Moore v. Commissioner, 7 T.C. 1250 (1946)

For purposes of tax law, the term "artistic composition" refers to an entirety, not a mere aggregation of parts, and the period of work on it extends from the commencement to the completion of the unitary composition, not preliminary sketches or models.

Summary

The petitioner, an artist, sought to benefit from Section 107(b) of the tax code, which provided tax relief for income derived from artistic works completed over a period of 36 months or more. The Tax Court had to determine whether the artist's work on a sculpture for a government building spanned the required timeframe. The court held that the artist's preliminary sketches and the interruption of the project due to the war did not extend the period of work to meet the 36-month requirement, denying the petitioner the tax benefits.

Facts

The petitioner, Mr. Moore, was commissioned by the government to create a sculpture for a building. He had created some sketches and models from 1937 to 1940. His design was selected in a 1940 War Department competition. He received $11,500 in 1942, which was over 80% of the total he received under the contract. Due to the war, the project was postponed indefinitely in September 1942, and his services were formally terminated in March 1943.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue denied the petitioner's claim for tax relief under Section 107(b). The artist then petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the artist's work on the artistic composition (the sculpture) covered a period of 36 calendar months or more, as required by Section 107(b) of the tax code.

Holding

1. No, because the artist's preliminary sketches did not count as part of the work on the final artistic composition, and the project was interrupted before the 36-month period was reached.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the term "artistic composition" refers to the complete,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

unitary work, not merely an aggregation of its parts. The court stated, “It seems to us that the term ‘artistic composition’ used in the statute has reference to an entirety and not to a mere aggregation of parts.” The court determined that the earliest date that could be considered the commencement of work was July 9, 1940, when the design was selected. Furthermore, the court found that the work effectively ceased in September 1942 when the project was postponed, despite the artist’s continued “thinking” about the sculpture. Even if the termination date of March 1, 1943, was used, the 36-month requirement was not met.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies how the period of work is determined for artistic compositions under tax law. It emphasizes that preliminary work and conceptualization are not considered part of the actual work on the composition itself. Furthermore, it establishes that a project’s indefinite postponement effectively ends the period of work, even if the artist continues to contemplate the project. This ruling influences how artists and tax professionals assess eligibility for tax benefits related to long-term artistic projects, indicating that the focus should be on the tangible creation of the final artwork within a defined timeframe. It highlights the importance of clearly defining the start and end dates of a project for tax purposes. Later cases would likely distinguish the “thinking” about a project from actual work performed on a project. Cases would also analyze what constitutes “completion” of a project.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.