Litton Business Systems, Inc. v. Commissioner, 61 T. C. 367, 1973 U. S. Tax Ct. LEXIS 3, 61 T. C. No. 42 (T. C. 1973)

An intercompany advance can be considered a bona fide debt for tax purposes if it reflects a genuine debtor-creditor relationship and not merely an equity investment.

Summary

Litton Business Systems, Inc. (Litton) created a subsidiary, New Eureka, to acquire the assets of Old Eureka through a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code. Litton transferred its stock to New Eureka, part of which was treated as a capital contribution and part as a sale, creating an advance account. The IRS challenged the interest deductions on this account, arguing it was equity rather than debt. The Tax Court held that the advance account was a bona fide debt, allowing New Eureka to deduct interest expenses. The decision hinged on the economic reality of the transaction, including the financial stability of Old Eureka, the terms of the advance, and the parties' consistent treatment of the account as debt.

Facts

In 1961, Litton Industries, Inc. (Litton) entered into a reorganization agreement with Old Eureka, a successful specialty printing company, to acquire its assets in exchange for Litton stock. To facilitate this, Litton created a wholly owned subsidiary, New Eureka, which was capitalized with $1,000 and then transferred Litton stock valued at $28,542,802. 50. Of this, $9,227,385. 19 was treated as a capital contribution, while $19,315,417. 31 was treated as a sale, creating an advance account. New Eureka used the stock to acquire Old Eureka's assets. The advance account bore interest at 5. 25% and was evidenced on both companies' books. New Eureka made regular principal and interest payments, reducing the account balance over time despite some readvances from Litton.

Procedural History

The IRS issued a notice of deficiency disallowing New Eureka's interest expense deductions on the advance account, arguing it was equity rather than debt. Litton Business Systems, Inc. , as the successor to New Eureka, petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination. The Tax Court upheld the validity of the advance account as a bona fide debt, allowing the interest deductions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the transfer of $19,315,417. 31 in Litton stock from Litton to New Eureka created a bona fide debt obligation, allowing New Eureka to deduct interest expenses on the advance account.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. Yes, because the advance account was treated as a debt by both parties, evidenced by formal documentation, regular payments, and the economic reality of the transaction, which included the financial stability of Old Eureka and the reasonable expectation of repayment.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court analyzed multiple factors to determine if the advance account was a bona fide debt, following the approach of the Ninth Circuit in A. R. Lantz Co. v. United States. The court looked beyond formal documentation to the economic reality and the parties' genuine intent to create a debt. Key considerations included:

- The formal documentation of the debt, though not conclusive, supported the claim of debt.
- The absence of a formal note was not significant, as the debt was evidenced on both companies' books and in correspondence.
- The advance was payable on demand, not subordinated to other creditors, and bore a reasonable interest rate.
- New Eureka's ability to obtain similar financing from outside sources suggested the terms were not a distortion of what would be available in an arm's-length transaction.
- The debt-to-equity ratio was relatively low at 2:1, countering suggestions of thin capitalization.
- The financial stability of Old Eureka and the expectation of continued success supported the likelihood of repayment.
- New Eureka's consistent payments and net reduction of the advance account balance over three years demonstrated adherence to a debtor-creditor relationship.
- Litton's 100% stock interest in New Eureka minimized the importance of the lack of a security interest.

The court concluded that the advance account was a bona fide debt, allowing New Eureka to deduct interest expenses.

Practical Implications

This decision provides guidance on how intercompany advances can be structured to qualify as debt for tax purposes:

- Similar cases should focus on the economic reality and the parties' genuine intent to create a debt, rather than just formal documentation.
- Regular payments and a net reduction of the debt balance can be strong indicators of a debtor-creditor relationship.
- Businesses should ensure that intercompany advances are not thinly capitalized and that the subsidiary has a reasonable expectation of repayment.
- The decision impacts how corporations structure their intercompany financing

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

to optimize tax benefits, particularly in reorganizations and acquisitions.
- Later cases, such as A. R. Lantz Co. v. United States, have applied similar reasoning in analyzing the debt-equity distinction for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.