21 T.C. 15 (1953)

When a taxpayer sells a story, the gain from the sale is considered a capital gain if the story is a capital asset, held for more than six months, and not held primarily for sale in the ordinary course of their trade or business.

Summary

This case involves Fred MacMurray, his wife, and Leslie Fenton, who challenged the Commissioner of Internal Revenue's determination regarding the tax treatment of income received from the sale of a story for a motion picture. The Tax Court addressed two primary issues: (1) whether a loss limitation under Section 130 of the Internal Revenue Code applied to the community property losses of the MacMurrays' ranch business, and (2) whether the income MacMurray and Fenton received from the film constituted ordinary income or capital gains. The court held that Section 130 did not apply to the MacMurrays' community property and that the income received by MacMurray and Fenton was a capital gain from the sale of the story, not ordinary income like dividends or compensation. This decision hinged on whether the story was a capital asset and not part of their regular trade or business and if it was held for more than six months before sale.

Facts

Fred and Lillian MacMurray, residents of California, owned ranch properties as community property. For five consecutive years, losses from the ranch operations exceeded $50,000. MacMurray was also a well-known actor. Leslie Fenton was a producer-director of motion pictures. In 1944, MacMurray, Fenton, and Creighton J. Tevlin purchased the story "Pardon My Past." They intended to sell it to a corporation they formed to produce a film. The corporation, Mutual Productions, was formed, with MacMurray and Fenton holding stock. Mutual Productions entered into an agreement with Columbia Pictures Corporation for the film's production and distribution. Under the agreement, the film's budget included $150,000 for the story purchase. The producers (MacMurray, Fenton, and Tevlin) received a payment of $100,000 from the film's receipts. The Commissioner determined the payments to MacMurray and Fenton should be taxed as ordinary income. MacMurray, Fenton, and Tevlin had never been in the business of buying and selling stories.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued notices of deficiency to Fred and Lillian MacMurray and Leslie Fenton, challenging their tax returns. The MacMurrays and Fenton petitioned the Tax Court to contest the deficiencies. The Tax Court consolidated the cases for trial and entered a decision in favor of the petitioners regarding both issues. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue decided not to appeal the Tax Court's decision.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Section 130 of the Internal Revenue Code, limiting deductions when business losses exceed income, applies to community property businesses based on the total loss sustained in each year by the community or each spouse's share.
2. Whether payments received by Fred MacMurray and Leslie Fenton from the production of "Pardon My Past" constituted ordinary income (as dividends or compensation) or capital gain from the sale of their story interests.

Holding

1. No, because the court held that Section 130 applied to each spouse's share of the community property losses, not the total loss.
2. Yes, because the court determined the payments were capital gains from the sale of their interests in the story, not ordinary income.

Court's Reasoning

Regarding the loss limitation, the court focused on the language of Section 130, which refers to deductions "allowable to an individual." Because the ranch was community property, and each spouse was only entitled to claim half the losses, Section 130's limitations did not apply. The court also noted that the respondent's application of the rule would create a disparity in the tax treatment based on the taxpayer's state of residence, which the Court found no basis to do. Regarding the payments from the film, the court analyzed whether the story constituted a "capital asset." The court found that the story was a capital asset because MacMurray and Fenton were not in the business of selling stories. The court stated, "An actor or a producer-director does not in the ordinary course of his trade or business hold property primarily for sale to customers." The court further determined that the petitioners had held the story for more than six months before the sale. The court also considered the testimony regarding the intent of the parties. The court agreed that the payments were part of the purchase price, and that the transaction was a bona fide sale, not disguised income. The court concluded that the amounts received were payments for the sale of a capital asset and thus qualified for capital gains treatment.

Practical Implications

This case provides guidance in the tax treatment of the sale of intellectual property, such as stories, by individuals who are not in the business of buying and selling such property. The ruling is particularly helpful because it distinguishes between the income received by an actor or producer-director, which is usually considered ordinary income, and the sale of a story that is part of a one-off transaction. It highlights the importance of the characterization of the asset sold and the seller's trade or business. The case affirms that for the capital gains treatment to apply, the

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

asset must be held for more than six months. This case also influences how courts analyze the substance of a transaction and its purpose, as opposed to the form. In cases where a payment is made to an individual who also has an ownership interest in the business, courts will carefully examine the underlying facts to determine if the payment constitutes a sale of an asset or a disguised dividend or payment for services. This case highlights the importance of documenting a transaction in a way that reflects the parties' intentions.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.