Continental Oil Co. v. Jones, 177 F.2d 508 (10th Cir. 1949)

Notes taken in payment of customer accounts are considered capital assets when their sale is not a regular part of the taxpayer's business.

Summary

Continental Oil Co. sought to deduct a loss from the sale of customer notes as an ordinary loss. The IRS disallowed the deduction, arguing it was a capital loss subject to limitations. The Tenth Circuit affirmed the Tax Court's decision, holding that the notes were capital assets because the sale of such notes was not a routine and ordinary part of Continental Oil's business, therefore the loss was a capital loss subject to restrictions. The Court emphasized that the notes were not held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business.

Facts

Continental Oil Co. sold finishing materials to Union Furniture Co. and Rockford Chair & Furniture Co. on open account. Because payments were slow, Continental Oil accepted secured trust deed notes from Union Furniture Co. in 1933 and from Rockford Chair & Furniture Co. in 1936. Continental Oil collected some principal on the Union Furniture Co. notes. Continental Oil sold both sets of notes in 1943, resulting in a loss of $11,442.43.

Procedural History

Continental Oil deducted the $11,442.43 loss as a worthless debt on its 1943 tax return. The Commissioner disallowed the deduction, determining that the sales resulted in capital losses that could not offset taxable income because Continental Oil had no capital gains. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's determination. Continental Oil appealed to the Tenth Circuit.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the loss from the sale of customer notes is deductible as an ordinary loss under Section 23(f) of the Internal Revenue Code, or as a capital loss under Section 117.
2. Whether the notes are considered "property held by the taxpayer primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business" and therefore excluded from the definition of capital assets under Section 117(a)(1).

Holding

1. No, because the notes were capital assets and the loss is subject to the limitations in Section 117.
2. No, because the notes were not held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of Continental Oil's business.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that Section 23(g) limits losses from sales of capital assets to the extent provided in Section 117, which restricts such losses to the amount of gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets. Under Section 117(a)(1), capital assets include property held by the taxpayer, but exclude certain types of property such as stock in trade, inventory, depreciable property, and property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business.

The court acknowledged that the notes came into Continental Oil’s possession in the ordinary course of its business. However, the court distinguished this case from others where the taxpayer regularly took property in payment for goods or services and then routinely sold the property. In this case, the notes were taken long after the goods were sold, were not sold for many years, and the transactions were isolated. Therefore, the court concluded that the notes were not held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of Continental Oil’s business and were considered capital assets.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the distinction between ordinary and capital losses for businesses that occasionally sell customer notes. It establishes that the key factor is whether the sale of such notes is a regular and ordinary part of the business, or an isolated transaction. Businesses should carefully document their practices regarding the sale of customer notes to support their tax treatment of any resulting losses. This ruling highlights that simply receiving notes in the ordinary course of business is insufficient to treat their sale as generating an ordinary loss; the sale itself must be an ordinary business practice. Later cases have cited Continental Oil Co. v. Jones to determine whether assets fall within the exceptions to the definition of “capital asset,” focusing on the frequency and regularity of sales.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.