Nicholls, North, Buse Co. v. Commissioner, 56 T. C. 1225 (1971)

The court held that strict substantiation requirements under Section 274 must be met for corporate entertainment expenses to be deductible, and personal use of corporate facilities may result in a constructive dividend.

Summary

Nicholls, North, Buse Co. purchased a yacht, *Pea Picker III*, for purported business use but failed to substantiate its business purpose as required by Section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code. The court disallowed deductions for depreciation, operating expenses, and investment credit due to inadequate substantiation. Additionally, the court ruled that the personal use of the yacht by the controlling shareholder's son constituted a constructive dividend to the shareholder, measured by the yacht's fair rental value for the period of use rather than its purchase price.

Facts

Nicholls, North, Buse Co. , a Wisconsin corporation, purchased the yacht *Pea Picker III* with corporate funds in 1964. The yacht was used for both business and personal purposes, with the latter including use by the president's sons. The company claimed deductions for depreciation, operating expenses, and investment credit related to the yacht. The president of the company, Herbert Resenhoeft, owned a majority of the voting stock and allowed his sons to use the yacht without restriction. The company maintained a log of the yacht's use, but it did not adequately document business purposes for most occasions.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deductions and asserted a deficiency against the company and Resenhoeft, arguing that the yacht's use constituted a constructive dividend to Resenhoeft. The case was heard in the United States Tax Court, which upheld the Commissioner's disallowance of deductions and found that Resenhoeft received a constructive dividend based on the yacht's fair rental value for the period of personal use.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the taxpayer corporation met the substantiation requirements of Section 274 for the depreciation, operating expenses, and investment credit related to the yacht.
2. Whether the personal use of the yacht by the shareholder's son constituted a constructive dividend to the controlling shareholder.
3. Whether the measure of the constructive dividend should be the yacht's purchase price or its fair rental value for the period of personal use.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the taxpayer failed to provide adequate substantiation of the business purpose for the yacht's use as required by Section 274.
2. Yes, because the controlling shareholder's decision to allow his son to use the yacht for personal purposes constituted a constructive dividend to the shareholder.
3. The fair rental value for the period of personal use, not the purchase price, because the yacht was owned by the corporation.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied Section 274, which requires strict substantiation of business entertainment expenses. The taxpayer's log failed to document business discussions or purposes for most occasions of yacht use, and the court rejected the argument that the mere presence of business-related guests was sufficient circumstantial evidence of business purpose. The court also considered the assignment of income doctrine from *Helvering v. Horst*, holding that Resenhoeft's control over the yacht's acquisition and use by his son constituted a constructive dividend to him. The court chose the fair rental value as the measure of the dividend, citing cases where corporate ownership of an asset precluded using the purchase price as the measure of a constructive dividend.

Practical Implications

This case underscores the importance of meticulous record-keeping and substantiation for corporate entertainment expenses. Businesses must maintain detailed logs that document the specific business purpose of each use of an entertainment facility to meet the requirements of Section 274. The decision also serves as a reminder that personal use of corporate assets by shareholders, especially those in control, can result in constructive dividends, with the fair rental value as the likely measure. Legal practitioners should advise clients on the necessity of clear policies and documentation regarding the use of corporate assets to avoid unintended tax consequences. Subsequent cases have continued to apply these principles, reinforcing the need for strict compliance with substantiation rules.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.