Hollingsworth v. Commissioner, 71 T. C. 580 (1979)

A corporate note's loss is treated as a capital loss if purchased with a substantial investment motive, even if business motives are present.

Summary

In Hollingsworth v. Commissioner, the taxpayer, an officer and director of Mid-America Insurance Investors Corp. , purchased a $50,000 convertible subordinated note from the company. When the note became worthless in 1974, he sought to deduct the loss as an ordinary business expense. The Tax Court, however, ruled that the loss was subject to capital loss treatment under Section 165(g)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code because the taxpayer had a substantial investment motive for purchasing and holding the note. The decision hinged on the court's finding that the taxpayer's motives included not just business considerations but also a significant investment interest, reinforced by his other investments in the company's stock and warrants.

Facts

John Hollingsworth was a founder, president, and director of Mid-America Insurance Investors Corp. , which issued $1,650,000 in convertible subordinated notes in 1972 to raise capital for expansion. Hollingsworth purchased a $50,000 note on January 31, 1972, borrowing the full amount and using the note as collateral. At the time, he also owned Mid-America stock and warrants, expecting their value to increase with the company's growth. The note was convertible into stock at $5 per share. Mid-America's financial condition deteriorated, and by October 1974, the company ceased operations, rendering the note worthless. Hollingsworth sought to deduct the loss as an ordinary business expense, while the IRS treated it as a capital loss.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Hollingsworth's 1974 federal income tax and disallowed the ordinary loss deduction for the note. Hollingsworth petitioned the United States Tax Court, which upheld the Commissioner's position, ruling that the loss on the note was subject to capital loss treatment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the taxpayer's loss on a convertible subordinated note that became worthless in 1974 should be treated as an ordinary loss under Section 165(a) of the Internal Revenue Code or as a capital loss under Section 165(g)(1).

Holding

1. No, because the taxpayer had a substantial investment motive in purchasing and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

holding the note, making the loss subject to capital loss treatment under Section 165(g)(1).

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the rule from W. W. Windle Co. v. Commissioner, which states that a corporate note is a capital asset unless the taxpayer can negate a substantial investment motive for its purchase and holding. The court found that Hollingsworth’s investment in the note was motivated by the potential for the note to be converted into stock at a profit, given his expectation that the company’s stock would rise. His ownership of other Mid-America securities further supported the existence of an investment motive. Even though Hollingsworth had business motives related to protecting his employment and increasing his bonus, the court determined that the investment motive was substantial and thus controlling. The court rejected Hollingsworth’s claim of informal pressure to purchase the note as insufficient to negate the investment motive, especially in light of his voluntary purchase and existing employment contract.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of the taxpayer’s motive in determining the tax treatment of losses on corporate securities. For legal practitioners, it is crucial to carefully document the reasons for a client’s investment in corporate notes, especially when the client is an officer or director of the issuing company. The ruling clarifies that even if business motives exist, a substantial investment motive will result in capital loss treatment, affecting the deductibility of losses. This case has been followed in subsequent decisions, reinforcing the principle that the nature of the asset at the time of acquisition determines its tax treatment upon disposition, regardless of later changes in motive.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.