Board of Trade of the City of Chicago v. Commissioner, 106 T. C. 369 (1996)

Membership transfer fees paid to a corporation can be excluded from gross income as contributions to capital if they are paid with an investment motive and increase the members' equity.

Summary

The Board of Trade of the City of Chicago (CBOT), a taxable membership corporation, argued that membership transfer fees should be treated as non-taxable contributions to capital rather than taxable income. The fees were used to reduce the mortgage on the CBOT building, which was the corporation's largest asset and liability. The court held that these fees were indeed contributions to capital because they were earmarked for a capital purpose, increased the members' equity, and members had an opportunity to profit from their investment in CBOT. This decision underscores the importance of the payor's investment motive and the direct correlation between the fees and the enhancement of members' equity.

Facts

The CBOT, established in 1859, operates a futures exchange and owns the CBOT building, which includes office space leased to third parties. When a membership is transferred, the transferee must pay a transfer fee, as stipulated in CBOT's bylaws (Rule 243). These fees were designated for reducing the mortgage debt on the CBOT building. During the years in question (1988-1990), the transfer fees collected were $319,800, $333,350, and $345,050, respectively. The CBOT's members have voting and dissolution rights, and their memberships are freely transferable. The CBOT treated these fees as capital contributions for financial reporting and tax purposes.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in CBOT's federal income tax for 1988, 1989, and 1990, asserting that the membership transfer fees should be included in CBOT's gross income as payments for services. CBOT challenged this determination in the United States Tax Court, which ultimately held that the transfer fees were nontaxable contributions to capital.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the membership transfer fees paid to CBOT during the years 1988, 1989, and 1990 are contributions to capital or payments for services.

Holding

1. Yes, because the transfer fees were paid with an investment motive, as evidenced by their earmarking for reducing CBOT's mortgage debt, the resulting increase in members' equity, and the members' opportunity to profit from their investment due

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

to the lack of restrictions on the transferability of their membership interests.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied section 118 of the Internal Revenue Code, which excludes contributions to a corporation’s capital from gross income. The key factor in distinguishing contributions to capital from payments for services is the payor’s motive. The court identified three objective factors supporting an investment motive: (1) the fees were earmarked for reducing the mortgage on the CBOT building, a capital expenditure; (2) the payments increased the members’ equity in CBOT; and (3) members had the opportunity to profit from their investment in CBOT due to the transferable nature of memberships. The court noted that while the fees were mandatory and not pro rata, these characteristics do not preclude them from being treated as contributions to capital. The court also emphasized that the fees were not directly related to the services provided by CBOT’s Member Services Department, further supporting the conclusion that they were contributions to capital.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that membership transfer fees can be treated as non-taxable contributions to capital when they are used for capital purposes and enhance members’ equity. Legal practitioners should analyze similar cases by examining the payor’s motive and the direct impact of fees on the organization’s capital structure. This ruling may influence how other membership organizations structure their fees and report them for tax purposes. Businesses operating as membership corporations should consider how their bylaws and fee structures can be designed to support a capital contribution argument. Subsequent cases, such as *Rev. Rul. 77-354*, have distinguished this ruling by emphasizing the need for fees to be earmarked for capital purposes and to enhance members’ equity.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.