Estate of Henry A. Golwynne, Deceased, Samson Rosenblatt and Isidore Englander, Executors, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 26 T.C. 1209 (1956)

A stock redemption is not equivalent to a taxable dividend if it serves a legitimate business purpose, such as improving a corporation's credit standing, rather than being solely a means of distributing earnings.

Summary

The Estate of Henry A. Golwynne challenged the Commissioner of Internal Revenue's assessment that the redemption of preferred stock was a taxable dividend. Golwynne, the sole stockholder and president of a corporation, received part of his salary in corporate notes. These notes were later exchanged for preferred stock. The corporation subsequently redeemed some of the preferred stock, using the proceeds to offset Golwynne's overdraft. The Tax Court ruled that the redemption was not essentially equivalent to a dividend, as it served the legitimate corporate purpose of initially improving the corporation's credit by replacing the notes with preferred stock. The court emphasized that taxing the redemption would effectively tax Golwynne's salary twice.

Facts

From 1942 to 1945, Golwynne, president and sole stockholder of Golwynne Chemicals Corporation, received part of his salary in corporate notes due to the company's cash flow limitations. The amounts of notes received annually were: $17,086.65 in 1942; $17,702.73 in 1943; $7,036.83 in 1944; and $22,000.00 in 1945. Golwynne reported the full amount of his salary, including the notes, as taxable income in each of these years. In 1944 and 1946, notes totaling $45,000 were exchanged for preferred stock to improve the corporation's credit standing. In 1949, the corporation redeemed 75 shares of preferred stock for $7,500. Golwynne used this sum to cover an overdraft in his drawing account. The corporation had a significant earned surplus at the time of the redemption.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Golwynne's 1949 income tax, arguing the redemption of preferred stock was essentially equivalent to a dividend and therefore taxable. The Estate of Henry A. Golwynne challenged this determination in the U.S. Tax Court. The Tax Court heard the case in New York City. After Golwynne's death, the executors of his estate pursued the case, with the court issuing a decision under Rule 50.

Issue(s)

Whether the redemption of preferred stock was "at such time and in such manner as to make it essentially equivalent to the distribution of a taxable dividend" under

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Section 115(g) of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

No, because the redemption was not essentially equivalent to a taxable dividend.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the “net effect” test, which determines whether a stock redemption is essentially equivalent to a dividend. If the redemption serves a legitimate business purpose, it is not taxed as a dividend. The court found that the redemption, in this case, was part of an initial transaction to improve the corporation’s credit rating by replacing the notes with preferred stock. This purpose justified the redemption, particularly because Golwynne had previously reported the notes as income. Taxing the redemption as a dividend would effectively tax the same income twice. The court distinguished this case from situations with unreasonable salaries or where the transaction was a means of tax avoidance. The court cited the case of *S.K. Ames, Inc. v. Commissioner* (C.A. 1, 1954) to support the argument.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance for corporations and taxpayers regarding the tax implications of stock redemptions. It emphasizes that redemptions with a bona fide business purpose, such as improving the corporation’s financial standing, are less likely to be treated as taxable dividends, especially where they are part of an integrated transaction. Tax advisors should consider the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.