Bradford v. Commissioner, 23 T.C. 497 (1955)

A taxpayer cannot deduct a loss from assuming the liabilities under when-issued contracts until the loss is realized and the amount can be definitively ascertained, even if the taxpayer is an accrual basis taxpayer.

Summary

The case concerns a broker, Bradford, who took over a customer's obligations under when-issued contracts. The IRS determined that Bradford realized income on the transaction when it acquired the securities. Bradford claimed the difference between the contract price and the current selling price, less the value of securities received, was deductible as either a bad debt or an ordinary loss. The Tax Court held that Bradford did not realize income at the time of the transaction. Further, the court ruled Bradford could not deduct a loss because the loss was not yet realized. The loss would be realized when the contracts were performed or disposed of, and the amount of loss would not be determined until then. The court emphasized that tax deductions are based on realized losses and the amount of the loss must be ascertainable.

Facts

A broker, Bradford, relieved a customer, Popp, of his obligations under when-issued contracts. Bradford assumed Popp's rights and liabilities in exchange for approximately $63,000 in securities. The when-issued contracts represented net commitments to purchase securities at a contract price exceeding the selling price on a when-issued basis by about $123,000. Bradford contended that the difference between the contract price and the selling price ($123,000) less the securities' value ($63,000), which equaled approximately $60,000, was deductible as a bad debt or an ordinary loss.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that Bradford realized income from the transaction. Bradford challenged this determination in the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court reviewed the case and ruled on whether Bradford realized income from the exchange and whether Bradford was entitled to deduct a loss in the taxable year. The Tax Court sided with the IRS ruling in part, holding Bradford did not realize income in the transaction, but could not deduct a loss either.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Bradford realized taxable income by acquiring title to the securities.

2. Whether Bradford sustained a deductible loss on the transaction in the year ended November 30, 1946.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the court found the acquisition of the securities to offset the liability of the when-issued contracts did not constitute taxable income at the time of receipt, but was a factor to be considered in determining the ultimate gain or loss.

2. No, because Bradford did not prove they sustained a deductible loss within the taxable year as the loss was neither realized nor ascertainable.

Court's Reasoning

The court first addressed whether Bradford realized taxable income upon receiving the securities from the client. The court referenced I.T. 3721 and stated the amount received for assuming liabilities under a when-issued contract is not taxable as ordinary income at the time of receipt but is a factor in determining the ultimate gain or loss. This applied because Bradford acquired the when-issued contracts as an investment. The court then examined whether Bradford could deduct a loss. The court noted that the Commissioner's determination is considered correct, and the burden is on the taxpayer to establish the loss. Bradford had to point to the law that authorizes the deduction and present facts clearly bringing the claim within the scope of that law. The court found that the customer's obligation to pay for the stock did not constitute a debt, which is a prerequisite for a bad debt loss. The court cited *Lucas v. American Code Co.* and stated that the income tax law is concerned only with realized losses or gains, as a potential loss was not enough. The potential loss was not realized, nor was it reasonably certain or ascertainable in amount, as it was subject to market fluctuations.

Practical Implications

This case is significant for tax lawyers and accountants dealing with securities transactions, especially when-issued contracts. It reinforces that the timing of loss recognition is crucial. The case makes clear that the IRS will examine whether a loss is actually realized and its amount is ascertainable before allowing a deduction, even for accrual-basis taxpayers. For practitioners, this decision means that they must advise clients on the importance of waiting until a loss is actually realized and the amount is determined before attempting to deduct it. It highlights the importance of documenting the sale or disposition of assets to establish when a loss is realized. This case also suggests that structuring transactions to clearly show a realized loss can influence the timing and ability to claim a deduction. Later cases will likely examine what events constitute realization of a loss and when the amount becomes sufficiently ascertainable.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.