Tollefsen v. Commissioner, 52 T. C. 671 (1969)

Withdrawals from a subsidiary corporation controlled by a parent corporation may be treated as constructive dividends to the shareholders of the parent corporation.

Summary

In Tollefsen v. Commissioner, George Tollefsen, who owned all the stock in Tollefsen Bros. , Inc. , which in turn wholly owned Tollefsen Manufacturing Corp. , withdrew funds from the inactive subsidiary. The court held that these withdrawals were not bona fide loans but constructive dividends from Tollefsen Bros. to Tollefsen, due to his complete control over both entities. The court found no intention of repayment, as Tollefsen used the funds for personal investments and failed to provide credible evidence of a repayment plan. This case underscores the importance of intent and control in distinguishing between loans and dividends in corporate transactions.

Facts

George Tollefsen owned all the stock in Tollefsen Bros. , Inc. , which was the sole shareholder of Tollefsen Manufacturing Corp. In March 1960, Tollefsen Manufacturing sold its assets and manufacturing rights, becoming inactive. Subsequently, Tollefsen began making cash withdrawals from Tollefsen Manufacturing, which were recorded as loans and evidenced by non-interest-bearing promissory notes. These funds were used for personal investments, including trips to Norway and acquiring interests in various businesses. Tollefsen did not assign these interests to Tollefsen Manufacturing, and as of the hearing, no formal repayments had been made on the 1960 and 1961 withdrawals.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Tollefsen’s 1961 income tax, treating the withdrawals as dividends. Tollefsen petitioned the United States Tax Court, which upheld the Commissioner’s determination, finding that the withdrawals were not loans but constructive dividends from Tollefsen Bros. to Tollefsen.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the net withdrawals made by George Tollefsen from Tollefsen Manufacturing during 1961 were intended as bona fide loans or as permanent withdrawals.
2. Whether, if the withdrawals were permanent, they constituted dividends to Tollefsen from Tollefsen Bros. , Inc.

Holding

1. No, because the withdrawals were not intended as bona fide loans; Tollefsen did

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

not intend to repay the amounts withdrawn, as evidenced by the use of funds for personal investments and lack of formal repayments.
2. Yes, because the withdrawals were treated as constructive dividends from Tollefsen Bros. to Tollefsen, given his complete control over both corporations.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the principle that withdrawals from a corporation must be intended as bona fide loans with a clear expectation of repayment. The court found that Tollefsen’s explanation for the withdrawals was unconvincing, as the funds were used for personal investments rather than for the benefit of Tollefsen Manufacturing. The lack of interest on the promissory notes and the absence of formal repayments further supported the court’s finding that there was no intent to repay. The court also considered Tollefsen’s control over both corporations, concluding that the withdrawals were effectively distributions from Tollefsen Bros. , resulting in constructive dividends to Tollefsen. The court cited cases such as *Leach Corporation* and *Jacob M. Kaplan* to support its analysis of intent and control in determining the nature of corporate withdrawals.

Practical Implications

This decision emphasizes the importance of documenting and substantiating the intent to repay corporate withdrawals to avoid their classification as dividends. For legal practitioners, it highlights the need to carefully structure transactions between related entities to ensure they are respected as loans. Businesses must maintain clear records and evidence of repayment plans when shareholders withdraw funds. The case also impacts tax planning, as it demonstrates how the IRS may treat withdrawals as dividends when control and intent are not properly managed. Subsequent cases have cited Tollefsen in analyzing similar issues, reinforcing the principle that control and intent are critical factors in distinguishing loans from dividends.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.