24 T.C. 659 (1955)

For installment sale tax purposes, a buyer does not take property “subject to” a mortgage unless they have no personal obligation for the mortgage debt and the debt is satisfied from the property itself, not from the seller’s payments from the proceeds of the sale.

Summary

The United States Tax Court considered whether a real estate developer, Stonecrest Corporation, could report income from installment sales in a manner that excluded the mortgage amount from the “total contract price.” The court found that the buyers in Stonecrest’s transactions did not “assume” the mortgages or take the properties “subject to” them because the buyers were not immediately liable for the mortgage debt. The seller, Stonecrest, continued to pay the mortgage until the property was deeded to the buyer at a later date. Therefore, the court held that the Commissioner incorrectly calculated the taxable income by including the mortgage amount in the initial payments and the selling price.

Facts

Stonecrest Corporation built and sold houses, financing the construction through bank loans secured by deeds of trust. The original blanket deed of trust on the entire tract was released on individual lots as loans for the construction of housing units on these lots were made. When selling a house, Stonecrest would enter into a Uniform Agreement of Sale with the buyer. This agreement specified a purchase price, a down payment, and monthly payments. The agreement also referenced the existing mortgage on the property. The buyer was required to guarantee Stonecrest’s obligation on the mortgage loan and was to assume the mortgage when the property was deeded to them, which usually occurred upon full payment of the purchase price. Until that time, Stonecrest made the mortgage payments. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies against Stonecrest, arguing that the buyers either assumed the mortgage or took the property subject to it, and thus, the mortgage amount should be included in the calculation of reportable income.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in Stonecrest’s income and excess profits taxes. The cases were consolidated for hearing and decision by the Tax Court. The court examined whether the sales agreements indicated that the buyers had assumed the mortgages or taken the properties subject to them, as per the regulations for installment sales under the Internal Revenue Code.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the buyers of property from Stonecrest assumed the mortgages on the properties, within the meaning of the relevant tax regulation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether the buyers took the properties “subject to” the mortgages, as that phrase is used in the regulation.

Holding

1. No, because the buyers did not assume the mortgages upon the sale.
2. No, because the buyers were not considered to take the properties subject to the mortgages.

Court’s Reasoning

The court examined the language of the relevant regulation, which provided that when property is sold on the installment plan, the amount of the mortgage should be included in the “selling price.” However, the amount of the mortgage should not be included in the “initial payments” or the “total contract price” to the extent that it did not exceed the seller’s basis in the property only if the buyer assumed the mortgage or took the property subject to the mortgage. The court determined that the buyers in Stonecrest’s transactions did not assume the mortgages because the agreement explicitly stated they would assume the mortgages only upon conveyance of the property. Furthermore, the court found that the buyers did not take the property subject to the mortgage because, under the agreement, Stonecrest was responsible for making mortgage payments until the property was fully paid for and conveyed. The court distinguished between the buyer’s guarantee of Stonecrest’s mortgage loan and the assumption of the mortgage itself. The court held that the buyer’s guarantee of Stonecrest’s debt did not mean the buyer had assumed the mortgage, nor did the fact that the mortgage debt was to be satisfied by Stonecrest’s payments from the sale proceeds mean the sale was “subject to” the mortgage.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on how installment sales of mortgaged property should be treated for tax purposes. The case clarifies the definitions of “assume” and “subject to” a mortgage and how these definitions affect the calculation of reportable income under installment sales agreements. This case demonstrates that for a buyer to be considered to have assumed a mortgage or taken property subject to a mortgage for the purposes of the installment sale rules, they must have a direct and immediate obligation for the debt. The decision highlights the importance of carefully drafting real estate sales agreements to specify when responsibility for a mortgage debt shifts to the buyer, as this determines when the mortgage becomes part of the calculation for installment sales income. Taxpayers and legal professionals should carefully analyze the terms of the sales agreement and determine how the mortgage debt is allocated between the seller and the buyer and consider the definitions of “assume” and “subject to” a mortgage. Subsequent cases continue to rely on this case as a guide for defining when a buyer takes property subject to a mortgage.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.