Packard v. Commissioner, 85 T. C. 397 (1985)

Prepaid feed expenses by cash-basis taxpayers in cattle feeding operations are deductible in the year of payment if they serve a business purpose and do not materially distort income.

Summary

Petitioners invested in a cattle-feeding program through a subchapter S corporation and a partnership, aiming to offset capital gains with deductions from prepaid feed expenses. The court found the transactions had economic substance but applied the step-transaction doctrine, treating the partnership as conducting the operations from the outset. The court allowed the deduction of prepaid feed expenses in 1971, recognizing business purposes such as securing feed supply and fixing prices, despite tax avoidance motives. The court also rejected a theft loss claim by one petitioner, emphasizing the practical implications for future tax planning involving similar arrangements.

Facts

In late 1971, petitioners Sue B. Packard and Richard A. Wainwright, having recently sold their electronics company, invested in a cattle-feeding program through Cornwall Investment Corp. They formed Queen Feeding & Livestock Co. , a subchapter S corporation, with Packard as the sole shareholder. Queen purchased feed in December 1971, deducting the expense that year. In early 1972, petitioners formed D & S Investment Co. , a partnership, which purportedly bought Queen's stock in an installment sale, followed by Queen's liquidation. The cattle feeding occurred in three rounds from February 1972 to February 1973, with the operation resulting in a loss.

Procedural History

The IRS challenged the deductions claimed by petitioners, asserting the transactions were a sham and lacked economic substance. The Tax Court consolidated the cases and held hearings, ultimately deciding that while the transactions were not a sham, the step-transaction doctrine applied to disregard the corporate structure.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the cattle-feeding program was a sham transaction that should be disregarded for tax purposes.
2. Whether the step-transaction doctrine should apply to collapse the series of steps taken by the petitioners into a single transaction.
3. Whether the prepaid feed expenses were deductible in the year of payment (1971).
4. Whether petitioner Wainwright was entitled to a theft loss deduction due to the transfer of partnership funds.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the transactions had economic substance and a reasonable possibility of profit existed.
2. Yes, because the steps were part of a preconceived plan to conduct the cattle-feeding operation through a partnership, resulting in the disregard of the corporate structure.
3. Yes, because the prepaid feed expenses were a payment, not a deposit, and served a business purpose without materially distorting income.
4. No, because there was no evidence of theft under Nebraska law, and the funds were used for partnership purposes.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied the sham transaction doctrine, determining that while tax avoidance was a motive, the transactions had economic substance, evidenced by actual investment and potential for profit. The step-transaction doctrine was applied because the formation of Queen, the prepayment of feed, and the subsequent transactions were part of a single plan to conduct the feeding operation through a partnership. The court found that the prepaid feed expenses were deductible in 1971 under the cash method of accounting, as they were a payment, not a deposit, and served valid business purposes such as securing feed and fixing prices. The court rejected Wainwright’s theft loss claim, finding no evidence of theft and that the funds were used for partnership purposes.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the deductibility of prepaid expenses in agricultural operations when supported by business purposes, despite tax avoidance motives. It highlights the importance of structuring transactions to reflect their true economic substance, as the court will apply doctrines like step-transaction to collapse artificial steps. For future tax planning, taxpayers must ensure that any prepaid expenses are tied to legitimate business reasons and do not materially distort income. The case also underscores the need for clear partnership agreements to prevent disputes over the use of funds. Subsequent cases have cited Packard in evaluating similar tax shelter arrangements and the application of the step-transaction doctrine.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.