Gilmore v. Commissioner, 20 T.C. 579 (1953)

Corporate distributions made to shareholders prior to the sale of their stock, even if related to the sale, are generally considered taxable dividends if they are made out of the corporation's earnings and profits, and not part of the sale proceeds.

Summary

The case concerns the tax treatment of a distribution made by the Ottumwa Hotel Company to its shareholders just before the sale of their stock. The petitioner, a shareholder, received a payment per share, which he claimed was part of the proceeds from the sale of his stock. The IRS, however, treated this payment as a taxable dividend. The Tax Court sided with the IRS, ruling that because the corporate board declared the distribution before the stock sale, and the distribution was made from the company's earnings, it constituted a dividend. The court distinguished this from scenarios where a buyer directly purchases assets, and the shareholders subsequently receive the proceeds as part of the sale. The court emphasized that the form of the transaction mattered, and in this case, the corporation made the distribution, not the buyer.

Facts

Merrill C. Gilmore owned shares in the Ottumwa Hotel Company. The company's board of directors received an offer from the Sniders to purchase all outstanding stock at $175 per share but excluding the cash on hand and U.S. bonds. The Sniders offered that the cash and bond proceeds, after paying debts and taxes, could be paid to the shareholders. The board accepted the offer and passed a resolution to distribute the company's cash and bond proceeds to the shareholders of record. Subsequently, the petitioner transferred his stock to the Sniders. The company then distributed $6.50 per share to shareholders. The IRS assessed a deficiency, arguing the payment received by Gilmore was a taxable dividend, not part of the stock sale proceeds. The petitioner contended it was additional consideration for his stock.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a tax deficiency against the petitioner, arguing that the payment of $6.50 per share received by the petitioner was a taxable dividend. The petitioner challenged this determination in the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $6.50 per share payment received by the petitioner from the Ottumwa Hotel Company constitutes a taxable dividend under Section 115(a) of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the distribution was made by the corporation out of its earnings and profits, as a dividend declared prior to the transfer of the stock, not as part of the sale consideration.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Section 115(a) of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code, which defines a dividend as any distribution made by a corporation to its shareholders out of earnings or profits. The court found that the Ottumwa Hotel Company had sufficient earnings and profits to cover the distribution made to its shareholders, including the petitioner. The board of directors declared the dividend before the stock sale to the Sniders was finalized. The court distinguished this from cases where the buyer purchases the assets of the corporation, and the shareholders subsequently receive the proceeds as part of the sale. The Court stated, "The Sniders made no contract with the individual stockholders beyond agreeing to pay them $175 a share for their stock." The court emphasized the form of the transaction: because the corporation distributed the funds, it was a dividend and not a part of the consideration for the stock. The court distinguished this case from the situations where a buyer directly purchased the assets of the company, and the shareholders received the proceeds from the sale. The court cited the fact that the Sniders specifically excluded liquid assets from the offer and that the corporate board directed the distribution of the cash and bond proceeds to the shareholders. The court found the key was that the corporate distribution occurred before the stock transfer.

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of the form of a transaction in tax law. The court focused on the fact that the distribution came from the corporation. Attorneys advising clients on stock sales must carefully structure these transactions to achieve the desired tax results. If the intent is to treat a distribution as part of the sale proceeds, the buyer should purchase the assets of the company directly, not merely the stock, thus avoiding corporate distributions and potentially higher tax liabilities. If a corporation has accumulated earnings and profits, any distribution of those earnings to its shareholders is likely to be considered a dividend unless it is clearly structured as part of a liquidation or redemption that meets specific requirements. Later cases follow this logic in determining whether a distribution from a corporation to its shareholders should be classified as a dividend or part of a stock sale.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.