24 T.C. 187 (1955)

An assignment of a royalty contract for a patent, treated as a gift, transfers property rights, and the subsequent income from the royalties is taxable to the assignee, not the original owner of the patent.

Summary

Franklin A. Reece assigned his royalty contract for a patented invention to his wife, Teresa, as a gift. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue sought to tax Reece on the royalty payments received by Teresa, arguing that the assignment was merely an assignment of future income. The Tax Court held that the assignment transferred property rights, including the right to receive royalty payments, and, therefore, the income was taxable to Teresa, the new owner of those rights, and not to Franklin Reece. The court emphasized that the assignment was absolute and that Reece had treated the assignment as a gift, paying a gift tax on its value.

Facts

Franklin A. Reece invented a helical traverse double grooved roll. He patented it in 1930. In 1929, Reece entered into a contract with Universal Winding Company, assigning his patent rights in exchange for royalties based on spindle sales. In 1935, Reece made a gift of the royalty contract to his wife, Teresa. The assignment was absolute, and Universal Winding Company acknowledged and consented to the assignment. Reece paid a gift tax on the value of the assigned royalty contract. Universal Winding Company subsequently made royalty payments directly to Teresa. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined deficiencies in Reece's income tax, claiming the royalty payments to Teresa were taxable to him.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued deficiency notices for the years 1947 and 1950, asserting that Franklin Reece should be taxed on the royalty payments made to his wife. Reece challenged the IRS's determination in the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court consolidated two cases, one for each year in question. After the initial briefs, the IRS conceded that amounts paid to Teresa were capital gains, but the issue of whether it should be taxed to the husband remained.

Issue(s)

Whether the royalty payments made to M. Teresa Reece in 1947 by Universal Winding Company were taxable to petitioner, Franklin A. Reece?

Holding

No, because the assignment of the royalty contract constituted a transfer of property rights, and the income from that property was taxable to the assignee,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Teresa, not the assignor, Franklin.

Court’s Reasoning

The court relied on the principle that an assignment of income does not relieve the assignor of the tax, but the assignment of property rights does shift the tax liability to the new owner of the property. The court found that Reece’s assignment to his wife was not a mere assignment of future income but an absolute transfer of the royalty contract itself. The court emphasized that Reece had treated the assignment as a gift, paying a gift tax on it, further indicating the transfer of property rights. The court also noted that the payments represented a purchase price from the sale of the invention. The court cited several precedents to support its holding, including *William Ernest Seatree*, *John F. Canning*, and *Carl G. Dreymann*.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the tax treatment of income derived from assigned patent rights. It establishes that if the assignment is of the underlying property right (e.g., the royalty contract) and is complete, the income is taxable to the assignee. This is critical when structuring transactions involving intellectual property, gifts, and estate planning. An attorney advising a client would need to ensure the assignment is a transfer of the property right and not merely an attempt to redirect income. The decision also has implications for the taxation of other forms of intellectual property income, such as copyrights. The case highlights the importance of correctly characterizing a transaction to align tax consequences with economic substance, specifically that a gift of property rights has different tax implications than an assignment of income.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.