15 T.C. 10 (1950)

The death of a partner triggers a transmission of their interest in partnership installment obligations, making the unrealized profit taxable to the decedent's estate unless a bond is filed to defer the tax.

Summary

The Tax Court held that the death of Meyer Goldberg, a partner in M. Goldberg & Sons, triggered a taxable event regarding his share of unrealized profits from installment obligations. The partnership used the installment method of accounting. Goldberg's estate was liable for income tax on his share of these profits because no bond was filed under Section 44(d) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court relied on the precedent set in *F.E. Waddell et al., Executors*, finding the death resulted in a transmission of the decedent's interest. The court rejected arguments that the partnership's continuation negated the transmission.

Facts

Meyer Goldberg was a partner in M. Goldberg & Sons, a furniture business that used the installment method of accounting. Upon Meyer's death in August 1945, he held a 30% share in the partnership. His 30% share of the unrealized gross profits on installment obligations was $30,168.42 at the time of his death. The partnership agreement specified that upon Meyer's death, the surviving partners would continue the business and purchase Meyer's interest. No bond was filed with the Commissioner guaranteeing the return of the unrealized profit as income by those receiving it.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Meyer Goldberg's estate tax return, attributing the deficiency to the inclusion of unrealized profit on installment obligations. The estate contested the adjustment. The Tax Court reviewed the Commissioner's determination.

Issue(s)

Whether the death of a partner, in a partnership owning installment obligations, constitutes a transmission or disposition of those obligations under Section 44(d) of the Internal Revenue Code, thereby triggering a taxable event for the decedent's estate if no bond is filed.

Holding

Yes, because the death of a partner dissolves the old partnership, resulting in the transmission of the decedent's interest in the installment obligations to their estate, which triggers the recognition of income under Section 44(d) of the Internal

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Revenue Code if no bond is filed to defer the tax.

Court's Reasoning

The court relied heavily on the precedent set in *F.E. Waddell et al., Executors*. The court reasoned that the death of a partner dissolves the partnership, causing an immediate vesting of the decedent's share of partnership property in their estate. This vesting constitutes a transmission of the installment obligations. The court rejected the estate's argument that because the partnership continued, there was no transmission of the installment obligations, stating, "While we are firmly of the opinion that this is the natural, indeed, the only reasonable construction to be placed on the words of the statute, as applied to the facts of this case, and that resort to interpretation to carry out its intent is not necessary, we agree with the Commissioner also that this is a required construction if the intent and purpose of the Act is to be carried out, and that the Act easily yields such a construction.". The court emphasized that cases concerning the continuation of a partnership for other tax purposes were not controlling because they did not involve the application of Section 44(d).

Practical Implications

This case clarifies that the death of a partner is a taxable event concerning installment obligations held by the partnership. Attorneys should advise clients to consider the tax implications of installment obligations in partnership agreements and estate planning. Specifically, the estate can either recognize the income in the year of death or file a bond with the IRS to defer the recognition of income until the installment obligations are actually collected. The ruling underscores the importance of proper tax planning to mitigate potential tax liabilities upon a partner's death. This case has been followed in subsequent cases involving similar issues, reinforcing the principle that death can trigger a taxable disposition of installment obligations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.