Paparo v. Commissioner, 72 T. C. 701 (1979)

A stock redemption is treated as a dividend if it does not result in a meaningful reduction of the shareholder's proportionate interest in the corporation.

Summary

In Paparo v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that payments received by Jack and Irving Paparo from House of Ronnie, Inc. , in exchange for their stock in Nashville Textile Corp. and Jasper Textile Corp. , were taxable as dividends, not capital gains. The court applied the test from United States v. Davis, determining that the redemption did not meaningfully reduce the Paparos' interest in the subsidiaries. The decision emphasized that the effect of the redemption, not the underlying business purpose, is critical in assessing dividend equivalence under section 302(b)(1). This case underscores the importance of a meaningful reduction in ownership for favorable tax treatment in stock redemptions.

Facts

Jack and Irving Paparo owned House of Ronnie, Inc. , and its subsidiaries, Nashville Textile Corp. and Jasper Textile Corp. In 1970, they transferred their stock in the subsidiaries to House of Ronnie in exchange for $800,000, funded by a public offering of House of Ronnie stock. The transaction was part of a broader plan to acquire Denise Lingerie Co. and to go public. After the redemption, Jack's ownership in House of Ronnie increased to 81. 17% and Irving's to 74. 15%. The Paparos reported the payments as capital gains, while the IRS treated them as dividends.

Procedural History

The IRS issued notices of deficiency to the Paparos, asserting that the payments should be taxed as dividends. The Paparos petitioned the Tax Court, which consolidated the cases and ruled in favor of the IRS, holding that the redemption did not qualify for capital gains treatment under section 302(b)(1) or 302(b)(2).

Issue(s)

1. Whether the redemption of the Paparos' stock in Nashville and Jasper by House of Ronnie was part of an overall plan that began in 1970 and ended in 1972.
2. Whether the redemption resulted in a meaningful reduction of the Paparos' proportionate interest in Nashville and Jasper under section 302(b)(1).
3. Whether the redemption was substantially disproportionate under section 302(b)(2) as of March 30, 1970.

Holding

1. No, because there was no evidence of a formal financial plan from 1970 to 1972, and the redemption was not contingent on subsequent public offerings.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because the redemption did not meaningfully reduce the Paparos' interest in Nashville and Jasper; their control remained essentially unaltered.
3. No, because the redemption did not meet the statutory requirements for substantial disproportionality under section 302(b)(2) as of March 30, 1970.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the test from United States v. Davis, which requires a meaningful reduction in the shareholder's proportionate interest for a redemption to be treated as an exchange under section 302(b)(1). The court found that the Paparos' control over Nashville and Jasper was not meaningfully reduced by the redemption, as their ownership percentages remained high. The court also rejected the argument that the redemption was part of a broader plan, as there was no evidence of a formal plan and the redemption's funding was contingent on future events. Additionally, the court dismissed the Paparos' contention that the redemption was substantially disproportionate under section 302(b)(2), as their ownership percentages after the redemption did not meet the statutory thresholds. The court emphasized that the effect of the redemption, not the underlying business purpose, determines dividend equivalence.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the importance of a meaningful reduction in ownership for favorable tax treatment in stock redemptions. It highlights that a redemption must be evaluated at the time it occurs, not based on future events or plans. For practitioners, this case underscores the need to carefully structure transactions to ensure they meet the statutory tests for exchange treatment. Businesses should be aware that even if a transaction is part of a broader business strategy, it must independently satisfy the requirements of section 302(b) to avoid dividend treatment. Subsequent cases, such as Grabowski Trust v. Commissioner, have continued to apply the Davis test, emphasizing the need for a clear and immediate change in ownership to qualify for capital gains treatment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.