Gregory v. Helvering, 293 U.S. 465 (1935)

A transaction, though structured to comply with the literal requirements of the law, lacks tax validity if it is devoid of any legitimate business purpose beyond tax avoidance.

Summary

The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, denying a taxpayer's claimed tax benefit from a corporate reorganization. The taxpayer created a wholly-owned subsidiary, transferred shares to it, and then liquidated the subsidiary, claiming a tax-free reorganization under the Revenue Act of 1928. The Court found the transaction was solely designed to avoid taxes, lacking any genuine business purpose. The Court held that the reorganization provision applied only to transactions that are "in substance" what they appear to be in form, and that the tax law must be interpreted to promote its intended goals, not to permit tax evasion. The decision established the "business purpose" doctrine, which holds that a transaction's tax consequences depend not only on its formal structure but also on its underlying business justification.

Facts

Mrs. Gregory owned all the stock of the United Mortgage Corporation. She wished to transfer some of her shares in United Mortgage Corporation to herself, without recognizing a taxable gain. She formed a new corporation, the Averill Corporation, and transferred some of her shares in United Mortgage Corporation to Averill. Averill's only asset was the United Mortgage Corporation stock. Averill was then liquidated, and Mrs. Gregory received the United Mortgage stock. She claimed this was a tax-free reorganization under the Revenue Act of 1928. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency, arguing that the transaction was a sham designed solely for tax avoidance.

Procedural History

The Board of Tax Appeals (now the Tax Court) upheld the Commissioner's assessment. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed. The Supreme Court granted certiorari to review the lower court decisions.

Issue(s)

Whether the transaction qualified as a "reorganization" under the Revenue Act of 1928, despite lacking a business purpose beyond tax avoidance.

Holding

No, because the Supreme Court reversed the Second Circuit's decision, holding that the transaction did not qualify as a reorganization because it lacked a business

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

purpose and was merely a device to avoid taxes.

Court's Reasoning

The Court, through Justice Sutherland, emphasized the importance of interpreting the tax laws according to their intent and the underlying realities of a transaction. While the taxpayer followed the formal requirements of the reorganization provisions, the Court found that the transaction was, in substance, a scheme to avoid taxes, not a legitimate business undertaking. The Court stated that the purpose of the reorganization provision was to allow tax-free reorganizations that were related to a business; it was not intended to permit a taxpayer to create a corporation merely as a device for distributing corporate profits. The Court highlighted that the Averill Corporation was created and dissolved to serve no purpose other than to serve as a conduit for distributing the shares of United Mortgage Corporation to Mrs. Gregory. "To hold otherwise would be to exalt artifice above reality and to deprive the statutory provision in question of all serious purpose." The Court concluded that the reorganization provisions did not apply to the transaction because it was not "the thing which the statute intended."

Practical Implications

Gregory v. Helvering has several important implications:

1. **Business Purpose Doctrine:** This case established the business purpose doctrine, which requires that a transaction have a legitimate business purpose beyond tax avoidance in order to receive tax benefits. This doctrine is a cornerstone of tax law and is applied in various contexts to prevent tax evasion and ensure the integrity of the tax system. The IRS can and does challenge transactions that lack this business purpose, even if they technically comply with the letter of the tax law.

2. **Substance over Form:** The case emphasizes the principle of substance over form. Tax law looks beyond the formal structure of a transaction to its underlying economic realities. If a transaction is designed primarily for tax avoidance and lacks economic substance, the courts will disregard the formal structure and recharacterize the transaction for tax purposes. This requires attorneys to structure transactions not only to comply with the law but also to have genuine business justification.

3. **Impact on Corporate Transactions:** The case has significantly shaped how corporate transactions are structured. Corporate reorganizations, mergers, acquisitions, and other complex transactions are now carefully scrutinized to ensure they have a valid business purpose. Tax advisors and attorneys must provide thorough documentation demonstrating the business rationale behind a transaction. Tax planning must be integrated with business objectives.

4. **Subsequent Case Law:** The business purpose doctrine has been cited and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

applied in numerous subsequent cases, including those involving corporate reorganizations, family partnerships, and tax shelters. Courts continue to emphasize the importance of economic substance and the absence of tax avoidance motives.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.