Armour v. Commissioner, 1949 WL 7845 (T.C.)

Whether the sale of a business constitutes the sale of an entire business, thus allowing for capital gains treatment, or merely the sale of individual assets, which could be subject to ordinary income tax rates and price regulations.

Summary

The petitioner, Armour, sold his embroidery manufacturing business. The Commissioner argued that the sale was merely a sale of machinery exceeding OPA price regulations, and the excess should be treated as ordinary income. The Tax Court, however, found that Armour sold his entire business, including machinery, lease, goodwill, trade name, and customer base. Since OPA regulations did not apply to the sale of an entire business, the court ruled that the entire sale was eligible for capital gains treatment. The decision hinged on whether the transaction was a sale of the entire business or just a sale of individual assets subject to price controls.

Facts

Armour owned and operated an embroidery manufacturing business. He sold the business in its entirety. The sale included machinery, the business's lease, goodwill, the trade name, and customer lists. Armour retired from the embroidery business after the sale and did not re-enter the field. The Commissioner contended the sale price exceeded Office of Price Administration (OPA) price ceilings for the machinery, and the excess should be treated as ordinary income instead of capital gains.

Procedural History

The Commissioner determined a deficiency in Armour's income tax, arguing that the sale resulted in ordinary income rather than capital gains. Armour petitioned the Tax Court for a redetermination of the deficiency. The Tax Court reversed the Commissioner's determination, finding that Armour sold his entire business, entitling him to capital gains treatment.

Issue(s)

Whether the sale of Armour's embroidery manufacturing business constituted the sale of an entire business, eligible for capital gains treatment, or merely the sale of individual assets (machinery) subject to OPA price regulations, with the excess sale price taxable as ordinary income.

Holding

No, because the petitioner sold his entire business, not merely individual assets. This sale, including goodwill and customer lists, constituted the sale of a business, exempt from OPA price regulations and thus eligible for capital gains treatment. According to the Court, "Petitioner sold the machines; he sold his lease; he sold his

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

good will; he sold his trade name; and he made his customers available to the purchasers. He actually intended to and did retire from the embroidery business…and has not reentered it since."

Court’s Reasoning

The court emphasized that Armour sold his entire business, including tangible and intangible assets. The court highlighted the inclusion of the lease, goodwill, trade name, and customer relationships as crucial factors indicating the sale of a going concern, not just individual assets. Because the sale encompassed the entire business, OPA price regulations did not apply. The court noted that, "Respondent concedes that O.P.A. price regulations did not apply to the sale of an entire business." The court explicitly avoided deciding whether any OPA ceiling existed or what it was for the machinery, because it was a moot point once they determined the whole business was sold.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the importance of distinguishing between the sale of an entire business and the sale of individual assets for tax purposes. Attorneys and tax advisors must carefully analyze the components of a sale to determine whether it constitutes the sale of a going concern, which may qualify for capital gains treatment. Factors such as the transfer of goodwill, customer relationships, and the seller’s non-compete agreement are crucial in making this determination. This case emphasizes that the substance of the transaction, rather than its form, controls the tax consequences. The decision informs how to structure business sales to achieve desired tax outcomes, especially when assets might be subject to price controls or regulations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.