22 T.C. 181 (1954)

Whether an agreement grants a perpetual right or a license for the use of a trademark determines whether payments received are taxable as ordinary income or as proceeds from the sale of a capital asset.

Summary

Tommy Armour, a famous golfer, entered into agreements with two sporting goods companies allowing them to use his name as a trademark. The agreements initially constituted licenses, and the payments Armour received were treated as ordinary income. Later, Armour executed consents to the registration of his name as a trademark, and he argued that these consents converted the agreements into sales of trademark rights, entitling him to capital gains treatment on subsequent payments. The Tax Court held that the consents did not change the nature of the agreements and the payments remained ordinary income, emphasizing that the original agreements limited the duration of the right to use Armour's name and the consents did not extend this duration. The court distinguished between a license and a sale, stating that the latter requires transfer of the whole interest for tax purposes.

Facts

Tommy Armour (the petitioner) entered into agreements with Worthington Ball Company and Crawford, MacGregor, Canby Company (later Sports Products, Inc.) to allow them to use his name as a trademark on golf balls and golf clubs/equipment, respectively. These agreements granted exclusive rights, licenses, and privileges for a specified period and provided for royalties based on sales. Later, Armour executed documents giving both companies the "exclusive right, license, and privilege to use and register my name…from this date forth." Armour received payments from both companies, calculated by sales volume. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that these payments constituted ordinary income and assessed a tax deficiency. Armour contended that the 1949 documents he signed changed the original agreements into sales of capital assets, thus, payments received after 1949 should be treated as capital gains.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue assessed a tax deficiency against Thomas D. Armour for 1949 and 1950, treating the income derived from the trademark agreements as ordinary income. Armour contested this, claiming the payments should be taxed as capital gains. The case was heard by the United States Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the agreements between Armour and the companies, prior to the 1949 consents, constituted a license or a sale for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether the documents Armour executed in 1949, giving consent to register his name as a trademark "from this date forth," changed the character of the agreements from a license to a sale of trademark rights for tax purposes.

Holding

1. Yes, the agreements before 1949 were licenses and not sales, because they granted limited rights for a specified time.

2. No, the 1949 documents did not change the nature of the agreements from licenses to sales, as the documents did not extend the duration of the agreements.

Court's Reasoning

The court focused on the nature of the agreements and the legal effect of the documents Armour executed in 1949. For the agreements predating the 1949 consents, the court found that the contracts were limited in duration, granting only the right to use Armour's name for a specific period. The court cited precedent establishing that if an assignee acquires less than the entire interest, the agreement is considered a license, and any payments constitute royalty income. Therefore, the court held that payments received before the 1949 documents were ordinary income from licensing agreements.

Regarding the 1949 documents, the court stated that the use of the phrase "from this date forth" did not convert the existing license agreements into a perpetual sale of the trademark rights. "We construe the words in question to mean merely that the consents shall apply from the dates of their respective execution to the time of termination of the contracts to which they respectively related." The court emphasized that the 1949 consents did not alter the duration of the original agreements or provide for any new consideration. The court believed it was critical that the rights of the companies, even after signing the 1949 documents, remained unchanged as to the duration of their use of Tommy Armour's name. Thus, since the documents did not alter the agreements, payments received after signing were also considered ordinary income.

Practical Implications

This case illustrates the importance of carefully drafting agreements involving intellectual property, especially trademarks, to clarify whether the intent is to license or sell the rights. The decision highlights that the substance of the transaction, not just its form, determines its tax consequences. The focus on the duration of the agreement is critical. If the agreement confers rights limited in time, even if it grants exclusivity, it is likely a license, and payments will be taxed as ordinary income. If, however, the agreement transfers an entire interest in the trademark, then it's a sale, and the payments could be taxed as capital gains. Further, this case shows that later documents might not change the initial

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

agreement, especially if they do not alter the core agreement's duration.

This case is often cited in similar disputes regarding the taxation of income from intellectual property rights and the distinction between licenses and sales. Lawyers should advise their clients to explicitly define the scope and duration of the rights transferred in trademark agreements to avoid any ambiguity that could lead to unintended tax consequences. Furthermore, the case is a reminder to analyze the totality of the agreements, including any related documents, to correctly determine the economic substance of the transaction.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.