Wattley v. Commissioner, 21 T.C. 527 (1954)

A taxpayer generally cannot disregard the corporate form of a business to claim tax benefits when the corporation was legitimately formed and operated.

Summary

The case involves a real estate broker, Wattley, who attempted to treat income received by his wholly-owned corporation as if it were his personal income, seeking to spread the tax liability over a longer period under Section 107(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The Tax Court ruled against Wattley, holding that he could not disregard the corporate entity. The court found that the corporation was properly formed, operated, and earned the income in question. The court stated that having elected to conduct business through a corporation, Wattley must accept the tax implications of that choice.

Facts

Wattley was a real estate broker who owned all the stock of R.B. Wattley Co. Inc. The corporation engaged in the real estate business, including leasing and managing property. Wattley personally negotiated a lease on behalf of the corporation. The corporation received a commission from the lease. Wattley claimed that this commission was for his personal services, not the corporation's, and he was entitled to spread the income over the period he provided the services. The IRS disagreed, asserting that the commission was the corporation's income.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a tax deficiency. Wattley petitioned the Tax Court to dispute the IRS's determination. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

Whether Wattley could disregard the corporate form of R.B. Wattley Co. Inc. to treat the commission income as his personal income for tax purposes.

Holding

No, because the court found that the corporation was a valid legal entity and the income was earned by the corporation, not Wattley in his individual capacity.

Court's Reasoning

The court emphasized that a taxpayer cannot simply disregard the corporate form, particularly when the corporation was legitimately established and actively engaged in business. The corporation had its own income, maintained a bank account, hired

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

employees, and conducted business in its own name. The court cited *Moline Properties, Inc. v. Commissioner*, 319 U.S. 436, for the principle that a taxpayer who chooses to operate through a corporation must accept the tax consequences of that choice. Furthermore, the court noted that correspondence and other documents demonstrated that the corporation, not Wattley individually, was the entity involved in the lease transaction and entitled to the commission. The court stated, "Having elected to conduct a real estate business through the medium of a wholly owned corporation, the petitioner must accept the tax disadvantages of such a choice, and may not now 'be heard to disavow the corporate existence.'"

Practical Implications

This case reinforces the importance of respecting the corporate form for tax purposes. Attorneys advising clients on business structures should emphasize that if a corporation is used, it will be treated as a separate entity. Income and expenses must be properly attributed to the correct entity. This means:

- Careful attention must be paid to corporate formalities, such as holding meetings, maintaining separate bank accounts, and ensuring that contracts and other legal documents are executed in the corporation's name.
- Tax planning should consider the implications of the corporate form from the outset of a business venture, as it is difficult to "undo" the corporate structure for tax benefits later.
- Cases like this affect how the IRS and courts will examine the allocation of income and expenses to a corporation. If a taxpayer tries to treat corporate income as personal income, the court will scrutinize the facts to determine who earned the income.

Later cases continue to emphasize that the corporate form must be respected unless there is a clear basis for disregarding it, such as fraud or abuse of the corporate form.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.