Hagan v. Commissioner, 27 T.C. 953 (1957)

A bad debt loss is deductible as a business bad debt if it is proximately related to the taxpayer's trade or business, even if the taxpayer is not primarily in the business of lending money.

Summary

The case concerns the tax treatment of bad debts and other expenses claimed by a produce dealer, Hagan. He made advances to two corporations, Navigation and Cash & Carry. The court addressed whether the losses from these advances were business or non-business bad debts, whether the advances to Cash & Carry were loans or capital contributions, and whether certain expenses were deductible. The court found that the Navigation debt was a business bad debt because it was related to Hagan's produce business. The Cash & Carry advances were determined to be loans, but not worthless in the year claimed. The court allowed the deduction of certain business expenses.

Facts

Hagan, a produce dealer, advanced funds to Navigation, a corporation formed to import bananas. The advances were intended to secure a supply of bananas for Hagan's produce business. Hagan also advanced funds to Cash & Carry, in which he was a shareholder. Cash & Carry was struggling financially and was in liquidation. Hagan claimed business bad debt deductions for the Navigation and Cash & Carry losses, and sought to deduct certain business expenses.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Hagan's claimed deductions for bad debts and certain expenses. Hagan petitioned the Tax Court, challenging the Commissioner's determinations.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the bad debt loss on the advances to Navigation was incurred in trade or business.

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

3. Whether the advances to Cash & Carry became worthless in the tax year claimed.

4. If the advances to Cash & Carry were loans, whether their worthlessness was incurred in trade or business.

5. Whether certain claimed expenses were deductible as business expenses.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

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

2. The advances were loans, not capital contributions.

3. No, the advances to Cash & Carry did not become wholly worthless in the tax year claimed, but the stock was worthless.

4. Not applicable, because the court determined the loans did not become worthless in the year claimed.

5. Yes, the claimed expenses were deductible as business expenses.

Court’s Reasoning

The court focused on whether the debts were proximately related to Hagan’s trade or business. With respect to Navigation, the court emphasized that Hagan invested in the corporation to obtain bananas for his established produce business, and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.