Leslie v. Commissioner, 50 T. C. 11 (1968)

Interest deduction is not denied under IRC section 265(2) when indebtedness is incurred for general business purposes, even if tax-exempt securities are held, unless a direct relationship exists between the borrowing and the purchase or carrying of such securities.

Summary

John E. Leslie, a partner in Bache & Co. , a brokerage firm, challenged a tax deficiency based on the disallowance of interest deductions under IRC section 265(2). Bache regularly borrowed large sums for its operations, including a small amount of tax-exempt securities. The Tax Court held that the interest deduction was not disallowed because the indebtedness was not incurred specifically to purchase or carry the tax-exempt securities. The court emphasized the need for a direct connection between borrowing and the purchase of tax-exempt securities for section 265(2) to apply, which was not present in this case. This decision clarifies that general business borrowings do not trigger section 265(2) unless directly linked to tax-exempt securities.

Facts

John E. Leslie was a partner in Bache & Co. , a brokerage firm that borrowed large sums to finance its operations, including margin loans to customers. Bache also held a small amount of tax-exempt securities, acquired through its underwriting activities and market maintenance, which were sold within 90 days according to firm policy. The tax-exempt securities were not used as collateral for Bache’s borrowings. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed a portion of Bache’s interest deduction under IRC section 265(2), arguing it was incurred to purchase or carry tax-exempt securities.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a tax deficiency against Leslie for 1959, disallowing a portion of the interest deduction claimed by Bache. Leslie petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which heard the case and ruled in favor of Leslie, holding that the interest deduction was not disallowed under section 265(2).

Issue(s)

1. Whether any of Bache & Co. ‘s indebtedness was incurred or continued to purchase or carry tax-exempt securities within the meaning of IRC section 265(2).

Holding

1. No, because the indebtedness was incurred for general business purposes, not specifically for purchasing or carrying tax-exempt securities. The court found no

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

direct relationship between Bache's borrowings and its holding of tax-exempt securities.

Court's Reasoning

The court interpreted IRC section 265(2) to require a direct connection between the purpose of the indebtedness and the purchase or carrying of tax-exempt securities. The court reviewed legislative history and case law, noting that the section does not apply merely because a taxpayer holds tax-exempt securities and borrows funds. In this case, Bache's borrowings were part of its large-scale operations and not specifically for tax-exempt securities. The court rejected the Commissioner's allocation method as inconsistent with the statute's purpose. The court also likened Bache to a "financial institution," suggesting that section 265(2) was not intended to apply to entities like Bache, which borrow for general business purposes. The dissent argued that Bache's regular purchase of tax-exempt securities as part of its business operations justified applying section 265(2).

Practical Implications

This decision provides clarity for businesses, especially those in the financial sector, on when interest deductions may be disallowed under IRC section 265(2). It emphasizes that general business borrowings do not automatically trigger the disallowance unless there is a direct link to tax-exempt securities. This ruling affects how businesses structure their financing and investment strategies, particularly in managing tax-exempt securities. Subsequent cases have referenced Leslie in distinguishing between general business borrowings and those specifically for tax-exempt securities. It also highlights the importance of understanding the legislative intent behind tax provisions in applying them to complex business operations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.