reporting income on the cash basis, did not include the sales price of the materials in their income. In 1945, the partnership forgave Brazoria’s debt for the materials, and this was treated as a contribution to capital. The partnership had already recovered its cost by including it in cost of goods sold in 1943 and 1944. Brazoria was later dissolved and distributed its assets in a liquidating dividend.

Procedural History

The case was heard by the United States Tax Court. The Commissioner contended that the basis of the houses should be reduced by the forgiven debt. The Court needed to determine the appropriate basis for the houses, which was necessary for calculating gains or losses and depreciation. It also needed to address the liquidating dividend paid to the petitioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Brazoria’s basis in the houses should be reduced by the amount of the forgiven debt, which was a contribution to capital?

2. Whether the amount of debt forgiven should be included in the basis of the petitioner’s stock in Brazoria for purposes of determining the liquidating dividend?

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

1. No, because the supplying partnership had already recovered its costs, the contributed materials had a zero basis, and therefore, no increase in the basis of the houses was warranted.

2. No, because the partnership had already recovered the cost of the materials, allowing an increased basis in the stockholders’ shares would result in a double tax benefit.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the principle that a gratuitous cancellation of a corporate debt by a stockholder is treated as a contribution to capital. It cited "Helvering v. American Dental Co." The Court reasoned that the materials provided had a zero basis when the debt was forgiven because the partnership had already deducted their cost. The Court cited the case of "Brown Shoe Co., Inc. v. Commissioner" to support the position that contributions to capital can affect the basis. The Court determined that the petitioner could not use the forgiven debt to increase their basis in the stock. Doing so would grant the partners a further tax advantage on the disposition of the property since they had already recovered the costs.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of basis in determining tax liabilities when a corporation receives a contribution to capital through the forgiveness of debt. The ruling ensures that corporations and shareholders do not receive a double tax benefit. Attorneys should advise their clients about the tax implications of such transactions, emphasizing that the basis of the property at the time of the contribution is critical. Proper accounting for cost recovery by related parties before the debt forgiveness is essential. The ruling also provides guidance on the treatment of liquidating dividends, emphasizing the importance of using the actual cost basis when determining gain or loss from such distributions. The decision in this case emphasizes the concept of basis and that it is determined at the time of the contribution; after that, the property’s tax basis should be considered.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 