Able Metal Products, Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 32 T.C. 1149 (1959)

Income derived from a contract for personal services constitutes personal holding company income if the contract either designates specific individuals to perform the services or grants the other party the right to designate those individuals, and if those individuals own at least 25% of the corporation's stock.

Summary

The United States Tax Court determined that Able Metal Products, Inc. was a personal holding company (PHC) and subject to additional taxes. The court found that income received by Able Metal from a sales representative agreement qualified as personal holding company income under Section 543(a)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The contract with Kool Vent Aluminum Awning Corporation of Indiana designated two specific individuals, George A. Zajicek, Jr., and Don R. Zajicek, who were also the principal stockholders of Able Metal, to perform the sales and service functions. This designation, coupled with their substantial stock ownership, made the income from the contract PHC income.

Facts

Able Metal Products, Inc., an Ohio corporation, was formed in September 1954. On October 1, 1954, Able Metal entered into a sales representative agreement with Kool Vent Aluminum Awning Corporation. The agreement stipulated that George A. Zajicek, Jr., and Don R. Zajicek, the principal officers and sole stockholders of Able Metal, would personally supervise the services provided. The contract outlined specific duties including sales promotion, dealer relations, and advertising recommendations. Able Metal's gross income in 1954 and 1955 consisted primarily of payments from this contract. During these years, George and Don Zajicek each owned 50% of Able Metal's stock and were the only employees. The contract was non-assignable except to the Zajiceks, and Kool Vent could terminate it if the Zajiceks left the company.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Able Metal's income tax for 1954 and 1955. Able Metal contested this assessment, arguing that the income was not personal holding company income. The case was heard by the United States Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the income Able Metal received from the contract with Kool Vent qualified as "personal holding company income" under Section 543(a)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the contract specifically designated the Zajiceks to perform the services, and they owned more than 25% of the company's stock.

Court's Reasoning

The court first addressed the requirements for a corporation to be deemed a personal holding company. It noted that at least 80% of the corporation's gross income must be personal holding company income, and more than 50% of its stock must be owned by not more than five individuals during the last half of the taxable year. Since the Zajiceks owned all of the stock, and over 80% of the gross income came from the Kool Vent contract, the primary issue was whether the contract income constituted personal holding company income.

Section 543(a)(5) defines personal holding company income to include amounts received under a contract where the corporation is to furnish personal services if the contract designates the individual who is to perform the services. The court emphasized the fact that the contract explicitly stated that George and Don Zajicek would personally supervise the services, and they were the only ones providing the services. The court cited the agreement's preamble, which emphasized their prior experience. The court noted that the contract was made non-assignable except to the Zajiceks and could be terminated if they left Able Metal, which demonstrated the importance of their personal involvement. The court found that the contract was a personal service contract since it required the services of specific individuals.

The court also rejected Able Metal's argument that Section 543(a)(5) only applies when the contract covers only one individual. The court clarified that the singular includes the plural, based on the rules of statutory interpretation.

The court relied on prior cases, particularly *General Management Corporation* and *Allen Machinery Corporation*, where the presence or absence of designated individuals in personal service contracts was critical.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of carefully drafting personal service contracts and structuring ownership in corporations to avoid personal holding company status. If a company enters into a contract where the identity of the service provider is critical, and that individual or those individuals also own a significant portion of the company, the income from that contract is likely to be classified as personal holding company income. Corporate planners and attorneys must consider the implications of this ruling when structuring businesses that rely on the personal services of their owners or key employees.

The case emphasizes that:

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

- The specific designation of individuals in a service contract can have significant tax consequences.
- The intention of the parties, as demonstrated by the terms of the contract, is crucial.
- The court will look beyond the corporate structure to the individuals providing the services.

Later cases continue to cite *Able Metal Products* when analyzing whether income from personal service contracts is personal holding company income.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.