26 T.C. 940 (1956)

A bad debt loss is considered a business bad debt, deductible in full, if it is proximately related to the taxpayer's trade or business, even if the debt arises from an investment in a related business venture.

Summary

The case involved a taxpayer, Dorminey, who sought to deduct losses from loans made to two corporations under the business bad debt provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deductions, claiming they were nonbusiness bad debts, subject to less favorable tax treatment. The Tax Court held that the loss from loans to a banana importing company was a business bad debt because the loans were made to secure a supply of bananas for Dorminey's produce business. The court also found that the advances to a wholesale grocery company, though loans, did not become worthless in the tax year at issue. Furthermore, the court determined that Dorminey's stock in the grocery company did become worthless, entitling him to a capital loss deduction.

Facts

J.T. Dorminey was a wholesale produce dealer. He made loans to two companies: U.S. and Panama Navigation Company (Navigation), a banana importing business, and Cash and Carry Wholesale Grocery Company (Cash & Carry). Dorminey was a major shareholder and vice president of Navigation. The loans to Navigation were made to secure a supply of bananas for his produce business. Dorminey formed Cash & Carry and made advances to the company after its incorporation. Both companies experienced financial difficulties, and Dorminey's loans became worthless. Dorminey also owned stock in Cash & Carry which he claimed became worthless. Dorminey sought to deduct the losses as business bad debts. The Commissioner disallowed the deductions, claiming they were nonbusiness bad debts.

Procedural History

Dorminey filed a petition in the United States Tax Court, challenging the Commissioner's disallowance of the business bad debt deductions and other adjustments to his tax return. The Tax Court heard the case, examined the facts, and rendered a decision.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the advances made by Dorminey to Navigation were business bad debts deductible under Section 23(k)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

2. Whether the advances made by Dorminey to Cash & Carry were contributions to capital or loans.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

3. Whether the advances made by Dorminey to Cash & Carry became worthless in 1947.

4. Whether Dorminey's stock in Cash & Carry became worthless in 1947.

Holding

1. Yes, because the bad debt loss was incidental to and proximately related to Dorminey's produce business.

2. The court determined the advances to Cash & Carry were loans.

3. No, because the loans did not become wholly worthless in 1947.

4. Yes, because the stock became worthless in 1947.

Court's Reasoning

The court examined whether the bad debt was incurred in the taxpayer's trade or business. The court found that Dorminey's advances to Navigation were directly related to securing a supply of bananas for his produce business. "The advances were incidental to and proximately related to his produce business." Because the loans were motivated by his business, the resulting bad debt was a business bad debt. The court distinguished this from a nonbusiness debt, where the relationship to the business is not proximate. The Court cited the fact that Dorminey could not obtain bananas because of economic conditions and that his primary motive was to ensure a supply of bananas for his produce business.

Regarding the loans to Cash & Carry, the court determined the advances were loans. However, the court found the advances to Cash & Carry did not become worthless in 1947. The court considered whether the advances were capital contributions or loans. The court noted Dorminey's intent to create loans and that the business was expected to prosper. The Court found that the stock in Cash & Carry did become worthless in 1947.

Practical Implications

This case is important for taxpayers who are actively involved in a trade or business and make investments or loans to other entities that are related to their business. The case emphasizes that a bad debt is deductible as a business bad debt if it is proximately related to the taxpayer's trade or business. Attorneys should examine the facts to determine the taxpayer's motivation. The proximity between the debt and the taxpayer's business is crucial. If the primary motivation for the loan or investment is to further the taxpayer's business, the loss is more likely to be classified as a business bad debt. The decision to extend credit or make a loan must have a clear business purpose. The case also illustrates the importance of proper documentation of transactions, especially for the purpose of establishing the nature

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

of the debt. Furthermore, the case highlights the importance of establishing the year the debt became worthless.

This case has been cited in later cases dealing with bad debt deductions, particularly those involving loans or investments made by taxpayers in related businesses or ventures.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.