Merritt Dredging Co. v. Commissioner, 50 T. C. 733 (1968)

A corporation formed for legitimate business purposes, such as limiting liability, will not be deemed created for the principal purpose of tax evasion or avoidance under Section 269.

Summary

In Merritt Dredging Co. v. Commissioner, the Tax Court upheld the separate incorporation of three dredging entities, ruling that their formation was driven by legitimate business concerns rather than tax evasion. The Merritts formed Dredge Clinton, Inc. , Dredge Cherokee, Inc. , and Southern Dredging Corp. to limit liability as their business shifted to more hazardous operations. Despite potential tax benefits, the court found that tax avoidance was not the principal purpose, emphasizing the importance of business judgment in corporate structuring decisions.

Facts

Richard and Duane Merritt, owners of Merritt Dredging Co. , formed three new corporations: Dredge Clinton, Inc. , Dredge Cherokee, Inc. , and Southern Dredging Corp. This restructuring followed a significant change in their business from millpond work to more hazardous open-harbor dredging. The new corporations were formed to limit liability, particularly after the sale of a partner's interest, which required the separate incorporation of dredges. Additionally, concerns about potential harm to Merritt Dredging Co. 's reputation and the acquisition of a portable dredge for inland operations motivated the formation of Southern Dredging Corp.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue challenged the formation of these corporations under Section 269, arguing that the principal purpose was to evade federal income tax by securing multiple surtax exemptions. The case was heard by the Tax Court, which after trial and extensive testimony from Richard Merritt, ruled in favor of the petitioners, holding that the corporations were not formed primarily for tax evasion purposes.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioners were incorporated for the principal purpose of evasion or avoidance of Federal income tax by securing the benefit of the surtax exemption, under Section 269.

Holding

1. No, because the court found that the principal purpose of forming the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

corporations was not tax evasion or avoidance but rather a legitimate business purpose of limiting liability.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied Section 269, which allows the disallowance of tax benefits if the principal purpose of acquiring control over a corporation is tax evasion or avoidance. The court’s analysis focused on the intent behind the formation of the corporations, as articulated by Richard Merritt’s testimony and corroborating evidence. The court emphasized that the Merritts’ primary concern was to protect against increased liability due to the shift to more hazardous dredging operations. The court cited precedents like Tidewater Hulls, Inc. v. United States, which upheld the validity of limiting liability as a business purpose for separate incorporation. The court also noted that the sharing of resources among the corporations did not negate their separate existence for liability purposes. The court rejected the Commissioner’s arguments, finding no evidence that tax avoidance was the principal purpose, and concluded that the Merritts’ decisions were driven by prudent business judgment.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of demonstrating legitimate business purposes in corporate structuring to avoid the application of Section 269. For attorneys, it highlights the need to document and articulate clear business reasons for forming new entities, especially when tax benefits might accrue. Businesses operating in hazardous industries should consider the liability benefits of separate incorporation, as supported by this case. The ruling may encourage companies to structure their operations to limit liability, knowing that such structuring, when properly justified, will not be deemed tax evasion. Subsequent cases, like Airport Grove Corp of Polk County v. United States, have cited Merritt Dredging in affirming the significance of business purpose over tax avoidance in corporate formation decisions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.