Smith v. Commissioner, 70 T. C. 651 (1978)

Corporate redemptions of stock that satisfy a shareholder's unconditional personal obligation to purchase that stock result in constructive dividends to the shareholder.

Summary

Arthur Smith was unconditionally obligated under a 1960 stock purchase agreement to buy his father's estate's shares in family corporations. After his father's death, the corporations redeemed these shares, relieving Arthur of his obligation. The Tax Court held that this redemption constituted a constructive dividend to Arthur, taxable to the extent of corporate earnings and profits. However, the redemption of shares owned by his sister's estate and her heirs did not result in a constructive dividend since Arthur had no unconditional obligation to purchase those shares. The court also denied relief to Arthur's wife, Martha, under the innocent spouse provisions.

Facts

In 1960, Arthur C. Smith, Jr. , and his father, Arthur C. Smith, Sr. , executed a stock purchase agreement requiring Arthur to purchase his father's shares in nine family corporations upon his father's death. The agreement also gave Arthur's sister, Elizabeth Fullilove, and her heirs the option to sell their shares to Arthur within ten years of his father's death. After Arthur Sr. 's death in 1969, Arthur Jr. was financially unable to fulfill his obligation. Following contentious negotiations, the family corporations redeemed all shares held by Arthur Sr. 's estate and the Fullilove estate and heirs in 1971, relieving Arthur Jr. of his obligation to purchase his father's shares.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Arthur and Martha Smith's federal income tax for 1971 and 1972, asserting that the corporate redemptions constituted constructive dividends to Arthur. The Smiths petitioned the Tax Court, which consolidated their cases. The court found for the Commissioner regarding the redemption of Arthur Sr. 's estate's shares but ruled in favor of the Smiths for the Fullilove estate and heirs' shares.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the corporate redemptions of stock held by Arthur Sr. 's estate resulted in constructive dividends to Arthur Jr. because they satisfied his unconditional personal obligation to purchase the stock.
2. Whether the corporate redemptions of stock held by the Fullilove estate and heirs resulted in constructive dividends to Arthur Jr.
3. Whether Martha Smith qualifies as an innocent spouse under section 6013(e)(1) for relief from liability for the tax deficiency arising from the constructive dividends.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. Yes, because the redemptions satisfied Arthur Jr. ‘s unconditional obligation to purchase his father’s stock, resulting in constructive dividends taxable to him to the extent of corporate earnings and profits.
2. No, because Arthur Jr. was never unconditionally obligated to purchase the Fullilove stock, and thus no constructive dividends resulted from those redemptions.
3. No, because Martha Smith did not meet the requirements for innocent spouse relief under section 6013(e)(1).

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied well-established law that corporate satisfaction of a shareholder’s personal obligation can result in a constructive dividend. Arthur Jr. ‘s unconditional obligation to purchase his father’s stock under the 1960 agreement was satisfied by the corporate redemptions, which were equivalent to the corporation paying Arthur a dividend that he then used to fulfill his obligation. The court rejected the argument that the redemption was primarily for a valid corporate business purpose, finding instead that it was primarily to relieve Arthur of his personal obligation. Regarding the Fullilove estate and heirs’ shares, Arthur Jr. had no such unconditional obligation, so no constructive dividend resulted from those redemptions. Martha Smith was denied innocent spouse relief because she had knowledge of the transactions and benefited from them.

Practical Implications

This case emphasizes the importance of understanding the tax consequences of corporate redemptions, especially when they relate to shareholders’ personal obligations. Attorneys advising on estate planning and corporate transactions should ensure that clients understand that corporate redemptions satisfying personal obligations can be treated as constructive dividends. This ruling highlights the need to carefully draft stock purchase agreements and consider alternative structures that might avoid unintended tax consequences. Later cases, such as *Decker v. Commissioner*, have distinguished *Smith* based on the presence of a valid corporate business purpose for the redemption, but *Smith* remains the controlling authority where a shareholder’s unconditional personal obligation is directly satisfied by a corporate redemption.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.