Miller v. Commissioner, 32 T.C. 954 (1959)

A taxpayer who elects the standard deduction cannot also deduct real estate taxes paid on partnership property when the funds used to pay the taxes originated from the taxpayer's individual income. Additionally, a partnership's purchase of a partner's interest in securities does not automatically provide a stepped-up basis for the remaining partners.

Summary

The United States Tax Court addressed several tax issues involving Victor and Beatrice Miller. The court determined that the Millers, who had elected the standard deduction on their individual tax return, could not also deduct real estate taxes paid on partnership property using individual funds. The court also addressed the question of basis adjustments. The court held that the purchase of a partner's interest in partnership securities by the partnership itself did not provide a stepped-up basis for the remaining partners. The final issue involved whether certain notes were in "registered form" for purposes of capital gains treatment. The court found that the notes were in registered form, entitling the Millers to capital gains treatment on the retirement of the notes.

Facts

Victor A. Miller and his wife, Beatrice, filed joint tax returns. Miller was a partner in the A.S. Miller Estate partnership. The partnership owned several assets, including real estate at 851 Clarkson Street. Miller managed the real estate and other assets. Marcella M. duPont, another partner, sold her partnership interest in certain securities to the partnership, but retained her interest in the Clarkson Street property. The partnership subsequently distributed some securities to the B and C Trusts, which were also partners. Miller continued to manage the real estate and receive the income. Miller paid real estate taxes on 851 Clarkson Street, but claimed the standard deduction on his individual tax return. The partnership paid the taxes on 851 Clarkson Street. Miller had made arrangements for the registration of certain notes held by the partnership.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the Millers' income taxes for 1953 and 1954. The Millers challenged the deficiencies in the U.S. Tax Court. The Commissioner amended the answer at the hearing, claiming an increased deficiency for 1953. The Tax Court considered several issues related to the tax treatment of deductions, basis, and the nature of the notes. The Tax Court found in favor of the Commissioner on the main issues.

Issue(s)

1. Whether a taxpayer who has elected to take the standard deduction on his own

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

return may also get the benefit of a deduction for real estate taxes which he, in practical effect, paid individually, out of his own funds, on investment property titled in the name of a partnership.

2. Whether the purchase by a partnership of the interest of one of four partners in certain notes and securities of the partnership gave rise to a stepped-up basis to the remaining partners with respect to their interests as partners in the notes and securities so purchased.

3. Determination of basis of certain maturing notes.

4. Whether said notes were in registered form within the meaning of sections 117 (f) and 1232 (a) (1) of the Codes of 1939 and 1954, respectively.

Holding

1. No, because, as a practical matter, Miller paid the taxes himself as an individual, and given that he elected the standard deduction, he could not also deduct the taxes.

2. No, because the partnership did not acquire any assets in the transaction with Marcella which it did not already own.

3. The court determined that respondent's position with respect to the basis of the Cooper notes was correct.

4. Yes, because the steps taken to register the obligations satisfied the purpose of registration, and the provisions of section 117(f) were complied with.

Court's Reasoning

Regarding the real estate tax deduction, the court reasoned that because Miller elected the standard deduction, he could not deduct the real estate taxes, which were a nonbusiness expense. The court emphasized that Miller, as managing partner, effectively controlled the funds used to pay the taxes. The income from the property belonged to Miller. The court assumed that the property was owned by the partnership, but determined that Miller was not entitled to the deduction regardless, as the funds to pay the tax came from Miller's income. The court quoted sections 23(aa)(2) and 63(b) of the Codes of 1939 and 1954, respectively, which supported its decision.

Concerning the basis issue, the court found that the partnership's purchase of a partner's interest did not trigger a stepped-up basis for the remaining partners. The court cited a prior case, , to support this conclusion. The court stated, "The partnership, as such, engaged in no transaction affecting it as a computing unit. It continued after the withdrawal of the partner in the same business, under the same name, without interruption, as agreed."

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

On the matter of the notes being in registered form, the court held that the notes were in registered form. Although the notes were not registered at the time of issuance, the court found that the registration was bona fide, and that Miller's action of having them stamped as registered satisfied the requirements for capital gains treatment under sections 117(f) and 1232 of the 1939 and 1954 Codes, respectively. The court stated that the narrow question was "whether the notes in controversy were in registered form after issuance."

Practical Implications

This case has several practical implications:

* Taxpayers who elect the standard deduction cannot also claim deductions for non-business expenses, even if they have a substantial interest in the underlying asset.

* The purchase of a partner's interest by the partnership does not alter the cost basis of the partnership assets for the remaining partners. This has implications for calculating gain or loss upon the sale or disposition of partnership assets. It is crucial to understand how property is held and the legal structure of the holding.

* For debt instruments, the court determined that they may be put into registered form subsequent to issuance, thus qualifying for capital gains treatment. This shows the need to analyze the form of notes and debt instruments, to determine the proper tax treatment upon retirement.

The case also highlights the importance of proper documentation and adherence to formal procedures in tax matters. The actions taken regarding the note registration were key to the court's decision. The case should inform legal practice in the area of partnership taxation, and how taxpayers should approach these matters.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.