30 T.C. 1013 (1958)

Under Internal Revenue Code Section 24(b)(1), losses from sales of property between an individual and a corporation where the individual owns more than 50% of the corporation's stock are not deductible for tax purposes.

Summary

The U.S. Tax Court held that a taxpayer could not deduct losses from the sale of mixed metal to a corporation in which he and his wife owned more than 50% of the stock. The taxpayer argued that Section 24(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, which disallows such deductions, did not apply because the mixed metal changed from a capital asset to stock in trade in the hands of the corporation. The court rejected this argument, stating that the provision applied regardless of the type of property sold and that the bona fide nature of the sale and the fair market value of the transactions were immaterial. The court emphasized that the losses and gains could not be combined for tax purposes since they resulted from separate purchases.

Facts

Frank C. Engelhart purchased mixed metal (an alloy of tin and lead) in multiple lots. Engelhart held some lots for over six months (resulting in a long-term capital gain when sold) and some for less than six months (resulting in a short-term capital loss when sold). He sold both lots to Kester Solder Company, of which he and his wife owned more than 50% of the stock. Engelhart reported both the capital gain and loss on his 1951 tax return. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the loss deduction.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a tax deficiency for Engelhart for 1951, disallowing the deduction of the loss from the sale of the mixed metal. Engelhart petitioned the Tax Court, challenging the Commissioner's determination. The Commissioner filed a motion to dismiss the petition, arguing that Engelhart failed to state a cause of action because of Section 24(b)(1). The Tax Court heard arguments on the motion, and the parties filed briefs.

Issue(s)

Whether Section 24(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 prevents the deduction of a loss from the sale of property between an individual and a corporation in which that individual and their spouse own more than 50% of the stock, even if the sale was at fair market value and bona fide?

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Yes, because Section 24(b)(1) explicitly disallows the deduction of losses on sales of property between an individual and a controlled corporation, regardless of the nature of the property or the circumstances of the sale, provided that the ownership requirements are met.

Court’s Reasoning

The court’s reasoning centered on the plain language of Section 24(b)(1). The statute provides that no deduction is allowed for losses from sales of property between an individual and a corporation when the individual owns over 50% of the corporation’s stock. The court found no ambiguity in this provision, concluding that it applied directly to the facts of the case. Engelhart’s argument that the nature of the asset changed was rejected based on prior case law that held Section 24(b)(1) applies irrespective of the type of property sold. The court emphasized that the fact that the sales were at fair market value and bona fide was immaterial. Furthermore, it distinguished the transactions based on the different holding periods and the fact that the gains and losses resulted from separate purchases.

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the strict application of Section 24(b)(1). Attorneys and tax advisors should carefully advise clients to understand the implications of selling assets to closely held corporations where they hold a majority ownership stake. This decision confirms that even if a transaction is conducted at arm’s length and reflects fair market value, a loss cannot be recognized for tax purposes if the sale is between a taxpayer and a controlled corporation. Taxpayers cannot offset gains from these transactions with losses from similar transactions. Any attempt to circumvent this rule, for example, by arguing that the nature of the property changes or that a net gain resulted from all transactions, is likely to fail. Counsel must consider separate accounting for sales of assets with different holding periods. This case demonstrates that the form of the transaction is critical and that substance-over-form arguments are unlikely to prevail if the statutory requirements are clearly met. This holding remains good law and continues to apply to similar scenarios.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.