Goldstein Brothers, Inc., 23 T.C. 1047 (1955)

For a transaction to qualify as a tax-free reorganization under Section 112(b)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code, there must be a continuity of interest by the owners of the original company in the reorganized entity, meaning the owners receive a proprietary interest in the new corporation by reason of, and in exchange for, their interest in the old corporation.

Summary

The case involved a dispute over the basis of assets acquired by Goldstein Brothers, Inc. (petitioner) in a transaction related to the reorganization of Olympia. The IRS determined that the transaction did not qualify as a tax-free reorganization because the former bondholders of Olympia, who became the shareholders of Goldstein Brothers, did not receive their shares in exchange for their proprietary interest in Olympia, but potentially for new capital. Therefore, the court agreed with the IRS disallowing petitioner's claimed depreciation based on the assets' original basis. The court emphasized the requirement of a continuity of interest to qualify the transaction as a reorganization under the tax code.

Facts

Olympia was in receivership. Bondholders initiated foreclosure proceedings on the G.B. properties. A bondholders' protective committee formulated a reorganization plan involving the creation of Goldstein Brothers, Inc. The plan offered Olympia's bondholders the option of receiving new bonds or cash. Goldsteins owned approximately 34% of the bonds initially, increasing their holdings to about 65% by the time of the plan's consummation. The entirety of the new company's stock was distributed to the Goldsteins. Goldstein Brothers, Inc. claimed depreciation on the G.B. properties based on Olympia's original basis for the asset.

Procedural History

The IRS disallowed parts of the depreciation amounts, claiming the reorganization did not meet the requirements of a tax-free exchange. The case went to the Tax Court to determine whether the transaction qualified as a tax-free reorganization under Section 112(b)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transfer of assets to Goldstein Brothers, Inc. qualified as a tax-free reorganization under Section 112(b)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code, thus allowing the company to use Olympia's basis for depreciation purposes.

Holding

1. No, because the transaction did not meet the continuity of interest requirement

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

necessary for a tax-free reorganization.

Court’s Reasoning

The court acknowledged that literal compliance with the statute was not sufficient to qualify a transaction as a reorganization. The court stated that a continuity of interest must exist; the former owners should receive a proprietary interest in the new or transferee corporation by reason of, and in exchange for, their interest in the transferor. The court found that the Goldsteins and Lares, the shareholders of the new corporation, might have contributed new capital in exchange for stock instead of a prior proprietary interest in the original property. The court highlighted that 33% of the former bondholders received no continuing proprietary interest.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the importance of the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.