30 T.C. 1037 (1958)

To qualify for non-recognition of gain under Section 112(b)(11) of the 1939 Internal Revenue Code, a corporate reorganization must have a genuine business purpose beyond the mere distribution of earnings and profits.

Summary

The United States Tax Court ruled that a stock distribution from a corporation to its sole shareholder did not qualify for tax-free treatment under Section 112(b)(11) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The corporation transferred stock in its subsidiary to a newly formed corporation, which then distributed the new corporation's stock to the shareholder. The court found that the transaction lacked a genuine business purpose and was primarily a device to distribute corporate earnings as a dividend, thus making the distribution taxable.

Facts

Perry Bondy was the sole shareholder and president of Market Motors, Inc., an Ohio corporation that was a Ford automobile dealer. Market Motors, Inc., also owned Bondy Real Estate, Inc. In 1953, Market Motors, Inc., transferred all of its Bondy Real Estate, Inc., stock to a newly created corporation, P. E. B., Inc., in exchange for all of P. E. B., Inc., stock. Market Motors, Inc., then distributed the P. E. B., Inc., stock to Perry Bondy. The parties stipulated that the fair market value of the distributed stock was a certain amount, which would be ordinary dividend income unless the transaction qualified as tax-free under Internal Revenue Code Section 112(b)(11). The formation of P.E.B., Inc. and the subsequent distribution of its shares were undertaken as part of a property settlement in the context of Mr. Bondy's divorce proceedings.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Perry Bondy's income tax for 1953, asserting that the distribution of P. E. B., Inc., stock constituted a taxable dividend. The issue was brought before the United States Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether the distribution of P. E. B., Inc., stock to Perry Bondy was a taxable dividend, or whether it qualified for non-recognition of gain under Section 112(b)(11) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

Holding

Yes, the distribution of P. E. B., Inc., stock to Perry Bondy was a taxable dividend because the transaction lacked a business purpose and was primarily a device to distribute corporate earnings.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court examined the requirements for a tax-free distribution under Section 112(b)(11), which required a “plan of reorganization.” The court noted that, per *Gregory v. Helvering*, the tax statute was not intended to apply to transactions lacking a genuine business purpose. The court determined that the formation of P. E. B., Inc., and the subsequent stock distribution served no business purpose of Market Motors, Inc. The court found that the transaction’s sole purpose was to transfer earnings and profits to Bondy, which would be taxable. The court dismissed the argument that the transfer served a business purpose related to the company’s Ford franchise by noting that the distribution served no business purpose for the parent company. The court emphasized that the plan’s form followed a corporate reorganization, but there was no plan to reorganize a business at all; it was simply a mechanism to distribute assets to the shareholder.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the critical importance of a valid business purpose for corporate reorganizations to qualify for tax-free treatment. Tax advisors and corporate attorneys must carefully analyze the underlying motivations and objectives of a transaction, as well as its mechanics, to determine whether it serves a genuine business purpose beyond the mere distribution of earnings. The creation of a new subsidiary and distribution of its shares will not be considered a reorganization if it does not serve the business purpose of the original corporation. Courts will scrutinize transactions that appear to be primarily tax-avoidance schemes. This case remains a key precedent for distinguishing between legitimate corporate restructurings and disguised dividend distributions, informing the analysis of subsequent cases involving corporate reorganizations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.