Paine v. Commissioner, 23 T.C. 391 (1954)

Profit realized from the sale of non-interest-bearing notes, originally issued at a discount, is considered interest income, not capital gain, even if the notes are sold before maturity.

Summary

The United States Tax Court addressed whether profits from selling discounted notes just before maturity were taxable as ordinary income (interest) or capital gains. The taxpayers sold non-interest-bearing notes, originally issued at a discount, shortly before their maturity dates. The court held that the profit realized from these sales, representing the difference between the discounted issue price and the face value at maturity, was essentially interest income. This ruling emphasized that despite the form of the transactions (sales), the substance—compensation for the use of money (forbearance on debt) over time—dictated the tax treatment. The court distinguished this scenario from cases where capital gains treatment might apply, emphasizing that the increment in value was a form of interest and therefore taxable as ordinary income.

Facts

The Niles Land Company leased mineral lands to the Chemung Iron Company. Chemung later assigned this lease to Oliver Iron Mining Company. Niles and Toledo Investment Company sold iron ore-bearing lands to Oliver, receiving promissory notes as partial payment. These non-interest-bearing notes were secured by mortgages and guaranteed by U.S. Steel. The notes were originally issued at a discount. Petitioners, who received the notes through inheritance or trusts, sold the notes just before maturity to a bank for an amount close to their face value. The profit earned on these sales was the subject of the dispute. The taxpayers claimed this profit was a capital gain, while the Commissioner argued it was interest income.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in income taxes for the taxpayers, asserting that the profit from the note sales should be taxed as ordinary income. The taxpayers contested this determination, leading to consolidated cases heard by the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court, after reviewing stipulated facts and testimony, upheld the Commissioner’s assessment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the profit realized upon the sale of non-interest-bearing notes, sold before maturity, should be taxed as ordinary income or capital gain.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 

1. Yes, because the profit represented interest income and was not eligible for capital gains treatment.

Court’s Reasoning

The court determined that the profit from the sale of the notes was, in substance, interest. The court reasoned that the discount from the face value of the notes represented compensation for the use of money and the forbearance of the debt until maturity. Despite the form of the transactions (sales), the court looked to the underlying economic reality. The court emphasized that the notes did not require annual payments of interest, and the original value was based on a simple discount rate. The court also distinguished this case from situations where the increment might be considered a capital gain, such as when registered notes were retired. In this case, the notes were not in registered form. The court also considered the testimony of a bank officer who stated that the notes were sold to achieve capital gains treatment, but found that the transaction was, in essence, the sale of a right to interest income. The court cited prior cases, such as Old Colony R. Co. v. Commissioner, defining interest as compensation for the use of borrowed money, and Deputy v. DuPont, which defined interest as compensation for the use or forbearance of money.

Practical Implications

This case has significant implications for taxpayers involved in transactions involving discounted notes or similar financial instruments. It clarifies that profits realized from the sale of such instruments, especially when the sale occurs shortly before maturity, may be classified as interest income rather than capital gains, even if the sale meets the technical definition of a “sale or exchange.” Attorneys should advise clients that the substance of a transaction, including the nature of the profit as compensation for the use of money, will often determine the tax treatment. The court’s focus on economic reality means that taxpayers cannot transform ordinary income into capital gains simply by structuring a transaction as a “sale.” This case continues to inform the treatment of similar transactions and is frequently cited to determine whether proceeds are properly characterized as ordinary income or capital gains. Later cases dealing with original issue discount, and sales of debt instruments often cite Paine.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved. 