Faitoute v. Commissioner, 38 B.T.A. 32 (1938)

Withdrawals from a corporation's account are considered loans, not disguised dividends, when the transaction is consistently treated as a loan on the company's books, a note is executed, and the corporation has insufficient earnings to support dividend payments.

Summary

The case addresses whether withdrawals made by a shareholder from his corporation's account were loans or disguised dividends. The court determined the withdrawals were loans based on the facts that the corporation's records consistently treated the transactions as loans, a note was executed for the balance, the shareholder received a salary, and the corporation lacked sufficient surplus to distribute the amounts as dividends. This case underscores the importance of consistent record-keeping and the objective characteristics of financial transactions when classifying shareholder withdrawals for tax purposes.

Facts

Moses W. Faitoute and his wife maintained running "loan accounts" with the Victor International Corporation from its inception in 1946 until its liquidation in 1950. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that certain withdrawals from the loan accounts should be considered disguised dividends, subject to income tax, rather than loans. The company's books consistently recorded the withdrawals as loans. Faitoute received salaries during the periods in question, some of which were credited to his loan account. Faitoute executed a note in 1949 for the net balance due. The corporation reported the amounts as loan receivables.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency based on recharacterizing certain shareholder withdrawals as dividends. The case was heard before the Board of Tax Appeals (B.T.A.) to resolve the dispute over the classification of the shareholder withdrawals.

Issue(s)

1. Whether withdrawals from a shareholder's account with a corporation are properly characterized as loans or disguised dividends for tax purposes.

Holding

1. No, because the evidence demonstrated the withdrawals should be characterized as loans and not disguised dividends.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The court focused on whether the withdrawals were loans or disguised dividends, a question of fact. The Board considered several factors in concluding that the withdrawals were loans, including:

- *Consistent Treatment:* Both the corporation and Faitoute treated the transactions as loans from the outset. The company's books recorded the transactions as loan receivables.
- *Lack of Dividend Capacity:* The court emphasized that the corporation did not have sufficient earned surplus to declare dividends of the amounts withdrawn by Faitoute.
- *Salaries & Note:* Faitoute received salaries from the corporation, some credited to his loan account, which rebutted any intention to avoid taxes. Faitoute executed a promissory note in 1949 for the net balance.

The court noted that the failure to charge interest was not determinative. It cited several cases which supported its conclusion. The court concluded that, under all the circumstances, the Commissioner improperly determined the deficiency.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on how to distinguish between loans and dividends for tax purposes, particularly in the context of shareholder withdrawals from a corporation. Practitioners should consider several factors, including:

- *Record-Keeping:* The most crucial aspect is the consistent treatment of the transaction in the company's financial records. Loans should be documented as such from the beginning.
- *Substance Over Form:* The court looked beyond the mere form of the transaction to its substance, as reflected in the corporation's financial capacity.
- *Written Agreements:* Executing a promissory note is essential for treating a shareholder advance as a loan.
- *Interest:* While the lack of interest wasn't dispositive in this case, it's generally recommended that loans between shareholders and corporations bear a reasonable interest rate.

This ruling guides business owners and tax advisors to structure and document shareholder withdrawals to reflect their true nature to avoid tax disputes. Failing to follow these factors can lead to the IRS recharacterizing the withdrawals as dividends, resulting in higher taxes and penalties. Later cases frequently cite this decision when examining whether shareholder transactions are loans or disguised dividends, reinforcing the importance of its principles in corporate tax planning.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.