27 T.C. 200 (1956)

Income from a valid, irrevocable trust is not taxable to the grantor, and royalty payments made to the trust by the grantor's business are deductible, provided the royalty rate is reasonable.

Summary

John T. Potter established irrevocable trusts for his family, assigning a patent application to them. Simultaneously, his business entered a non-exclusive licensing agreement with the trusts for the patent. The IRS sought to tax Potter on the trust income and disallow royalty deductions. The Tax Court held the income was not taxable to Potter, as the trusts were valid and the assignment complete. Further, the Court allowed the business to deduct the royalty payments, finding the rate reasonable. The Court also addressed other tax issues including interest deductions for advances to the children and the taxability of interest on government bonds and the failure to file for a declaration of estimated tax.

Facts

John T. Potter (Petitioner) operated the Potter Instrument Company. In 1944, Potter established irrevocable trusts for his wife and two children, assigning his patent application for a counter chronograph to the trusts. The trust instrument was executed February 1, 1944. The trusts entered into a non-exclusive license agreement with Potter's business for the patent, providing for graduated royalty payments. The business also borrowed money from the children, and Potter paid their income taxes and offset accrued interest on the loans. The company transferred US Treasury bonds to the trusts to settle accrued royalties. Potter did not file a declaration of estimated tax for 1946. The IRS determined deficiencies, asserting the trust income should be taxed to Potter, disallowing royalty deductions, and including bond interest in his income and assessing penalties.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Respondent) determined income tax deficiencies against Potter. Potter contested these deficiencies in the U.S. Tax Court. The Tax Court heard the case, examined the facts and the law, and issued its findings of fact and opinion, resolving the issues in favor of the taxpayer on the primary issues.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the income from the Potter Trusts was taxable to Potter under section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, or whether Potter's company was entitled to deduct royalties under section 23(a)(1)(A) of the 1939 Code?

2. Whether Potter was entitled to deduct, as interest, certain payments made on

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

behalf of his children that were offset on their books of account?

3. Whether the interest on certain Government bonds was properly taxable to Potter?

4. Whether the respondent erred in determining additions to tax under section 294(d)(1)(A) and (d)(2) of the 1939 Code for failure to file a declaration of estimated tax?

Holding

1. No, because the trusts were valid, and Potter had validly assigned the patent application to the trusts, and the royalty payments were made at a reasonable rate.

2. Yes, because the payments offset at year end constituted "interest paid" under section 23 (b).

3. No, because ownership of the bonds was transferred to the trusts.

4. Yes, because the failure to file a declaration of estimated tax was not due to reasonable cause.

Court's Reasoning

The Court focused on the validity of the trusts and the nature of the assignment of the patent application. The Court found the assignment was valid under 35 U.S.C. § 47 and that the trusts were irrevocable. The Court distinguished the case from the *Clifford* doctrine, noting the trusts' duration and the grantor's lack of control. Regarding the royalty payments, the Court found the payments were ordinary and necessary business expenses and were not excessive. The court referenced *Limericks, Inc. v. Commissioner* in holding that excessive payments are not deductible. The Court looked at the reasonableness of the royalty rate, finding the negotiated rate was fair at the time of the agreement, given the state of the market. The Court addressed the issue regarding the interest deduction, finding that offsetting the advances constituted payment. Finally, because Potter left the responsibility of filing his taxes to another person, the Court held the additions to tax under section 294 were proper.

Practical Implications

This case is critical for tax planning involving family trusts. It demonstrates that when properly structured, trusts can shift income from the grantor to the beneficiaries. However, the royalty payments must be reasonable; otherwise, they will be disallowed. As the Court stated in *Limericks, Inc. v. Commissioner*, "rentals or other payments for the use of property which are excessive in amount, taking into consideration all the facts of the particular case, do not constitute ordinary and necessary business expenses." The case stresses the importance of independent

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

trustees and the lack of grantor control over trust assets. Later cases will look to the substance of transactions, and whether they are a true transfer of economic benefits or a sham transaction designed for tax avoidance.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.