James v. Commissioner, 53 T. C. 63 (1969)

Stock issued for services is taxable as income and does not qualify for non-recognition under Section 351.

Summary

In James v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed whether stock received by William James and the Talbots in exchange for their contributions to Chicora Apartments, Inc. was taxable. James received stock for arranging financing and an FHA commitment, while the Talbots exchanged land for stock. The court ruled that James' stock was compensation for services, not property, making it taxable income. As James did not transfer property, the Talbots' exchange did not meet the control requirement of Section 351, resulting in taxable gain for them. This case underscores the distinction between stock issued for services versus property under tax law.

Facts

William James, a builder and developer, and C. N. Talbot entered into an agreement to develop an apartment project. The Talbots contributed land, while James was responsible for securing financing and an FHA commitment. Chicora Apartments, Inc. was formed, with James and the Talbots each receiving 50% of the stock. The stock issued to James was in exchange for his services in obtaining the FHA commitment and financing, while the Talbots received their stock for the land they transferred.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the Jameses' and Talbots' income taxes for 1963, asserting that James received taxable income from stock issued for services and that the Talbots realized a taxable gain on their land transfer. The petitioners challenged these determinations before the United States Tax Court, which upheld the Commissioner's position.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the stock received by James was issued in exchange for property or as compensation for services.
2. Whether the Talbots' exchange of land for stock qualified for non-recognition of gain under Section 351.

Holding

1. No, because James received his stock for services performed, not for property transferred. The stock was taxable as ordinary income.
2. No, because James was not considered a transferor of property, the Talbots did

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

not meet the control requirement of Section 351, resulting in a taxable gain on their land transfer.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied Section 351(a), which provides for non-recognition of gain if property is transferred to a corporation in exchange for stock, and the transferors control the corporation post-exchange. However, stock issued for services is explicitly excluded from this provision. The court found that James’ efforts in securing the FHA commitment and financing were services, not property, as he never owned the commitments. The court cited precedents like United States v. Frazell, distinguishing between services and property. Since James was not a property transferor, the Talbots lacked the required control after their transfer, making their gain taxable. The court emphasized the statutory intent to tax stock received for services as income.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that stock issued for services, even if those services result in obtaining commitments or financing, is taxable as income. Practitioners must carefully distinguish between contributions of property and services when structuring corporate formations. The ruling impacts how developers and investors structure real estate projects, ensuring that service contributions are properly accounted for as taxable income. Subsequent cases like Commissioner v. Brown have further refined this distinction, emphasizing the need for clear agreements on the nature of contributions in corporate formations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.