Aqualane Shores, Inc. v. Commissioner, 30 T.C. 519 (1958)

When property is transferred to a corporation solely in exchange for stock, the corporation's basis in the property is the same as the transferor's basis.

Summary

Aqualane Shores, Inc., challenged the Commissioner's determination of deficiencies in its income taxes. The central issue was the corporation's basis in land transferred to it by its shareholders. The Tax Court held that the transaction was a tax-free exchange under Section 112(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code, as the land was effectively exchanged for stock. Therefore, the corporation's basis in the land was the same as the transferors', which resulted in the deficiency determination being upheld. The court looked beyond the form of the transaction to its substance, finding that the purported cash down payment and debt were shams, and the exchange was effectively for stock.

Facts

Three partners, the Walkers, purchased undeveloped land in Florida for $69,850. They intended to develop it into waterfront property. They organized Aqualane Shores, Inc., a corporation, with an initial capital of $500, primarily for tax advantages and to facilitate sales. The Walkers transferred the land to the corporation for $250,000, receiving 30 shares of stock. The agreement included a $9,000 cash down payment (which involved simultaneous check transfers), the assumption of existing mortgages, and the remaining balance payable in installments. The corporation's books reflected the land at $250,000. No significant payments were made on the purported debt. The Commissioner determined that the basis of the land was the same as the transferors'.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined tax deficiencies against Aqualane Shores, Inc., based on the reduced basis of the land. The case was brought before the United States Tax Court to determine whether the basis of the land should be the original purchase price or the fair market value at the time of the transfer. The Tax Court sided with the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transaction of transferring land to the corporation was, in substance, an exchange solely for stock under Section 112(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code.

2. If the transaction was an exchange solely for stock, whether the corporation's basis in the land should be the transferors' basis or the purchase price as reflected in the transaction.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the substance of the transaction showed an exchange of property solely for stock.

2. Yes, because the corporation's basis in the land should be the same as the transferors' basis.

Court's Reasoning

The court focused on the substance of the transaction, not just its form. The court determined that the "down payment" was a wash because of the simultaneous exchange of checks. The court also found that the purported debt lacked economic reality, as there was no true debtor-creditor relationship between the corporation and the Walkers, considering the small amount of cash, the lack of enforcement of the "debt," and its subordination to other creditors. The court found that the corporation was formed and the land transferred in order to be exchanged for stock, and the purported down payment and sale were merely formalities that were not consistent with a true sale. The court emphasized the importance of looking beyond the form to the substance to determine the nature of the transaction for tax purposes, especially where the formal structure does not reflect the true economic realities. The court determined that the tax code was designed to tax an individual, and not a collection of paper transactions designed to avoid a tax burden, and thus, the basis of the property in the corporation should be the same as the basis in the hands of the transferor.

The court cited several factors to support its conclusion, including the initial capital of the corporation being very small, the intended development needing significant capital, the lack of a down payment, the absence of any serious debt, and the fact that the Walker's interests in the corporation were proportional to their interests in the transferred land. The court also took into account that the Walkers did not pursue payment of the debt from the corporation, even though payments were in default. The court stated that while no single factor was controlling, when considered together, they proved that in substance it was an exchange.

Practical Implications

This case is important for businesses structured as corporations and for the tax implications of property transfers. It illustrates that courts will scrutinize transactions to determine their substance over their form. Lawyers should advise their clients about the importance of structuring transactions to reflect economic reality. Failing to do so may result in unfavorable tax consequences. The Aqualane Shores case provides a roadmap for identifying when a transaction is, in reality, a tax-free exchange rather than a sale. The factors the court considered are the ones that should be reviewed when evaluating a transaction's tax implications. The case emphasizes the importance of documentation and following through with the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

economic terms of the transaction to avoid the IRS recharacterizing the deal. This case remains important for determining tax consequences for property transfers and is frequently cited in similar cases involving the transfer of assets to a newly formed corporation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.