Reinach v. Commissioner, 16 T.C. 1328 (1951)

Commodity futures contracts held by a speculator are considered capital assets, and losses from their sale are capital losses, unless the taxpayer is a dealer holding them for sale to customers in the regular course of business. Furthermore, the statute of limitations for assessing deficiencies related to a carryback refund is governed by the period applicable to the year of the loss that generated the refund.

Summary

The case involves a taxpayer, Reinach, who claimed ordinary losses from commodity futures trading and expenses related to an investment advisory service he attempted to establish. The Commissioner argued that the losses were capital losses and disallowed the claimed deductions. The Tax Court sided with the Commissioner on both issues. The court held that Reinach was a speculator, not a dealer, in futures contracts, so his losses were capital losses subject to limitations. It also disallowed deductions for expenses incurred in forming the investment advisory service, finding that the business was still in its formative stages. Furthermore, the court determined that the Commissioner was not barred by the statute of limitations from assessing a deficiency for an earlier year based on an erroneous carryback refund.

Facts

Reinach engaged in buying and selling commodity futures contracts. He dedicated his time and capital to these transactions, but did not hold himself out as a dealer. He sought to deduct losses from these futures contracts as ordinary losses. He also attempted to establish an investment advisory service. He incurred expenses in 1947 in an attempt to get the service started, but the business was never organized and never operated. Reinach claimed these expenses as deductions. The Commissioner determined the losses from futures transactions were capital losses, the expenses from setting up an investment advisory service were not deductible and assessed a deficiency for 1945 based on a refund received as a result of a net operating loss carryback from 1947. Reinach contested the Commissioner’s determinations.

Procedural History

The case was heard by the United States Tax Court. The Commissioner issued a deficiency notice to Reinach, disallowing certain deductions and assessing a tax deficiency. Reinach contested the Commissioner’s determination. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner on all issues.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Reinach’s losses from commodity futures transactions were capital losses or ordinary losses.

2. Whether the expenses incurred by Reinach in attempting to establish an

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

investment advisory service were deductible in 1947.

3. Whether the Commissioner was barred by the statute of limitations from assessing a deficiency for 1945 based on a refund related to a net operating loss carryback from 1947.

Holding

1. No, because Reinach was a speculator and not a dealer in commodity futures contracts, the losses were capital losses subject to the limitations of Section 117(d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

2. No, because the investment advisory service was still in its formative stages and had not yet begun operations in 1947, the expenses were not deductible.

3. No, because under Section 276(d) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Commissioner was allowed to assess a deficiency related to an erroneous carryback refund within the period applicable to the year of the loss that generated the refund.

Court's Reasoning

The court first considered whether Reinach's losses from commodity futures trading should be treated as ordinary or capital losses. It distinguished between speculators and dealers, stating that, unless the taxpayer is a dealer in such contracts, holding them on purchase for sale to customers in the regular course of his business, they must be considered capital assets. The court found that Reinach was a speculator and not a dealer. In the court's view, Reinach was "merely a speculator in the futures markets, hoping on the basis of a quick flyer to reap substantial gains." The court held that Reinach's activity was that of a trader, where the losses should be considered capital losses.

The court next considered whether Reinach could deduct the expenses related to setting up an investment advisory service. The court found that the expenses were not deductible because the proposed business was still in its formative stages, and Reinach had no business in 1947. The court also found that even though Reinach devoted time and money to the project the idea was still in its formative stages when it was finally abandoned.

Finally, the court addressed the statute of limitations issue. The court relied on Section 276(d) of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides that the Commissioner can assess a deficiency attributable to a net operating loss carryback at any time before the expiration of the period within which a deficiency may be assessed with respect to the taxable year of the claimed net operating loss. The court held that since the assessment was made within the period of limitation for 1947, the year of the loss, it was timely.

Practical Implications

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

This case provides important guidance on how the IRS will classify commodity futures transactions and business formation expenses. For tax professionals, this case underscores the importance of properly categorizing a taxpayer's activities to determine whether income or losses are treated as ordinary or capital. The case highlights that taxpayers who merely speculate in commodity futures are typically treated as traders rather than dealers, and the gains and losses from their transactions are generally treated as capital gains and losses.

It also clarifies that expenses incurred in the formative stages of a business are generally not deductible until the business commences operations. Tax advisors should counsel clients to properly document the nature of their activities and the stage of development of their business ventures. Finally, the statute of limitations holding emphasizes that the IRS has a longer window to assess deficiencies related to erroneous carryback refunds.

Later cases have cited this case in similar disputes. The case continues to be referenced when determining capital gains versus ordinary income, and is relevant when determining at what point business formation expenses may become deductible.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.