Troy State University v. Commissioner, 62 T. C. 493 (1974)

Income from liquidation of a state-owned corporation is not exempt from federal taxation under either IRC Section 115(a)(1) or constitutional limitations on federal taxing power.

Summary

In Troy State University v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that the gain realized from the liquidation of Beard Memorial Hospital, Inc. , which was owned by Troy State University, was not exempt from federal taxation. The university argued that the income should be excluded under IRC Section 115(a)(1) and constitutional protections for state instrumentalities. The court, however, found that the gain did not 'accrue' to the state and the hospital's activities were not an 'essential governmental function. ' This decision clarified that state ownership of a corporation does not automatically exempt its income from federal taxes, especially when the income arises from activities not central to state governance.

Facts

Beard Memorial Hospital, Inc. , was a corporation that owned and rented hospital facilities to two physicians, Colley and Stewart, who also owned all of its stock. In 1966, they transferred the stock to Troy State University, which was managed and controlled by the Alabama State Board of Education. Immediately after the transfer, the university liquidated the hospital corporation, resulting in a taxable gain under IRC Section 1245 due to the recapture of depreciation deductions. The university argued that this gain should be exempt from federal taxation under IRC Section 115(a)(1) and constitutional principles.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that Troy State University was liable for a tax deficiency as the transferee of Beard Memorial Hospital, Inc. 's assets. The case was heard by the United States Tax Court, where the university challenged the taxability of the gain from the hospital's liquidation.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the gain realized by Beard Memorial Hospital, Inc. , upon its liquidation is excludable from gross income under IRC Section 115(a)(1).

2. Whether the gain is exempt from federal taxation under constitutional limitations on the federal power to tax state instrumentalities.

Holding

1. No, because the gain did not 'accrue' to the State of Alabama through the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

university, and the hospital's activities were not an 'essential governmental function' under IRC Section 115(a)(1).

2. No, because the hospital's activities were not essential governmental functions and any burden on the state from the tax was speculative and uncertain.

Court's Reasoning

The court analyzed the statutory language of IRC Section 115(a)(1), which requires income to 'accrue' to a state to be exempt. The court found that the gain did not 'accrue' to the state because the hospital was a separate legal entity, and its earnings did not directly benefit the state treasury. Furthermore, the court examined the legislative history and case law, determining that 'essential governmental functions' are those necessary for the state's operation, not those that could be performed by private entities. The court cited cases like *Flint v. Stone Tracy Co.* and *Helvering v. Therrell* to support its conclusion that the hospital's operation was not an essential governmental function. The court also considered the possibility that the tax could be absorbed by private parties, further undermining the university's claim of constitutional exemption.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for the taxation of income generated by state-owned corporations. It establishes that mere state ownership does not automatically confer tax exemption on a corporation's income, particularly when that income arises from activities not central to state governance. Legal practitioners should carefully analyze the nature of a state-owned entity's activities when advising on potential tax exemptions. The decision also impacts how state universities and other state instrumentalities structure their acquisitions and liquidations of assets, as they must consider the tax implications of such transactions. Subsequent cases have cited Troy State University to distinguish between essential governmental functions and those that are not, influencing the application of IRC Section 115(a)(1) and constitutional tax immunity principles.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.