Henry Schwartz Corp. v. Commissioner, 60 T. C. 728 (1973)

The cash surrender value of a life insurance policy received as part of the consideration in a stock sale transaction is taxable as long-term capital gain, not ordinary income.

Summary

Henry and Sydell Schwartz sold all shares of five corporations they controlled to Suval Industries, Inc. , receiving $850,000 and a life insurance policy on Henry's life valued at $30,000. The Tax Court determined that the policy was part of the stock sale consideration, thus its cash surrender value should be taxed as long-term capital gain. The court upheld a negligence penalty for failing to report this income and disallowed corporate deductions for travel, entertainment, and depreciation due to insufficient substantiation, treating parts as constructive dividends to Henry and Sydell. The court also disallowed a business loss and upheld the Commissioner's determination of reasonable compensation for Henry's part-time work.

Facts

Henry and Sydell Schwartz owned all the stock in five corporations. They sold these shares to Suval Industries, Inc. , for $850,000, adjusted for the book value of the assets. Additionally, they received a life insurance policy on Henry's life, which was not listed on the corporations' books and had a cash surrender value of approximately $30,000. Henry Schwartz Corp. , a corporation previously owned by Henry and Sydell, claimed deductions for travel, entertainment, and depreciation of an automobile used by Henry for both business and personal purposes. The corporation also claimed a business loss related to investments in other companies, and Henry received compensation from the corporation.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in the Schwartzes' and Henry Schwartz Corp. 's income taxes, including the cash surrender value of the life insurance policy as ordinary income, imposing a negligence penalty, and disallowing various deductions claimed by the corporation. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determinations on the life insurance policy's tax treatment and the negligence penalty, disallowed the deductions for travel, entertainment, and depreciation due to insufficient substantiation, and rejected the claimed business loss due to lack of proof.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the cash surrender value of a life insurance policy received by Henry Schwartz in connection with the sale of corporate stock should be taxed as ordinary income or long-term capital gain.
2. Whether the failure to report the cash surrender value of the life insurance policy

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

constituted negligence under Section 6653(a).
3. Whether Henry Schwartz Corp. was entitled to deductions for travel, entertainment, and depreciation expenses.
4. Whether portions of the disallowed deductions should be treated as constructive dividends to Henry and Sydell Schwartz.
5. Whether Henry Schwartz Corp. could deduct a business loss related to investments in other companies.
6. Whether the compensation paid to Henry Schwartz by Henry Schwartz Corp. was reasonable.
7. Whether certain disallowed deductions should be considered in computing the dividends paid deduction for personal holding company tax purposes.

Holding

1. No, because the life insurance policy was part of the consideration for the stock sale, its cash surrender value should be taxed as long-term capital gain.
2. Yes, because the failure to report the cash surrender value of the policy as income constituted negligence under Section 6653(a).
3. No, because the corporation failed to substantiate the travel, entertainment, and depreciation expenses under Section 274(d).
4. Yes, because portions of the disallowed deductions represented personal benefits to Henry and Sydell Schwartz, they should be treated as constructive dividends.
5. No, because the corporation failed to establish the amount and timing of the alleged business loss.
6. No, because the Commissioner's determination of reasonable compensation for Henry's part-time efforts was upheld as reasonable under the circumstances.
7. Yes, for travel and entertainment expenses, but no, for the disallowed portions of compensation to Henry, as these were preferential dividends under Section 562(c).

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the life insurance policy was part of the stock sale consideration based on the agreement between the parties, which specified that Suval would deliver the policy to Henry and release any interest therein. The court distinguished this case from others where policies were not part of the sale consideration, citing *Mayer v. Donnelly*. The negligence penalty was upheld because Henry, an experienced businessman, failed to report the policy's value despite recognizing its significance in the sale agreement. The court disallowed the deductions for travel, entertainment, and depreciation due to the corporation's failure to substantiate them under Section 274(d), although some expenses were deemed ordinary and necessary, resulting in constructive dividends for the remainder. The business loss was disallowed due to lack of proof of the amount and timing of the loss. The court upheld the Commissioner's determination of reasonable compensation for Henry's part-time work, considering the corporation's passive income and Henry's other business activities. Finally, the court allowed a dividends paid deduction for travel and entertainment expenses but not for the disallowed

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

compensation, as it constituted a preferential dividend under Section 562(c).

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that life insurance policies received as part of stock sale considerations should be treated as capital gains, not ordinary income, affecting how such transactions are structured and reported. It also reinforces the importance of proper substantiation for corporate deductions under Section 274(d), as failure to do so can result in disallowed deductions and potential constructive dividends to shareholders. The ruling emphasizes the need for detailed record-keeping and substantiation to support business expense deductions, particularly in closely held corporations. It also highlights the need for careful documentation of business losses to ensure deductibility. Finally, it underscores the IRS's scrutiny of compensation in closely held corporations, requiring that such compensation be reasonable in light of the services rendered and the corporation's financial situation.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.