Redding v. Commissioner, 71 T. C. 597 (1979)

Stock rights distributed as part of a corporate spin-off can qualify as a tax-free distribution under Section 355 if they are integral to the overall transaction.

Summary

In Redding v. Commissioner, the IRS challenged the tax treatment of stock rights distributed by Indianapolis Water Co. to its shareholders, allowing them to purchase Shorewood stock at a discount. The Tax Court held that this distribution was part of a tax-free spin-off under Section 355, as the rights were a mere step in the overall transaction to divest control of Shorewood. The court reasoned that since the rights were short-term, transferable, and used solely for the spin-off, they did not have independent tax significance. This ruling clarifies that stock rights can be used in corporate separations without triggering immediate tax consequences if structured as part of a Section 355 transaction.

Facts

Indianapolis Water Co. distributed transferable short-term rights to its shareholders to purchase Shorewood stock at $5 per share, less than its market value. These rights were issued on January 7, 1971, and expired on January 22, 1971. The shareholders, including Redding and Moses, exercised their rights and received Shorewood stock on February 2, 1971. The distribution was motivated by regulatory pressure to separate Shorewood's real estate business from Water Co. 's utility operations. Over 80% of Shorewood's stock was distributed, satisfying the control requirement of Section 355.

Procedural History

The IRS determined deficiencies in the petitioners' 1971 taxes, arguing the rights distribution was a taxable dividend. The Tax Court consolidated the cases of Redding and Moses, who argued the transaction qualified as a tax-free spin-off under Section 355. The court ruled in favor of the petitioners, holding that the rights distribution was an integral part of a Section 355 transaction.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the distribution of stock rights by Indianapolis Water Co. to its shareholders, followed by the distribution of Shorewood stock upon exercise of those rights, constitutes a tax-free spin-off under Section 355?
2. Whether the stock rights had independent tax significance, thus triggering immediate tax consequences?

Holding

1. Yes, because the distribution of Shorewood stock through the use of stock rights

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

satisfied the requirements of Section 355 as the rights were merely a step in the overall transaction.
2. No, because the rights were short-term, transferable, and used solely for participation in the spin-off, thus lacking independent tax significance.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the step transaction doctrine, viewing the rights distribution as part of an integrated plan to divest Shorewood. The court emphasized that the rights were short-term and only used for the spin-off, thus not having independent tax significance. The court also noted that the transaction met the Section 355 requirements, including distributing over 80% of Shorewood’s stock and having a valid business purpose. The court distinguished this case from others where rights distributions were taxable, citing the lack of a binding commitment as not fatal to the Section 355 treatment in this context. The dissent argued that the rights had independent significance and that control was not clearly distributed to shareholders as required by Section 355.

Practical Implications

This decision allows corporations to use stock rights as a mechanism in spin-offs without immediate tax consequences to shareholders, provided the rights are part of an integrated transaction under Section 355. It impacts how corporate separations are structured, particularly when raising capital for the spun-off entity is a goal. The ruling clarifies that the absence of specific statutory language for stock rights in Section 355 does not preclude their use in such transactions. Practitioners must ensure that the rights are short-term and solely used for the spin-off to avoid triggering immediate tax events. Subsequent cases have cited Redding when analyzing the tax treatment of rights in corporate separations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.