

The Klear Cure Co., Inc. v. Commissioner, 9 T.C. 801 (1947)

Payments made for the use of a secret formula are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses, and compensation paid to a shareholder-employee is deductible to the extent it is reasonable and not a disguised distribution of profits.

Summary

The Klear Cure Co. sought to deduct royalty payments made to Strange and Kastner for the use of a secret formula and the full amount of salaries paid to Kaye McNamara, a shareholder-employee. The Commissioner disallowed these deductions, arguing that the formula was not secret and the salaries were unreasonable. The Tax Court held that the royalty payments were deductible because a secret formula existed and the salaries were reasonable, determined at arm's length and necessary to retain valuable services during a period of high business volume.

Facts

The Klear Cure Co. made payments to Strange and Kastner for the use of their secret formula for a concrete-curing product called Klearcure. Kaye McNamara, a shareholder, received salaries of \$6,700 and \$5,500 in 1942 and 1943, respectively. The Commissioner challenged the deductibility of these payments, claiming the formula wasn't actually secret, and McNamara's salary was unreasonable.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deductions claimed by The Klear Cure Co. The Klear Cure Co. then petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the payments made to Strange and Kastner for the use of their secret formula are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses.
2. Whether the salaries paid to Kaye McNamara in 1942 and 1943 were reasonable compensation and, therefore, deductible from the company's gross income.

Holding

1. Yes, the payments were deductible because Strange and Kastner owned a secret formula for Klearcure, and the payments were for its use.
2. Yes, the salaries paid to Kaye McNamara were reasonable and deductible because the amounts were determined in arms' length negotiations and were necessary to retain her services.

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that a secret formula can be considered property. The court distinguished the cases cited by the Commissioner, finding that in those cases, the taxpayer either failed to prove the existence of a secret formula or the item was not considered property. Here, the court found that Kastner and Strange did have a secret formula for Klearcure. The court also found that the salaries paid to McNamara were reasonable, noting that the amounts were arrived at in arms' length negotiations and were necessary to retain her services. The court emphasized the sharp disagreement among the directors regarding McNamara's salary, which negated any argument that the board's agreement to increase her wages was an attempt to distribute profits in the guise of wages. The court cited the increase in McNamara's responsibilities due to the greater volume of business during those years, making her particularly valuable given her knowledge of where to purchase scarce materials. The court said, "It is true that where, as here, payments are to a shareholder, the proof must show that the directors were not disguising distributions of profit in the form of salary."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that payments for secret formulas can be deductible business expenses if a genuine secret exists. It highlights the importance of proving the existence and value of the secret. It also emphasizes the importance of demonstrating that compensation paid to shareholder-employees is reasonable and not a disguised dividend. This case is important for tax attorneys and accountants advising businesses on the deductibility of payments for intangible assets and employee compensation, especially in closely held companies. The need for arm's-length negotiations and documentation to support the reasonableness of compensation is crucial in avoiding disallowance of deductions.