24 T.C. 638 (1955)

Advances made by a shareholder to a closely held corporation can be considered business debts, deductible as ordinary losses, if the shareholder's activities in guaranteeing and funding the corporation's debt are sufficiently business-related and go beyond merely protecting their investment.

Summary

George J. Schaefer, involved in motion picture distribution, formed Romay Pictures to produce a film. He invested capital and personally guaranteed corporate loans from third-party lenders. When the film exceeded budget, Schaefer made further advances under his guarantee. Romay Pictures failed, and Schaefer claimed a business bad debt deduction for these advances. The Tax Court distinguished between an initial capital contribution and subsequent advances made under a loan guarantee. It held that while the initial capital was not deductible as debt, the advances under the guarantee constituted business debt because Schaefer's guarantee was a business activity required by external lenders and tied to his trade, allowing him to deduct the worthless debt as an ordinary loss.

Facts

Petitioner George J. Schaefer was engaged in the business of supervising motion picture distribution. He formed Romay Pictures, Inc. to produce a film, investing $14,000 initially, later increased by $11,000 at the insistence of lenders. To secure loans for Romay from Bank of America and Beneficial Acceptance Corporation (BAC), Schaefer personally guaranteed completion of the film and subordinated his advances to these primary lenders. When production costs exceeded initial funding, Schaefer advanced $53,273.65 to complete the film, receiving promissory notes from Romay. The film's commercial performance was poor, Romay became insolvent, and Schaefer's advances became worthless.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Schaefer's business bad debt deduction for the $53,273.65 advanced to Romay Pictures. Schaefer petitioned the Tax Court to contest this disallowance.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $11,000 paid into Romay Pictures was a capital contribution or a debt, deductible as a bad debt?

2. Whether the $53,273.65 advanced by Schaefer to Romay Pictures under his completion guarantee constituted a business debt?

3. If the $53,273.65 was a business debt, did it become worthless in the taxable year

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1948?

4. Was the debt a non-business debt under Section 23(k)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, limiting its deductibility?

Holding

1. No, the $11,000 payment was a contribution to capital and not a debt.

2. Yes, the $53,273.65 advanced under the completion guarantee constituted a business debt.

3. Yes, the business debt became worthless in 1948.

4. No, the debt was not a non-business debt.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the initial $11,000 was intended as capital contribution, evidenced by representations made to lenders and the overall financial structure. However, the $53,273.65 advances were different. The court emphasized that Schaefer's guarantee and subsequent advances were not merely to protect his investment as a shareholder but were integral to securing financing from third-party lenders, BAC and Bank of America. These lenders required Schaefer's personal guarantee as a condition of providing loans to Romay. The court stated, "*In other words, the activities required were not matters left to petitioner's personal wishes or judgment and discretion as the controlling stockholder and dominant officer of Romay, but were matters in respect of which he was personally obligated under his individual contracts with the two lending institutions, and when taken as a whole these activities, which included further credit financing of Romay, if the occasion therefor arose, were in our opinion such as to make of them the conduct of a business by petitioner within the meaning of the statute and to make of the advances to Romay in the course thereof business and not nonbusiness debts under section 23(k).*" The court distinguished this situation from cases where shareholder advances are merely to protect an investment, noting the external business pressures from arm's-length lenders that compelled Schaefer's actions to be considered a business activity.

Practical Implications

Schaefer v. Commissioner is significant for clarifying the circumstances under which shareholder advances to closely held corporations can be treated as business bad debts. It highlights that when a shareholder's financial involvement, particularly in the form of loan guarantees and subsequent funding, is a necessary condition imposed by third-party lenders and is intertwined with the shareholder's trade or business, such activities can transcend mere investment protection and constitute a business activity. This case informs legal professionals and tax advisors that the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

nature of shareholder involvement, especially when driven by external business requirements from arm's-length lenders, is crucial in determining whether losses from such advances qualify as ordinary business bad debt deductions rather than capital losses from non-business debts. Later cases distinguish *Schaefer* by focusing on whether the shareholder's guarantee activity is genuinely a separate business pursuit or merely incidental to their investment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.