Gregory v. Helvering, 293 U.S. 465 (1935)

A transaction that complies with the literal terms of the tax law will still be disregarded for tax purposes if it lacks a legitimate business purpose and serves solely as a means of tax avoidance.

Summary

The case of *Gregory v. Helvering* is a landmark decision in U.S. tax law, establishing the "business purpose doctrine." Mrs. Gregory sought to reorganize her wholly-owned corporation to transfer shares of stock in a subsidiary to herself, in a transaction that followed the precise requirements of the tax code, yet lacked any legitimate business reason other than tax avoidance. The Supreme Court held that the transaction, while technically complying with the statute, was a sham because it served no business purpose and was executed solely to evade tax liability. The Court emphasized that the substance of a transaction, rather than its form, determines its tax consequences, affirming the Commissioner's right to disregard a transaction that lacks economic reality and is designed solely for tax avoidance.

Facts

Mrs. Gregory owned all the stock of a corporation (United Mortgage Corporation). United Mortgage owned shares in another corporation (Monitor Securities Corporation). Mrs. Gregory wished to sell the Monitor shares but wanted to minimize her tax liability. She formed a new corporation (Averill Corporation) and transferred the Monitor shares to it. She then liquidated Averill, distributing the Monitor shares to herself. This series of transactions followed the precise form of a tax-free reorganization under the Revenue Act of 1928. Mrs. Gregory then sold the Monitor shares, claiming the distribution was tax-free and generating a lower tax liability than a direct sale by United Mortgage.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the transaction was taxable, disregarding the corporate form because it lacked a legitimate business purpose. The Board of Tax Appeals (now the Tax Court) upheld the Commissioner's decision. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed, and the Supreme Court granted certiorari.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a corporate reorganization, which strictly complies with the literal language of a tax statute, must be recognized for tax purposes if it serves no business purpose and is undertaken solely to avoid taxes.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the transaction lacked a business purpose, it was a mere device for tax avoidance and was not a valid reorganization under the tax law.

Court's Reasoning

The Supreme Court, in an opinion by Justice Sutherland, focused on the substance of the transaction rather than its form. The Court stated that the reorganization provision of the tax law was not intended to permit a transaction that "though within the literal terms of the statute, is not within its spirit." The Court found that Averill Corporation "was created for the sole purpose of serving as a conduit for the passage of title" to Mrs. Gregory. It served no economic purpose and was merely a step to achieve tax avoidance. The Court emphasized that the statute intended to allow tax-free reorganizations only when they are "incident to the readjustment of corporate structures" and not as a device for tax evasion. The Court concluded that to permit such a tax avoidance scheme would be to exalt artifice above reality and to deprive the statutory provision of all serious purpose.

Practical Implications

Gregory v. Helvering established a fundamental principle: Tax law is concerned with the substance of a transaction, not merely its form. This case has several significant implications:

1. **Business Purpose Doctrine**: The case cemented the business purpose doctrine, which requires that transactions have a genuine business purpose beyond tax avoidance to be recognized for tax purposes. This doctrine has been used in many subsequent cases to challenge tax-motivated transactions.

2. **Substance over Form**: The case underscored the principle that the tax consequences of a transaction are determined by its economic reality. This means that even if a transaction is structured to comply with the literal requirements of the law, it can be disregarded if it lacks economic substance or serves only as a tax-avoidance scheme.

3. **Impact on Tax Planning**: Tax advisors must carefully analyze transactions to ensure that they have a legitimate business purpose and economic substance. Planning solely for tax benefits, without a business rationale, increases the risk that a transaction will be challenged by the IRS. This case highlights the need for taxpayers and their advisors to consider the broader business context and the economic realities of transactions.

4. **Later Cases**: Numerous cases have cited *Gregory v. Helvering*, applying its business purpose doctrine to a wide variety of transactions. Courts continue to scrutinize transactions for their economic substance, and this case serves as a cornerstone for challenging tax avoidance schemes. Some significant cases that built on *Gregory* include:

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

- *Knetsch v. United States*, 364 U.S. 361 (1960), where the Supreme Court applied the economic substance doctrine to deny interest deductions on a sham transaction.
- *ACM Partnership v. Commissioner*, 157 F.3d 231 (3d Cir. 1998), where the Third Circuit invalidated a partnership transaction that lacked economic substance, despite complying with all the technical requirements of the tax code.

The principles established in *Gregory v. Helvering* remain central to tax law, influencing the interpretation of statutes and the government's ability to challenge transactions that lack economic substance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.