

### **33 T.C. 30 (1959)**

Distributions made in complete liquidation of a corporation are treated as exchanges for stock and are taxable as capital gains, not dividends, unless the liquidation is part of a reorganization that includes an exchange of like property.

#### **Summary**

In this case, the U.S. Tax Court addressed the tax treatment of distributions received by Walter L. Morgan from two corporations: Wellington Corporation and Fund Shares, Inc. The Commissioner argued that the distributions were essentially equivalent to taxable dividends. The court determined that the distribution from Wellington Corporation was a complete liquidation and therefore taxable as capital gains because it did not involve an exchange of like property, a requirement of reorganizations. The court also found that the distributions from Fund Shares, Inc. were also a complete liquidation and not a disguised dividend, rejecting the Commissioner's attempt to reallocate the distributions under Section 45 of the 1939 Code, which governs income allocation among related entities. The court emphasized that Section 45 did not authorize the reallocation of net assets in a liquidation context, and that the substance of the transaction was a complete liquidation of the company.

#### **Facts**

Walter L. Morgan (petitioner) owned 100% of the Wellington Corporation. The Wellington Corporation provided investment advisory services to Fund, Inc. Due to pressure from the IRS, the board of directors resolved to liquidate the company. The company distributed its assets (cash and U.S. Treasury bonds) to petitioner and was dissolved. Petitioner also held 53.33% of the stock in Fund Shares, Inc. The company's board of directors resolved to completely liquidate Fund Shares, Inc. The company distributed cash and Fund, Inc. stock to the petitioners. The Commissioner determined that the distributions from both corporations were taxable dividends, not capital gains.

#### **Procedural History**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in petitioners' income tax. The taxpayers challenged the Commissioner's determination in the U.S. Tax Court. The Tax Court heard the case and rendered a decision in favor of the taxpayers, holding that the distributions were properly treated as capital gains.

#### **Issue(s)**

1. Whether distributions made by Wellington Corporation to petitioner were in complete liquidation of his stock and taxable as capital gain under Section 115(c) of the 1939 Code, or taxable as dividends under Section 112(c)(2) of the 1939 Code.

2. Whether distributions made by Fund Shares, Inc. to the petitioners were in complete liquidation of their stock and taxable as capital gains, or taxable as dividends under Section 115(g)(1) of the 1939 Code.

## **Holding**

1. Yes, because the distribution was a complete liquidation, not part of a reorganization involving an exchange of like property.
2. Yes, because the distributions were in complete liquidation of Fund Shares, Inc., and the Commissioner's attempt to treat them as a dividend from Wellington Company under Section 45 of the 1939 Code was not authorized by law.

## **Court's Reasoning**

Regarding Wellington Corporation, the court found that the distribution was a complete liquidation under Section 115(c) and should be taxed as capital gain unless it fell under Section 112(c)(2). The court found that the requirements of a reorganization under Section 112(c)(2) were not met because no exchange occurred in kind, as described in section 112(b)(1). The distribution consisted solely of cash and bonds. The court emphasized that the language of the statute was clear and should not be extended by implication or enlarged to embrace matters not specifically pointed out. The court distinguished this case from those where a reorganization included an exchange of like property, and thus a distribution was treated as a dividend. Concerning Fund Shares, the court held that the IRS's attempt to apply Section 45 to reallocate the distributions and treat them as dividends from another corporation was improper. The court clarified that Section 45 authorized the allocation of income and deductions but not the reallocation of net assets in a liquidation context. The court found no basis to disregard the corporate entities and treat the distribution from Fund Shares as a dividend from another corporation, since the substance was a complete liquidation. The court applied the principle from *Edward H. Ellis & Sons v. United States*, 187 F.2d 698, that it could not manufacture missing links or imagine facts to apply the code.

## **Practical Implications**

This case emphasizes that for a liquidating distribution to be taxed as capital gains, it must strictly comply with Section 115(c) of the 1939 Code unless it is part of a reorganization that must meet the conditions of Section 112(c)(2). Specifically, liquidations are taxable at capital gains rates, and will not be considered dividends unless an exchange occurs, and a distribution occurs as a result. When planning the liquidation of a corporation, it is crucial to consider the exact nature of the distributions to avoid recharacterization as dividends, especially if the IRS can show that the transaction fits the reorganization and exchange description. The Court's limitation on the scope of Section 45, which does not authorize the recharacterization of distributions, is also important. This decision limits the IRS's

ability to disregard corporate entities and recharacterize liquidating distributions under Section 45 unless the statute is strictly applied.

### **Meta Description**

The case establishes that liquidating distributions are taxed as capital gains, not dividends, unless the liquidation forms part of a reorganization with an exchange and that Section 45 does not allow recharacterization of distributions.

### **Tags**

Morgan v. Commissioner, U.S. Tax Court, 1959, Corporate Liquidation, Capital Gains, Taxable Dividends, Section 45