*21 T.C. 448 (1954)*

When war contracts are contributed to a partnership, the fair market value of those contracts at the time of contribution establishes the basis for determining taxable gain.

**Summary**

In a case involving the valuation of war contracts contributed to a partnership, the U.S. Tax Court, on remand from the Court of Appeals, addressed the issue of determining the fair market value of these contracts. The court rejected the Commissioner's zero valuation, finding that the contracts did indeed have a fair market value at the time of contribution. However, it also rejected the taxpayer's high valuation. The court ultimately determined a fair market value of $250,000, based on its analysis of the evidence, which included testimony of expert witnesses, considering factors such as the contracts' renegotiation, termination clauses, and availability of materials. The case emphasizes the importance of supporting valuations with credible evidence and accounting for all relevant factors.

**Facts**

Murray Thompson and Kibbey W. Couse were partners in a partnership that acquired war contracts. The issue involved determining the fair market value of these contracts at the time they were contributed to the partnership upon the dissolution of a corporation, Couse Laboratories, Inc. The Commissioner determined a zero basis for the contracts, which the taxpayers challenged. The taxpayers presented valuation evidence from expert witnesses to support their valuation of the contracts.

**Procedural History**

The case was initially heard by the Tax Court, which found the contracts had no basis. The Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit reversed, remanding the case to the Tax Court. The Tax Court considered additional evidence and arguments on the valuation issue, and the taxpayers filed additional briefs. The Tax Court, after considering the evidence and arguments, determined the fair market value of the contracts and ordered decisions to be entered under Rule 50.

**Issue(s)**

1. Whether the war contracts, assumed to have fair market value upon the dissolution of the corporation, had a basis in the hands of the partnership that must be recovered in calculating the taxable gain attributable to such contracts.

2. What was the fair market value of the contracts?

**Holding**

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

1. Yes, the contracts had a basis in the hands of the partnership that must be considered when computing the profits derived from the contracts.

2. The fair market value of the contracts was $250,000.

**Court's Reasoning**

The court first addressed the question of whether the contracts, assuming they had a fair market value, had a basis in the hands of the partnership. The court held that if the contracts possessed a fair market value when contributed, then such value established a basis. The Court stated that "If the contracts did in fact have a fair market value on October 31, 1942, they had a basis when contributed to the partnership, and such basis must be taken into account in computing the profits derived from such contracts." The court then turned to the more difficult task of determining fair market value. The court found that it could determine a fair market value even though this task was difficult. It considered testimony from both petitioners and from other expert witnesses on the fair market value of the contracts. The court rejected the high valuations proposed by the taxpayers. The court determined that the witnesses' valuations were faulty because they took into account factors that related to the business as a whole, not to the value of the contracts themselves, they ignored renegotiation possibilities, the contracts termination clauses, and problems with materials availability. Ultimately, the court made a determination of fair market value based on its "best judgment on the entire record".

**Practical Implications**

This case is a reminder of the importance of properly valuing assets for tax purposes. The court emphasized that the value of an asset, in this case, war contracts, must be supported by reliable evidence and take into account all relevant factors, including market conditions, contract terms, and other risks. This case has important implications for attorneys and taxpayers, particularly those involved in business valuations, partnership contributions, and transactions involving intangible assets. Attorneys should advise their clients to carefully consider these factors when determining the fair market value of assets and should gather sufficient evidence to support their valuations. Further, it highlights that the court will not simply accept valuations based on speculative assumptions, but will conduct its own evaluation based on the evidence and the specific circumstances.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 