Fabreeka Products Company v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 34 T.C. 290 (1960)

Transactions designed solely for tax avoidance and lacking economic substance will be disregarded under the substance over form doctrine, but genuinely incurred expenses within such transactions may still be deductible if they are otherwise allowable under the tax code.

Summary

Fabreeka Products Co. engaged in a bond purchase and dividend distribution scheme recommended by its tax advisor to generate a tax deduction for bond premium amortization, offsetting a planned dividend to shareholders. The company purchased callable bonds at a premium, borrowed against them, declared a dividend in kind of the bonds (subject to the loan), and then quickly resold the bonds. The Tax Court disallowed the bond premium amortization deduction, applying the substance over form doctrine, finding the transaction lacked economic substance and was solely tax-motivated. However, the court allowed deductions for interest, stamp taxes, and legal fees genuinely incurred during the transaction, as these were actual expenses, even though the overall scheme failed to achieve its tax avoidance goal.

Facts

Petitioner Fabreeka Products Co. sought to offset its year-end dividend distribution with a tax deduction. Following advice from tax advisor Gerald Glunts, Fabreeka's board authorized the purchase of up to $300,000 in public utility bonds. On November 16, 1954, Fabreeka purchased $170,000 face value of Illinois Power Company bonds at a premium price of 118. The bonds were callable on 30 days' notice. Fabreeka financed most of the purchase with a bank loan secured by the bonds. On December 20, 1954, Fabreeka declared a dividend in kind to its shareholders, payable in the bonds subject to the loan. James D. Glunts, a shareholder and uncle of the tax advisor, was appointed agent to sell the bonds. On December 27, 1954, the bonds were resold, the loan was repaid, and the remaining proceeds were distributed to shareholders as dividends. Fabreeka claimed a deduction for bond premium amortization, interest expense, stamp taxes, and a consulting fee paid to Glunts' firm.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed Fabreeka's deductions for bond premium amortization, interest, stamp taxes, and the service fee. Fabreeka petitioned the Tax Court, contesting the deficiency.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Fabreeka is entitled to a deduction for amortization of bond premium under Section 171 of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code in respect of the bond

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

transaction.
2. Whether Fabreeka is entitled to deductions for interest, stamp taxes, and the fee paid to its tax advisor in connection with the bond transaction.

Holding

1. No, because the bond transaction lacked economic substance and was solely designed for tax avoidance; thus, the bond premium amortization deduction is disallowed under the substance over form doctrine.
2. Yes, because these expenses were actually incurred and are otherwise deductible under the tax code, despite the failure of the overall tax avoidance scheme.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court, applying the substance over form doctrine, held that the bond transaction was a "devious path" to distribute a dividend, which is not a deductible expense for a corporation. Quoting *Minnesota Tea Co. v. Helvering*, the court stated, "A given result at the end of a straight path is not made a different result by following a devious path." The court found the "given result" was a non-deductible dividend, and the bond transaction was merely an artifice to create a deduction. The court relied on *Maysteel Products, Inc.*, which similarly disallowed bond premium amortization in a tax avoidance scheme. However, regarding interest, stamp taxes, and the advisor fee, the court distinguished these as genuinely incurred expenses. Referencing *Gregory v. Helvering*, the court reasoned that even when a transaction fails for lack of business purpose, genuinely incurred expenses related to component steps might still be deductible. The court noted no "public policy" reason to disallow these deductions, unlike expenses related to illegal acts. The concurring opinion by Judge Murdock highlighted the artificial market for bonds created by tax-motivated transactions, questioning Congressional intent to allow such deductions. Judge Pierce dissented in part, arguing that all deductions should be disallowed because the entire scheme lacked "economic reality" and was a "purchase" of tax deductions, undermining the integrity of the tax system.

Practical Implications

Fabreeka Products reinforces the substance over form doctrine in tax law, particularly for transactions lacking economic substance and primarily motivated by tax avoidance. It serves as a cautionary tale against elaborate tax schemes designed solely to generate deductions without genuine economic activity. However, the case also clarifies that even within a failed tax avoidance scheme, certain genuinely incurred and otherwise deductible expenses, like interest and advisory fees, may still be allowed. This distinction highlights that the substance over form doctrine targets the core tax benefit sought from artificial transactions, not necessarily every incidental expense. Later cases distinguish *Fabreeka* by focusing on whether a transaction, while tax-sensitive, also possesses sufficient economic reality or

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

business purpose beyond tax reduction. Legal practitioners must advise clients to ensure transactions have a legitimate business purpose and economic substance beyond mere tax benefits to withstand scrutiny under the substance over form doctrine, but also to properly document and claim genuinely incurred expenses even in complex transactions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.