LoBue v. Commissioner, 28 T.C. 133 (1957)

Whether a stock option granted to an employee is primarily intended as compensation, rather than to provide a proprietary interest, depends on the facts and circumstances surrounding the grant of the option and is subject to taxation as ordinary income if compensatory.

Summary

The case concerns the taxability of a stock option granted to Philip J. LoBue by his employer, Household. The Commissioner determined that the difference between the market price and the option price of the stock at the time of exercise constituted compensation, taxable as ordinary income. LoBue argued the option was solely for acquiring a proprietary interest, thus not taxable at the time of exercise. The Tax Court examined the negotiations, terms of the agreement, and the circumstances, concluding the option was primarily compensatory. The Court held the option price was established to compensate LoBue and the spread between option and market price was taxable as ordinary income. The Court rejected LoBue's arguments regarding restrictions on selling the stock.

Facts

LoBue was hired by Household. As part of his employment, Household granted LoBue an option to purchase 10,000 shares of its stock at a price of $18.70 per share. Negotiations for his employment included discussion of a base salary. To offset the forfeiture of deferred compensation from his previous job and salary reductions, the stock option became a key part of the compensation package. The stock's market price at the time of exercise was $33.75, creating a substantial spread. LoBue argued the option's purpose was to give him a proprietary interest in the company. The Commissioner asserted the spread between the option price and market price constituted compensation subject to income tax.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in LoBue's income tax, asserting the spread between the option and market price at the time of exercise was taxable compensation. The Tax Court heard the case after LoBue challenged the Commissioner's determination. The Tax Court sided with the Commissioner.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the stock option granted to LoBue was intended to compensate him for services rendered or to provide him with a proprietary interest in the company.
2. Whether, if the gain from the exercise of the option was compensatory, the shares had an ascertainable market value in LoBue's hands during the taxable

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

year, considering his arguments regarding restrictions on sale.

Holding

1. Yes, the option was intended to compensate LoBue. The option's bargain nature and its spread between the option price and market price was the primary inducement for LoBue to accept the job.
2. Yes, the shares had an ascertainable market value. Despite any informal agreement regarding the sale of the shares and restrictions from Section 16(b) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, the Tax Court found the stock had a market value, as LoBue could have sold the shares up to their fair market value on the date of acquisition without liability under section 16(b).

Court's Reasoning

The Court emphasized the factual nature of determining compensatory intent. It considered the complete record, including negotiations, correspondence, and company statements. The court noted the agreement on LoBue's base salary and the significance of the stock option in supplementing it. The Tax Court was convinced that "the decisive element was the bargain nature of the stock option and that it was the assurance that there would be a substantial spread between the option price and the market price which persuaded petitioner to accept his job with Household." The Tax Court held the option price was compensatory because it gave LoBue an economic benefit as consideration for accepting employment. The Court referenced that "each case must be decided upon its own peculiar facts, and facts which have been deemed significant under some circumstances may serve as guides, but are not necessarily controlling." Additionally, the court considered that the corporation may have desired to aid the petitioner in his attempt to secure favorable tax treatment. The Court found no formal contract restricted LoBue from selling shares. Further, the Court found section 16(b) did not restrict his sales below market value.

Practical Implications

This case is crucial for determining when stock options constitute taxable compensation. It highlights the importance of meticulously documenting the circumstances surrounding stock option grants, including the negotiations, the intentions of both the employer and employee, and the overall compensation package. The court's emphasis on the bargain nature of the option as a compensatory factor means that practitioners must analyze the economic benefits conferred by the option. Legal counsel needs to advise clients on the tax implications of stock options and the factors courts consider when determining compensatory intent. Specifically, the case underscores that if a stock option's price is set below market value to attract an employee or compensate for other factors, the spread will likely be treated as taxable compensation at the time the option is exercised. Subsequent cases often cite LoBue for its analysis of stock options as compensation and the importance of considering the factual context. The case

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

provided guidance on how to analyze similar compensation and the importance of well-documented agreements.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.