Australian Timken Proprietary, Ltd. v. Commissioner, 6 T.C. 952 (1946)

The source of income is determined by the location of the economic activity that generates the income, not merely the location where title to goods transfers.

Summary

Australian Timken, a foreign corporation, received payments from American Timken for bearings sold to Australian customers. The IRS sought to tax these payments as income from U.S. sources, arguing the sales occurred in the U.S. The Tax Court held that the income's source was Australia, where Australian Timken's sales activities took place. The court emphasized that the payments were for maintaining the Australian market for Timken bearings, not merely for the physical sale of goods in the U.S.

Facts

During 1940-1943, Australian Timken (petitioner) had an agreement with American Timken where American Timken sold bearings directly to Australian Timken's customers due to wartime conditions. Australian Timken had established a sales force and engineering support in Australia to promote Timken bearings. Title to the bearings passed directly from American Timken to the Australian customers f.o.b. Canton, Ohio. The payments from American Timken to Australian Timken were roughly equivalent to the difference between American Timken's price to Australian Timken and the price charged to the customers. Australian Timken maintained no office or place of business in the U.S.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed deficiencies against Australian Timken, arguing the income was from U.S. sources. Australian Timken petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiencies.

Issue(s)

Whether payments received by a foreign corporation from a U.S. corporation for sales to the foreign corporation's customers are considered income from sources within the United States when the foreign corporation has no U.S. presence and its activities generating the sales occur outside the U.S.

Holding

No, because the source of the income was the sales activity of Australian Timken's agents and its exclusive right to sell Timken bearings in its territory, which were located outside the United States. The court emphasized that the situs of the activity, not the situs of the sale, is of critical importance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court reasoned that the source of income from the sale of personal property is generally where the seller surrenders title. However, this rule isn’t determinative when considering income beyond the manufacturer’s profits. The court stated, “It is the situs of the activity or property which constitutes the source of the compensation paid and not the situs of the sales by which it is measured that is of critical importance.” The payments to Australian Timken were in recognition of its established sales force and exclusive market rights in Australia. The court distinguished this from a typical sale, noting Australian Timken never had title to the goods. The court relied on precedent such as *Piedras Negras Broadcasting Co.*, 43 B.T.A. 297, aff’d, 127 F.2d 260, which supports sourcing income based on the location of the activity generating the income.

Practical Implications

This case establishes that the source of income is not always where the sale occurs or where title transfers. Courts must look to the economic substance of the transaction and identify where the income-generating activity takes place. This is particularly relevant in international transactions where companies may have complex arrangements. The case highlights that even if a sale technically occurs in the U.S., the income may be sourced elsewhere if the substantial economic activity (sales efforts, market maintenance, etc.) occurs in another country. This ruling influences how multinational companies structure their operations to optimize tax outcomes and requires careful consideration of where value is created within the organization. Later cases have cited this decision to support the principle of sourcing income based on the location of the underlying economic activity, especially in the context of services and intangible property.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.