Cirelli v. Commissioner, 82 T. C. 335 (1984)

A family partnership is a sham for tax purposes if it lacks genuine business purpose and the dominant family member retains absolute control.

Summary

Charles J. Cirelli's children formed a partnership, C Equipment Co. , to lease equipment and a yacht to their father's construction company. The Tax Court found the partnership to be a sham, not valid for tax purposes, due to Cirelli's complete control over its operations and lack of genuine business purpose. The court ruled that the partnership's property should be treated as owned by the corporation, disallowed yacht expenses as non-deductible personal use, and determined that certain payments were constructive dividends to Cirelli.

Facts

In 1972, Charles J. Cirelli's five children formed C Equipment Co. , a partnership under Maryland law, with each child owning a 20% interest. The partnership leased construction equipment and a yacht exclusively to Cirelli's corporation, Charles J. Cirelli & Son, Inc. , a construction contractor. Cirelli controlled all aspects of the partnership, including negotiating purchases, determining rental rates, and signing all partnership checks. The partnership's activities generated income from 1972 to 1975, but distributions were primarily for the children's taxes and education. The yacht, named the "Lady C," was used predominantly by Cirelli and his corporation, with minimal evidence of business use.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in the federal income taxes of the petitioners, including the children and the corporation, for the years 1973 to 1975. The petitioners contested these deficiencies, leading to the case being heard by the United States Tax Court. The court's decision focused on whether the partnership was valid for tax purposes, the tax treatment of the partnership's property, and the deductibility of yacht expenses.

Issue(s)

1. Whether C Equipment Co. was a valid partnership for federal income tax purposes in 1975?
2. If not, who should be treated as owning C Equipment Co. 's property for tax purposes?
3. Are amounts paid by Charles J. Cirelli & Son, Inc. , to C Equipment Co. deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses?
4. Are certain amounts constructive dividends taxable to Charles J. Cirelli?

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the partnership was a sham, lacking genuine business purpose and with Cirelli retaining absolute control.
2. The Cirelli corporation, because it was treated as the real owner of the partnership's property.
3. No, because the "rentals" were not ordinary and necessary business expenses as they were payments to a sham partnership for the corporation's own property.
4. Yes, because the yacht was used for Cirelli's personal benefit, and payments to the children and for yacht expenses were for Cirelli's benefit.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the doctrine of substance over form, focusing on Cirelli's control over the partnership and the lack of genuine business purpose. The court used the guidelines under Section 704(e) of the Internal Revenue Code and the test from *Commissioner v. Culbertson* to determine the partnership's validity. Key factors included Cirelli's control over all partnership decisions, the partnership's exclusive dealings with the Cirelli corporation, and the lack of independent action by the children. The court found that the yacht was not operated for profit but for Cirelli's personal benefit, thus disallowing related expenses. The court also determined that payments made to the children and yacht expenses were constructive dividends to Cirelli, as they were for his benefit.

Practical Implications

This decision underscores the importance of genuine business purpose and actual control in family partnerships. Attorneys should advise clients that the IRS will closely scrutinize family partnerships, especially where a dominant family member retains control. The case highlights that mere formalities, such as a partnership agreement, are insufficient if the partnership lacks substance. Practitioners must ensure that family partnerships operate independently and have a legitimate business purpose to avoid being classified as shams. This ruling also affects how expenses related to personal use assets, like yachts, are treated for tax purposes, emphasizing the need for clear evidence of business use to claim deductions. Subsequent cases have cited *Cirelli* in determining the validity of family partnerships and the tax treatment of corporate property and expenses.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.