Brittingham v. Commissioner, 66 T. C. 373 (1976)

For tax purposes, related companies are not considered controlled by the same interests if there is no common design to shift income between them.

Summary

Dallas Ceramic Co. purchased tile from Ceramica Regiomontana, a Mexican company owned by Juan Brittingham and his family. The IRS claimed that the price paid was inflated due to common control, seeking to adjust Dallas Ceramic's income under Section 482. The Tax Court found no common control between the companies, as Robert Brittingham and his family, who owned Dallas Ceramic, had no interest in Ceramica. The court also determined the price was arm's-length, rejecting the IRS's use of customs values. Additional issues included unreported income and penalties for Juan and Roberta Brittingham.

Facts

Robert and Juan Brittingham, along with their families, owned equal shares in Dallas Ceramic Co. , a Texas corporation. Juan and his family owned Ceramica Regiomontana, a Mexican tile manufacturer. Dallas Ceramic purchased tile from Ceramica at a price higher than the U. S. customs value. The IRS argued that the companies were controlled by the same interests, justifying an income adjustment under Section 482. The court examined the ownership and control of both companies, the pricing of the tile, and the tax implications for the Brittinghams.

Procedural History

The IRS issued deficiency notices to Dallas Ceramic and the Brittinghams for the years 1963-1966, asserting adjustments under Section 482 and penalties for unreported income and fraud. Dallas Ceramic challenged the 1966 deficiency in U. S. District Court, which found in favor of the IRS. The Tax Court consolidated the cases of Dallas Ceramic, Robert, Juan, and Roberta Brittingham, ruling on the Section 482 allocation and related tax issues.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Dallas Ceramic and Ceramica were owned or controlled by the same interests under Section 482.
2. Whether the price Dallas Ceramic paid for Ceramica's tile was an arm's-length price.
3. Whether fraud penalties applied to Dallas Ceramic for the years 1963-1965.
4. Whether the 40-percent checks issued by Dallas Ceramic to Ceramica constituted unreported income for Robert Brittingham.
5. Whether Juan Brittingham had unreported U. S. -source income from the 40-percent checks.
6. Whether Juan Brittingham's tax returns were true and accurate, affecting his

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. | 1

deductions and credits.
7. Whether Juan Brittingham received a constructive dividend from the sale of property by Dallas Ceramic to his son-in-law.
8. Whether Roberta Brittingham was a resident alien during 1960-1966, and if her failure to file returns was due to reasonable cause.

Holding

1. No, because there was no common design to shift income between the companies, despite family ownership.
2. Yes, because the price was reasonable given the tile's quality and market position, not comparable to customs values.
3. No, because the IRS failed to provide clear and convincing evidence of fraud.
4. No, because the checks were payments for tile, not income to Robert Brittingham.
5. No, because the checks were not diverted to Juan's personal use and would not constitute U. S. -source income.
6. No, because Juan omitted material income, disqualifying his returns as true and accurate.
7. Yes, because Juan influenced the below-market sale of property to his son-in-law, resulting in a constructive dividend.
8. Yes, Roberta was a resident alien; no, her failure to file was not due to reasonable cause.

Court's Reasoning

The court determined that Section 482 did not apply because there was no common design to shift income between Dallas Ceramic and Ceramica, despite family connections. The price Dallas Ceramic paid for the tile was deemed arm's-length, as it reflected the tile's superior quality and market position compared to other Mexican tiles. The court rejected the IRS's use of customs values as an inaccurate measure of the tile's value. Regarding Juan Brittingham, his tax returns were not considered true and accurate due to omitted income, justifying the disallowance of deductions and credits. The court found a constructive dividend to Juan from the below-market sale of property to his son-in-law, influenced by Juan. Roberta Brittingham was deemed a resident alien due to her long-term presence in the U. S. , and her failure to file returns was not excused by reasonable cause.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that mere family ownership does not constitute control under Section 482 without evidence of income shifting. It emphasizes the importance of using appropriate comparables in determining arm's-length prices, rejecting the automatic use of customs values. Taxpayers must ensure their returns are true and accurate, as material omissions can disqualify deductions and credits. The ruling on constructive dividends highlights the need to consider indirect benefits to shareholders. For residency determinations, long-term physical presence in the U. S.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

can establish alien residency, impacting worldwide income taxation. Practitioners should advise clients on these principles when dealing with related-party transactions, tax return accuracy, and residency status.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.