6 T.C. 773 (1946)

Settlement proceeds from a lawsuit are taxable as income under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code unless the taxpayer can demonstrate that the proceeds represent a non-taxable return of capital, such as for damage to goodwill, and allocate the settlement amount accordingly.

Summary

R.J. Durkee sued a group of electrical contractors for conspiracy to restrain trade, alleging lost profits and destruction of business goodwill. The case was settled for $25,000, and Durkee, after deducting attorney's fees and court costs, reported the net amount of $19,439.95 on his tax return but argued it was not taxable. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination that the settlement was taxable income because Durkee failed to prove what portion of the settlement was for non-taxable capital recovery (e.g., goodwill) versus taxable lost profits or punitive damages. The court emphasized the lack of evidence allowing allocation among the various potential elements of recovery.

Facts

R.J. Durkee, an electrical contractor, sued 30 other contractors, alleging they conspired to restrain trade from 1928 to 1939 by fixing prices, maintaining a quota system, and coercing architects and builders against him. Durkee claimed this conspiracy destroyed his business goodwill and deprived him of income. He sought $300,000 in damages, based on an Ohio statute allowing for double damages in antitrust cases. The suit was settled in 1941 for $25,000, with Durkee signing a release discharging the defendants from all claims, including those asserted in the lawsuit. Durkee reported the net settlement amount on his tax return but argued it was non-taxable.

Procedural History

Durkee filed suit in the Court of Common Pleas, Cuyahoga County, Ohio. After an amended petition and general denials by the defendants, the case was settled before trial. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined the settlement proceeds were taxable income and assessed a deficiency. Durkee petitioned the Tax Court for redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the settlement proceeds received by Durkee in the antitrust lawsuit are taxable income under Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because Durkee failed to demonstrate that the settlement represented a

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

non-taxable return of capital (e.g., for damage to goodwill) and failed to provide a basis for allocating the settlement amount among different potential elements of recovery (e.g., lost profits, damage to goodwill, punitive damages).

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the Commissioner's determination of taxability is presumed correct, and the taxpayer bears the burden of proving otherwise. The court acknowledged that if the settlement were demonstrably for the destruction of goodwill, it would be a non-taxable return of capital (to the extent of its basis). However, the court found it impossible to allocate the settlement amount between lost profits (taxable income) and damage to goodwill (potential capital recovery) based on the record. The court noted the amended petition alleged both loss of profits and damage to goodwill, but there was no basis for dividing the settlement between the two. Further, the release covered claims not only of Durkee individually, but also of a dissolved partnership and a corporation, further obscuring the nature of the recovery. The court cited *Raytheon Production Corporation*, where a similar lack of allocation led to the entire settlement being treated as taxable income. The court distinguished *Highland Farms*, where a clear division existed between punitive and remedial elements of recovery, allowing for exclusion of punitive damages from taxable income. The court stated: "If the amount received in settlement of such an action had been shown to be received for the good will of petitioner's business, it would, above its basis, be a capital recovery, and he would not be taxable. But clearly, it is impossible for us so to state, under the facts of record here."

Practical Implications

This case underscores the critical importance of carefully documenting and allocating settlement proceeds to specific types of damages. Taxpayers seeking to treat settlement proceeds as a non-taxable return of capital must provide clear evidence supporting that characterization. Settlement agreements should explicitly allocate portions of the settlement to specific claims, such as damage to goodwill or capital assets, and evidence should be maintained to support the allocation. The Durkee case highlights the risk of unfavorable tax treatment when a settlement agreement is broadly worded and lacks specific allocation, especially when multiple plaintiffs or types of claims are involved. Later cases cite Durkee for the principle that the taxpayer bears the burden of proving the nature of settlement proceeds for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.