Blue Flame Gas Co. v. Commissioner, 54 T. C. 584 (1970)

A purported loan from a lessee to a lessor, coinciding with lease payments, may be treated as advance rental income and a dividend if the transaction is economically indistinguishable from prepaid rent.

Summary

Blue Flame Gas Co. and its sole shareholder, Joe Zedrick, entered into a lease agreement with Petrolane for business assets, which included a simultaneous $100,000 loan to Zedrick. The court ruled that this loan was effectively advance rental payments, taxable to Blue Flame ($85,000) and Zedrick ($15,000) in the year received. Additionally, amounts received by Zedrick attributable to Blue Flame were deemed dividends. The court also allowed Blue Flame a bad debt deduction for reserves set aside on the sale of accounts receivable with recourse and determined that Zedrick's lumber business operated as a partnership, allowing him to deduct his share of its losses.

Facts

Blue Flame Gas Co. , a Washington corporation, and its sole shareholder Joe Zedrick, negotiated the lease of their liquefied petroleum gas business assets to Petrolane on December 1, 1963. The lease, valued at $100,000 over 10 years, was executed concurrently with a $100,000 loan from Petrolane to Zedrick, with repayments scheduled to coincide exactly with the lease payments. Zedrick owned some of the leased assets individually. Blue Flame also sold its accounts receivable to Petrolane with a repurchase obligation. Separately, Zedrick operated a lumber business as a partnership, despite having initially formed a corporation that never became operational.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the income taxes of Blue Flame and Zedrick, treating the $100,000 loan as advance rental income and a dividend. Blue Flame and Zedrick petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which held that the purported loan constituted advance rentals and a dividend, allowed a bad debt deduction for Blue Flame, and permitted Zedrick to deduct his share of the lumber partnership's losses.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $100,000 payment from Petrolane to Zedrick constituted advance rental income to Blue Flame and Zedrick, and whether amounts received by Zedrick attributable to Blue Flame constituted a dividend?
2. Whether Blue Flame was entitled to a bad debt deduction under section 166(g) for additions to a reserve upon the sale of its accounts receivable with recourse?
3. Whether Zedrick's lumber business was operated as a partnership, allowing him

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

to deduct his distributive share of its net operating losses?
4. Whether Zedrick was entitled to a depreciation deduction for assets used in the lumber business?
5. Whether Zedrick was liable for additions to tax under sections 6651(a) and 6653(a)?

Holding

1. Yes, because the transaction was economically indistinguishable from prepaid rent, and the loan was interdependent with the lease.
2. Yes, because the sale of accounts receivable with recourse qualified for a deduction under section 166(g), as the debts arose from sales in the ordinary course of business.
3. Yes, because the lumber business was operated as a partnership rather than a corporation, which never became active.
4. Yes, because the assets were used in the partnership business.
5. Yes, because Zedrick failed to file a timely return without reasonable cause.

Court's Reasoning

The court analyzed the transaction as a whole, finding the purported loan lacked traditional loan characteristics such as interest and security. The court noted the interdependence between the loan and the lease, with repayment schedules coinciding exactly with rental payments, and concluded that the $100,000 was advance rental income. For the portion attributable to Blue Flame, the court applied the step transaction doctrine, treating the payment as a dividend to Zedrick as the sole shareholder. The bad debt reserve deduction was allowed under section 166(g), as the accounts receivable arose from sales in the ordinary course of business. The court found that the lumber business operated as a partnership because the corporation never became active, thus allowing Zedrick to deduct partnership losses. The court also upheld the additions to tax for late filing, finding no reasonable cause for Zedrick's delay.

Practical Implications

This decision emphasizes the importance of the economic substance of transactions over their form, particularly in distinguishing between loans and advance payments. It instructs practitioners to carefully structure transactions to avoid unintended tax consequences. The ruling on section 166(g) clarifies that bad debt reserves can be deducted for the sale of receivables with recourse, regardless of whether the sale was in the ordinary course of business at the time of sale. The case also highlights the need to clearly establish the operational status of a business entity, as the court will look to actual business operations rather than formalities in determining tax treatment. Later cases have cited this decision in analyzing similar transactions, particularly those involving purported loans linked to lease payments.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.