Hirotoshi Yamamoto and Shizuko Yamamoto, Petitioners v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 73 T. C. 946 (1980)

Transfers of property to a subsidiary corporation do not qualify for nonrecognition of gain under Section 351 if not exchanged for stock or securities in that corporation.

Summary

Hirotoshi Yamamoto transferred properties to his wholly-owned subsidiary, receiving cash, debt release, and mortgage assumption in return. He argued these transfers should be treated as part of a larger transaction to qualify for nonrecognition under Section 351. The Tax Court disagreed, holding that the transfers were sales, not exchanges for stock, and thus did not qualify for Section 351 nonrecognition. The court also clarified that Section 1239, which treats certain gains as ordinary income, does not apply to transactions between an individual and a corporation wholly owned by another corporation controlled by that individual. This case emphasizes the importance of the form of transactions in determining tax treatment and the limitations of applying the step-transaction doctrine.

Facts

Hirotoshi Yamamoto owned all the stock of Manoa Finance Co. , Inc. (Parent), which in turn owned all the stock of Manoa Investment Co. , Inc. (Subsidiary). In 1970 and 1971, Yamamoto transferred four properties to Subsidiary. In exchange, Subsidiary paid cash, assumed mortgages, and released debts owed by Yamamoto. Yamamoto used some of the proceeds to purchase stock in Parent. The transactions were recorded as sales on the books of both Yamamoto and Subsidiary. Yamamoto reported the transactions as sales on his tax returns, treating the gains as long-term capital gains.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Yamamoto’s federal income tax for 1970 and 1971. Yamamoto petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, arguing that the transfers should be treated as part of a larger transaction qualifying for nonrecognition under Section 351. The Tax Court rejected this argument and held that the transfers were sales, not Section 351 exchanges. The court also ruled that Section 1239 did not apply to the transactions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Yamamoto’s transfers of properties to Subsidiary qualify as exchanges for stock under Section 351, thus allowing for nonrecognition of gain.
2. Whether Section 1239 applies to the transfers, treating the recognized gain as ordinary income.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the transfers were not in exchange for stock or securities in Subsidiary but were sales, and thus did not qualify for Section 351 nonrecognition.
2. No, because Section 1239 does not apply to transactions between an individual and a corporation wholly owned by another corporation controlled by that individual.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that for Section 351 to apply, property must be transferred in exchange for stock or securities in the receiving corporation. Here, Yamamoto received cash, debt release, and mortgage assumption from Subsidiary, not stock in Subsidiary. The court rejected Yamamoto's argument to apply the step-transaction doctrine, finding no evidence of mutual interdependence or a preconceived plan linking the property transfers to the stock purchases in Parent. The court emphasized that the form of the transactions (recorded as sales) should be respected unless there is evidence that the form does not reflect the true intent of the parties.
Regarding Section 1239, the court noted that the statute, as it existed at the time, did not apply to transactions between an individual and a corporation wholly owned by another corporation controlled by that individual. The court declined to apply constructive ownership rules to attribute Parent's ownership of Subsidiary to Yamamoto, citing legislative changes and prior case law that limited the application of Section 1239.
Judge Tannenwald concurred, emphasizing that Section 351 did not apply because Yamamoto did not receive stock in the corporation to which he transferred the properties (Subsidiary).

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of the form of transactions in determining tax treatment. Taxpayers cannot rely on the step-transaction doctrine to recharacterize separate transactions as a single exchange for stock to qualify for Section 351 nonrecognition. The case also clarifies the limitations of Section 1239, which was amended in 1976 to include constructive ownership rules that would have applied to this case if it had occurred after the amendment.
Practitioners should carefully structure transactions to ensure they meet the requirements of Section 351 if nonrecognition of gain is desired. The decision also highlights the need to consider the specific ownership structure when applying Section 1239, as indirect ownership through a parent corporation does not trigger the section's application.
Subsequent cases have applied the principles from Yamamoto, particularly in distinguishing between sales and exchanges under Section 351 and in interpreting the scope of Section 1239 after its 1976 amendment.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.