Arthur Kober v. Commissioner, 19 T.C. 391 (1952)

Literary property held by a taxpayer in connection with their trade or business is considered a capital asset if not primarily held for sale to customers in the ordinary course of that business, qualifying for capital gains treatment.

Summary

Arthur Kober, a director, sold the literary property "Sorry, Wrong Number." The Commissioner argued that the proceeds were ordinary income because the property was held in connection with Kober's trade or business. The Tax Court held the property was a capital asset because it was not held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his business. This case clarifies that literary property can qualify for capital gains treatment, even if held in connection with a taxpayer's trade or business, as long as it's not held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of that business. The court declined to limit the statutory language only to speculators or traders in securities.

Facts

Arthur Kober, a director, sold the literary property "Sorry, Wrong Number." The Commissioner challenged Kober's treatment of the proceeds from the sale as capital gains, arguing the proceeds were ordinary income.

Procedural History

The case was heard by the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court sided with the taxpayer and determined the gains from the sale were capital gains.

Issue(s)

Whether the literary property "Sorry, Wrong Number" was a capital asset or property held by the taxpayer primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business.

Holding

Yes, the literary property was a capital asset because it was not held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of Kober's business.

Court's Reasoning

The court focused on the interpretation of Section 117(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The Commissioner argued that since Kober held the property intending to sell it in connection with his trade or business of being a director, it was not a capital asset. The court rejected the Commissioner's narrow interpretation, stating that the statute's language was not limited to only speculators

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

and traders. It reasoned that applying the Commissioner's argument would require distorting the statute's language. The court found that the literary property was held in connection with Kober's trade or business but was not held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business. The court referenced and followed its decision in *Fred MacMurray, 21 T.C. 15*, and noted the Commissioner's acquiescence in that case.

The court stated, "The issue here is not different from the comparable issue in Fred MacMurray, 21 T. C. 15, and we reach the same result in this case."

Practical Implications

This case is essential for authors, screenwriters, and other creative professionals. It provides that the sale of intellectual property can qualify for capital gains treatment if not held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business. This can lead to a lower tax liability compared to treating the proceeds as ordinary income. Tax advisors and attorneys must assess the nature of the taxpayer's business and their intent to sell literary works. The case emphasizes that even if property is held in connection with one's business, it is not automatically excluded from capital asset treatment. The court's reliance on a prior case (MacMurray) suggests a degree of consistency in the court's approach to similar issues. It reinforces the importance of proper categorization of assets for tax purposes.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.