Lake Gerar Development Co. v. Commissioner, 71 T. C. 887 (1979)

Interest received on a purchase money mortgage is considered personal holding company income for tax purposes.

Summary

Lake Gerar Development Co. and its subsidiary, Lake Gerar Hotel Corp. , sold a hotel and received interest on purchase money mortgages from the buyer. The issue before the court was whether this interest constituted personal holding company income under section 543(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The court, citing prior cases under earlier tax codes, determined that such interest is indeed personal holding company income, emphasizing that the definition of interest for this purpose remains broad and consistent with general income tax provisions. The decision impacts how corporations are taxed based on the type of income they receive, particularly from real estate transactions.

Facts

Henlopen Hotel Corp. and its wholly owned subsidiary, Lake Gerar Hotel Corp. , owned the Henlopen Hotel in Rehoboth Beach, Delaware. In January 1970, they agreed to sell the hotel and an adjacent property to Miller Properties for promissory notes secured by purchase money mortgages. Lake Gerar Hotel Corp. received $13,824. 67 in interest during its fiscal year ending April 26, 1972, and Henlopen received $59,394. 39 in interest during its fiscal year ending April 30, 1972. Both corporations elected the installment method of reporting gain under section 453 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in income and personal holding company taxes against Lake Gerar Development Co. and its related parties for various taxable years. The petitioners contested these deficiencies, leading to consolidated cases before the United States Tax Court. The court addressed whether the interest received from the purchase money mortgages constituted personal holding company income.

Issue(s)

1. Whether interest received on a purchase money mortgage constitutes “interest” for purposes of determining personal holding company income under section 543(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Holding

1. Yes, because the court found that the definition of “interest” for personal holding company income purposes includes interest from purchase money mortgages,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

consistent with prior case law and the general income tax provisions.

Court’s Reasoning

The court relied on two prior cases, *O’Sullivan Rubber Co. v. Commissioner* and *West End Co. v. Commissioner*, which addressed similar issues under earlier tax codes. The court noted that the legislative history of the 1954 Code did not indicate an intent to narrow the definition of interest for personal holding company income purposes. The court emphasized that the regulations defining interest under the 1954 Code remained unchanged from those under the 1939 Code, and that interest from purchase money mortgages should be treated the same as interest from any other type of debt. The court rejected the argument that treating purchase money mortgage interest as personal holding company income would be unfair, stating that the personal holding company provisions provide a mechanical test without consideration of the taxpayer’s motivation. The court also noted that section 543(b)(3) of the Code specifically addresses interest on purchase money mortgages as part of “rents,” further supporting the inclusion of such interest in personal holding company income.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that interest received on purchase money mortgages is to be treated as personal holding company income, affecting how corporations involved in real estate transactions are taxed. Corporations must consider this ruling when planning transactions to avoid unintended tax consequences. Legal practitioners should advise clients on the potential for triggering personal holding company status when receiving interest from purchase money mortgages. The ruling may influence business strategies, particularly for real estate developers and investors, who must account for this tax treatment in their financial planning. Subsequent cases, such as *Bell Realty Trust v. Commissioner*, have continued to apply this principle, affirming the broad definition of interest for personal holding company income purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.