Fort Howard Corp. v. Commissioner, 103 T. C. 345 (1994)

Financing costs incurred in connection with a corporate stock redemption, such as a leveraged buyout, are not deductible or amortizable under IRC section 162(k).

Summary

In Fort Howard Corp. v. Commissioner, the Tax Court ruled that financing costs incurred by a corporation during a leveraged buyout (LBO) were non-deductible under IRC section 162(k), which disallows deductions for expenses related to stock redemptions. Fort Howard Corp. underwent an LBO in 1988, incurring significant costs for debt financing, which it sought to deduct. The court found these costs were directly related to the redemption of its stock, hence covered by section 162(k). The decision also addressed whether a portion of a fee paid to Morgan Stanley constituted interest, concluding it was a service fee instead. This case underscores the broad interpretation of expenses 'in connection with' stock redemptions and their non-deductibility.

Facts

In 1988, Fort Howard Corp. executed a leveraged buyout (LBO) to purchase all its outstanding shares. The buyout was financed through various debt instruments, including bank loans and bridge notes. The company incurred substantial costs for obtaining this financing, totaling $169,117,239, which it capitalized and partially deducted on its 1988 tax return. Additionally, Fort Howard paid Morgan Stanley a $40 million transaction fee, which it allocated partly as additional interest and partly as financing costs. The company sought to deduct these costs, arguing they were not directly connected to the stock redemption but rather to the financing itself.

Procedural History

The IRS challenged Fort Howard's deductions, asserting they were barred by IRC section 162(k). Fort Howard petitioned the U. S. Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies assessed by the IRS. The court heard the case and issued its opinion in 1994, affirming the IRS's position and disallowing the deductions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the financing costs incurred by Fort Howard Corp. in connection with its LBO were deductible under IRC section 162(k)?
2. Whether a portion of the $40 million fee paid to Morgan Stanley constituted interest deductible under IRC section 163?

Holding

1. No, because the financing costs were incurred in connection with the stock redemption, and thus fall within the scope of IRC section 162(k), which disallows

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

such deductions.
2. No, because the $40 million fee paid to Morgan Stanley was for services rendered and not interest as defined under IRC section 163.

Court’s Reasoning

The court interpreted the phrase ‘in connection with’ broadly, as intended by Congress, finding that the financing was necessary and integral to the redemption. The court rejected Fort Howard’s argument that the costs were only related to the financing and not the redemption, emphasizing the factual relationship between the two. The court also distinguished between the ‘origin of the claim’ test and the statutory test under section 162(k), which focuses on whether expenses are related to a redemption. Furthermore, the court found that amortization of these costs constituted an ‘amount paid or incurred,’ thus subject to section 162(k). Regarding the Morgan Stanley fee, the court determined it was a payment for services, not interest, based on the parties’ intent and the nature of the fee, which did not correlate with the amount borrowed or the term of the financing.

Practical Implications

This decision impacts how companies structure and account for financing in leveraged buyouts and similar transactions involving stock redemptions. It clarifies that financing costs directly related to a redemption are non-deductible, prompting businesses to carefully consider the tax implications of such transactions. The ruling may influence future LBOs to explore alternative financing structures to minimize non-deductible expenses. Additionally, it serves as a reminder to clearly define the nature of fees paid to financial advisors to avoid misclassification as interest. Subsequent cases have cited Fort Howard when analyzing the deductibility of expenses under section 162(k), reinforcing its precedent in tax law.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.