Hassen v. Commissioner, 63 T. C. 175 (1974)

Loss deductions are disallowed for indirect sales between related parties even if the transaction involves an intermediary.

Summary

In Hassen v. Commissioner, the Tax Court disallowed a loss deduction claimed by Erwin and Birdie Hassen on the foreclosure of their community property, Golden State Hospital. The property was foreclosed upon by Pacific Thrift & Loan Co. , which then sold it to U. L. C. , a corporation controlled by the Hassens. The court ruled that this constituted an indirect sale between related parties under IRC § 267(a)(1), disallowing the loss deduction. The decision hinged on the pre-arranged nature of the transaction, where Pacific Thrift agreed to give the Hassens or their designate the first right to repurchase the property, maintaining their economic interest despite the intermediary sale.

Facts

In 1955, Erwin and Birdie Hassen purchased Golden State Hospital as community property. They defaulted on a loan secured by the property, leading Pacific Thrift & Loan Co. to foreclose on May 31, 1961. Before the foreclosure, Pacific Thrift's officer promised Erwin Hassen that if Pacific Thrift bought the property, the Hassens or their designate would have the first right to repurchase it for the note's outstanding balance plus costs. U. L. C. , a family-controlled corporation, entered an escrow agreement on June 5, 1961, to purchase the property from Pacific Thrift, completing the purchase on August 30, 1961. The Hassens claimed a loss deduction on their 1961 tax return, which was challenged by the Commissioner.

Procedural History

The Hassens filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court after the Commissioner disallowed their loss deduction. The Tax Court consolidated several related cases involving the Hassens and their corporations. The court's decision focused on whether the transaction constituted an indirect sale under IRC § 267(a)(1), ultimately disallowing the deduction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether IRC § 267(a)(1) prohibits the Hassens from deducting a loss on the foreclosure of Golden State Hospital, where the property was indirectly sold to U. L. C. , a related party.

Holding

1. Yes, because the transaction constituted an indirect sale between the Hassens and U. L. C. , related parties under IRC § 267(b)(2), and no genuine economic loss

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

was realized due to the pre-arranged nature of the sale.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the principles from McWilliams v. Commissioner, which established that indirect sales between related parties are disallowed unless there is a genuine economic loss. The court found that the Hassens’ economic interest in Golden State Hospital continued uninterrupted despite the intermediary sale to Pacific Thrift, as evidenced by the pre-arranged agreement allowing U. L. C. to purchase the property. The court rejected the Hassens’ arguments that the transactions were separate and independent, emphasizing that the intent to retain economic interest negated any real loss. The court also distinguished this case from McNeill and McCarty, where no pre-arrangement existed to retain investment, and followed the reasoning in Merritt v. Commissioner, which supported the disallowance of loss deductions in similar circumstances.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how tax practitioners analyze transactions involving related parties and intermediaries. It underscores the importance of evaluating the economic substance of transactions rather than their legal form, particularly when assessing loss deductions. Practitioners must be cautious in structuring transactions to avoid disallowance under IRC § 267(a)(1), ensuring that any sales or transfers result in genuine economic losses. The case also highlights the need to consider pre-arrangements and the continuity of economic interest in related party transactions. Subsequent cases have cited Hassen to reinforce the principle that indirect sales between related parties, even through intermediaries, are subject to scrutiny under IRC § 267.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.