***Brown v. Commissioner*, 18 T.C. 930 (1952)**

A debt between family members is not considered bona fide for tax purposes if it lacks economic substance and is essentially a disguised gift.

Summary

The case concerns whether interest payments made by William H. Brown to his children were deductible. The IRS disallowed the deductions, arguing that the underlying transactions did not create a genuine debt, but were instead disguised gifts. The court agreed, finding that Brown retained control over the funds purportedly given to his children. The court held that the transactions lacked economic substance because the children provided no consideration for their father's notes, and the interest payments were, in essence, gifts, which are not deductible as interest. This decision highlights the importance of genuine economic substance in family transactions to justify tax deductions.

Facts

William H. Brown claimed to have gifted $32,500 to his two children, which was used to redeem notes secured by a deed of trust. Subsequently, the children exchanged these notes for Brown's personal notes. Brown then deducted interest payments made on these personal notes in 1951 and 1952. The IRS disallowed these deductions, claiming the transactions lacked economic substance and were, in effect, gifts.

Procedural History

The case was heard in the United States Tax Court. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in William H. Brown's income tax, disallowing the interest deductions. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner, upholding the disallowance.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transactions between Brown and his children created a bona fide debt.

2. Whether the interest payments made by Brown to his children were deductible under Section 23(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the transactions lacked economic substance and were essentially disguised gifts.

2. No, because the payments were not interest on a genuine debt and thus not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

deductible.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court scrutinized the transactions, recognizing that they were not arm’s-length dealings. The court emphasized that Brown maintained control over the funds, indicating a lack of a real, bona fide debt. The court cited cases like *Commissioner v. Culbertson* to highlight the need for genuine economic substance in transactions between family members. The court reasoned that because the children provided no consideration, the notes were merely a promise to make a gift in the future. The court stated, “No consideration passed from the children to petitioner and hence, no valid debt was owed by petitioner to his children.”

Practical Implications

This case underscores that family transactions must be structured and documented carefully to withstand scrutiny. To be deductible, interest payments must arise from a bona fide debt – one with economic substance and consideration. This case guides how tax deductions are analyzed in similar situations. It indicates a high degree of scrutiny will be given to transactions not at arm’s length. Any transactions between related parties should be structured as if they were between strangers to ensure that a legitimate debt is created, or the deductions will be disallowed. This case remains relevant in tax planning for families to determine the validity of interest deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.