33 T.C. 888 (1960)

The Tax Court held that the rental income received by a corporation from its doctor-shareholders, who operated their medical practices in the corporation's building, qualified for the commercial enterprise exception to the personal holding company income rules.

Summary

Medical-Surgical Group, Inc. (the corporation) was formed by nine doctors and one dentist to construct a building for medical offices. The doctors also formed a partnership to operate a medical laboratory and X-ray department in the building. The IRS determined the corporation was a personal holding company due to the nature of its income (primarily rent from shareholders). The court addressed whether the rent paid by the doctor-shareholders for their individual office space was excluded from personal holding company income under Section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950, which provided an exception for rents from "bona fide commercial" enterprises. The court held that operating a medical practice constitutes a "commercial enterprise" within the meaning of the statute, thus the corporation was not subject to the personal holding company tax.

Facts

Medical-Surgical Group, Inc., an Idaho corporation, was formed in 1946 by nine doctors and one dentist. Each subscribed for 10% of the stock. The corporation's primary purpose was to construct and operate a medical office building. Eight of the doctor-shareholders formed a partnership to operate a medical laboratory and X-ray department in space leased from the corporation. The corporation's income came primarily from rent paid by the doctors for their individual office spaces, the partnership for its laboratory, and a pharmacy. The IRS determined that the corporation was a personal holding company and assessed surtaxes for the years 1947-1953 because more than 80% of its income was personal holding company income.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the corporation's personal holding company surtaxes for the years 1947 through 1953. The corporation contested these deficiencies in the U.S. Tax Court. The case was submitted to the court on a stipulated record, and the sole issue was whether the rental income received by the corporation qualified for the exception under Section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950, which would exclude it from personal holding company income.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the rent paid by the doctor-shareholders to the corporation for their

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

individual office space constituted “personal holding company income” as defined in Section 502(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.
2. Whether the doctors’ use of the corporation’s property was for the operation of a “bona fide commercial enterprise” within the meaning of Section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950, thus exempting the rent from personal holding company income.

Holding

1. No, because the rental income was not personal holding company income.
2. Yes, because operating a medical practice constitutes a “bona fide commercial enterprise” within the meaning of Section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950.

Court’s Reasoning

The court focused on the meaning of “commercial enterprise” within Section 223. The court acknowledged the general purpose of personal holding company rules was to prevent tax avoidance. The IRS argued that the term “commercial” should be interpreted narrowly to mean a mercantile enterprise, whereas the corporation argued for a broader interpretation to include all bona fide business enterprises. The court considered the legislative history of both Section 502(f) and Section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950, concluding that Congress intended a broad interpretation of “commercial enterprise.” The court emphasized that the purpose of the legislation was to provide relief from the unintended consequences of Section 502(f) to corporations whose shareholders were conducting legitimate business activities and to not create an environment that would cause tax liability for legitimate business enterprises. The court reasoned that excluding a professional practice from this category would undermine the intention of Congress, as it would exclude many service-oriented businesses. The court explicitly stated that the practice of medicine is a business activity with profit as a primary goal, and that the IRS itself recognized this by considering professional practices to be a “trade or business.” The court concluded that the rent received by the corporation from its shareholders was not personal holding company income, since the shareholders were engaged in “bona fide commercial enterprises.”

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance on interpreting “commercial enterprise” within the context of personal holding company rules. It suggests that the term should be broadly construed to include income-generating business activities. The decision is important for entities that are structured similarly to the corporation in this case and are in industries beyond the practice of medicine. The Tax Court’s reasoning suggests that any shareholder-owned business that generates rental income would potentially fall under the purview of this case, as long as the business meets the “commercial enterprise” requirement. This case underscores the importance of considering the intent of Congress when interpreting tax laws and legislative

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

history, especially when dealing with ambiguous terms. Moreover, the case serves as a caution against applying penalty taxes without a clear finding of tax avoidance, and the court made specific note that they did not believe the circumstances indicated tax avoidance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.