Golwynne v. Commissioner, 29 T.C. 1216 (1958)

A stock redemption by a corporation is not treated as a dividend if it is not essentially equivalent to a dividend distribution, particularly when the redemption serves a legitimate corporate business purpose, such as improving the company's credit standing, and is not primarily aimed at shareholder tax avoidance.

Summary

In Golwynne v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether the redemption of preferred stock was essentially equivalent to a taxable dividend under Section 115(g) of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code. The decedent, sole shareholder of Golwynne Chemicals Corporation, received preferred stock in exchange for promissory notes representing unpaid salary. The corporation redeemed some of this preferred stock years later. The court held that the redemption was not equivalent to a dividend because the stock issuance served a legitimate business purpose (improving credit) and the redemption was tied to the original transaction, preventing double taxation of the decedent's salary. This case highlights the "net effect" test and the business purpose exception in stock redemption cases.

Facts

Henry A. Golwynne was the president and sole stockholder of Golwynne Chemicals Corporation. From 1942 to 1945, the corporation issued promissory notes to Golwynne as part of his salary because it wished to conserve cash. Golwynne reported the full salary, including the notes, as taxable income in those years. In 1944 and 1946, to improve its credit standing, the corporation issued preferred stock to Golwynne in exchange for these promissory notes. In 1948 and 1949, the corporation redeemed some of the preferred stock at par value. Golwynne did not report the $7,500 received from the 1949 redemption as income, but the Commissioner determined it was a taxable dividend.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Golwynne's income tax for 1949, asserting that the stock redemption was essentially equivalent to a taxable dividend. Golwynne challenged this determination in the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the redemption of preferred stock, originally issued in exchange for corporate notes representing unpaid salary, was "at such time and in such manner" as to be "essentially equivalent to the distribution of a taxable dividend" under Section 115(g) of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No. The Tax Court held that the redemption of the preferred stock was not essentially equivalent to a taxable dividend because the stock was initially issued for a bona fide corporate business purpose (improving credit standing), and the redemption was considered a completion of the original transaction, not a disguised dividend distribution.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the "net effect" test, established in cases like *Flanagan v. Helvering*, to determine if the stock redemption was essentially equivalent to a dividend. The court found that the "net effect" of the redemption was not a dividend because it served a legitimate corporate business purpose. The preferred stock was issued to improve the corporation's credit by removing notes payable from its balance sheet. The court emphasized that Golwynne had already paid income tax on the salary represented by the notes when they were received. Taxing the redemption proceeds as a dividend would result in double taxation of the same income, which the court sought to avoid, citing *United States v. Supplee-Biddle Co.* The court relied heavily on the precedent of *Keefe v. Cote*, a case with similar facts, where the First Circuit held that a stock redemption under comparable circumstances was not a dividend because it was the final step in fulfilling a legitimate corporate purpose. The Tax Court quoted *Keefe v. Cote*, stating, "Thus it could be found that there was a corporate purpose in issuing the shares, and it could also be found that they were redeemed in carrying out that corporate purpose." The court distinguished situations where salary might be unreasonably high or a scheme to avoid taxes, noting no issue of salary reasonableness was raised by the respondent.

Practical Implications

Golwynne v. Commissioner provides a practical example of the "business purpose" exception to the rule that stock redemptions can be taxed as dividends. It illustrates that when a stock redemption is demonstrably linked to a legitimate corporate purpose, and not primarily a tax avoidance strategy, it is less likely to be treated as a dividend, even in closely held corporations. For legal professionals, this case underscores the importance of documenting legitimate business reasons for issuing and redeeming stock, especially in scenarios involving shareholder-employees and prior compensation. It highlights that courts will consider the entire transactional context and aim to avoid double taxation when evaluating stock redemptions under Section 115(g) (and its successors in later tax codes). Later cases applying this ruling would likely focus on the strength and documentation of the corporate business purpose and the avoidance of shareholder-level tax manipulation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.