21 T.C. 175 (1953)

Payments made by a lessee to a third-party trust for the benefit of the lessor's creditors and shareholders are taxable to the lessor as income if the payments are made in consideration for the lease.

Summary

The U.S. Tax Court addressed whether payments made by a sublessee to a trust established for the benefit of the taxpayer corporation's stockholders and creditors constituted taxable income to the corporation. The corporation leased a building and subleased part of it to another company. The sublessee agreed to pay a percentage of its sales over a certain amount to a trustee, who then distributed the funds to the corporation's shareholders and creditors. The court held that these payments were taxable to the corporation, as they were made in consideration for the sublease. The court distinguished the case from situations where the payments were not directly linked to the corporation's business operations or were made to third parties as compensation for services performed by the shareholders.

Facts

Brockman Building Corporation, Inc. (the "taxpayer") leased a building and subleased space to J.J. Haggarty Stores, Inc. Haggarty agreed to pay a fixed rental and, separately, to pay a percentage of its sales over a certain amount to the Title Insurance and Trust Company, acting as trustee (the "Haggarty trust"). The Haggarty trust distributed payments to Brockman's stockholders and creditors. The taxpayer, facing financial difficulties, negotiated a new sublease with Haggarty that included the percentage payments to the trust. The Haggarty trust was established after the bank, who was the lessor of the Brockman Building, objected to a provision in the proposed lease that included the percentage payments. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the percentage payments were income to the taxpayer. The taxpayer argued that the payments were made directly to the trust for services rendered by the stockholders.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed deficiencies and penalties against Brockman Building Corporation, Inc. for unpaid income, excess profits, and declared value excess-profits taxes. The taxpayer contested these assessments in the U.S. Tax Court, arguing the percentage payments to the trust were not income to the corporation and that failure to report the income was due to reasonable cause. The U.S. Tax Court considered the case and the evidence presented by both parties.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the payments made by Haggarty to the Haggarty trust were taxable income to the taxpayer.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether the statute of limitations barred assessment of the deficiencies.

3. Whether the taxpayer was liable for penalties for failing to file timely excess profits tax returns.

4. Whether the taxpayer was liable for penalties for negligence or intentional disregard of rules and regulations.

Holding

1. Yes, because the payments to the Haggarty trust were made in consideration for the sublease and effectively benefited the taxpayer by providing funds to its creditors and stockholders.

2. No, because the statute of limitations was extended due to the taxpayer's omission of more than 25% of gross income.

3. No, because the failure to file timely excess profits tax returns was due to reasonable cause.

4. No, because the taxpayer acted in good faith and did not negligently disregard the rules and regulations.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied on the principle that income is taxed to the entity that earns it. The court cited *United States v. Joliet & Chicago R. Co.*, which supported the taxation of payments made to a third party when those payments were made as part of the consideration for a lease and ultimately benefited the taxpayer. The court found the form of the transaction – the creation of the trust – did not change the substance. The payments to the trust, though made by Haggarty, were part of the consideration for the Haggarty sublease and benefited the taxpayer by liquidating the taxpayer's obligations to its bondholders and shareholders. The court distinguished this situation from cases where the payments were for services performed by the shareholders. The court found the stockholders, as individuals, did not perform the services of the transaction and were not responsible for the consummation of the sublease. Because the taxpayer's income exceeded 25% of that reported on the return, the statute of limitations was extended. The court found the taxpayer's failure to file timely returns was due to reasonable cause, as the taxpayer had acted in good faith and had disclosed the nature of the transaction. The same rationale held for penalties.

Practical Implications

This case is a critical reminder that the IRS will look at the substance of a transaction, not just its form, when determining tax liability. If a corporation arranges for payments to be made to a third party, but those payments are part of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the consideration for a lease, sale, or other business transaction that benefits the corporation, the IRS is likely to treat the payments as income to the corporation. Attorneys should carefully analyze the economic substance of any transaction involving payments to third parties. The court's focus on whether the payments were essentially part of the compensation for the use of the property, rather than compensation for services rendered by shareholders, is critical in determining the tax implications. Furthermore, this case reinforces the importance of full disclosure on tax returns to avoid penalties for negligence. Legal professionals should also ensure that all tax filings are made in a timely fashion. The case shows the importance of structuring agreements in a manner that clearly reflects the economic reality of the transaction to support the legal arguments for the parties. Later cases are likely to cite this case when determining the appropriate taxation for similar structures.

This ruling emphasizes the importance of thoroughly documenting the business purpose behind any financial arrangement, as well as the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved. This can help in substantiating the tax treatment of payments in question.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.