26 T.C. 967 (1956)

A contract granting exclusive rights to purchase a product can be considered a capital asset, and the disposition of those rights for a sum of money constitutes a "sale or exchange" resulting in capital gain.

Summary

The Pittston Company contested a tax deficiency, arguing that $500,000 received by its subsidiary, Pattison & Bowns, Inc., from the Russell Fork Coal Company should be taxed as capital gain rather than ordinary income. Pattison & Bowns held a contract giving it the exclusive right to buy all the coal mined by Russell Fork for a specified period. When Russell Fork paid Pattison & Bowns to terminate this contract, the IRS treated the payment as ordinary income. The Tax Court disagreed, holding that the contract was a capital asset and that its disposition constituted a sale or exchange, thus qualifying for capital gains treatment.

Facts

On January 25, 1944, Pattison & Bowns entered into a contract with Russell Fork giving Pattison & Bowns the exclusive right to purchase all the coal mined by Russell Fork for ten years, at a discount. Pattison & Bowns also made a loan of $250,000 to Russell Fork. From January 25, 1944, to October 14, 1949, Pattison & Bowns purchased and resold coal from Russell Fork, earning profits. On October 14, 1949, Russell Fork paid Pattison & Bowns $500,000 to acquire all of Pattison & Bowns' rights under the coal purchase contract. Pittston Company, the parent of Pattison & Bowns, reported this $500,000 as a long-term capital gain on its 1949 consolidated income tax return.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined a deficiency in Pittston's income tax, asserting the $500,000 was ordinary income. Pittston petitioned the United States Tax Court. The Tax Court ruled in favor of Pittston, concluding the $500,000 was capital gain. The case was decided under Rule 50, indicating the court would enter a decision consistent with its opinion, but with the final calculation of the deficiency to be made by the parties.

Issue(s)

Whether the contract between Pattison & Bowns and Russell Fork constituted a "capital asset" under the Internal Revenue Code.

Whether the $500,000 payment received by Pattison & Bowns from Russell Fork was received as a result of a "sale or exchange" of a capital asset.

Holding

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

Yes, the contract constituted a capital asset because it created a valuable contractual right.

Yes, the $500,000 payment was received as a result of a sale or exchange because it represented a transfer of property rights for consideration.

Court’s Reasoning

The court first addressed whether the contract was a capital asset. The court cited section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, defining capital assets as property held by the taxpayer (with exceptions not relevant here). The court rejected the Commissioner’s argument that the contract was extinguished and never matured into a capital asset. The court stated, “The character of an asset is not governed by the disposition subsequently made of it.” The court found that Pattison & Bowns acquired a valuable contractual right under the contract. The court referenced several cases that held contractual rights to be capital assets.

The court then considered whether the $500,000 payment constituted a “sale or exchange.” The court rejected the Commissioner’s assertion that the payment was merely an extinguishment of a right. The court stated that the transaction “may constitute a sale”. The court cited cases where the right was transferred for consideration and continued to exist as property, finding that these situations constituted a “sale or exchange,” even though it resulted in terminating the contract. The Court found that Russell Fork acquired the right to sell coal to whomever they chose, a right they did not previously possess.

Practical Implications

This case is critical for understanding when contractual rights can be considered capital assets for tax purposes. It demonstrates that even contracts that seem to be extinguished can still be classified as a capital asset when they are transferred for valuable consideration, thereby generating capital gains, rather than ordinary income. This case guides how to characterize payments made to terminate contracts. Specifically, if the payment results in a transfer of rights, it’s more likely to be considered a sale or exchange. Lawyers advising clients on transactions involving the sale or termination of contract rights need to consider whether a property right is being transferred or simply extinguished. Furthermore, this case is still cited today for determining the tax treatment of transfers of contract rights.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.