Lippman v. Commissioner, 52 T. C. 135 (1969)

The surrender of non-negotiable debentures that do not represent a valid debt does not qualify as a charitable contribution under IRC § 170.

Summary

Osteopathic doctors paid staff fees to a hospital, receiving in return non-negotiable debentures. They later surrendered these debentures, claiming the face value as charitable deductions. The Tax Court held that these debentures did not represent enforceable debts and thus, their surrender did not qualify as charitable contributions under IRC § 170. The court emphasized that for a surrender to be considered a charitable contribution, the debenture must represent a valid, enforceable debt.

Facts

In 1962, osteopathic doctors on the staff of Lakeside Hospital Association were required to pay staff assessment fees to retain their hospital privileges. The hospital used these funds to meet a condition of a bond underwriting agreement. In return, the doctors received non-negotiable debentures from the hospital. Later that year, the doctors surrendered these debentures to the hospital and claimed charitable deductions for their face value on their tax returns.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the doctors' income tax returns, disallowing the claimed charitable deductions. The cases were consolidated and brought before the United States Tax Court, where the petitioners argued that the surrender of the debentures constituted a charitable contribution under IRC § 170.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the surrender of non-negotiable debentures to a charitable organization constitutes a charitable contribution under IRC § 170.

Holding

1. No, because the non-negotiable debentures did not represent a valid, enforceable debt, and thus, their surrender did not qualify as a charitable contribution.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court examined the terms of the non-negotiable debentures, finding that they did not establish an unconditional obligation to pay, which is necessary for a valid debt. The court cited previous cases where similar arrangements were not

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

considered valid debts. The debentures were deemed worthless as they provided no enforceable rights to the doctors. The court concluded that the surrender of such debentures was a “meaningless gesture” and did not constitute a charitable contribution under IRC § 170. The court emphasized that for a surrender to be a charitable contribution, it must involve the relinquishment of a bona fide, enforceable debt. The court’s decision was influenced by the policy of preventing tax avoidance through the manipulation of financial instruments.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for a surrender to be considered a charitable contribution, the surrendered instrument must represent a valid, enforceable debt. Tax practitioners must carefully evaluate the terms of any financial instruments before claiming deductions for their surrender. This ruling impacts how charitable organizations structure their financial arrangements with donors to ensure compliance with tax laws. Subsequent cases have distinguished this ruling by focusing on whether the surrendered instruments were indeed enforceable debts. This case serves as a reminder of the importance of substance over form in tax law, particularly in the context of charitable contributions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.