R.E. Thompson v. Commissioner, 28 T.C. 116 (1957)

Losses claimed by a taxpayer from transactions with wholly-owned corporations are disallowed if the transactions lack an arm's-length relationship and were not conducted for a true business purpose, and the taxpayer effectively realized offsetting benefits through an increase in the value of their stock.

Summary

The case concerns a taxpayer, R.E. Thompson, who was both a building contractor and the sole shareholder of two corporations. Thompson entered into construction contracts with these corporations, and his costs exceeded the contract prices. He sought to deduct the excess costs as losses under the Internal Revenue Code. The Tax Court disallowed the deductions, finding that Thompson did not maintain an arm's-length relationship with his corporations and that the transactions lacked a genuine business purpose. The court reasoned that Thompson's actions, such as using more expensive materials, were for his benefit as a shareholder, increasing the value of his stock, rather than resulting in a true economic loss. The court emphasized the importance of disregarding transactions between related taxpayers that lack good faith or finality.

Facts

R.E. Thompson, a building contractor and sole shareholder of Frederick Courts, Inc. and Parkwood, Inc., entered construction contracts with these corporations to build rental housing projects. His costs exceeded the contract prices, partly due to furnishing superior quality materials. The corporations amended the contracts and provided additional payments to Thompson. Despite these payments, Thompson still had unreimbursed costs, which he claimed as deductible losses. Thompson's investments in the corporations were small relative to the project financing, primarily from Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insured loans.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Thompson's claimed loss deductions. Thompson petitioned the Tax Court to challenge the Commissioner's determination. The Tax Court reviewed the case and sided with the Commissioner, disallowing the deductions. The decision was reviewed by the full court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the amounts expended by Thompson in excess of the contract prices with his wholly-owned corporations are deductible as losses under Section 23(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

2. Whether the transactions between Thompson and his wholly-owned corporations were conducted at arm's length.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the expenditures were effectively capital contributions that increased the basis of Thompson's stock, not deductible losses.

2. No, because the transactions lacked an arm's-length relationship.

Court's Reasoning

The court focused on the lack of an arm's-length relationship between Thompson and his corporations. The court noted that "transactions between a sole stockholder and his wholly owned corporation are subject to special scrutiny." The court determined that the profit motive was minimal. Thompson's expenditures, such as using higher-quality materials than required, benefited him as a shareholder through the increase in value of his stock, not as an individual contractor sustaining a loss.

The court cited *Higgins v. Smith*, 308 U.S. 473 (1940), stating that domination and control of a wholly-owned corporation require disallowance of a claimed loss. It also referenced *Crown Cork International Corporation*, 4 T.C. 19 (1944), which established that transactions between related parties must have a true purpose beyond tax avoidance and good faith to be respected. The court found that Thompson retained complete control over the corporations, despite the involvement of the FHA. The court concluded that the excess costs should be treated as capital contributions, increasing the basis of Thompson's stock.

The court quoted from *Higgins v. Smith* to emphasize its point: "Indeed this domination and control is so obvious in a wholly owned corporation as to require a peremptory instruction [to a jury] that no loss in the statutory sense could occur upon a sale by a taxpayer to such an entity."

Practical Implications

This case is a crucial reminder that transactions between closely related entities, especially wholly-owned corporations, are scrutinized closely by the IRS and the courts. Taxpayers and their legal counsel must ensure that any such transactions are conducted at arm's length and for legitimate business reasons, not merely for tax avoidance. The substance of the transaction, and not just its form, determines its tax consequences. If the taxpayer effectively receives an offsetting benefit, like an increase in stock value, the transaction may not result in a deductible loss.

Legal practitioners should advise clients that if the client controls both sides of a transaction, deductions will likely be disallowed. Additionally, this case is frequently cited in tax planning for related-party transactions to ensure a proper business purpose.

Subsequent cases reinforce the principles in this decision, continuing to highlight

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the importance of arm’s-length dealings and true economic losses. The ruling remains an important precedent regarding the deductibility of losses between related taxpayers, especially corporations and their shareholders.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.