Estate of Margita Applestein, Deceased, Louis Applestein, Administrator, and Louis Applestein, Surviving Husband, Petitioners v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent, 80 T. C. 331 (1983)

An individual is taxable on income from an asset if they retain control over it and its proceeds, even if nominally transferred to another party.

Summary

Louis Applestein, an experienced stock trader, transferred National Realty stock to his children's accounts just before a merger and engaged in extensive trading using these accounts. The Tax Court ruled that the gains from the merger and subsequent trades were taxable to Applestein because he retained control over the assets and their proceeds. The court applied the assignment of income doctrine, holding that the transfers were anticipatory assignments of income and that Applestein never relinquished the benefits and burdens of ownership over the securities.

Facts

Louis Applestein, a retired IRS manager and experienced stock trader, learned of a proposed merger between National Realty Corp. and United National Corp. in late December 1972. He bought additional shares of National Realty and transferred them to his minor children's custodial accounts just before the merger's effective date. Applestein also conducted extensive stock trading in these accounts, using funds from his and his relatives' accounts, treating these as loans to his children. The children reported the income from these transactions on their tax returns.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Applestein's 1973 federal income tax. Applestein petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, which ruled in favor of the Commissioner, holding that Applestein was taxable on the gains from the merger and the subsequent stock trading.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Louis Applestein is taxable on the gain from the exchange of National Realty stock transferred to his children after the merger was approved but before its effective date?
2. Whether Louis Applestein is taxable on income derived from securities trading in accounts set up for his children?

Holding

1. Yes, because the transfer of the stock constituted an anticipatory assignment of income, as the merger was virtually certain to occur after shareholder approval, and Applestein retained control over the stock until the merger's effective date.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Yes, because Applestein never relinquished the benefits and burdens of ownership over the securities, treating the accounts as his own and controlling the use of proceeds.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the assignment of income doctrine, emphasizing that the substance of the transaction, not its form, determines tax liability. For the National Realty stock, the court found that the merger was virtually certain to occur after shareholder approval on February 7, 1973, making the stock merely a vehicle for the merger proceeds. The transfer to the children’s accounts shortly before the merger’s effective date was an anticipatory assignment of income. Regarding the stock trading, the court noted that Applestein retained control over the accounts, using his funds and discretion in trading, and treated the proceeds as reducing debts owed to him by his children. The court cited *Helvering v. Horst* and *Lucas v. Earl* to support its conclusion that income from property is taxable to the party who retains control over it.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the principle that tax liability follows control over assets and their income. It warns against using family members or other entities to shift income for tax purposes without relinquishing control. Practitioners should advise clients to avoid arrangements where they retain control over assets nominally transferred to others, as such arrangements may be treated as anticipatory assignments of income. This case has been cited in subsequent rulings to uphold the taxation of income to the party who retains control over the asset producing it, emphasizing the importance of substance over form in tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.