26 T.C. 894 (1956)

In determining whether a corporation has acquired "substantially all" the assets of another, the court considers the nature of the assets acquired relative to the overall assets and operations of the selling corporation, not just a specific percentage.

Summary

Daniels Buick, Inc. sought to use the base period experience of Kelley Buick Sales & Service Company to compute its excess profits credit. The Internal Revenue Code allowed this if Daniels Buick was a "purchasing corporation," meaning it had acquired substantially all of Kelley Buick's properties (other than cash). Daniels Buick argued it acquired 87.25% of the available assets. The Tax Court disagreed, holding that acquiring a lease on property was not equivalent to acquiring the property itself, and that cash did not include certain assets like accounts receivable. The court determined that Daniels Buick did not acquire "substantially all" of Kelley Buick's non-cash assets, and therefore, could not use Kelley Buick's earnings history.

Facts

Daniels Buick, Inc. was incorporated in 1950 and began operating as a Buick dealer in Columbus, Ohio. Kelley Buick Sales & Service Company, also a Buick dealer, dissolved on June 30, 1950. Daniels Buick purchased certain assets from Kelley Buick, including inventory and some equipment, but leased the real property. The real estate included lots owned by the Kelleys, which Kelley Buick had used for its operations. The assets purchased from Kelley Buick were valued at $38,742.83. Kelley Buick had total assets of $308,371.51, including $211,486.11 in cash assets.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Daniels Buick's income tax for 1951. The issue was whether Daniels Buick was a "purchasing corporation" under Section 474 of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code. The case went before the United States Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether Daniels Buick, Inc. acquired "substantially all" of the properties (other than cash) of Kelley Buick Sales & Service Company, making it a "purchasing corporation" under Section 474(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

Holding

No, because Daniels Buick did not purchase substantially all of the assets of Kelley Buick, as a lease on the real property used by Kelley Buick was not equivalent to the purchase of that property itself. Therefore, Daniels Buick could not use the base

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

period experience of Kelley Buick.

Court’s Reasoning

The court focused on the definition of “purchasing corporation” under Section 474 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The court analyzed whether Daniels Buick acquired “substantially all” of Kelley Buick’s properties, excluding cash. The court found that Daniels Buick did not acquire the real estate, instead leasing it. The court differentiated between the ownership of land and a leasehold interest, asserting that a lease, even a long-term lease, is not equivalent to acquisition of ownership. The court emphasized that whether assets were acquired was a question of fact. The court also addressed the meaning of “cash” in the statute. The court held that “cash” in this context meant liquid assets such as currency and not broader categories of current assets like accounts receivable. The court concluded that the non-acquired assets, along with the leased real estate, represented a substantial portion of the selling corporation’s properties, thus, Daniels Buick did not acquire “substantially all” of Kelley Buick’s non-cash assets. The court cited Milton Smith, 34 B. T. A. 702 (1936) and Daily Telegram Co., 34 B. T. A. 101, 105 (1936) which stated that whether substantially all assets have been acquired is a question of fact.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on the interpretation of “substantially all” assets in tax law, especially when determining eligibility for tax benefits related to acquisitions. The case demonstrates that the form of the transaction matters; leasing assets is treated differently than purchasing them. Attorneys should carefully analyze the nature of the acquired assets, considering the overall business operations of the selling corporation. The case reinforces that “cash” is narrowly defined in this context, and other current assets may not be excluded. The ruling helps to clarify the importance of asset ownership in meeting statutory requirements for tax benefits tied to asset acquisition. Subsequent cases involving similar tax provisions would need to consider this holding when determining what constitutes “substantially all” assets, considering asset valuations and the actual nature of the assets acquired, versus leased. The outcome highlights the need for detailed documentation and a clear understanding of tax implications when structuring business acquisitions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.