Hynes v. Commissioner, 74 T. C. 1266 (1980)

A trust may be classified as an association taxable as a corporation if it exhibits corporate characteristics, including associates, an objective to carry on business for profit, continuity of life, centralization of management, and limited liability.

Summary

John Hynes created the Wood Song Village Trust to develop and sell real estate. The trust exhibited corporate characteristics such as continuity of life, centralized management, and limited liability. The Tax Court ruled that the trust was an association taxable as a corporation, meaning its losses could not be deducted on Hynes' personal tax returns. Hynes was also denied deductions for business losses related to a mortgage guarantee and personal expenses like wardrobe and home office costs due to lack of substantiation or ineligibility under tax law.

Facts

John B. Hynes, Jr. , created the Wood Song Village Trust in 1973 to purchase and develop real estate in Brewster, Massachusetts, for profit. Hynes was the sole beneficiary and one of three trustees, holding all shares of beneficial interest. The trust agreement provided for continuity of life, centralized management, and limited liability. The trust sold lots in 1973, 1974, and 1975 but incurred losses. In 1975, a mortgage on the trust's property was foreclosed, and Hynes, who had personally guaranteed the mortgage, claimed a business loss deduction on his 1976 tax return. Hynes also claimed deductions for various personal expenses related to his employment as a television newsman.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued deficiency notices to Hynes for the tax years 1973 through 1976, disallowing the trust's losses and Hynes' claimed deductions. Hynes petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for redetermination. The Tax Court considered whether the trust was an association taxable as a corporation, and the eligibility of Hynes' claimed deductions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Wood Song Village Trust is an association taxable as a corporation under 26 C. F. R. § 301. 7701-2?
2. Whether Hynes is entitled to a deduction for a business loss resulting from the foreclosure of the trust's mortgage he guaranteed?
3. Whether Hynes may deduct interest and real estate taxes owed by the trust when the bank foreclosed on its mortgage?
4. Whether Hynes is entitled to deduct certain expenditures for his wardrobe, laundry, dry cleaning, haircuts, makeup, hotels, meals, and automobile use and depreciation as business expenses?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

5. Whether Hynes may deduct expenses for using a room in his residence as a home office under 26 U. S. C. § 280A?
6. Whether the Wood Song Village Trust failed to report income in 1975 from the sale of certain property?

Holding

1. Yes, because the trust exhibited corporate characteristics including associates, an objective to carry on business for profit, continuity of life, centralization of management, and limited liability.
2. No, because any loss would be a bad debt subject to 26 U. S. C. § 166, and Hynes had not paid anything under his guarantee in 1976.
3. No, because the interest and taxes were obligations of the trust, not Hynes personally, and he had not paid them.
4. No, because Hynes failed to substantiate the claimed deductions beyond amounts allowed by the Commissioner.
5. No, because the home office was not the principal place of business for either Hynes or his wife, nor was it maintained for the convenience of their employers.
6. Yes, because the trust failed to provide evidence to refute the Commissioner's determination that it did not report income from the sale.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the criteria from 26 C. F. R. § 301. 7701-2 to determine if the trust was an association taxable as a corporation. It found that the trust had associates (Hynes as the sole beneficiary), an objective to carry on business for profit, continuity of life (20 years after the death of the original trustees), centralized management (the trustees had full authority), and limited liability (under Massachusetts law and the trust agreement). The court emphasized that "resemblance and not identity" to corporate form was the standard. For the business loss deduction, the court ruled that any loss would be a bad debt under 26 U. S. C. § 166, not a business loss under § 165, and Hynes had not paid anything under his guarantee in 1976. Hynes' personal expense deductions were disallowed due to lack of substantiation or ineligibility under the tax code. The home office deduction was denied because it was not the principal place of business for either Hynes or his wife. The court sustained the Commissioner's determination on the unreported income issue due to lack of evidence from the trust.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the importance of understanding the tax implications of business structures. Trusts designed to carry on business activities may be taxed as corporations if they exhibit corporate characteristics, affecting how losses and income are reported. Taxpayers must carefully substantiate deductions, especially for personal expenses related to employment. The ruling also highlights the stringent requirements for home office deductions under § 280A. Later cases, such

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

as *Curphey v. Commissioner*, have continued to apply these principles, emphasizing the need for clear evidence of business use and principal place of business for home office deductions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.