Benjamin v. Commissioner, 66 T. C. 1084 (1976)

A partial redemption of stock by a corporation is treated as a dividend if it does not meaningfully reduce the shareholder's proportionate interest in the corporation.

Summary

In Benjamin v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled on a 1964 redemption of 2,000 shares of Starmount's class A preferred stock owned by Blanche Benjamin, the majority shareholder. The court held the redemption was essentially equivalent to a dividend because it did not meaningfully reduce her interest in the corporation, as she retained all voting control. The decision underscores that for a redemption to be treated as a sale rather than a dividend, it must effect a significant change in the shareholder's ownership or control. Additionally, the court addressed the statute of limitations, the validity of IRS inspections, and the tax implications of corporate payments for personal expenses.

Facts

Blanche Benjamin owned all of Starmount Corporation's voting preferred stock. In 1964, Starmount redeemed 2,000 shares of her class A preferred stock for $200,000, which was credited to accounts extinguishing debts owed to the corporation. Blanche retained control over Starmount after the redemption. The corporation also made payments for the maintenance of Blanche's residence and her sons' country club dues. The IRS determined deficiencies for 1961 and 1964, asserting the redemption was a dividend and the residence maintenance payments were taxable income to Blanche.

Procedural History

The IRS assessed tax deficiencies against Blanche and her husband Edward for 1961 and 1964. The Benjamins petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination. The court consolidated their cases and ruled that the 1964 redemption was taxable as a dividend, the statute of limitations was not a bar, and the IRS did not violate inspection rules. The court also held that maintenance payments for the Benjamins' residence were taxable income, but not the sons' country club dues.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the 1964 redemption of 2,000 shares of Starmount's class A preferred stock from Blanche Benjamin was "essentially equivalent to a dividend" under IRC § 302(b)(1)?
2. Whether the assessment of a deficiency against Blanche and/or Edward Benjamin was barred by the statute of limitations under IRC § 6501(a)?
3. Whether the deficiency determination was the product of an invalid second inspection of the Benjamins' books of account under IRC § 7605(b)?
4. Whether amounts expended by Starmount for the upkeep of the Benjamins'

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

residence and their sons' country club dues were includable in the Benjamins' taxable income?

Holding

1. Yes, because the redemption did not meaningfully reduce Blanche's interest in Starmount as she retained all voting control.
2. No, because the omitted income exceeded 25% of the reported gross income, extending the limitations period to 6 years under IRC § 6501(e).
3. No, because there was no second inspection of the Benjamins' books of account.
4. Yes, for the residence maintenance, as it constituted a constructive dividend; No, for the country club dues, as they benefited the sons, not the Benjamins directly.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the Supreme Court's test from United States v. Davis, requiring a meaningful reduction in the shareholder's interest for a redemption to qualify as a sale. Blanche's retention of absolute voting control post-redemption negated any meaningful reduction in her interest. The court rejected arguments based on the 1950 agreement between Blanche and her sons, finding it did not constitute a firm plan to redeem her stock. The court also dismissed arguments about the statute of limitations and IRS inspection rules, finding the deficiency was timely and no second inspection occurred. Regarding the corporate payments, the court distinguished between the personal benefit of residence maintenance, which was taxable, and the sons' country club dues, which were not.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that redemptions by a majority shareholder must result in a significant change in ownership or control to avoid being treated as dividends. Practitioners should ensure clients understand that retaining voting control post-redemption is likely to result in dividend treatment. The case also emphasizes the importance of precise agreements when structuring stock redemptions to qualify for sale treatment. For tax planning, this decision highlights the need to carefully consider the tax implications of corporate payments for personal expenses, distinguishing between direct benefits to shareholders and benefits to other parties. Subsequent cases have cited Benjamin for its application of the "meaningful reduction" test and its analysis of constructive dividends.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.