Commissioner v. Korell, 339 U.S. 619 (1950)

In determining the amortization of bond premiums for tax purposes, the amount payable on an earlier call date, rather than the amount payable at maturity, is used when calculating the deduction.

Summary

The Supreme Court addressed a dispute over the amortization of bond premiums for tax purposes. The taxpayers purchased bonds at a premium, meaning they paid more than the face value. These bonds had multiple redemption dates and prices, including a "regular redemption" price and a "special redemption" price exercisable on the same call date prior to maturity. The Commissioner allowed amortization based on the regular redemption price, but disallowed it for the difference between the regular and special redemption prices. The Court affirmed the Commissioner's determination, holding that the amortizable premium should be calculated based on the amount payable on the earlier call date.

Facts

Taxpayers purchased bonds at a premium. The bonds had a call date prior to maturity. The bonds had a "regular redemption" price and a "special redemption" price exercisable on the same call date. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue allowed the amortization of the bond premiums to the extent that the cost exceeded the "regular redemption" price. The Commissioner disallowed the difference between the higher "regular" and the lower "special redemption" prices.

Procedural History

The case originated in the Tax Court, where the Commissioner's determination was upheld. The Supreme Court granted certiorari to resolve the issue of bond premium amortization when multiple redemption prices existed. The Supreme Court affirmed the Tax Court's decision.

Issue(s)

Whether, in determining the amortizable bond premium, the redemption price at the earlier call date should be used rather than the maturity price, when both apply?

Holding

Yes, because the Court held that the amount payable on the earlier call date is to be used in computing the deduction for amortization of bond premiums.

Court's Reasoning

The Court considered the application of Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

which allowed deductions through the amortization of premiums paid on bonds. The court recognized that, although neither the statute nor its legislative history addressed the specific scenario of multiple redemption prices, the Commissioner's interpretation was reasonable and consistent with the purpose of the statute. The Court relied on the Commissioner's determination, which was presumed to be correct, and the petitioners failed to provide a persuasive argument to justify their position.

The Court emphasized that the bonds were held for only a short period, and the special redemption price was not generally available during that time, which influenced the decision. The Court's decision was based on the practical application of the tax code and the lack of sufficient evidence to overcome the presumption of correctness afforded to the Commissioner's determination.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance for calculating amortizable bond premiums, particularly in situations with multiple redemption options. It underscores the importance of using the amount payable on the earlier call date when available. It also reinforces the deference given to the Commissioner's interpretation of the tax code. Lawyers and tax professionals should carefully examine the specific terms of bond instruments, including call dates and redemption prices. The decision highlights that taxpayers bear the burden of proving that the Commissioner's assessment is incorrect. This case guides tax professionals in advising clients on bond investments and tax planning strategies related to bond premiums.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.