Ellison v. Commissioner, 80 T. C. 378 (1983)

Rental income reserved to the seller in a property sale is taxable to the buyer if it constitutes part of the purchase price.

Summary

In *Ellison v. Commissioner*, partnerships purchased apartment complexes with agreements that allowed sellers to retain initial rents as part of the transaction. The court ruled that these reserved rents were taxable to the buyer-partnerships because they were essentially deferred purchase price payments, benefiting the partnerships by reducing the cost of acquisition. The case underscores the principle that substance over form governs tax treatment, emphasizing that income derived from property owned and operated by the buyer is taxable to the buyer, regardless of contractual arrangements to the contrary.

Facts

CFC — 77 Partnership A (CFC — 77A) purchased the Town Park apartment complex with the benefits and obligations of ownership passing as of July 1, 1977. The sales agreement included a stated purchase price of $5,250,000 and additional payments of $650,000, including $500,000 in reserved rents to be collected by the seller, REICA Properties, before December 15, 1977. Similarly, CFC — 77 Partnership C (CFC — 77C) purchased the Villa del Rey complex, with the benefits and obligations of ownership passing as of November 1, 1977. The agreement allowed the seller, Villa del Rey No. Two, Ltd. , to receive the first $150,000 of rents over the subsequent three months. Both complexes were managed by seller affiliates post-sale, but as agents of the buyer partnerships.

Procedural History

The IRS Commissioner determined tax deficiencies for the petitioners, members of the partnerships, asserting that the reserved rents were taxable to them. The cases were consolidated and heard by the United States Tax Court, which ruled in favor of the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the rental income reserved to the sellers of the apartment complexes is taxable to the buyer-partnerships or to the sellers?

Holding

1. Yes, because the reserved rents were, in substance, deferred payments of the purchase prices of the complexes, benefiting the buyer-partnerships.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. | 1

The court applied the principle that taxation is governed by the substance of a transaction rather than its form. The partnerships owned and managed the complexes, using their capital and labor to produce the rents. The sellers' rights to the rents did not contribute to their production. The court noted the short duration of the rent reservation (3-5. 5 months) and the near certainty of receiving the full amounts due to high occupancy rates, indicating the rents were effectively part of the purchase price. The court cited *Bryant v. Commissioner*, where similar production payments were deemed part of the purchase price, and *Helvering v. Horst*, affirming that income derived from property is taxable to the owner. The court rejected the applicability of *Thomas v. Perkins*, as it pertains uniquely to oil and gas transactions, and found no partnership existed between the buyers and sellers for tax purposes.

Practical Implications

Ellison v. Commissioner establishes that in property sales where rents are reserved to the seller, tax practitioners must scrutinize the substance of the transaction to determine if the reserved income is part of the purchase price and thus taxable to the buyer. This ruling impacts how real estate transactions are structured to avoid unintended tax consequences, particularly in arrangements involving deferred or contingent payments. It also emphasizes the importance of considering the economic reality of a transaction over its legal form when assessing tax liability. Subsequent cases, such as *Brountas v. Commissioner*, have further clarified the tax treatment of reserved income in property sales, reinforcing the principle set forth in *Ellison*.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. | 2