6 T.C. 431 (1946)

Res judicata applies to bar relitigation of the same factual and legal issues in subsequent tax years, but only when the underlying facts and contracts remain identical; new contracts or factual scenarios preclude the application of res judicata, even between the same parties.

Summary

The Tax Court addressed whether royalties assigned by Sunnen to his wife were taxable income to him. Sunnen argued res judicata based on a prior decision regarding earlier tax years. The court held that res judicata applied to royalties from the same contract as in the prior case but not to royalties from new contracts or different inventions. On the merits, the court found that the royalty assignments were anticipatory assignments of income, making Sunnen taxable on those royalties, except where res judicata applied.

Facts

Joseph Sunnen, the petitioner, owned several patents. He entered into licensing agreements with a corporation (in which he held a majority stock interest) allowing them to manufacture and sell his patented devices in exchange for royalties. Shortly after executing these agreements, Sunnen assigned the royalty agreements to his wife. The licensing agreements were for a limited time and subject to cancellation.

Procedural History

The Commissioner assessed deficiencies against Sunnen for the tax years 1937-1941, arguing the royalty payments to his wife were taxable income to him. Sunnen appealed to the Tax Court, claiming res judicata based on a prior Tax Court decision in his favor concerning the tax years 1929-1931. The Tax Court sustained the plea of res judicata as to royalties in the amount of $4,881.35 paid in 1937, but rejected the plea for all other tax years and royalty agreements. The Tax Court then held the remaining royalties were taxable income to Sunnen.

Issue(s)

1. Whether res judicata applies to bar the Commissioner from taxing Sunnen on royalty payments to his wife in 1937-1941, given a prior decision holding such royalties were not taxable to Sunnen in 1929-1931.
2. Whether, if res judicata does not apply, the assignment of royalty agreements to Sunnen’s wife constituted an anticipatory assignment of income, making the royalties taxable to Sunnen.

Holding

1. Yes, as to the $4,881.35 royalty payment in 1937 under the licensing

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

agreement of January 10, 1928, because there was complete identity of issues and parties with the prior proceeding.
2. Yes, as to all other royalties paid under the licensing agreements during the taxable years 1937-1941, because the assignments were anticipatory assignments of income.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that res judicata applies when a controlling fact or matter is in issue between the same parties and is again put in issue in a subsequent suit. Citing Tait v. Western Maryland Ry. Co., 289 U. S. 620. However, this only holds if the cause of action is the same in both suits. The court distinguished Blair v. Commissioner, 300 U. S. 5, where a new, controlling fact had intervened. The court found a "complete identity of issues and parties" regarding the 1937 royalty payment of $4,881.35, rendering res judicata applicable despite subsequent decisions that might have changed the outcome. However, the doctrine did not extend to royalties from the renewal contract or other inventions, because "A question can-not have been adjudged before the subject matter basing the question came into existence." Citing National Bank of Louisville v. Stone, 174 U. S. 432, 435.

On the merits, the court followed Helvering v. Horst, 311 U. S. 112; Helvering v. Eubank, 311 U. S. 122; Lucas v. Earl, 281 U. S. 111; Harrison v. Schaffner, 312 U. S. 579, holding that assignments of income are taxable to the assignor. The court found the facts closely parallel to Estate of J. G. Dodson, 1 T. C. 416, where a taxpayer was deemed to have anticipatorily assigned income. Because Sunnen retained title to the patents, the royalty assignments were considered mere attempts to reallocate income.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the limits of res judicata in tax law. While a prior judgment can bind the IRS in subsequent years, it only applies when the underlying facts and contracts are identical. New contracts or different factual scenarios require a fresh analysis. This decision also reinforces the principle that assigning the right to receive income from property while retaining ownership of the property itself generally constitutes an anticipatory assignment of income, taxable to the assignor. It emphasizes the importance of transferring the underlying asset, not just the income stream, to achieve effective tax planning. Later, the Supreme Court in *Commissioner v. Sunnen*, 333 U.S. 591 (1948) further clarified the application of res judicata, holding that changes in the legal climate could preclude its application even where the facts remained the same, thus modifying the Tax Court's approach.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.