Rainier Brewing Co. v. Commissioner, 7 T.C. 162 (1946)

A lump-sum payment received for the exclusive and perpetual right to use trade names is considered the sale of a capital asset, not prepaid royalties taxable as ordinary income; and the basis for determining gain or loss is the fair market value on March 1, 1913, adjusted for tax benefits previously received.

Summary

Rainier Brewing Co. received $1,000,000 in notes in 1940 for the exclusive and perpetual right to use its trade names in Washington and Alaska. The Tax Court addressed whether this was ordinary income (prepaid royalties) or a capital gain from the sale of a capital asset. The court held it was a capital transaction, relying on its prior decision in *Seattle Brewing & Malting Co.* The court also determined the proper basis for calculating gain, addressing the impact of prohibition and prior deductions for obsolescence. The court also ruled that no portion of the $1,000,000 payment should be allocated to a non-compete agreement.

Facts

- Rainier Brewing Co. granted Century Brewing Association the exclusive right to use the “Rainier” and “Tacoma” trade names in Washington and Alaska.
- In 1940, Century exercised an option to make a lump-sum payment of $1,000,000 in notes for the perpetual use of these trade names.
- Rainier’s predecessor had taken deductions for obsolescence of good will during prohibition years.
- The 1935 contract included an agreement by Rainier not to compete with Century in the beer business in Washington and Alaska.

Procedural History

- The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency, treating the $1,000,000 as ordinary income.
- Rainier Brewing Co. petitioned the Tax Court for review.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the $1,000,000 received by Rainier constitutes ordinary income or proceeds from the sale of a capital asset.
2. What is the proper basis for determining gain or loss on the sale of the trade names, considering the impact of prohibition and prior obsolescence deductions?
3. Whether any portion of the $1,000,000 should be allocated to the agreement not to compete.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

1. No, because the payment was for the exclusive and perpetual right to use the trade names, constituting the sale of a capital asset.
2. The basis is the fair market value of the trade names as of March 1, 1913, adjusted downward only by the amount of prior obsolescence deductions that resulted in a tax benefit.
3. No, because the agreement not to compete had little, if any, value in 1940 when the option was exercised.

Court's Reasoning

- The court relied on *Seattle Brewing & Malting Co.*, which involved the same contract, holding that the lump-sum payment was for the acquisition of a capital asset.
- The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that prohibition destroyed the value of the trade names, noting they were continuously used and renewed. Fluctuations in value do not destroy the taxpayer's basis and "[i]t has never been supposed that the fluctuation of value of property would destroy the taxpayer's basis."
- The court determined the March 1, 1913, value to be $514,142, considering expert testimony and the trend toward prohibition. "[T]he value of property at a given time depends upon the relative intensity of the social desire for it at that time, expressed in the money that it would bring in the market."
- The court held that the basis should be reduced only by the amount of obsolescence deductions from which Rainier's predecessors received a tax benefit. It distinguished *Virginian Hotel Corporation*, which involved tangible assets, and emphasized that good will is not depreciable. The court cited *Clarke v. Haberle Crystal Springs Brewing Co.*, stating that obsolescence due to prohibition was not within the intent of the statute: "[W]hen a business is extinguished as noxious under the Constitution the owners cannot demand compensation from the Government, or a partial compensation in the form of an abatement of taxes otherwise due."
- The court found that the agreement not to compete had minimal value in 1940, as Century had already established its market presence. Any competition would also be restricted by the implied covenant not to solicit old customers.

Practical Implications

- This case clarifies the distinction between ordinary income (royalties) and capital gains in the context of trade name licensing agreements. A lump-sum payment for perpetual rights indicates a sale of a capital asset.
- It highlights the importance of establishing the March 1, 1913, value for assets acquired before that date for tax basis calculations.
- The case illustrates the limited impact of prior obsolescence deductions on basis, emphasizing that only deductions resulting in a tax benefit reduce the basis.
- It demonstrates that the value of a non-compete agreement must be assessed

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

at the time of the sale, not necessarily at the time the underlying agreement was made, and its value can diminish over time.
- Later cases have cited *Rainier Brewing* for its discussion of valuing intangible assets and the treatment of non-compete agreements in asset sales.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.