Mariani Frozen Foods, Inc. v. Commissioner, 81 T. C. 448 (1983)

U. S. shareholders of a foreign corporation must include their pro rata share of the corporation's undistributed foreign personal holding company income as income, even if the foreign corporation is unable to distribute dividends due to its corporate governance structure.

Summary

Mariani Frozen Foods, Inc. and related petitioners were assessed deficiencies by the IRS for failing to include their pro rata share of undistributed foreign personal holding company income from Simarloo Pty. , Ltd. , an Australian corporation, in their U. S. taxable income. The Tax Court found that Simarloo qualified as a foreign personal holding company due to the majority ownership by U. S. shareholders and the nature of its income, primarily from the sale of securities. The court rejected the petitioners' arguments that Simarloo's inability to distribute dividends due to its corporate governance structure should exempt them from the foreign personal holding company rules. The decision affirmed the inclusion of the constructive dividends in the U. S. shareholders' income, impacting how similar cases involving foreign entities and U. S. shareholders are treated under tax law.

Facts

Mariani Frozen Foods, Inc. (MFF) and L. F. G. , Inc. (LFG) were U. S. corporations that held 40% each of the shares of Simarloo Pty. , Ltd. , an Australian corporation engaged in developing fruit orchards. During its fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, Simarloo sold shares of Dairy Farm and Hong Kong Land, realizing a gain of $1,595,231, of which $250,016 was attributed to foreign currency exchange. Simarloo's income from these sales constituted more than 60% of its gross income, qualifying it as a foreign personal holding company. MFF and LFG did not report their pro rata share of Simarloo's undistributed income, leading to IRS assessments of deficiencies.

Procedural History

The IRS sent notices of deficiency to MFF and LFG in 1978, asserting that they should have included their pro rata share of Simarloo's undistributed foreign personal holding company income in their U. S. taxable income for their fiscal years beginning May 1, 1973. MFF and LFG, along with their transferees, filed petitions with the Tax Court contesting these deficiencies. The Tax Court consolidated these cases and issued its opinion in 1983.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Simarloo Pty. , Ltd. qualified as a foreign personal holding company for its fiscal year ending June 30, 1973?
2. Whether the foreign currency exchange gain realized by Simarloo from the sale of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Dairy Farm and Hong Kong Land shares should be treated as foreign personal holding company income?
3. Whether the U. S. shareholders of Simarloo must include their pro rata share of Simarloo's undistributed foreign personal holding company income as income, despite Simarloo's inability to distribute dividends due to its corporate governance structure?

Holding

1. Yes, because Simarloo met the statutory requirements for being classified as a foreign personal holding company, with more than 50% of its stock owned by a U. S. group and more than 60% of its gross income from foreign personal holding company sources.
2. Yes, because the foreign currency exchange gain was part of the gain from the sale of securities, which qualifies as foreign personal holding company income under the Internal Revenue Code.
3. Yes, because the inability to distribute dividends due to corporate governance does not exempt U. S. shareholders from including their pro rata share of the foreign personal holding company's undistributed income in their U. S. taxable income.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the statutory definition of a foreign personal holding company, finding that Simarloo met the ownership and income tests. The court rejected the petitioners' arguments that the foreign currency exchange gain should be treated separately from the gain on the sale of securities, as it was an integral part of the transaction. The court also distinguished this case from *Alvord v. Commissioner*, which had allowed an exception to the foreign personal holding company rules when the IRS prevented dividend distributions. In this case, the inability to distribute dividends was due to Simarloo's corporate governance, not government action, and the court found that U. S. shareholders were presumed to have the power to procure dividend distributions. The court emphasized that the foreign personal holding company provisions are mechanical tests designed to prevent tax avoidance, and the inability to distribute dividends due to corporate governance does not negate these rules.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the application of the foreign personal holding company rules to U. S. shareholders of foreign corporations, even when the foreign corporation's ability to distribute dividends is limited by its corporate governance. It clarifies that foreign currency exchange gains are to be included in the calculation of foreign personal holding company income when they arise from the sale of securities. For legal practitioners, this case underscores the importance of considering the foreign personal holding company rules when advising U. S. clients

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

with interests in foreign corporations, especially those with significant income from passive investments. Subsequent cases have applied this ruling to similar situations, emphasizing the need for U. S. shareholders to report their pro rata share of undistributed foreign personal holding company income, regardless of the foreign corporation’s ability to distribute dividends.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.