21 T.C. 600 (1954)

A corporation does not realize taxable income when it purchases and retires its own debenture bonds at a price below their face value, where the bonds were issued in exchange for preferred stock at a value substantially less than the face value of the bonds.

Summary

Fashion Park, Inc. (the petitioner) issued debenture bonds in a non-taxable reorganization, exchanging them for its preferred stock. The preferred stock had an initial value significantly less than the bonds' face value. Later, the company purchased and retired some of these bonds at a price below their face value. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue argued that the difference between the face value and the purchase price represented taxable income under the *Kirby Lumber* doctrine. The Tax Court, however, ruled in favor of Fashion Park, distinguishing the case from *Kirby Lumber* and holding that the bond retirement did not result in taxable income because the bonds were effectively issued at a discount, reflecting the original lower value of the stock.

Facts

Fashion Park, Inc. issued 5% debenture bonds with a face value of $50 each in a tax-free reorganization, exchanging the bonds for outstanding preferred stock. The preferred stock had an initial value of $5 per share, even though it had a stated liquidation value of $50. Fashion Park purchased some of these debentures from its affiliates at prices above the original $5 value (at which the original stock was issued) but below their $50 face value and then retired them. Fashion Park also received some of the debentures as dividends in kind from its affiliates, reporting them at fair market value as income. The Commissioner determined deficiencies, arguing that the difference between the face value of the retired bonds and their purchase price represented taxable income to Fashion Park, as did the difference between the fair market value and face value of debentures acquired as dividends.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Fashion Park's income tax for the fiscal years ending November 30, 1947 and 1948, and also for the fiscal year ended November 30, 1949. The Tax Court reviewed the case based on a stipulation of facts, exhibits, and testimony. The Tax Court sided with the petitioner, leading to the current decision.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Fashion Park realized taxable income when it purchased and retired its debenture bonds at a price less than their face value?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the Tax Court found that, based on the history of issuance, the bonds were essentially issued at a discount, and the purchase and retirement did not result in an economic gain for Fashion Park.

Court's Reasoning

The court distinguished the case from *United States v. Kirby Lumber Co., 284 U.S. 1 (1931)*, where the Supreme Court held that a corporation realized taxable income when it repurchased its bonds at a discount, because the bonds in *Kirby Lumber* had been issued at par. In this case, the court emphasized that Fashion Park's bonds were issued in exchange for preferred stock that had been issued originally at $5 per share even though the stock had a liquidation value of $50 per share. The court held that the purchase and retirement of the bonds at less than face value did not result in taxable gain because, in effect, Fashion Park had received only $5 per bond when it issued them, and it was repurchasing them for an amount greater than its original cost. The court cited *Rail Joint Co., 22 B.T.A. 1277 (1931)* (affirmed by the Second Circuit), which involved similar facts, holding that there was no taxable gain when a corporation retired bonds at a discount where the bonds were originally issued in exchange for assets that had been carried on the company's books at a significantly lower value. The Court further reasoned, "It is not enough to speak only of buying and retiring bonds for less than par; the question is whether there has been gain under all the circumstances, and this requires consideration of all that has been received or accrued on the one hand and given up on the other."

Practical Implications

The case provides important guidance on the tax treatment of repurchasing and retiring debt instruments. It highlights that the application of the *Kirby Lumber* rule depends on the specific circumstances of the bond issuance. If a corporation effectively receives less than the face value of bonds when they are issued, such as when the bonds are exchanged for discounted stock or assets, then repurchasing and retiring them at a discount may not result in taxable income. This is because the corporation has not experienced an economic gain. Tax advisors should carefully analyze the history of the debt issuance when advising clients on the tax consequences of bond retirements. This case also illustrates the importance of examining the substance of a transaction over its form, particularly in tax matters. Later cases considering this issue often cite to *Fashion Park*.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.