Union Bankers Ins. Co. v. Commissioner, 64 T. C. 807 (1975)

A subsidiary's purchase of its parent's stock from a shareholder is treated as a constructive dividend from the subsidiary to the parent and a redemption by the parent, and costs of acquiring insurance policies through reinsurance are amortizable over their estimated useful life.

Summary

In Union Bankers Ins. Co. v. Commissioner, the Tax Court addressed two primary issues: the tax implications of a subsidiary purchasing its parent's stock from a shareholder, and the amortization of costs associated with acquiring insurance policies through reinsurance agreements. The court held that such a stock purchase by a subsidiary results in a constructive dividend from the subsidiary to the parent, and a redemption by the parent. Additionally, the court ruled that the costs of acquiring blocks of accident and health insurance policies via reinsurance agreements are amortizable over their estimated useful life of seven years. These decisions clarify the tax treatment of intercorporate transactions and the treatment of intangible assets in the insurance industry.

Facts

Union Bankers Insurance Company (Union) and its subsidiary, Bankers Service Life Insurance Company (Bankers), were involved in two key transactions. First, Bankers purchased Union's stock from General Insurance Investment Co. (General), a shareholder of Union. Second, Union acquired various blocks of accident and health insurance policies from other insurance companies through reinsurance agreements, paying premiums for these acquisitions. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) challenged the tax treatment of these transactions, asserting that the stock purchase resulted in taxable dividends and distributions, and that the reinsurance costs should not be amortized.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of deficiency to Union for the years 1960-1967, asserting that Union was liable for deficiencies in its own taxes and as a transferee of Bankers. Union petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of these deficiencies. The court heard arguments on the tax implications of the stock purchase and the amortization of reinsurance costs.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the purchase by Bankers of Union's stock from General resulted in a constructive dividend from Bankers to Union and a redemption by Union?
2. Whether the distributions resulting from the stock purchase by Bankers and Union were taxable under section 815?
3. Whether Union is entitled to amortize the cost of acquiring blocks of accident and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

health insurance policies over their estimated useful life?

Holding

1. Yes, because under section 304(a)(2), the purchase by Bankers of Union's stock from General was treated as a constructive dividend from Bankers to Union and a redemption by Union.
2. Yes, because the stock purchase resulted in distributions from both Bankers and Union within the meaning of section 815, generating taxable income to the extent these distributions were charged to their respective policyholders surplus accounts.
3. Yes, because the cost of acquiring the insurance policies was amortizable over their reasonably estimated useful life of seven years, as supported by industry and Union's own experience.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied section 304(a)(2) to treat the stock purchase as a constructive dividend from Bankers to Union and a redemption by Union, emphasizing that this statutory provision was intended to prevent shareholders from obtaining favorable tax treatment by selling stock to a subsidiary rather than directly to the parent. The court rejected the argument that this treatment should only apply to the selling shareholder, finding no basis for such a limitation in the statute or legislative history. For the amortization issue, the court relied on section 1. 817-4(d) of the Income Tax Regulations, which allows amortization of costs over the reasonably estimated life of the contracts. The court determined that a seven-year life was reasonable based on Union's and industry experience, despite the IRS's contention that such policies had an indeterminate life. The court also dismissed the IRS's argument that only policies requiring additional reserves were amortizable, finding no such limitation in the regulations or case law.

Practical Implications

This decision has significant implications for corporate tax planning and the insurance industry. For corporations, it clarifies that indirect stock redemptions through subsidiaries are treated as constructive dividends and redemptions, affecting how such transactions should be structured and reported. For insurance companies, the ruling establishes that costs associated with acquiring insurance policies through reinsurance can be amortized, providing a clear method for calculating these deductions. This may influence how insurance companies approach acquisitions and their tax strategies. The decision also impacts how similar cases involving intercorporate transactions and intangible asset amortization are analyzed, and it has been cited in subsequent cases to support these principles.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.