Hellermann v. Commissioner, 77 T. C. 1361 (1981)

Nominal gains from asset sales are taxable income under the 16th Amendment, even if inflation reduces their real value.

Summary

In Hellermann v. Commissioner, the taxpayers argued that only their real gain, adjusted for inflation, should be taxed, not their nominal gain. They sold buildings purchased in 1964 for a significant profit in 1976. The Tax Court rejected their argument, holding that Congress has the authority to define income in terms of dollars, which have a constant legal value, regardless of inflation's impact on their purchasing power. This decision upheld the taxation of the full nominal gain as income under the 16th Amendment, emphasizing Congress's broad power over currency and taxation.

Facts

Arthur and V. Louise Hellermann purchased four buildings in 1964 for $93,312. They sold these buildings in 1976 for $264,000, reporting a capital gain of $170,688 on their 1976 tax return. They paid the capital gains tax but did not calculate or pay the additional minimum tax required by the Internal Revenue Code. The Hellermanns argued that due to inflation, their real gain was less than the nominal gain, contending that only the real gain should be subject to taxation.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in the Hellermanns' 1976 federal income taxes and asserted that they owed the minimum tax. The Hellermanns filed a petition with the U. S. Tax Court to challenge this determination. The Tax Court considered whether the portion of the gain attributable solely to inflation was taxable income under the 16th Amendment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the portion of the nominal gain from the sale of property, which is attributable solely to inflation, constitutes taxable income under the 16th Amendment?

Holding

1. No, because the nominal gain, measured in legal dollars, is taxable income under the 16th Amendment, regardless of any inflation-related decrease in real value.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied on two primary grounds to reject the Hellermanns' argument. First,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

it emphasized Congress's power to establish the dollar as a unit of legal value for determining taxable income, citing cases such as *Legal Tender Cases* and *Norman v. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.* , which upheld Congress's broad authority over currency. The court noted that dollars have a constant legal value under the uniform monetary system created by Congress, and thus, the Hellermanns' gain in legal value was taxable. Second, the court applied the doctrine of common interpretation, stating that income should be understood as a layperson would, not an economist. The Hellermanns received more dollars than they paid, which falls within the common perception of income. The court concluded that the 16th Amendment allows Congress to tax such nominal gains as income, and thus, the Hellermanns were liable for the minimum tax on the full amount of their reported gain.

Practical Implications

This decision reaffirms that capital gains are to be calculated and taxed based on nominal dollars, not adjusted for inflation, impacting how similar cases are analyzed. It underscores Congress's authority over the definition of taxable income, influencing legal practice in tax law by maintaining the status quo on inflation adjustments. Businesses and taxpayers must consider this ruling when planning asset sales and tax strategies, as it does not allow for inflation adjustments to reduce taxable income. Subsequent cases have followed this precedent, and legislative changes would be required to alter this approach to taxing capital gains.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.