

Strong v. Commissioner, 66 T. C. 12 (1976)

A corporation with a business purpose, even if minimal, must be recognized as a separate taxable entity and cannot be disregarded for tax purposes.

Summary

Partners in Heritage Village Apartments Co. formed a corporation to secure financing for an apartment complex at an interest rate exceeding New York's usury limit for individuals. The corporation held title to the property and facilitated the loans. The IRS argued the corporation's losses should be attributed to it, not the partnership. The Tax Court held that the corporation, despite being a mere tool for circumventing usury laws, had a business purpose and engaged in sufficient activities to be recognized as a separate taxable entity. Therefore, the losses were the corporation's, not the partnership's.

Facts

The partners of Heritage Village Apartments Co. formed Heritage Village, Inc. in 1967 to secure financing for an apartment complex at interest rates above the New York usury limit for individuals. The corporation held title to the property, obtained loans, and engaged in related activities. The partnership agreement allowed the corporation to act as a nominee for the partnership. The corporation borrowed money, mortgaged the property, and disbursed loan proceeds. The partnership reported net operating losses from the project, which the IRS challenged, asserting the losses belonged to the corporation.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies in the partners' individual tax returns for the years 1968 and 1969, attributing the net operating losses to the corporation. The partners petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which consolidated their cases. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the IRS, holding that the corporation was a separate taxable entity and the losses were its, not the partnership's.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the corporation, formed to circumvent New York usury laws, should be disregarded for tax purposes as a mere nominee of the partnership?

Holding

1. No, because the corporation had a business purpose and engaged in activities sufficient to be recognized as a separate taxable entity under the principles established in *Moline Properties v. Commissioner*.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court applied the principle from *Moline Properties v. Commissioner* that a corporation must be recognized as a separate taxable entity if it has a business purpose or engages in business activity. The court found that avoiding state usury laws was a valid business purpose. The corporation's activities, such as borrowing money, mortgaging property, and disbursing loan proceeds, were deemed sufficient business activities. The court distinguished this case from others where corporations were disregarded as mere titleholders, noting the corporation here did more than hold title. The court also considered the corporation's separate insurance policy and the creation of mutual easements, which would not have been possible if the corporation were merely a nominee. The court concluded that the corporation's existence could not be ignored for tax purposes, and the losses belonged to the corporation.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores that even a corporation formed for a limited purpose, such as circumventing usury laws, must be recognized as a separate taxable entity if it engages in any business activity. Practitioners should be cautious in structuring transactions involving nominee corporations, as the IRS will closely scrutinize attempts to disregard corporate entities for tax purposes. The case illustrates that the corporation's activities need not be extensive; even minimal business activity can lead to recognition as a separate entity. This ruling may affect how similar cases involving nominee corporations are analyzed, emphasizing the importance of the corporation's business purpose and activities. Subsequent cases and IRS rulings have continued to refine the boundaries of when a corporation can be disregarded for tax purposes.