Buckeye Union Casualty Co. v. Commissioner, 54 T. C. 13 (1970)

Income from the release of reserves in a reinsurance transaction during corporate liquidation is not considered a “sale or exchange of property” under section 337 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Summary

In Buckeye Union Casualty Co. v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that income derived from the release of unearned premium reserves during a reinsurance transaction did not qualify for nonrecognition under section 337 of the Internal Revenue Code. The case involved three affiliated insurance companies that transferred their businesses to a newly formed subsidiary of Continental Insurance Co. through reinsurance and assumption agreements. The court held that the income from retaining 35% of the unearned premium reserves was underwriting income, not gain from a property sale, and thus taxable. This decision clarifies the tax treatment of income realized from reinsurance transactions during corporate liquidation.

Facts

The Buckeye Union Casualty Company, its subsidiary Mayflower Insurance Company, and Buckeye Union Fire Insurance Company, all Ohio-based insurance firms, planned to liquidate and transfer their businesses to Buckeye Union Insurance Company (Continental Buckeye), a newly formed subsidiary of Continental Insurance Co. The transfer was executed through a Reinsurance and Assumption Agreement and a Supplemental Agreement. Under the reinsurance agreement, Continental Buckeye assumed all policy liabilities and other obligations in exchange for net assets equivalent to 65% of the unearned premium reserves and full reserves for losses and expenses. The supplemental agreement included the transfer of goodwill for $5. 7 million and other assets for specific amounts. The transaction resulted in a $16,376,071. 52 increase in the petitioners’ net worth, with $10,676,071. 52 retained from the unearned premium reserves.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined tax deficiencies for the Buckeye companies for the taxable year 1965, asserting that the income from the unearned premium reserves should be taxable. The companies filed petitions with the U. S. Tax Court, which consolidated the cases for trial. The court’s decision focused solely on whether the income from the unearned premium reserves was from a “sale or exchange of property” under section 337, thus qualifying for nonrecognition of gain.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the income of $10,676,071. 52 realized from retaining 35% of the unearned premium reserves under the reinsurance and assumption agreement

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

constitutes a “sale or exchange of property” within the meaning of section 337 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the income was not derived from a “sale or exchange of property” but rather from the release of reserves due to the reinsurance transaction, which does not qualify for nonrecognition under section 337.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the income in question resulted from the elimination of the need to maintain unearned premium reserves after Continental Buckeye assumed the policy risks, not from a “sale or exchange. ” The court emphasized that the transaction was a reinsurance arrangement, not a sale of property, as the companies were relieved from policy liabilities for less than they had reserved. The court also found that the goodwill, including renewal expirations, was transferred under the supplemental agreement for $5. 7 million, separate from the reinsurance transaction, and no other property was exchanged for the retained reserves. The court cited section 832 of the Internal Revenue Code and prior cases to support its conclusion that the retained reserves constituted underwriting income, which is taxable and not subject to section 337’s nonrecognition provisions.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for insurance companies undergoing liquidation and engaging in reinsurance transactions. It clarifies that income from the release of unearned premium reserves in such transactions is not considered a “sale or exchange of property” and thus is not eligible for nonrecognition under section 337. Practitioners should carefully structure reinsurance transactions to distinguish between income from goodwill sales and income from reserve releases, as the latter is taxable. This case may influence future tax planning strategies for insurance companies in liquidation, prompting them to consider the tax implications of retaining or transferring reserves. Subsequent cases, such as those dealing with similar tax issues in corporate liquidations, may reference this ruling to determine the tax treatment of reserve releases in reinsurance contexts.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.