Container Corp. v. Comm'r, 134 T. C. 122 (U. S. Tax Court 2010)

In Container Corp. v. Commissioner, the U. S. Tax Court ruled that guaranty fees paid by a U. S. subsidiary to its Mexican parent were not subject to U. S. withholding tax. The court determined these fees were Mexican source income, analogous to payments for services, and thus not taxable under Section 881(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. This decision underscores the importance of determining the source of income for multinational corporations and impacts how guaranty fees are treated in cross-border transactions.

Parties

Container Corporation (Petitioner), successor to the interest of Container Holdings Corporation, successor to the interest of Vitro International Corporation, filed the petition in the U. S. Tax Court against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent).

Facts

Vitro, S. A. , a Mexican corporation, provided a guaranty to its U. S. subsidiary, International, for debt securities issued to U. S. investors. International paid Vitro annual guaranty fees of 1. 5% of the outstanding principal, totaling $6,708,095 over three years (1992-1994). The Commissioner determined that these fees should have been subject to a 30% U. S. withholding tax under Section 881(a) of the Internal Revenue Code as they constituted "fixed or determinable annual or periodical" income from a U. S. source.

Procedural History

The Commissioner issued a notice of deficiency to Container Corporation for failure to withhold U. S. taxes on the guaranty fees. Container Corporation petitioned the U. S. Tax Court to redetermine its liabilities. The case was tried in Dallas, Texas, and the court's decision was rendered on February 17, 2010.

Issue(s)

Whether the guaranty fees paid by International to Vitro are considered U. S. source income subject to withholding tax under Section 881(a) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Rule(s) of Law

Section 881(a) of the Internal Revenue Code imposes a 30% tax on "fixed or determinable annual or periodical" (FDAP) income received by a foreign corporation from sources within the United States. The source of FDAP income is determined under Sections 861 through 863 of the Code. Section 861(a)(3) and Section 862(a)(3) specify that the source of income from services is where the services are

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

performed. If a category of FDAP income is not specifically listed, the income is sourced by analogy to the most similar listed category.

Holding

The U. S. Tax Court held that the guaranty fees paid by International to Vitro are not U. S. source income subject to withholding tax under Section 881(a). Instead, these fees are analogous to payments for services and thus sourced to Mexico, where the guaranty was provided.

Reasoning

The court reasoned that the guaranty fees were not interest because they did not compensate for the use or forbearance of money, as Vitro did not extend funds to International. The court rejected the argument that the fees were analogous to interest, finding that the predominant feature of the guaranty was not the immediate payment of funds but a promise to perform a future act if International defaulted.

The court analyzed whether the fees could be considered compensation for services, concluding that the minimal services provided by Vitro's Mexican subsidiary, Corporativo, were insufficient to justify the fees. The court then sourced the fees by analogy, determining that guaranties are more akin to services because they are produced by the obligee's promise and assets. The court noted that the fees were sourced to Mexico, where Vitro's assets and management were located, rather than to International's location in the U. S.

The court distinguished this case from Bank of America v. United States, where commissions on letters of credit were sourced as interest due to the direct substitution of credit. Here, Vitro augmented rather than substituted International's credit, and the fees were not for an immediate obligation but for a contingent future action.

Disposition

The U. S. Tax Court held that International was not required to withhold taxes on the guaranty fees paid to Vitro, as they constituted Mexican source income. The decision was to be entered under Rule 155 of the Tax Court Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Significance/Impact

This decision clarifies the sourcing of guaranty fees in cross-border transactions, emphasizing that such fees may be sourced to the location of the guarantor's assets and management rather than the location of the debtor. It impacts how multinational corporations structure their financing and guaranty arrangements to minimize tax liabilities. The ruling also highlights the challenges of categorizing income that does not fit neatly into statutory definitions, requiring courts to apply

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

analogies based on the underlying economic substance of transactions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.