Specialty Engineering Co. v. Commissioner, 12 T.C. 1172 (1949)

When a settlement payment resolves claims involving both capital assets and ordinary income, the payment and related expenses must be allocated proportionally between the two categories for tax purposes.

Summary

Specialty Engineering Co. and John G. Ogden were previously partners operating under a verbal agreement regarding a beverage bottle carrier invention. After a dispute, Ogden sued Specialty. The court found in favor of Ogden. While Specialty's appeal was pending, they settled for $140,000. Specialty deducted the settlement and related legal fees as ordinary expenses, while Ogden reported the settlement as a capital gain. The Tax Court held that the settlement and associated expenses must be allocated between capital expenditures (patent acquisition) and ordinary income (profits from the use of Ogden's share of the partnership), based on the underlying components of the original judgment.

Facts

John G. Ogden invented a beverage bottle carrier and disclosed his invention to Specialty Engineering Co. in 1931.
Ogden and Specialty entered verbal agreements (1931 and 1932) to jointly exploit the invention; Specialty would manufacture, Ogden would sell, and profits would be split.
A patent was jointly issued to Ogden and Specialty in 1935, with other patents following.
Ogden terminated the arrangement in November 1938.

Procedural History

Ogden sued Specialty in Pennsylvania state court in 1939, alleging breach of contract and seeking an accounting, injunctions, and reassignment of the patent.
The state court ruled in Ogden's favor, awarding him $248,339.33, representing the value of his partnership interest and profits from the use of his assets.
Specialty appealed to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.
While the appeal was pending, Specialty and Ogden settled for $140,000.
Specialty deducted the $140,000 settlement and $13,509.35 in related fees as ordinary expenses.
Ogden reported the $140,000 as a long-term capital gain and deducted $56,806.55 in legal fees.
The Commissioner disallowed Specialty's deductions and reclassified Ogden's gain as ordinary income. Both parties appealed to the Tax Court.

Issue(s)

Whether the $140,000 settlement payment by Specialty to Ogden should be treated

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

entirely as either (1) a deductible ordinary expense for Specialty and ordinary income for Ogden, or (2) a non-deductible capital expenditure for Specialty and capital gain for Ogden; or whether it should be allocated between the two categories.
Whether the legal fees and other costs incurred by both parties should be treated entirely as either (1) deductible ordinary expenses or (2) capital expenditures to be offset against the settlement amount, or whether these expenses should be allocated proportionally.

Holding

Yes, the settlement payment and associated expenses must be allocated proportionally between capital expenditures and ordinary income, because the settlement resolved claims involving both a capital asset (Ogden's partnership interest, including the patent) and ordinary income (profits attributable to the use of Ogden's share of the partnership).

Court's Reasoning

The court reasoned that the original state court judgment included components representing both the value of Ogden's partnership interest (a capital asset) and profits/interest thereon (ordinary income).
The settlement was a compromise of that judgment, therefore it implicitly encompassed both capital and income elements.
The court rejected the Commissioner's argument that the entire payment was for a capital asset, as well as Ogden's argument that it was entirely capital gain.
Citing *Cohan v. Commissioner*, the court found that an allocation was necessary and proper, even if inexact, to reflect the true nature of the transaction.
The court approved Specialty's proposed allocation method, which apportioned the settlement based on the ratio of the capital asset component of the original judgment to the total judgment amount.
Expenses were to be allocated using the same ratio. The court stated that "It would be unjust, in such circumstances, to say that both petitioners have failed for lack of proof… Some allocation seems necessary and proper".

Practical Implications

This case establishes a clear rule for allocating settlement payments and related expenses in cases involving mixed claims. Taxpayers cannot simply characterize the entire settlement as either capital or ordinary, but must analyze the underlying claims and apportion the payment accordingly.
This decision affects how legal practitioners advise clients on structuring settlements to achieve the most favorable tax treatment. It emphasizes the importance of documenting the specific claims being resolved and their relative values.
Specialty Engineering is frequently cited in cases involving the settlement of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

intellectual property disputes, partnership dissolutions, and other situations where both capital and income elements are present.
Subsequent cases have further refined the allocation methods, but the core principle of proportional allocation remains influential.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.