

***Telephone Answering Service Co. , Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 63 T. C. 423 (1974)***

Section 337 nonrecognition of gain applies only if a corporation's complete liquidation results in the termination of the corporate entity and the cessation of business operations in corporate form.

**Summary**

TASCO sold its subsidiary's stock and liquidated, attempting to apply Section 337 to avoid recognizing the gain. The court held that the transaction did not qualify for nonrecognition because TASCO's business continued uninterrupted through a new subsidiary, New TASCO, with substantial continuity of shareholder interest. The decision emphasized that Section 337 requires a genuine cessation of the corporate business, not merely a transfer to a new entity controlled by the same shareholders.

**Facts**

TASCO owned Houston and North American, operating telephone-answering services. In 1966, TASCO sold Houston's stock to General Waterworks, realizing a gain. TASCO then transferred its assets to a new subsidiary, New TASCO, and distributed its shares along with cash and North American's stock to its shareholders, claiming a complete liquidation under Section 337. New TASCO continued TASCO's business without interruption, with the same shareholders and operations.

**Procedural History**

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in TASCO's tax returns for 1965 and 1966, asserting that the gain from the Houston stock sale was taxable. TASCO petitioned the Tax Court, arguing that the sale was part of a complete liquidation under Section 337. The Tax Court ruled against TASCO, holding that the transaction did not meet the requirements of Section 337.

**Issue(s)**

1. Whether the sale of Houston's stock by TASCO qualified for nonrecognition of gain under Section 337 because it was part of a complete liquidation.

**Holding**

1. No, because the transaction did not result in a complete liquidation as required by Section 337. TASCO's business continued through New TASCO, with substantial continuity of shareholder interest.

**Court's Reasoning**

The court reasoned that Section 337 requires a bona fide elimination of the corporate entity and cessation of business in corporate form. The continuity of TASCOT's business through New TASCOT, with over 84% of the same shareholders, indicated that the transaction was not a genuine liquidation but a mere shift of assets. The court emphasized that Congress intended Section 337 to apply only when the shareholders disassociated from the business in corporate form. The court distinguished this case from others where liquidation-reincorporation transactions were upheld due to insufficient shareholder continuity or the cessation of the business. The dissent argued that the transaction should be treated as a liquidation, criticizing the majority's focus on shareholder continuity.

### **Practical Implications**

This decision clarifies that for Section 337 to apply, a corporation must genuinely liquidate and cease its business operations in corporate form. It impacts how similar transactions should be structured to avoid recognition of gain, requiring careful consideration of the continuity of business and shareholder interest. Practitioners must ensure that the liquidation results in a cessation of the corporate business, not just a transfer to another entity controlled by the same shareholders. The ruling has implications for tax planning in corporate liquidations, emphasizing the need for a substantive end to the corporate entity. Subsequent cases have applied this ruling to similar scenarios, reinforcing the requirement for a genuine liquidation.