L.R. Henry, Transferee, 25 T.C. 670 (1956)

A stockholder is liable as a transferee for unpaid corporate taxes to the extent of assets received in a liquidation if the distribution was part of a series of distributions that rendered the corporation insolvent, even if the initial distribution did not cause insolvency.

Summary

The case involves a determination of transferee liability for unpaid corporate income and excess profits taxes. The IRS sought to hold L.R. Henry, a former shareholder of River Mills, Inc., liable as a transferee of corporate assets. Henry argued she sold her stock in the corporation and received no assets from it. The court found that the payment Henry received for her stock was a distribution in liquidation, part of a series of distributions that left the corporation insolvent and unable to pay its tax liabilities. The court held Henry liable as a transferee. Additionally, the court addressed the statute of limitations, finding Henry was estopped from denying the validity of waivers extending the assessment period because she signed them as treasurer of the corporation.

Facts

L.R. Henry was a shareholder of River Mills, Inc. In 1945, her husband, who owned the majority of the stock, decided to retire and wind up the corporation's affairs. The company sold its fixed assets. Henry was concerned about losing her investment and demanded to be paid for her stock. On February 1, 1946, Henry's husband withdrew funds from the corporation and gave Henry a check for $53,611.68, which she received for her stock. The corporation then dissolved.

Procedural History

The IRS assessed deficiencies in income and excess profits taxes against River Mills, Inc., for the years 1944 and 1945. The Commissioner determined that Henry was liable as a transferee of corporate assets. The Tax Court heard the case to determine Henry's transferee liability and the applicability of the statute of limitations.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the payment received by L.R. Henry for her stock was a distribution in liquidation, rendering her a transferee of corporate assets.

2. Whether the assessment of transferee liability against Henry was barred by the statute of limitations.

Holding

1. Yes, because the payment to Henry was a liquidating distribution as it occurred

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

during the process of winding up the corporate affairs.

2. No, because the statute of limitations was extended by valid waivers, and Henry was estopped from denying their validity.

Court's Reasoning

The court first determined whether Henry was a transferee. The court stated that "[w]hen a corporation in the process of liquidation distributes its assets to its stockholders, leaving it without means to pay its tax liability, each stockholder is liable as a transferee to the extent of the value of the assets received by him." The court found that the payment to Henry was a liquidating distribution because it occurred during the winding up of the corporate business. The court reasoned that the form of the transaction did not change the substance; Henry received funds that originated from the corporation as part of the liquidation process. The court distinguished this situation from cases where a stockholder sold shares before a liquidation by a purchaser.

The court then addressed the statute of limitations. The court found that waivers extending the assessment period had been properly executed. Even though the corporate existence had technically ended, the court found that Henry, as treasurer of the company, was estopped from denying the validity of the waivers she executed, because the Commissioner relied on them in good faith. Therefore, the assessment of liability was timely.

Practical Implications

This case highlights that substance over form is critical when determining transferee liability. Even if a transaction is structured as a sale, it may be treated as a liquidating distribution if it occurs during the winding up of a corporation. This decision also underscores the importance of carefully reviewing the financial condition of a corporation undergoing liquidation, particularly when considering whether the remaining distributions will render the corporation insolvent. For practitioners, this case serves as a reminder to carefully analyze the timing and character of distributions to shareholders in the context of corporate liquidations. The case also underscores the importance of ensuring that any waivers of the statute of limitations are properly executed to protect the government's ability to assess and collect taxes. Later cases will rely on this precedent to determine when a series of transactions amounts to a distribution in liquidation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.