28 T.C. 894 (1957)

Payments designated as "premiums for making a loan" are considered interest for tax purposes if they represent compensation for the use of borrowed money, irrespective of their label.

Summary

L-R Heat Treating Co. borrowed funds and, in addition to stated interest, paid lenders a "premium for making the loan." The Tax Court addressed whether these premiums constituted interest for tax purposes, specifically concerning excess profits tax calculations. The court held that despite the "premium" label, these payments were indeed interest because they compensated lenders for the use of capital. This case underscores the principle that the economic substance of a transaction, rather than its formal designation, governs its tax treatment. The decision clarifies that costs associated with borrowing money, beyond stated interest, can still be classified as interest for tax law.

Facts

L-R Heat Treating Co. secured 14 separate loans from various lenders to operate its business during the taxable years in question.
In each loan transaction, the company's directors authorized borrowing a specific sum, stipulating a 6% interest rate and an additional "premium for making the loan."
The lenders withheld the "premium" directly from the loan amount, so the company received less than the face value of the loan.
The amounts withheld as premiums were determined through negotiations and varied based on loan size and term, ranging from $650 on a $5,000 loan to $25,000 on a $100,000 loan.
The company recorded the 6% interest under "interest on borrowed capital" and the premiums under "finance charges and other costs."
For excess profits tax calculations, L-R Heat Treating Co. did not treat these premiums as interest, claiming them as ordinary business expenses.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in L-R Heat Treating Co.'s income and excess profits taxes for the fiscal years 1951-1953.
The Commissioner adjusted the company's excess profits net income by treating the "premiums for making loans" as interest under Section 433(a)(1)(O) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.
L-R Heat Treating Co. petitioned the Tax Court to contest the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the sums paid by L-R Heat Treating Co., designated as "premium for

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

making the loan," constitute ordinary and necessary business expenses or are, in reality, interest payments on borrowed capital for the purpose of adjustments under Section 433(a)(1)(O) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

Holding

1. Yes, the amounts withheld by the lenders as "premium for making the loan" were in reality interest payments on borrowed capital because they represented compensation to the lenders for the use of their money.

Court’s Reasoning

The court defined interest based on precedent, citing *Old Colony R. Co. v. Commissioner*, as "an amount which one has contracted to pay for the use of borrowed money," and *Deputy v. DuPont*, as "compensation for the use or forbearance of money." The court emphasized that Congress intended the term "interest" to have its ordinary, everyday business meaning.

The court referenced its prior decision in *Court Holding Co.*, which involved similar facts where a bonus paid for a loan was deemed interest. The court found the present case indistinguishable, stating that whether the premium was withheld or paid back to the lender is immaterial; the economic effect is the same.

The court dismissed the petitioner’s arguments that the varying rates of premiums and the labeling of the payment as "premium" rather than "interest" should dictate its tax treatment. Quoting *United States Playing Card Co.*, the court stated, "it is a well established principle of law that the name by which an instrument or transaction is denominated is not controlling in determining its true character."

The court concluded that the premiums were paid solely to obtain the use of borrowed capital, which squarely fits the definition of interest, regardless of the label or bookkeeping treatment applied by the petitioner. The court noted the petitioner did not argue the premiums were for any other services or considerations.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the tax law principle of substance over form. It demonstrates that the label parties assign to a payment is not determinative for tax purposes; the true nature of the transaction and the economic reality prevail.

For legal professionals and businesses, this case serves as a reminder to carefully analyze the substance of financial transactions, especially those involving borrowing and lending. Costs associated with obtaining loans, even if termed as fees, premiums, or commissions, may be treated as interest if they compensate the lender for the use of capital.

This ruling has implications for how businesses structure loan agreements and account for borrowing costs, particularly in contexts where the characterization of payments impacts tax liabilities, such as in excess profits tax or interest deductibility limitations.

Later cases applying this principle would scrutinize similar "premium" or "fee"

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

arrangements in lending to determine if they are, in substance, additional interest, ensuring consistent tax treatment based on the economic reality of the transactions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.