Easson v. Commissioner, 33 T.C. 963 (1960)

When a taxpayer transfers mortgaged property to a controlled corporation, the gain recognized is limited by the adjusted basis of the property; gain exceeding the basis is treated as ordinary income if the property is depreciable.

Summary

In Easson v. Commissioner, the United States Tax Court addressed the tax consequences of transferring property subject to a mortgage to a newly formed corporation. The court held that gain on the exchange should be recognized to the extent the mortgage exceeded the property's adjusted basis, and that gain attributable to the depreciable building element should be treated as ordinary income, while gain on the land would be long-term capital gain. The court applied a practical approach to interpreting the nonrecognition provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, focusing on Congress' intent to postpone, not eliminate, taxation on genuine business reorganizations.

Facts

Jack L. Easson constructed and owned an apartment house in Portland, Oregon. After operating it through an old corporation which he then liquidated, Easson personally mortgaged the property. He later formed a new corporation, Envoy Apartments, and transferred the apartment house, still subject to the mortgage, to the new corporation in exchange for all its stock. The mortgage balance exceeded the property's adjusted basis. The fair market value of the property was also stipulated. Easson's purpose in forming the corporation included estate planning, limiting liability and separating the management of the property from his other assets, rather than tax avoidance.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the income tax liability of Jack L. Easson, June B. Easson, and the Envoy Apartments. The case was brought before the United States Tax Court to challenge these deficiencies, specifically regarding the application of the nonrecognition provisions of the Internal Revenue Code concerning the transfer of property to a controlled corporation.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the exchange of the apartment house subject to a mortgage for the capital stock of a newly organized corporation fell within the nonrecognition provisions of sections 112(b)(5) and 112(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.
2. Whether any recognized gain should be treated as ordinary income under

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

section 117(o) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.
3. What the tax basis of the property should be in the hands of the transferee corporation.

Holding

1. Yes, the exchange qualified under sections 112(b)(5) and 112(k), but only to the extent of the adjusted basis of the transferred property.
2. Yes, gain attributable to the depreciable building was treated as ordinary income under section 117(o), while gain from the land was accorded long-term capital gains treatment.
3. The basis of the property in the hands of the new corporation was determined under section 113(a)(8), allocating the basis between the building and the land.

Court's Reasoning

The court emphasized that nonrecognition provisions are designed to postpone, not eliminate, taxation. The court split the gain into its component parts. The court reasoned that to allow nonrecognition of gain to the extent the mortgage exceeded the adjusted basis would lead to an absurd result – a complete tax exemption on a portion of the actual gain. The court applied sections 112(b)(5) and 112(k) sequentially and held that the portion of the gain equal to the excess of the mortgage over the adjusted basis did not qualify for nonrecognition under section 112(b)(5) and was recognized. The court also found that Easson had met his burden to show that the exchange was primarily for bona fide business purposes and not tax avoidance, and that it was not a mere contrivance. The court then determined that the gain recognized on the depreciable property was to be treated as ordinary income. The court allocated the gain between the building and the land based on their respective fair market values.

The court cited several cases, including "Holy Trinity Church v. United States" for the principle that the statute’s spirit should be considered when its application leads to absurd results, and "Crane v. Commissioner" for the rule that one section of the act must be construed so as not to defeat the intention of another.

Practical Implications

This case is significant for its treatment of mortgaged property transfers to controlled corporations. It underscores the importance of: 1) a practical interpretation of tax law, especially where nonrecognition provisions are at issue, and 2) carefully structuring such transactions to avoid creating a negative tax basis or allowing for the complete avoidance of tax. The case highlights that tax deferral is the goal of nonrecognition rules, not tax elimination, and a focus on business purpose is critical. Lawyers should advise clients that the extent of recognized gain will depend upon the mortgage liability relative to the property’s basis. This case also indicates that if a transaction triggers ordinary income tax under section 117(o)

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

it will increase the basis of the property in the hands of the corporation, resulting in higher depreciation deductions and thus potentially lower corporate income taxes. Later courts may rely on this case for its analysis of business purpose in section 112(k) cases and the potential implications of the interplay between different parts of the Internal Revenue Code.

Meta Description

Easson v. Commissioner clarifies how property transfers to controlled corporations with mortgages are taxed, emphasizing the importance of basis and business purpose to determine recognized gains and their nature.

Tags

Easson v. Commissioner, U.S. Tax Court, 1960, Tax, Controlled Corporation, Mortgaged Property, Nonrecognition

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 