Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Commissioner, 95 T. C. 348 (1990)

The term 'branch or similar establishment' in the context of foreign base company sales income does not include an unrelated corporation operating under an arm's-length contractual arrangement.

Summary

Ashland Oil, Inc. involved a dispute over whether a Belgian corporation, Tensia, was a 'branch or similar establishment' of Drew Ameroid, a Liberian controlled foreign corporation (CFC), for the purposes of determining foreign base company sales income under section 954(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code. The IRS argued that Tensia's manufacturing activities for Drew Ameroid should be treated as a branch, subjecting Drew Ameroid's sales income to U. S. tax. The Tax Court rejected this argument, holding that Tensia, an unrelated corporation, did not fall within the ordinary meaning of 'branch or similar establishment. ' This decision clarified the scope of the branch rule, emphasizing the need for a direct ownership or control relationship to trigger foreign base company sales income attribution.

Facts

Drew Ameroid International (Drew Ameroid), a Liberian CFC, entered into a manufacturing, license, and supply agreement with Societe Des Produits Tensio-Actifs et Derives, Tensia, S. A. (Tensia), a Belgian corporation. Under this agreement, Tensia manufactured products for Drew Ameroid using Drew Ameroid's specifications and trademarks. Tensia owned the raw materials and finished products until purchased by Drew Ameroid, which then sold the products to unrelated third parties. Neither Drew Ameroid nor its affiliates owned any interest in Tensia, and vice versa. The IRS determined that Tensia's manufacturing activities constituted a 'branch or similar establishment' of Drew Ameroid, subjecting Drew Ameroid's sales income to U. S. tax.

Procedural History

Ashland Oil, Inc. , as the successor by acquisition of Ashland Technology, Inc. (formerly U. S. Filter Corporation), filed a motion for summary judgment in the U. S. Tax Court. The IRS opposed the motion, arguing that Tensia was a 'branch or similar establishment' under section 954(d)(2). The Tax Court granted Ashland's motion for summary judgment, holding that Tensia did not qualify as a branch or similar establishment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether an unrelated corporation operating under an arm's-length contractual arrangement constitutes a 'branch or similar establishment' for purposes of determining foreign base company sales income under section 954(d)(2)?

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Holding

1. No, because the term ‘branch or similar establishment’ does not encompass an unrelated corporation like Tensia, which operates independently and is not controlled by the CFC.

Court’s Reasoning

The Tax Court, in analyzing the term ‘branch or similar establishment,’ relied on the ordinary meaning of ‘branch’ as a division or office of a business located away from the main headquarters. The court found that Tensia, an unrelated corporation, did not fit this definition. The court also interpreted ‘similar establishment’ as an entity that bears the characteristics of a branch but goes by a different name for various purposes. The court rejected the IRS’s arguments based on tax rate disparities and the nature of the business relationship between Drew Ameroid and Tensia, emphasizing that the statutory language and legislative history did not support expanding the branch rule to cover unrelated entities. The court noted that the specific regulatory authority granted to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 954(d)(2) was limited to addressing the consequences of a branch’s existence, not defining what constitutes a branch. The court also considered the tax policy implications, noting that Tensia’s manufacturing income did not contribute to tax deferral or tax haven issues for Drew Ameroid or its U. S. shareholders.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that the branch rule under section 954(d)(2) does not apply to contractual manufacturing arrangements with unrelated entities. Tax practitioners should carefully analyze the ownership and control relationships between CFCs and manufacturing entities when determining foreign base company sales income. The decision limits the IRS’s ability to attribute foreign base company sales income to CFCs based solely on contractual arrangements with unrelated parties, potentially reducing the tax burden on U. S. shareholders of CFCs engaged in such arrangements. Subsequent cases and regulations may further define the scope of ‘branch or similar establishment,’ but this ruling provides a clear benchmark for distinguishing between related and unrelated entities in the context of foreign base company sales income.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.