22 T.C. 1312 (1954)

Foreign entities, even if structured as ‘anonymous companies’ without direct U.S. equivalents, may be treated as corporations for U.S. tax purposes if they possess key corporate characteristics such as centralized management, continuity of life, free transferability of interests, and limited liability.

Summary

William and Aloise Buckley held ownership certificates in Venezuelan ‘anonymous companies’ (Aurora and Anzoategui) that possessed royalty rights to Venezuelan oil properties. The Buckleys claimed depletion deductions and foreign tax credits on their U.S. income tax returns, treating the companies as pass-through entities. The Tax Court held that Aurora and Anzoategui were corporations for U.S. tax purposes due to their corporate characteristics under Venezuelan law, including centralized management, continuity of life, and limited liability. Consequently, the Buckleys were not entitled to depletion deductions or foreign tax credits directly and were required to treat distributions from these companies as dividend income.

Facts

Petitioners William and Aloise Buckley were U.S. citizens holding ownership certificates in two Venezuelan entities, Compania Anonima Regalia Aurora (Aurora) and Compania Anonima Regalias de Anzoategui (Anzoategui). These entities were formed as ‘anonymous companies’ under Venezuelan law and held royalty rights to oil-producing properties in Venezuela. Aurora and Anzoategui were managed by boards of directors, maintained corporate books and records, had seals, and conducted business activities, including buying and selling royalty rights and managing finances. Distributions were made to certificate holders after deducting expenses, taxes, and reserves. Petitioners reported distributions from these companies as income, claiming depletion deductions and foreign tax credits on their U.S. tax returns.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the Buckleys’ income taxes for 1948 and 1949. The Commissioner argued that Aurora and Anzoategui were corporations for U.S. tax purposes and that the Buckleys were not entitled to the claimed deductions and credits. The Buckleys petitioned the Tax Court to contest the deficiencies.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Venezuelan ‘anonymous companies,’ Aurora and Anzoategui, should be classified as corporations for U.S. federal income tax purposes.
2. Whether the petitioners, as certificate holders in these companies, were entitled to depletion deductions and foreign tax credits related to the royalty

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

income of the companies.
3. Whether the petitioners should have reported the full distributions received from Aurora and Anzoategui as income in the taxable years.

Holding

1. Yes, Aurora and Anzoategui were properly classified as corporations for U.S. tax purposes because they possessed salient corporate characteristics under Venezuelan law and their operational structure.
2. No, the petitioners were not directly entitled to depletion deductions or foreign tax credits because these rights belonged to the corporate entities, Aurora and Anzoategui, not the certificate holders.
3. Yes, the petitioners were required to treat the full distributions received from Aurora and Anzoategui as income in the respective taxable years, as these distributions were considered dividends from corporate entities.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court analyzed the characteristics of Aurora and Anzoategui under Venezuelan law and compared them to the characteristics of a corporation under U.S. tax law, referencing *Morrissey v. Commissioner*, 296 U.S. 344 (1935). The court found that both Venezuelan entities possessed key corporate attributes: (1) centralized management in their boards of directors, (2) continuity of life uninterrupted by the death or withdrawal of certificate holders, (3) free transferability of ownership certificates, and (4) limited liability for certificate holders. The court emphasized that these entities were formed for and engaged in business activities, including managing royalty rights, collecting income, and making distributions, thus fulfilling a business purpose. The court rejected the petitioners' argument that these entities should be treated as trusts, stating that even if a trust structure might have been conceptually suitable, the chosen 'anonymous company' form under Venezuelan law exhibited clear corporate characteristics. The court quoted *Moline Properties v. Commissioner*, 319 U.S. 436 (1943), stating, "so long as that purpose is the equivalent of business activity or is followed by the carrying on of business by the corporation, the corporation remains a separate taxable entity." Because Aurora and Anzoategui operated as corporations, the depletion deductions and foreign tax credits were attributable to the companies, not directly to the certificate holders. Distributions to the Buckleys were therefore taxable as dividends.

Practical Implications

Buckley v. Commissioner is significant for establishing that the classification of foreign entities for U.S. tax purposes depends on their inherent characteristics and operational structure, not merely their formal designation under foreign law. It clarifies that entities formed under foreign legal systems, even without direct U.S. corporate equivalents, can be treated as corporations if they exhibit core corporate

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

traits. This case is crucial for tax practitioners dealing with international tax planning and the classification of foreign business entities. It underscores the importance of analyzing the actual operational and legal characteristics of a foreign entity to determine its U.S. tax classification, especially when considering pass-through treatment versus corporate treatment and the availability of deductions and credits at the shareholder level. Later cases have cited *Buckley* to support the principle that foreign entities with corporate characteristics are taxed as corporations in the U.S., regardless of their specific foreign legal form.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.