Fehrs Finance Co. v. Commissioner, 58 T. C. 174 (1972)

A redemption of stock by a related corporation under IRC Section 304 does not qualify as an exchange if it is essentially equivalent to a dividend or fails to completely terminate the shareholder's interest.

Summary

Fehrs Finance Co. acquired stock from Edward and Violette Fehrs in exchange for annuities, then sold the stock to Fehrs Rental Co. , which canceled it. The court ruled that this was a redemption under IRC Section 304(a)(1) and not an exchange under Section 302(b) because the redemption did not meaningfully reduce the Fehrses' interest in the corporation and they failed to file the required agreement to waive attribution rules. Consequently, Fehrs Finance Co. 's basis in the stock was zero, resulting in a recognized gain of $100,000 in 1965 when it sold the stock to Fehrs Rental Co.

Facts

Edward J. Fehrs owned 1,223 shares of Fehrs Rental Co. (Rental), with his wife Violette owning 157 shares. In December 1964 and January 1965, Edward gifted some shares to family members. On February 28, 1965, Fehrs Finance Co. was incorporated with their daughters as shareholders. On March 1, 1965, Edward and Violette transferred their remaining shares to Fehrs Finance in exchange for lifetime annuities. Fehrs Finance sold these shares back to Rental the same day for $100,000 cash and a $625,000 note, and Rental canceled the shares.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a $32,459. 07 deficiency in Fehrs Finance's federal income tax for the year ending November 30, 1965, based on the sale of Rental's stock. Fehrs Finance contested this, leading to a trial before the U. S. Tax Court, where the court examined whether the transaction qualified as a redemption under IRC Section 304 and the tax implications thereof.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transaction in which Fehrs Finance obtained Rental's stock from Edward and Violette Fehrs constituted a redemption under IRC Section 304(a)(1)?
2. Whether such redemption qualified for treatment as an exchange under IRC Sections 302(b)(1) or 302(b)(3)?
3. What was Fehrs Finance's basis in the Rental stock for the year 1965?

Holding

1. Yes, because Edward and Violette Fehrs were in control of both Fehrs Finance and Rental, the transaction was treated as a redemption under IRC Section

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

304(a)(1).
2. No, because the redemption did not result in a meaningful reduction of the Fehrses' interest in Rental under Section 302(b)(1), and they did not file the required agreement to waive attribution rules under Section 302(b)(3).
3. Fehrs Finance's basis in the Rental stock was zero in 1965, because no gain was recognized by Edward and Violette Fehrs in that year, and future annuity payments' tax treatment could not be reliably predicted.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied IRC Section 304(a)(1), determining that Edward and Violette Fehrs were in control of both Fehrs Finance and Rental, treating the stock transfer as a redemption. The court rejected the argument that the transaction should be treated as an exchange under Section 302(b)(1), as the Fehrses' proportionate interest in Rental did not meaningfully change after the transaction. Additionally, the court found that the redemption did not qualify under Section 302(b)(3) because the Fehrses failed to file the required agreement to waive attribution rules. The court also noted that no distribution of property occurred in 1965, so no gain was recognized by the Fehrses in that year. Consequently, Fehrs Finance's basis in the stock remained zero, and it recognized a gain of $100,000 in 1965. The court emphasized that the tax treatment of future annuity payments would depend on circumstances in those years, not on Fehrs Finance's earnings and profits in 1965.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that stock redemptions by related corporations under IRC Section 304 must meet specific criteria to be treated as exchanges rather than dividends. Practitioners must carefully analyze whether a redemption meaningfully reduces the shareholder's interest and ensure compliance with filing requirements to waive attribution rules. The case also highlights the importance of considering the timing of gain recognition in transactions involving annuities, as future tax consequences may not be reliably predicted. Subsequent cases dealing with related-party stock redemptions should consider this precedent, particularly regarding the application of Sections 302 and 304. Businesses contemplating similar transactions should be aware of the potential tax implications and plan accordingly to avoid unintended tax consequences.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.