Nina J. Ennis, 17 T.C. 465 (1951)

The “amount realized” in a property sale, for the purpose of calculating taxable gain, includes the fair market value of non-cash consideration received, but only if that consideration is readily convertible to cash.

Summary

The case concerns the tax implications of a property sale where payment was structured through a land contract. The key issue was whether the land contract itself constituted an “amount realized” under tax law, triggering taxable gain in the year of the sale. The Tax Court held that the contract did not have an ascertainable fair market value and was not readily convertible to cash, and therefore, it was not considered an “amount realized.” The court emphasized the necessity of the obligation to be freely and easily negotiable to be considered equivalent to cash. The court’s decision hinged on whether the contractual obligation received could be readily converted to cash, which determined the timing and extent of the recognition of gain for tax purposes.

Facts

The taxpayer sold her interest in a property, Deer Head Inn, and received some cash and a land contract as consideration. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue argued that the land contract had a fair market value and therefore constituted an “amount realized” in the year of the sale, which would trigger taxable gain. Evidence was presented that the land contracts were used in Michigan, but the specific land contract at issue did not have an easily ascertainable market value. The Tax Court had previously considered this contract and determined that the wife did not realize any taxable gain in a previous case.

Procedural History

The Tax Court originally heard the case regarding the wife’s lack of taxable gain in the previous case and issued an opinion. The Commissioner filed a motion for rehearing, which was denied. The Commissioner subsequently made similar arguments about the contract’s value in the current case.

Issue(s)

Whether the land contract received by the taxpayer constituted an “amount realized” under Section 111(b) of the Internal Revenue Code in the year of the sale.

Holding

No, because the land contract did not have an ascertainable fair market value and was not freely transferable or easily convertible to cash, thus it was not considered an “amount realized” in the year of the sale.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Court’s Reasoning

The court relied on Section 111(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, which defines “amount realized” as the sum of any money received plus the fair market value of any property other than money received. The court stated that, “In determining what obligations are the ‘equivalent of cash’ the requirement has always been that the obligation, like money, be freely and easily negotiable so that it readily passes from hand to hand in commerce.” The court considered the lack of negotiability of the contract and the absence of a readily ascertainable fair market value. The court considered the testimony of a real estate expert, who testified that the specific contract was not easily saleable. The court also considered the fact that the sale of the property required an active liquor license, which decreased the salability of the contract. The court thus concluded that the contract did not have an ascertainable fair market value and did not constitute an “amount realized.”

Practical Implications

This case highlights the importance of determining the fair market value and negotiability of non-cash consideration received in a sale for tax purposes. The principle established in this case directly impacts how taxpayers report and the IRS assesses taxable gain from property sales involving land contracts or other deferred payment arrangements. The case informs future analyses of property sales where the consideration includes contracts or other obligations that are not readily convertible to cash. This case emphasizes that the mere existence of a land contract, even if commonly used, does not automatically trigger immediate tax consequences. This case is crucial in evaluating the tax implications of property sales where payment is not immediately in cash, especially when considering the timing of when gains are recognized. Further, the holding makes it necessary to gather supporting evidence and appraisals to establish a contract’s fair market value when determining the “amount realized” from a sale.

Later cases considering similar issues include cases which determine whether other financial instruments, such as promissory notes, qualify as

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.