Templeton v. Commissioner, 66 T. C. 509 (1976)

A taxpayer does not qualify for nonrecognition of gain under IRC Section 1033 if stock is purchased without the primary purpose of replacing condemned property.

Summary

In Templeton v. Commissioner, the court addressed whether the taxpayer could defer recognition of gain from condemned property by investing in stock of a corporation that owned similar property. Frank Templeton formed T. P. T. , Inc. , and transferred condemnation proceeds to it in exchange for stock, which T. P. T. then used to buy property from Templeton and his family. The court held that Templeton did not meet the requirements of Section 1033(a)(3)(A) because the primary purpose of the stock acquisition was not to replace the condemned property, but rather to facilitate transactions among family members. This ruling emphasizes the importance of the taxpayer's intent and the substance of transactions in applying tax relief provisions.

Facts

In 1947, Frank Templeton purchased the White tract, and in 1954, he and his wife bought the Thomas tract. After his wife's death in 1963, Templeton inherited her interests and gifted portions to his children. In 1969, learning of an impending condemnation of part of the White tract, Templeton formed T. P. T. , Inc. , and transferred part of the Thomas tract to it in exchange for stock. Following the condemnation, Templeton transferred the proceeds to T. P. T. for more stock, which T. P. T. used to buy property from Templeton and his children.

Procedural History

Templeton and his wife filed a petition in the U. S. Tax Court challenging the Commissioner's determination of income tax deficiencies for the years 1969, 1970, and 1971. The Commissioner argued that Templeton did not qualify for nonrecognition of gain under Section 1033. The Tax Court ruled in favor of the Commissioner, holding that Templeton's stock purchase did not meet the statutory requirements for nonrecognition of gain.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Frank Templeton's purchase of T. P. T. , Inc. stock qualified as a replacement of condemned property under IRC Section 1033(a)(3)(A).

Holding

1. No, because Templeton did not purchase the stock for the primary purpose of replacing the condemned property; instead, the transactions facilitated the movement of funds among family members.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court emphasized that Section 1033 is a relief provision intended to allow taxpayers to replace involuntarily converted property without recognizing gain, provided the proceeds are used to purchase replacement property. The court found that Templeton’s transactions did not meet this requirement because the primary purpose was not to replace the condemned land but to facilitate transactions among family members. The court noted that shortly after receiving the condemnation proceeds, T. P. T. used a significant portion to buy property from Templeton and his family, effectively returning the funds to them. This circular flow of money indicated that the stock purchase was not primarily for replacement purposes. The court distinguished this case from John Richard Corp. , where the stock purchase was directly linked to replacing the converted property. The court also stressed the need to look at the substance of the transactions, citing cases like Gregory v. Helvering and Commissioner v. Tower, which support examining the true nature of transactions beyond their form.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of the taxpayer’s intent and the substance of transactions when applying Section 1033. Practitioners must ensure that any reinvestment of condemnation proceeds is genuinely for the purpose of replacing the converted property, not merely for tax avoidance or to facilitate other transactions. The ruling suggests that circular transactions among related parties may be scrutinized, and taxpayers should be cautious about using corporate structures to achieve nonrecognition of gain if the primary purpose is not replacement. This case has been cited in subsequent decisions to emphasize the requirement of a direct link between the condemnation proceeds and the replacement property. It also highlights the need for clear documentation of the taxpayer’s intent to replace the condemned property to support any claim for nonrecognition of gain under Section 1033.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.