Ewing v. Commissioner, 27 T.C. 406 (1956)

When stockholders, liable as transferees due to asset receipt from a liquidated corporation, later pay the corporation's taxes, those payments are treated as capital losses, not ordinary losses, following the character of the original transaction.

Summary

The United States Tax Court addressed whether payments made by former stockholders, as transferees, to satisfy the tax liabilities of their dissolved corporation were deductible as ordinary or capital losses. The court, relying on the Supreme Court's decision in *Arrowsmith v. Commissioner*, held that these payments were properly classified as capital losses. The court reasoned that since the stockholders had originally treated the distributions from the liquidated corporation as capital gains, any subsequent payments made to satisfy the corporation's tax obligations, arising from the same liquidation, should also be treated as capital losses. The ruling clarified the tax treatment of transferee liability in corporate dissolutions, emphasizing the relationship between the initial liquidation transaction and any subsequent adjustments.

Facts

Ewing Chevrolet, Inc. (the corporation) was incorporated in Ohio. The petitioners, Floyd C. Ewing, Richard K. Ewing, C.C. Ewing, and Stanley C. Ewing, along with their wives, were officers and directors of the corporation and held its stock. The corporation was liquidated and dissolved on September 1, 1949, with the petitioners receiving distributions of assets in exchange for their stock. The petitioners reported capital gains from these distributions on their 1949 tax returns. Subsequently, the IRS determined deficiencies in the corporation's income taxes for periods prior to the dissolution, based on disallowed deductions for excessive salaries. The IRS assessed transferee liability against the petitioners as recipients of the corporation's assets. The petitioners paid the assessed taxes and interest in 1951 and claimed deductions for these payments as ordinary losses on their 1951 tax returns.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies against the petitioners for the tax liabilities of the dissolved corporation. The petitioners paid these deficiencies and then claimed deductions for the payments on their 1951 income tax returns. The Commissioner disallowed these deductions, classifying them as capital losses rather than ordinary losses. The petitioners challenged the Commissioner's determination in the United States Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether payments made by the petitioners, as transferees, to satisfy the tax liabilities of their dissolved corporation were deductible as ordinary losses.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether payments made by the petitioners, as transferees, to satisfy the interest liability of their dissolved corporation were deductible as interest.

Holding

1. No, because the payments were related to a capital transaction (the liquidation) and must be treated as capital losses.

2. No, because the payments were not interest on their own indebtedness but rather a part of their transferee liability, and thus should be treated as capital losses.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied heavily on the Supreme Court's decision in *Arrowsmith v. Commissioner*. In *Arrowsmith*, the Supreme Court held that if a taxpayer receives a capital gain in one year and is later required to make a payment related to that transaction, the payment should be treated as a capital loss. The Tax Court found that the situation in *Ewing* was analogous. The petitioners had received distributions in liquidation, which they treated as capital gains. The subsequent payments made to satisfy the corporation's tax liabilities arose from the same liquidation transaction. Therefore, the court concluded that the payments should be treated as capital losses.

The court rejected the petitioners' argument that the excessive salary payments led to their transferee liability. Instead, the court found that the distribution of assets upon liquidation was the event that created the transferee liability. The court also dismissed the contention that the payments should be deductible as ordinary losses because they essentially remitted part of their salaries. The court found no evidence that a legal obligation required them to return any portion of their salaries to the corporation. Furthermore, the court noted that the petitioners' liability arose from their status as transferees of corporate assets, not from the receipt of the salaries, as there was no evidence the corporation was insolvent at the time the salaries were paid or as a result of those payments.

The court also addressed the petitioners' claim that they should be allowed to deduct the amounts paid for interest on the corporate tax liability as interest. The court rejected this argument, stating that the petitioners were not paying interest on their own indebtedness, but rather, were paying the interest liability of the corporation. Consequently, the court held that these interest payments should also be classified as capital losses, consistent with the treatment of the underlying tax liability.

Practical Implications

This case is significant because it clarifies the tax treatment of payments made by transferees of corporate assets to satisfy the transferor's tax liabilities. The key takeaway for practitioners is that the character of the loss (ordinary or capital)

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

follows the character of the initial transaction. If the initial transaction resulted in a capital gain, any subsequent payments related to that transaction will generally be treated as capital losses, even if the underlying liability would have been an ordinary expense for the corporation itself.

This rule impacts tax planning for corporate liquidations and other transactions where assets are transferred. Attorneys should advise their clients on the potential tax consequences of future liabilities that may arise from the liquidation. Properly structuring the transaction to anticipate potential liabilities and their tax treatment can result in significant tax savings or avoiding unpleasant tax surprises.

This case reinforced the principle established in *Arrowsmith* and has been consistently applied in subsequent cases dealing with transferee liability. It influences legal practice in the tax area by requiring a careful analysis of the relationship between an initial capital gain and subsequent payments related to that gain to ensure proper tax treatment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.